

of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5941) for the relief of Julian A. Erskine.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 793) to promote the conservation of the Nation's wildlife resources on the Pacific flyway in the Tule Lake, Lower Klamath, Upper Klamath, and Clear Lake National Wildlife Refuges in Oregon and California and to aid in the administration of the Klamath reclamation project.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, August 18, 1964, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 16. An act to provide for the establishment of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways in the State of Missouri, and for other purposes;

S. 51. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to relinquish to the State of Wyoming jurisdiction over those lands within the Medicine Bow National Forest known as the Pole Mountain District;

S. 502. An act to preserve the jurisdiction of the Congress over construction of hydroelectric projects on the Colorado River below Glen Canyon Dam;

S. 1046. An act to provide hospital, domiciliary, and medical care for non-service-connected disabilities to recipients of the Medal of Honor;

S. 2419. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to condemn certain property in the city of St. Augustine, Fla., within the boundary of the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 162. Joint resolution extending recognition to the International Exposition for Southern California in the year 1968 and authorizing the President to issue a proclamation calling upon the several States of the Union and foreign countries to take part in the exposition.

HEARINGS BY SUBCOMMITTEE ON REFUGEES POSTPONED

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I wish to announce that hearings by the Judiciary Subcommittee on Refugees, scheduled for August 19 and 20, have been postponed. The subcommittee was to have heard officials in the Department of State on refugee movements and problems attributed to Communist regimes and activities in Asia. It is the subcommittee's intention to reschedule the hearings.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Wednesday, August 19, 1964, at 10 o'clock a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, AUGUST 18, 1964

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Colossians 4: 5: Walk in wisdom toward them that are without, redeeming the time.

Lord God, Almighty, may we daily bear kinship to the lowly man of Galilee who went about doing good, and inspired His followers to give their strength to the weak, their sympathy to the sorrowing, their substance to the poor, and their heart to God.

Grant that we may appropriate by faith the overtures of His friendship and accept the challenge to make a more daring trial of His moral and spiritual principles as we live and labor to build a nobler civilization.

May the Members of this legislative body feel the urge to come to the high vocation of public service, which Thou has entrusted to them, richly endowed with clear judgment and wise decision.

We beseech Thee to bless them with a calm and courageous spirit as they face many national and international problems which still defy any satisfactory solution.

In Christ's name we bring our needs and desires. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1342. An act to require passenger-carrying motor vehicles purchased for use by the Federal Government to meet certain passenger safety standards;

H.R. 4766. An act for the relief of the Boren Clay Products Co.;

H.R. 6578. An act for the relief of Mrs. Celsira Doddy; and

H.R. 7132. An act for the relief of Wetsel-Oviatt Lumber Co., Inc., Omo Ranch, El Dorado County, Calif.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 9361. An act for the relief of Kathryn Chol Ast.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 437. An act for the relief of Wilhelm Konyen, his wife Susanne Fritsch Konyen, and their children, Susanne Konyen and Willy Konyen; and

S. 486. An act to amend certain criminal laws applicable to the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the

House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1664. An act to provide for continuous improvement of the administrative procedure of Federal agencies by creating an Administrative Conference of the United States, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1794) entitled "An act to authorize the acquisition of and the payment for a flowage easement and rights-of-way over lands within the Allegheny Indian Reservation in New York, required by the United States for the Allegheny River—Kinzua Dam—project, to provide for the relocation, rehabilitation, social and economic development of the members of the Seneca Nation, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11134) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the President pro tempore, pursuant to House Joint Resolution 825, had appointed Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. COOPER as members on the part of the Senate to the Committee on Arrangements for the Abraham Lincoln Second Inaugural Address.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1965

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement obtained yesterday, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1160) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1965, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That clause (c) of section 102 of the joint resolution of June 29, 1964 (Public Law 88-325), is hereby amended by striking out "August 31, 1964" and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1964".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, the House will recall that last June—June 25—we passed a continuing resolution, covering July and August, in view of the fact that all of the appropriation bills could not be enacted into law by the beginning of the new fiscal year 1965 on July 1. The

House passed all of the regular appropriation bills by the first of the new fiscal year, but because of extended preoccupation with another matter the other body had not passed them. Since that time much progress has been made, but four of those bills have not been finally disposed of. This resolution simply continues the availability of funds under certain conditions for the agencies and programs through the month of September. I have conferred with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] about it. I know of no objection to this joint resolution.

Mr. JENSEN. I concur, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If I recall correctly, last year in these continuing resolutions we extended them to the end of the calendar year. Would the gentleman think that this year continuing through the month of September would be sufficient and that Congress might be adjourned by the 1st of October?

Mr. MAHON. I hope, and I believe, that the continuance through the entire month of September is unnecessary because I certainly hope, and believe, we will conclude the business before the end of September. As a matter of precaution, the 1 month was thought to be desirable. I join in the hope we will be through before October arrives.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman joins in the hope we will not be here all this year?

Mr. MAHON. I join in the fervent hope that we will not be here that long.

The resolution is in the usual form adopted by the House virtually every year under similar circumstances. In every respect and in all particulars, the present resolution, Public Law 88-325, merely continues for another month beyond August 31. Thus it continues to accommodate the public necessities on only a minimum, interim basis where the regular bills have not finally cleared. And in this connection, may I also repeat that these continuing resolutions are in the nature of advances on the regular appropriations. All expenditures made under the resolutions are charged against whatever is finally made available for the pertinent activity in the regular bill. So there is no enlargement.

As I pointed out here on the floor on July 1, the House this year passed all the regular bills by the first day of the new fiscal year 1965.

The House moved with dispatch. Not in 4 years have all the bills been cleared to the other body as early as the first day of the new fiscal year.

In all the bills of the session, the House made total reductions of about \$3,675,000,000 below the budget requests. And significantly, on a fiscal year basis—1965 compared to fiscal 1964—the House bills totaled about \$1,209,000,000 less than the previous year.

As of the moment, 10 of the regular 1965 bills have passed the other body, 8 of those have gone to the President; we have conferred on 1 of the other 2—military construction—and have a conference scheduled this afternoon on the Agriculture bill. Of the regular annual bills, only the Labor-HEW bill and the foreign aid bill are still in the other

body; the Labor-HEW bill has been reported from committee—and may yet pass today.

We are ready to report the usual closing supplemental bill to the House. Rare is the session when there are no last minute essentials to be taken care of; I do not recall any recent session when there was not such a bill.

In summary, then, Mr. Speaker, we have five bills yet to be finally cleared: two are in conference; one at the moment is on the Senate floor; one is in Senate committee; and one is in the House committee, ready to report. I believe the Senate committee is also in an advanced position and can probably move expeditiously.

As to the eight regular bills for fiscal 1965 sent to the President, may I just say that, in round figures, they total \$73,800,000,000 in appropriations. They aggregate about \$1,700,000,000 below the budget requests considered in connection with them. And according to the tentative figures, they approximate \$1,268,000,000 below the corresponding appropriations of the prior year.

It is too early to say with certainty just what the results will be on the five bills still in process but I would hazard the guess that when they are finalized, they will, in conjunction with results on the other eight bills, be pretty close to the previous year's total—perhaps slightly over. There is no doubt about being well under the budget requests.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the resolution.

I include the supporting figures in more detail:

The appropriation bills, 88th Cong., 2d sess., as of Aug. 18, 1964

[Does not include back-door appropriations or permanent appropriations under previous legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriation bills.]

Title and bill number	Prior year appropriations	House				
		Budget estimates to House	Amount as passed	House action compared with—		
				Prior year appropriations	Budget estimates	Amount reported
1964 DEFICIENCIES						
Department of HEW (H.J. Res. 875):						
Original resolution, 88th, 1st 1		\$41,886,000	\$41,886,000			
Subsequent consideration, 88th, 2d 2		\$247,802,000	\$247,802,000			
Total, H.J. Res. 875		289,688,000	289,688,000			
Department of Labor (H.J. Res. 962)		\$42,000,000	42,000,000			
Disaster relief (H.J. Res. 976)		\$50,000,000	50,000,000			
Deficiency, 1964 (H.R. 11201)		1,307,380,789	1,264,913,689		+\$42,467,100	
Total, 1964 deficiencies		1,689,068,789	1,646,601,689		+\$42,467,100	
1965 APPROPRIATION BILLS						
District of Columbia (H.R. 10199)	(\$313,469,518)	(357,702,300)	(338,205,200)	(+\$24,735,682)	(-19,497,100)	
Federal payment, 1965 regular	40,368,000	53,220,000	40,720,000	+352,000	-12,500,000	
Loan authorization	(19,300,000)	(14,400,000)	(26,400,000)	(+7,100,000)	(+12,000,000)	
Interior (H.R. 10433)		1,035,678,000	1,009,175,600		-26,502,400	
1965 regular appropriations	1,011,029,500	998,903,000	976,475,600	-34,553,900	-22,427,400	
Loan authorization	(6,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(14,000,000)	(+8,000,000)	(-6,000,000)	
1964 supplementals		36,775,000	32,700,000		-4,075,000	
Treasury-Post Office (H.R. 10532):						
1965 regular appropriations	6,055,766,000	6,271,991,000	6,225,420,000	+169,654,000	-46,571,000	
1964 supplementals (by transfer)		(1,675,000)	(1,100,000)		(-575,000)	
Legislative (H.R. 10723)		222,587,355	173,626,640		-48,960,715	
1965 regular appropriations	\$217,304,244	\$222,375,655	\$173,446,640	\$-43,857,604	\$-48,929,015	-\$290,270
1964 supplementals		211,700	180,000		-31,700	-\$290,270
Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare (H.R. 10809)		7,561,968,000	6,908,063,000		-653,905,000	
1965 regular appropriations	5,795,436,500	7,104,782,000	6,908,063,000	+1,112,626,500	-196,719,000	
1964 supplementals		457,186,000			-457,186,000	
Defense (H.R. 10639):						
1965 regular appropriations	48,223,210,000	47,471,000,000	46,750,267,000	-1,463,943,000	-711,733,000	
1964 supplementals (by transfer)		(6,000,000)	(6,000,000)			
State, Justice, Judiciary (H.R. 11134)		1,957,764,700	1,702,627,800		-255,136,900	
1965 regular appropriations	1,840,233,900	1,915,089,700	1,702,177,800	-138,056,100	-212,911,900	
1964 supplementals		42,675,000	450,000		-42,225,000	

See footnotes at end of table.

The appropriation bills, 88th Cong., 2d sess., as of Aug. 18, 1964—Continued

[Does not include back-door appropriations or permanent appropriations¹ under previous legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriation bills.]

Title and bill number	Prior year appropriations	House				
		Budget estimates to House	Amount as passed	House action compared with—		
				Prior year appropriations	Budget estimates	Amount reported
1965 APPROPRIATION BILLS—continued						
Agriculture (H. R. 11202)		5,588,922,600	5,182,665,000		—406,257,600	
1965 regular appropriations	6,246,297,215	5,582,259,600	5,182,665,000	—1,063,632,215	—399,594,600	
Loan authorization	(855,000,000)	(753,000,000)	(795,000,000)	(—60,000,000)	(+42,000,000)	
1964 supplementals		6,663,000			—6,663,000	
Independent offices (H. R. 11296)		14,244,653,400	8,118,965,500		\$ —6,125,687,900	\$ —5,200,000,000
1965 regular appropriations	13,275,913,050	14,099,653,400	8,118,965,500	\$ —5,156,947,550	\$ —5,980,687,900	\$ —5,200,000,000
1964 supplementals		145,000,000			—145,000,000	
Military construction (H. R. 11369): 1965 regular appropriations	1,585,880,000	1,879,000,000	1,599,014,500	+13,134,500	—279,985,500	
Public works (H. R. 11579): 1965 regular appropriations	4,407,240,700	4,372,449,000	4,325,969,200	—81,271,500	—46,479,800	
Foreign assistance (H. R. 11812): 1965 regular appropriations	3,264,023,137	3,958,377,000	3,739,249,400	+475,226,263	—219,127,600	
Total, 1965 regular	91,962,702,246	93,929,100,355	85,751,433,640	—6,211,268,606	—8,177,666,715	—5,200,290,270
1964 supplementals (included in 1965 bills)		688,510,700	33,330,000		—655,180,700	
Total, all appropriations		96,306,679,844	87,431,365,329		—8,875,314,515	—5,200,290,270
Total, loan authorizations	(880,300,000)	(787,400,000)	(835,400,000)	(—44,900,000)	(+48,000,000)	

Title and bill number	Prior year appropriations	Senate					Final appropriation		
		Budget estimates to Senate	Amount as passed	Senate action compared with—			Amount as approved	Final action compared with—	
				Prior year appropriations	Budget estimates	House action		Prior year	Budget estimates
1964 DEFICIENCIES									
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (H.J. Res. 875):									
Original resolution, 88th, 1st		\$41,886,000	\$258,090,000		+\$216,204,000	+\$216,204,000			-\$41,886,000
Subsequent consideration, 88th, 2d		\$247,802,000	\$31,598,000		-216,204,000	-216,204,000	\$289,688,000		+\$41,886,000
Total, H.J. Res. 875		289,688,000	289,688,000				289,688,000		
Department of Labor (H.J. Res. 962)		42,000,000	42,000,000				42,000,000		
Disaster relief (H.J. Res. 976)		50,000,000	50,000,000				50,000,000		
Deficiency, 1964 (H.R. 11201)		1,436,177,743	1,349,637,143		-86,540,600	+\$4,723,454	1,336,687,143		-99,490,600
Total, 1964 deficiencies		1,817,865,743	1,731,325,143		-86,540,600	+\$4,723,454	1,718,375,143		-99,490,600
1965 APPROPRIATION BILLS									
District of Columbia (H.R. 10199)	(\$313,469,518)	(357,862,300)	(342,181,975)	(+\$28,712,457)	(-15,680,325)	(+\$3,976,775)	(341,242,200)	(+\$27,772,682)	(-16,620,100)
Federal payment, 1965 regular	40,368,000	53,220,000	44,220,000	+3,852,000	-9,000,000	+3,500,000	40,720,000	+352,000	-12,500,000
Loan authorization	(19,300,000)	(14,400,000)	(26,400,000)	(+7,100,000)	(+12,000,000)		(26,400,000)	(+7,100,000)	(+12,000,000)
Interior (H.R. 10433)		1,035,961,000	1,029,226,400		-6,734,600	+20,050,800	1,023,277,200		-7,863,800
1965 regular appropriations	1,011,029,500	998,903,000	993,554,400	-17,475,100	-5,348,600	+17,078,800	994,069,200	-16,960,300	-4,833,800
Loan authorization	(6,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(14,000,000)	(+8,000,000)	(-6,000,000)		(14,000,000)	(+8,000,000)	(-6,000,000)
1964 supplementals		37,058,000	35,672,000		-1,386,000	+2,972,000	34,208,000		-2,850,000
Treasury-Post Office (H.R. 10532):									
1965 regular appropriations	6,055,766,000	6,268,691,000	6,240,423,000	+184,657,000	-28,268,000	+15,003,000	6,233,273,000	+177,507,000	-35,418,000
1964 supplementals (by transfer)		(1,675,000)	(1,100,000)		(-575,000)		(1,100,000)		(-575,000)
Legislative (H.R. 10723)		255,999,745	210,380,685		-45,619,060	+36,754,045	210,300,885		-45,698,860
1965 regular appropriations	\$217,304,244	\$255,788,045	\$210,231,685	\$-7,072,559	\$-45,556,360	\$+36,785,045	210,300,885	-7,003,359	-45,487,160
1964 supplementals		211,700	149,000		-62,700	-31,000			-211,700
Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare (H.R. 10809):									
1965 regular appropriations	5,795,436,500								
1964 supplementals									
Defense (H.R. 10939):									
1965 regular appropriations	48,223,210,000	47,471,000,000	46,774,401,000	-1,448,809,000	-696,599,000	+15,134,000	46,752,051,000	-1,471,159,000	-718,949,000
1964 supplementals (by transfer)		(6,000,000)	(6,000,000)				(6,000,000)		
State, Justice, Judiciary (H.R. 11134)		1,999,164,700	1,730,855,700		-268,309,000	+28,227,900	1,717,157,800		-282,006,900
1965 regular appropriations	1,840,233,900	1,915,089,700	1,700,405,700	-139,828,200	-214,684,000	-1,772,100	1,686,707,800	-153,526,100	-228,381,900
1964 supplementals		84,075,000	30,450,000		-53,625,000	+30,000,000	30,450,000		-53,625,000
Agriculture (H.R. 11202)		5,583,625,600	5,338,672,525		-244,953,075	+156,007,525			
1965 regular appropriations	6,246,297,215	5,566,962,600	5,323,872,525	-922,424,690	-243,090,075	+141,207,525			
Loan authorization	(855,000,000)	(753,000,000)	(795,000,000)	(-60,000,000)	(+42,000,000)				
1964 supplementals		16,663,000	14,800,000		-1,863,000	+14,800,000			

See footnotes at end of table.

The appropriation bills, 88th Cong., 2d sess., as of Aug. 18, 1964—Continued

[Does not include back-door appropriations or permanent appropriations¹ under previous legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriation bill.]

Title and bill number	Prior year appropriations	Senate					Final appropriation		
		Budget estimates to Senate	Amount as passed	Senate action compared with—			Amount as approved	Final action compared with—	
				Prior year appropriations	Budget estimates	House action		Prior year	Budget estimates
1965 APPROPRIATION BILLS—continued									
Independent offices (H.R. 11296)									
1965 regular appropriations	13,275,913,050	14,249,653,400	13,613,224,000		—636,429,400	*+5,494,258,500	13,454,859,000		—794,794,400
1964 supplementals		14,104,653,400	13,613,224,000	+337,310,950	—491,429,400	+5,494,258,500	13,454,859,000	+178,945,950	—649,794,400
Military construction (H.R. 11369): 1965 regular appropriations	1,585,880,000	145,000,000			—145,000,000				—145,000,000
Public works (H.R. 11579): 1965 regular appropriations	1,585,880,000	1,879,000,000	1,582,969,000	—2,911,000	—296,031,000	—16,045,500			
Foreign assistance (H.R. 11812): 1965 regular appropriations	4,407,240,700	4,440,749,000	4,443,283,200	+36,042,500	+2,534,200	+117,314,000	4,430,794,700	+23,554,000	—9,954,300
	3,264,023,137								
Total, 1965 regular	91,962,702,246	82,954,056,745	80,926,584,510	—1,976,658,099	—2,027,472,235	+5,822,463,270	73,802,775,585	—1,268,289,809	—1,705,318,560
1964 supplementals (included in 1965 bills)		283,007,700	81,071,000		—201,936,700	+47,741,000	64,658,000		—201,686,700
Total, all appropriations		85,054,930,188	82,738,980,653		—2,315,949,535	+5,954,927,724	75,585,808,728		—2,006,495,860
Total, loan authorizations	(880,300,000)	(787,400,000)	(835,400,000)	(—44,900,000)	(+48,000,000)		(+40,400,000)	(+15,100,000)	(+6,000,000)

¹ This resolution passed both Houses in 88th Cong., 1st sess. House bill included \$41,886,000 for activities to combat mental retardation; Senate bill added \$216,204,000 for "Payments to school districts." Resolution not finally adopted in 1st sess.

² Action renewed in 88th Cong., 2d sess.

³ Estimates submitted to Congress in H. Doc. No. 203, dated Jan. 21, 1964, considered as follows: "Payments to school districts," \$216,204,000 (previously added by Senate); "Defense educational activities," \$31,168,000; "Compliance activities, Mexican farm labor program," \$430,000.

⁴ Resolution not actually reported by Appropriations Committees for House or Senate consideration. Figures shown for balancing purposes. Amounts shown as reported and passed by Senate include \$31,168,000 for "Defense educational activities"; and \$430,000 for "Compliance activities, Mexican farm labor program."

⁵ Resolutions not reported by Appropriations Committees. Considered and passed in House and Senate without committee action. Figures shown for balancing purposes.

⁶ Includes Senate items.

⁷ Excludes Senate items.

⁸ Amount of \$5,200,000 reported for National Aeronautics and Space Administration eliminated on point of order by House due to lack of legislative authorization.

⁹ Final amount appropriated includes \$41,886,000 for activities to combat mental retardation; \$216,204,000 for "Payments to school districts"; \$31,168,000 for "Defense educational activities"; and \$430,000 for "Compliance activities, Mexican farm labor program."

NOTE.—Totals reflect amounts approved and comparisons at latest stage of congressional action on each bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain material in connection with the continuing resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1965

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H.R. 11202, the agricultural appropriation bill for 1965, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WHITTEN, NATCHER, MAHON, HORAN, and MICHEL.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill H.R. 11202, the agricultural appropriation bill for 1965.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 235]

Adair	Hébert	Pilcher
Albert	Hoeven	Pirnie
Alger	Hoffman	Powell
Avery	Jones, Ala.	Rains
Baring	Jones, Mo.	Roosevelt
Barry	Kee	Ryan, Mich.
Bolton,	Kluczynski	St. George
Frances P.	Kyl	Sheppard
Buckley	Landrum	Shipley
Daddario	Lankford	Smith, Calif.
Dawson	Lesinski	Thompson, La.
Diggs	McClory	Toll
Dingell	McDowell	Tollefson
Ellsworth	Macdonald	Wallhauser
Gibbons	Miller, Calif.	Whalley
Gill	Miller, N.Y.	Widnall
Gray	Morse	Winstead
Harvey, Mich.	Patman	Wyman
Healey	Pepper	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 377 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

APPOINTMENT OF A COMMISSIONER GENERAL FOR U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THE CANADIAN UNIVERSAL AND INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill S. 2905.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill was called up yesterday and was passed over without prejudice on the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford].

Although it was passed out of the subcommittee unanimously in its original form with an amendment and by the full Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Florida is now prepared to offer an amendment which in effect would set the salary of the Ambassador at \$22,500, which would leave him with the title of Ambassador but not the salary. Is that correct?

Mr. FASCELL. The gentleman from Ohio is correct.

Mr. HAYS. This, in my opinion, might have the effect of forcing the President to find some fellow who can afford this job even though he would not be

qualified for it, and would preclude some career person from taking it because he could not afford to have a job at this salary.

It seems a little strange to me when we passed the salary bill and raised all of the Ambassadors around the world that this one would be picked out and that his salary would be set, although he has the rank of Ambassador, even below a class 4 post. If the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] is available, may I ask what is his reason behind this?

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Do I understand correctly that the bill that was before us yesterday provided for a salary of \$28,500?

Mr. HAYS. For a class 2 post which, under the new salary schedule, would be that figure.

Mr. CONTE. Twenty-eight thousand five hundred dollars, and this sets the salary at \$22,500?

Mr. HAYS. Yes.

Mr. CONTE. That now satisfies the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HAYS. I hope we have not established a precedent around here that every bill reported out of the Committee on Foreign Affairs unanimously has to satisfy the gentleman from Michigan. Normally under these circumstances I would object, but in this case I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for United States participation in the Canadian Universal and International Exhibition to be held at Montreal, Canada, in 1967, as authorized by the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, as amended (22 U.S.C. 2451 et seq.), the President is hereby authorized to appoint or designate a Commissioner General, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and to appoint or designate not to exceed two other principal representatives, who shall receive compensation, allowances, and benefits as determined by the President but not in excess of that received by a chief of mission at a class 2 post, pursuant to the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 801): Provided, That no officer of the United States Government who is designated under this Act as Commissioner General or as a principal representative shall be entitled to such compensation.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FASCELL

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FASCELL: Page 1, line 9, after the word "Senate", strike out the comma, the remainder of the line and line 10 down to and including the word "representatives", and on page 2 strike out all on line 1 and on line 2 through the word "that" and insert in lieu thereof "receive annual compensation not in excess of \$22,500 and allowances and benefits as determined by the President but not in excess of those".

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill H.R. 11707 was laid on the table.

ANOTHER SCORE IN THE POLLUTION BATTLE

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on July 15, 1964, the Bureau of the Budget issued a revised Circular No. A-11 pertaining to the preparation and submission of annual budget estimates. The new circular directs all executive departments and establishments of the Federal Government, when making estimates for the design and construction of Federal facilities and buildings, to include estimates for the installation of air and water pollution control and treatment systems in accordance with instructions issued by the Public Health Service.

This new directive will insure that all Federal facilities and buildings hereafter designed and constructed will include adequate systems for the control and treatment of discharges resulting in either air or water pollution.

This new requirement is a significant step forward in the control of the waste discharges of Federal facilities and its initiation directly results from the activities of the House Government Operations Subcommittee on Natural Resources and Power, headed by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Jones]. Through the extended hearings held by this subcommittee, attention has been focused on the excessive and objectionable discharge of waste from Federal facilities and as a result of this attention, the directive in question has been issued.

We can be proud of the work of this committee and the results which are being accomplished from its activities. This is one more forward step in the long battle against the increasing water pollution which is the bane of our modern industrial system.

BASIC ELEMENTS OF A TRUE LITURGY

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I do not know who compiled, selected, arranged and edited the content of the book on congressional addresses and tributes to President Kennedy, but I would like to say to them and indeed to all who participated in any way, including the chairman and members of the

House committee that authorized its publication, that the finished product is a credit to the Congress in form as well as in concept and substance. Too much commendation cannot be given to all who contributed to a sacred job of love magnificently executed.

I am extending my remarks to include the comments on the book of one of my constituents to whom I had mailed one of the volumes allotted to me. The writer is Dr. Jacob J. Weinstein, rabbi of K.A.M. Temple in Chicago, well known in official Washington as a member of national commissions serving three Presidents of the United States.

Rabbi Weinstein writes:

As I glimpse through its pages I find not only the outpouring of the grief of a whole nation but I find the basic elements of a true liturgy.

Everything that is fine and decent in the Nation and everything enduring in the spiritual hunger of man is found here.

To how few is it given to have written in 3 short years the central commitments of his life on the tablet of a nation's heart. A majestic spirit moved through our Nation and those of us who were touched even by the slightest flutter of his wing must feel forever privileged.

L.B.J.—NO POVERTY HERE

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, while President Johnson's heart bleeds for the 35 million poverty-stricken citizens of the United States, his "party of the people," last Saturday, was happily partying with the millionaires—not in Appalachia, but in that depressed area known as Southampton, Long Island.

With the anguished criticisms of the Democrats over the millionaires in the Eisenhower Cabinet still fresh in my memory, I was somewhat surprised to receive this invitation:

Miss Charlotte Ford, Mr. Paul Newman, and the Young Citizens for Johnson in New York, Victor Anfuso, Jr., chairman, request the pleasure of your company at an L.B.J. barbecue in honor of Miss Lynda Bird Johnson at the home of Mrs. Henry Ford II.

August 16th, 1964.

Time: 5 o'clock p.m.

Dress: informal.

The New York Times, on August 17, carried a report on the frugal menu and other attractions:

SOME 1,900 DEMOCRATS FIND TEXAS ON LONG ISLAND: LYNDIA BIRD JOHNSON ATTENDS BARBECUE ON FORD ESTATE

(By McCandlish Phillips)

WATER MILL, L.I., August 16.—Fordness, the magnificent oceanfront estate of Mrs. Anne McDowell Ford a bit east of Southampton, tried to simulate a plain old Texas ranch tonight, and did it as persuasively as a crown princess passing herself off as a cowpoke's gal.

A red and white checked tablecloth can do little to disguise the essential gentility of the 22-room white brick Ford home with its slate-shingle second story and grounds reaching down to the sea. Guitar-snapping,

twangy-voiced hillbilly singers seemed like spillovers in a boudoir.

Never before had the estate been opened to any but small private parties, but late this afternoon the two white wood gates on the entrance road were flung wide and nearly 2,000 persons drove in for the newest wrinkle in political fundraising—"an L.B.J. barbecue in honor of Miss Lynda Bird Johnson," the 20-year-old daughter of the President.

The guests were preceded onto the grounds on Wickapogue Road by a stout gentleman in a string bolo tie, pointed leather shoes, and a cowboy shirt. He was Walter Jetton, of Fort Worth, Tex., a thrower of commercial barbecues who has served spare-ribs on the President's Texas ranch.

"A BIG FEED," TEXAS STYLE

It is doubtful that this area of superb and moneyed elegance has seen anything comparable to Mr. Jetton's approach to putting on what he called "a ree-al big feed." This is clearly filet mignon country.

Mr. Jetton came in with three refrigerator trucks and a staff of 15 who dished great helpings of baked beans, potato salad, baking-powder biscuits and other staples of the chuck wagon onto plastic plates. He put out tub-size copper kettles and boiled hundreds of ears of corn on the cob, which were dipped into butter and served.

Sturdy women took frozen apple turnovers out of the trucks in wooden trays, boiled them in deep fat and served up 4,000 "hot fried pies."

By an inexplicable rule of English usage, mansions of whatever size on the ocean here are called "cottages." The Ford cottage has 12 rooms for servants and an 11-car garage. Four high white columns at its front entrance lead into a marble foyer and then to a gold and ivory living room with French appointments and twin fireplaces at either end.

Guests were received in front of the house and then led through the center of the cottage (velvet ropes kept them from straying upstairs or to other side) to a rear veranda overlooking a formal lawn with Grecian urns at the far edge.

They passed through a canvas archway to a big red and white striped tent with 60 tables seating 8 persons each. Later, 2 dozen much larger tables had to be set up beside the tent. Scores also sat on the lawn with plastic platters and coffee in the cups.

To the left of the lawn is a stone-terraced, blue-tiled swimming pool with clay vases and 25 pieces of furniture surrounding it. Behind it, stretching 300 feet to a marsh, is a bird-filled pine forest with a carpetlike lawn and sculptured shrubs.

On this cool evening a soft breeze brushed through the high reeds in the marsh. The rose-streaked sky went slowly dark and a half moon came up behind the white silk of a vague mist. The party ended at 9:30 p.m.

Portable barbecue pits had been set up and 400 pounds of pork ribs were cooked in slabs. There also were 700 pounds of barbecued briskets and 200 large frying chickens. The party started at 5 p.m. By 7:30 there wasn't a rib left, or a chicken wing.

Mrs. Esther Coopersmith, national coordinator of barbecues for the Johnson campaign, expected 500 to 600 guests. "My hobby is raising money," Mrs. Coopersmith said.

The 1,900 guests paid \$15 each or \$25 a couple, and the gross receipts ran around \$22,000. Beer, but no liquor, was served. The barbecue was one of a series sponsored by Young Democrats.

Miss Charlotte Ford, 22-year-old daughter of Henry Ford II, the automobile maker, was hostess and Paul Newman, the actor, host.

The President's two daughters, Luci Baines Johnson, 17, and her older sister, Lynda Bird, are doing the political barbecue circuit.

Luci has already appeared at three, but this was Lynda's first.

Miss Johnson, an attractive college sophomore who exudes a quiet charm and ease, wore a sleeveless purple-pink buttoned linen dress with a belted front, a single strand pearl necklace and a small gold cross. She made a brief speech in the tent and then circulated among the guests, who included Mr. and Mrs. John Steinbeck and Huntington Hartford, who said it was the pleasantest political affair that he had ever attended.

Four years ago, Mrs. Ford, who was divorced from her husband in February, was listed as a member of volunteers for Nixon in Southampton, but Miss Ford said tonight that the whole family was for Mr. Johnson. Mr. Ford had already announced that preference.

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this 1 minute because a number of my colleagues have asked me to give them an answer on the recent progress of the balance of payments for the second quarter. I am placing my remarks on this in the body of the RECORD today.

It is indeed an alarming situation, as I tried to point out during debate on foreign aid about 3 weeks ago. I think it is unfortunate that the administration, which had the knowledge that this picture was going to be very bad, did not forthrightly come forth and explain this to the House and to the Congress so that we could have evaluated this in some of the important legislation we had to consider. This is a serious picture. We have not improved our basic balance of payments. This hand-to-mouth operation this administration has been undergoing for the last 4 years fails to attack the basic problem and in failing to do that has made the situation much worse.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

DR. AND MRS. ABEL GORFAIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2706) for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Abel Gorfain.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

CHARLES WAVERLY WATSON, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2728) for the relief of Charles Waverly Watson, Jr.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

JOHN F. MACPHAIL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5145) for the relief of John F. MacPhail, lieutenant, U.S. Navy.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ESTATE OF J. W. GWIN, SR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2747) for the relief of the estate of J. W. Gwin, Sr.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CWO ELDEN R. COMER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6136) for the relief of CWO Elden R. Comer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Elden R. Comer, Route 3, Box 22, Orland, California, the sum of \$1,680.62 in full settlement of the claim of the said Elden R. Comer against the United States. A claim was timely executed by the claimant under date of March 28, 1955, as prepared by the Navy Finance Center, Cleveland, Ohio, but there is no record of any Government action thereon. A subsequent claim was filed October 18, 1962, and payment was made for all amounts not barred by the statute of limitations. The above referred principal amount is for the balance of retired pay owing for the barred period August 1946 to October 1952. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HELEN J. GOOGINS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6839) for the relief of Helen J. Googins.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH], one of the members of the Committee of Objectors on the Private Calendar, who is unavoidably absent today, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

JONG WAN LEE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6479) for the relief of Jong Wan Lee.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH], one of the members of the Committee of Objectors on the Private Calendar, who is unavoidably absent today, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CONNECTICUT BEVERAGE CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5759) for the relief of Connecticut Beverage Co., Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Connecticut Beverage Company, Incorporated, of Norwich, Connecticut, the sum of \$20,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Connecticut Beverage Company, Incorporated, against the United States for an amount equal to the amount of tax imposed by section 5001 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and paid on distilled spirits owned by the Connecticut Beverage Company, Incorporated, which was damaged by the flood of March 6, 1963, in Norwich, Connecticut, and condemned by the Consumer Protection Department of Connecticut. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6: Strike "\$20,000" and insert "\$9,527.52".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BENJAMIN A. RAMELB

The Clerk called the bill (S. 353) for the relief of Benjamin A. Ramelb.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH], one of the members of the Committee of Objectors on the Private Calendar, who is unavoidably absent today, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

JOHN J. FEENEY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2288) for the relief of John J. Feeney.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John J. Feeney, of Watertown, Massachusetts, the sum of \$528, in full satisfaction of all his claims against the United States for reimbursement of payments made by him in satisfying a judgment entered against him on December 13, 1962, in the United States District Court, District of Massachusetts (civil action numbered 62-182-S), arising out of an accident involving an automobile owned by the United States and driven by the said John J. Feeney while acting within the scope of his employment as an employee of the Agricultural Research Service, United States Department of Agriculture, the United States not having been a party to said action: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES MAROWITZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1219) for the relief of Charles Marowitz.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MIKE MIZOKAMI, ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3642) for the relief of Mike Mizokami, Sam Mizokami, Tom Mizokami, and Hatsuyo Mizokami.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mike Mizokami, Sam Mizokami, Tom Mizokami, and Hatsuyo Mizokami, jointly, doing business as Mizokami Brothers Produce, of Blanca, Colorado, the sum of \$293,476. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said individuals against the United States for losses and damages sustained by them as the result of the institution of proceedings by the United States for the seizure of a shipment of spinach because of an erroneous determination by the Food and Drug Administration that such spinach was adulterated, when in fact it was not. Suit upon this claim may not be instituted under the tort claims procedure as provided in title 28, United States Code: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any

contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert: "That jurisdiction is hereby conferred on the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of Mike Mizokami, Sam Mizokami, Tom Mizokami, and Hatsuyo Mizokami, jointly, doing business as Mizokami Brothers Produce, of Blanca, Colorado, based upon damages and losses allegedly sustained as the result of erroneous determinations by the Food and Drug Administration in 1962 that spinach grown by the said Mike Mizokami, Sam Mizokami, Tom Mizokami, and Hatsuyo Mizokami, jointly, doing business as Mizokami Brothers Produce, of Blanca, Colorado, was contaminated by the pesticide heptachlor. Suit upon such claims may be instituted any time within one year of the date of approval of this Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT O. OVERTON, ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4082) for the relief of Robert O. Overton, Marjorie C. Overton, and Sally Eitel.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, (1) to Robert O. Overton, the sum of \$1,500; (2) to Marjorie C. Overton, the sum of \$5,000; and (3) to Sally Eitel, the sum of \$10,000, in full satisfaction of their claims against the United States arising out of an incident occurring on December 25, 1946, in Indianapolis, Indiana, involving a vehicle of the Army Air Corps for which suit may not be instituted under the tort claims procedure as provided in title 28, United States Code: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act for the payment of any one claim in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MARIE ROSE COLANDRO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4967) for the relief of Mrs. Marie Rose Colandro.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That sections 15 through 20, inclusive, of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act are hereby

waived with respect to the claim of Mrs. Marie Rose Colandro, of West Pittston, Pennsylvania, against the United States for benefits for herself and her children by reason of the Act of July 15, 1939 (5 U.S.C. 797, 797a), arising out of the death of her husband, Captain Anthony C. Colandro (serial number XXXXXXXX, Veterans' Administration claim numbered XC-6-357-043) while on active duty in the United States Air Force on December 22, 1949. Such claim shall be acted upon under the remaining provisions of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act without regard to section 416(b) of title 38, United States Code, if she files claim for such benefits with the Secretary of Labor within the six-month period which begins on the date of enactment of this Act, and makes the election required by section 7(a) of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, after "Act" insert "(5 U.S.C. 765-770)".

Page 1, line 11, strike "while on active duty".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT L. YATES AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5079) for the relief of Robert L. Yates and others.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the employees or former employees of the Department of Defense in the Messenger Service Branch, Brookley Air Force Base, Alabama, named in this section are respectively relieved of liability to the United States for certain overpayments of salary made to them as a result of administrative error during the period from May 29, 1960, through December 2, 1961. The net amounts of such overpayments (exclusive of payroll deductions for civil service retirement and Government service life insurance) were as follows:

Robert L. Yates, \$675.07;
Edward E. Skidmore, \$796.86;
Preston L. Simmons, \$676.75;
Sidney Sawyer, \$675.07;
Joe Davis, Junior, \$764.83;
Eugene C. Fortune, Junior, \$677.45;
Ludy Anderson, \$678.77;
James F. Copeland, \$675.07;
Clarence A. Baker, \$659.49.
Clarence G. Crawford, \$271.63.

In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for any amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to each person named in the first section, an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the claim of the United States for refund of the amount specified in the first section: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act for the payment of any one claim in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, and the same

shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 4, strike the word "Edward" and insert "Edmond".

Page 2, line 5, strike the word "Preston" and insert "Prester".

Page 2, line 25, strike the words "in excess of".

Page 3, line 1, strike "10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWARD BERGER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5411) for the relief of Edward Berger.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Edward Berger, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, an employee in the postal field service, is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of \$213.95. Such sum represents the amount of certain overpayments of compensation made to the said Edward Berger through administrative error in the determination of his longevity benefits as a postal field service employee. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Edward Berger, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, the sum certified to the Secretary of the Treasury by the Postmaster General as the sum of amounts paid to the United States by the said Edward Berger, or withheld from amounts otherwise due him from the United States, by reason of the liability referred to in the first section of this Act: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this section shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike "\$213.95" and insert "\$204.19".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAXIE L. STEVENS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6183) for the relief of Maxie L. Stevens.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH], one of the members of the Committee of Objectors on the Private Calendar, who is unavoidably absent today, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EARNEST O. SCOTT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6593) for the relief of Earnest O. Scott.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Earnest O. Scott of Silverdale, Washington, is relieved of liability to pay to the United States the sum of \$1,812.80, representing the aggregate amount of compensation held to have been erroneously paid to him due to administrative error while employed by the Department of the Navy as a firefighter during the period beginning October 18, 1959, and ending November 10, 1962, both dates inclusive. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for amounts for which liability is relieved by this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, after line 12 add the following: "Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Earnest O. Scott, an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the liability to the United States specified in the first section. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAJ. KENNETH F. COYKENDALL, U.S. ARMY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7026) for the relief of Maj. Kenneth F. Coykendall, U.S. Army.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Major Kenneth F. Coykendall, United States Army, is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the amount of \$805.92 representing overpayments of active duty pay as a member of the United States Army in the years 1949 through 1962, which he received as a result of erroneous credit of service for longevity pay purposes.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any

money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Major Kenneth F. Coykendall, the sum of any amount received or withheld from him on account of the payments referred to in the first section of this bill.

No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike "\$805.92" and insert "\$752.38".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OSCAR V. JOHNSON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7176) for the relief of Oscar V. Johnson.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GORDON W. MCGREW

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8300) for the relief of Gordon W. McGrew.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Gordon W. McGrew of Roy, Utah, is relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of \$3,484.82, representing the amount of compensation received between June 26, 1960, and May 8, 1961, while employed by the Maritime Administration at the Olympia Reserve Fleet, Olympia, Washington, in violation of the Act of July 31, 1894 (5 U.S.C. 62). In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for amounts for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Gordon W. McGrew an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the liability to the United States specified in the first section of this Act. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PATRICK J. CLYNE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8596) for the relief of Patrick J. Clyne.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Patrick J. Clyne, of San Francisco, California, is hereby relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of \$469.52, the amount in which he was indebted to the United States by reason of an overpayment of salary as an employee of the Maritime Administration as a result of an erroneous interpretation of personnel regulations governing promotion and longevity step increases for Government employees. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for any amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Patrick J. Clyne, an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the liability to the United States specified in the first section: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike "\$469.52" and insert "\$502.40". The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAPT. CHARLES H. GLASSETT, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9201) for the relief of Capt. Charles H. Glassett, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Captain Charles H. Glassett, Junior, United States Marine Corps, retired, is relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of \$4,092.60 representing an overpayment of retirement pay during the period September 1, 1958, through August 31, 1963, due to an error by the Marine Corps authorities. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this section.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Captain Charles H. Glassett, Junior, the amount certified to him by the Secretary of the Navy as the aggregate amount paid to the United States by the said Captain Charles H. Glassett, Junior, or withheld by the United States from amounts due him, on account of the liability referred to in the first section of this Act. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent

or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CWO EDWARD R. KREISS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9282) for the relief of Chief Warrant Officer Edward R. Kreiss.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Chief Warrant Officer Edward R. Kreiss, United States Navy, retired, is relieved of any liability under the Act of July 31, 1894 (5 U.S.C. 62), to pay to the United States all amounts received by him as a civilian employee of the Department of the Army from May 1, 1959, through December 14, 1962. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for amounts for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Chief Warrant Officer Edward R. Kreiss an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the liability to the United States specified in the first section.

SEC. 3. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike "Edward R. Kreiss" and insert "Edward E. Kreiss".

Page 2, line 3, strike "Edward R." and insert "Edward E.".

Page 2, line 7, strike "section." and insert: "section and, notwithstanding the provisions of the Act of July 31, 1894 (5 U.S.C. 62), said amount shall include any compensation due him for the period December 1, 1962, through December 14, 1962, and lump-sum leave payments based upon the period of civilian employment referred to in this Act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended to read: "For the relief of CWO Edward E. Kreiss."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LT. COL. JOHN W. CASSELL, U.S. ARMY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9286) for the relief of Lt. Col. John W. Cassell, U.S. Army.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH] I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CLARENCE L. AIU AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9406) for the relief of Clarence L. Aiu and others.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH] I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

LT. COL. JAMES P. HUBBARD, U.S. ARMY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9430) for the relief of Lt. Col. James P. Hubbard, U.S. Army.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

DANIEL WALTER MILES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9847) for the relief of Daniel Walter Miles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

WILLIAM L. CHATELAIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9902) for the relief of William L. Chatelain, U.S. Navy, retired.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That William L. Chatelain, of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, is relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of \$6,134.92, representing an overpayment of disability retired pay between May 10, 1954, and May 16, 1963, by the United States Navy through an administrative error on the part of the United States Navy Finance Center, Retired Pay Department, Cleveland, Ohio. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for amounts for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out

of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said William L. Chatelain, United States Navy, retired, an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the liability to the United States specified in the first section of this Act: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5: strike "\$6,134.92" and insert "\$6,134.32".

Page 1, line 6: strike "between May 10, 1954, and May 16, 1963," and insert "for the period from May 1, 1954 to April 30, 1963, inclusive."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

McKOY-HELGERSON CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9949) for the relief of McKoy-Helgerson Co.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH], I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ELMER LEVY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9976) for the relief of Elmer Levy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to Marilyn Grieves, of Ottawa, Illinois, as mother and next friend for John Robert Grieves, a minor, the sum of \$2,000 in full settlement of all claims of John Robert Grieves, a minor, and of Marilyn Grieves, as mother and next friend for John Robert Grieves, a minor, against the United States and Elmer Levy, and in full and final payment of the judgment and costs docketed in the United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois, in favor of the said Marilyn Grieves, mother and next friend for John Robert Grieves, a minor, against the said Elmer Levy for damages for personal injuries growing out of an accident on May 2, 1961, in Ottawa, Illinois, while said Elmer Levy was engaged in his duties as a postal employee: *Provided*, That no part of the money appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the*

same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 7, strike "10" and insert "20." The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRYGVE A. ROVELSTAD

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10259) to provide for the remuneration of artistic services rendered by Trygve A. Rovelstad in the creation of certain designs for the "American Roll of Honor," a memorial book, now reposing in the American Memorial Chapel of St. Paul's Cathedral, London, England.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

MRS. LOIS GRAYBILL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10294) for the relief of Mrs. Lois Graybill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the one-year time limitation upon the filing of applications for waiver of premiums provided in section 712(c), title 38, United States Code is hereby waived with respect to any application for waiver of premiums on national service life insurance policy numbered V 1421 04 08 (issued on the life of Albert C. Graybill, Veterans' Administration claim numbered XC-9 671 272) filed by Mrs. Lois Graybill of Williamsport, Pennsylvania, within the one-year period which begins on the date of enactment of this Act. Any payments made pursuant to such application shall be paid from the national service life insurance appropriation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARVIN S. KLINE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10526) for the relief of Marvin S. Kline.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Marvin S. Kline, of Fairborn, Ohio, the sum of \$742.56 in full settlement of all claims against the United States arising out of an overpayment of compensation paid to him as a result of administrative error by the United States Air Force from November 22, 1961,

through October 20, 1962, which he has repaid. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Marvin S. Kline, of Fairborn, Ohio, the sum of \$688.29 in full settlement of all claims against the United States arising out of an overpayment of compensation paid to him as a result of administrative error by the United States Air Force from November 22, 1961, through October 20, 1962, which he has repaid. The Secretary of the Treasury is further authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$48.27 to the civil service retirement and disability fund representing retirement reductions of the said Marvin S. Kline, and he is also authorized and directed to pay from the same moneys the amount of \$6 to the group life insurance fund representing insurance premium deductions of the said Marvin S. Kline. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWARD G. MORHAUSER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11223) for the relief of Edward G. Morhauser.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Frank J. Borrelli the sum of \$6,000 in full settlement of all claims against the United States and against Edward G. Morhauser arising out of an accident which occurred when said Edward G. Morhauser was operating a Government motor vehicle in the course of his duties as an employee of the United States Post Office Department and in full satisfaction of the judgment and costs entered against the said Edward G. Morhauser in civil action numbered 994-61 in the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey on July 30, 1962, based upon said accident. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 20 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction

thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COL. WILLIAM W. THOMAS, ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11468) for the relief of Col. William W. Thomas and Lt. Col. Norman R. Snyder, U.S. Air Force.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

C.M. SGT. ROBERT J. BECKER, U.S. AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11469) for the relief of C.M. Sgt. Robert J. Becker, U.S. Air Force.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

COL. THOMAS O. LAWTON, JR., U.S. AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11484) for the relief of Col. Thomas O. Lawton, Jr., U.S. Air Force.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

LT. COL. CLAUDE E. TABOR, JR., U.S. AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11485) for the relief of Lt. Col. Claude E. Tabor, Jr., U.S. Air Force.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

SHIRLEY SHAPIRO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11735) for the relief of Shirley Shapiro.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$300,000 to Shirley Shapiro, of New York, New York, in full settlement of all claims against the United States based upon the injuries, expenses, disabilities, or other losses, or damages suffered as the result of an accident which occurred in Naples, Italy, on or about July 6, 1962, when a United States Navy mail truck driven by an intoxicated member of

the Navy at an excessive speed went out of control and struck a parked car in which the said Shirley Shapiro was sitting. The operator of the Navy vehicle in that accident has been determined not to have been acting within the scope of his employment, and the claims based on the accident are not cognizable under the Federal Tort Claims Act provisions now set out in title 28 of the United States Code.

SEC. 2. No part of the amounts appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the claims covered by this Act, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike "\$300,000" and insert "\$150,000".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

E. F. FORT AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5898) for the relief of E. F. Fort, Cora Lee Fort Corbett, and W. R. Fort.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

FRANK B. ROWLETT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7348) for the relief of Frank B. Rowlett.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay to Frank B. Rowlett, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$100,000, which shall be exempt from all taxation, in full settlement for all rights in respect to his cryptologic inventions which are now or at any time have been placed in secrecy status by the War Department of the Department of Defense, including but not limited to all rights with respect to his inventions covered by Patent Applications, Serial Numbers 70,412 and 443,320, which were the subject of secrecy orders from the Department of Commerce, dated March 23, 1936, and May 16, 1942: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

QUALITY BEDDING CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10634) for the relief of the Quality Bedding Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Quality Bedding Company of Huntington, West Virginia, the sum of \$328.87, in full settlement of all claims of such company against the United States on account of the amount improperly deducted by the United States under Purchase Orders FNW-43600-5/CD2 and FNW-47003-6/CD2 issued by the General Services Administration. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THOMAS M. TALLEY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1875) for the relief of Thomas M. Talley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Thomas M. Talley of Pineview, Georgia, is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of \$1,601.19, representing overpayment of salary which he received as an employee of the Department of the Air Force at Warner Robbins Air Force Base, Georgia, such overpayments having been made as a result of administrative error in establishing his salary rate when he was promoted from the position of stock handler to the position of stock control clerk, effective July 19, 1959. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Thomas M. Talley, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayment referred to in the first section of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 8, add: "No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating

the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARY LANE LAYCOCK

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2170) for the relief of Mary Lane Laycock.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Mary Lane Laycock, of Washington, District of Columbia, is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of \$217.60, representing overpayments of salary which she received as an employee of the Department of Justice for the period from December 9, 1962, through August 3, 1963, following her promotion from grade GS-4 to grade GS-5, effective December 9, 1962, such overpayments having been made in violation of section 802(b) of the Classification Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C. 1132(b)) as a result of administrative error in determining the rate of basic compensation to which the said Mary Lane Laycock was entitled upon such promotion. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Mary Lane Laycock, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from her on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 11, add:

"No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEY LANDS IN PIMA COUNTY, ARIZ., TO EDWARD O. EARL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8156) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in Pima County, Ariz., to Edward O. Earl and the estate of Madelon Earl.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue, subject to the provisions of section 3, to Edward O. Earl a patent in

fee to the following described tract of land in the county of Pima, State of Arizona, lots 3 and 4, the west half of the southwest quarter of section 4, and lots 1 and 2 of section 5, all in township 16 south, range 10 east of the Gila and Salt River base and meridian, containing 258.97 acres.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed, subject to the provisions of section 3, to issue to the estate of Madelon Earl a patent in fee to the following described tract of land in the county of Pima, State of Arizona, the west half of the northeast quarter of section 8, township 16 south, range 10 east of the Gila and Salt River base and meridian, containing 80.00 acres.

SEC. 3. The patents authorized to be issued pursuant to sections 1 and 2 of this Act may be issued only after the payment of the fees and purchase price provided under the Desert Land Act of March 3, 1877, as amended (19 Stat. 377; 43 Stat. 320 et seq.), and upon reclamation of the land to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Interior in a manner comparable to the standards of reclamation required under said Desert Land Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Edward O. Earl, subject to the provisions of section 2, a patent in fee to the following described tract of land in the county of Pima, State of Arizona: lots 3 and 4, the west half of the southwest quarter of section 4, lots 1 and 2 of section 5, and the west half of the northeast quarter of section 8, all in township 16 south, range 10 east of the Gila and Salt River base and meridian, containing 338.97 acres.

"Sec. 2. The conveyance authorized by this Act shall be made subject to all existing rights of the city of Tucson and upon payment of an amount equal to the sum of (1) the fair market value of the land as of the effective date of this Act, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, exclusive of any value added by improvements to the lands made by Edward O. Earl or members of his family or their predecessors in interest, and (2) the administrative costs of the conveyance as determined by the Secretary.

"Sec. 3. The execution of the conveyance authorized by this Act shall not relieve Edward O. Earl of any liability to the United States for use of the conveyed lands prior to the date of the conveyance."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in Pima County, Arizona, to Edward O. Earl."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING ACCEPTANCE OF DECORATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12342) to authorize certain retired and other personnel of the U.S. Government to accept and wear decorations, presents, and other things tendered them by certain foreign countries.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the fol-

lowing-named retired and other personnel of the Government of the United States are hereby authorized to accept and wear such decorations, orders, medals, emblems, pres-

ents, and other things as have been tendered as of the date of approval of this Act by the foreign government or foreign governments immediately following their names, and that

the consent of Congress is hereby expressly granted for this purpose as required under clause 8 of section 9, article I, of the Constitution of the United States:

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
Green, Theodore Francis	Jan. 3, 1961	Greece	Cross of Grand Commander of Our Order of the Phoenix.	Reason for award unknown.
Smith, H. Alexander	Mar. 1, 1960	do	Cross of Knight Commander of the Royal Order of the Phoenix.	Do.
Vorys, John M.	Jan. 3, 1960	Finland	Order, Finnish White Rose	Do.
Wolverton, Charles A.	Jan. 3, 1959	Greece	Cross of Commander of the Royal Order of the Phoenix.	Do.
Capehart, Homer E.	Jan. 3, 1963	do	Cross of the Grand Commander of the Royal Order of Phoenix.	Do.
		do	Grand Cross of the Royal Order of Phoenix.	Do.
		Paraguay	Order of Merit of the Grand Cross (Praemium Meriti).	Do.
Chiperfield, Robert B.	do	Chile	Order of Merit, grade of commander.	Do.
		Greece	Cross of the Grand Commander of the Royal Order of Phoenix.	Do.
Judd, Walter H.	do	do	Cross of Commander of the Order of the Phoenix.	Do.
Chavez, Dennis	Nov. 18, 1962	Panama	Order of Vasco Nunez de Balboa	Do.
Keogh, Eugene J.		Spain	Order of Isabella the Catholic	Do.
Knowland, William F.	Jan. 3, 1959	Greece	Cross of the Grand Commander of the Order of the Phoenix.	Do.
Merrow, Chester E.	Jan. 3, 1963	do	do	Do.
Wolcott, Jesse P.	Jan. 3, 1957	do	do	Do.

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Gustafson, Rudolph O.	July 31, 1960	Iran	Homayun Medal	Reason for award unknown.
Reed, Horace G.	Dec. 31, 1961	France	Legion of Honor, rank of officer	Do.
Fox, Paul S.		Morocco	Order of Ouissam Alaouite, grade of commander	Do.
	Nov. 25, 1960	Bolivia	Condor de Los Andes, grade of official	Do.
Walker, Marion N. (Dr.)	Aug. 31, 1960	Haiti	Order of Honor and Merit, degree of chevalier.	Do.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Englund, Raymond E.	Jan. 31, 1958	Sweden	Knighthood of the Royal Order of the North Star.	Reason for award unknown.
Deering, Arthur L. (Dr.)	June 30, 1957	Portugal	Commander of the Military Order of Christ.	Do.
Marsh, Raymond E.	Jan. 1, 1951	Finland	Order of the White Rose of Finland, Knight 1st class.	For valuable contribution to Finnish forestry in a study which he made for Finland.
Morse, True D.	Jan. 20, 1961	U.S.S.R.	Gold medal	Presented by Mr. Evgeniy Chekmenev, Soviet Vice Minister of Agriculture and Chairman of the Soviet animal husbandry party.
Termohlen, William Dewey	July 28, 1959	France	Commander of the Legn of Agricultural Merit.	For distinguished service to the advancement of poultry industry in France.
Burmeister, Gustave	Dec. 29, 1961	U.S.S.R.	Order of Merit of Agriculture.	Do.
			2 gold medals	An agricultural delegation brought to this country under the Cultural Exchange Agreement negotiated by the Department of State presented medals as an expression of appreciation and gratitude for the program developed and executed during their visit in the United States.
McArdle, Richard E.	Mar. 17, 1962	Mexico	Order of Merit for Forestry of Miguel Angel de Quevedo—1951.	For valuable contribution to forestry in Mexico.
		Germany	Knight Commander's Cross of the Order of Merit.	For valuable contribution to forestry in Germany.
Ashby, Wallace	Aug. 31, 1960	U.S.S.R.	Gold, red, green, and white enamel medal.	For participation in a program for the Soviet agricultural mechanization team in 1958.
Kellogg, Charles E.	Oct. 31, 1960	do	Gold medal	For participation in the program at Beltsville for the Soviet animal husbandry team in 1958.
Knox, Charles W.	Oct. 31, 1961	do	Gold medal	Do.
Rodenwold, Zelta F.	Sept. 5, 1962	Tunisia	Medal (nondescriptive)	For participation in a program at Beltsville for a team from Tunisia in 1958.
Zeller, John H.	Apr. 30, 1962	U.S.S.R.	Gold medal	For participation in the program at Beltsville for the Soviet husbandry team in 1958.
Randell, Cortes G.	July 21, 1962	Ethiopia	Medallion	Mr. Randell made a survey of east Africa particularly Ethiopia, to locate, if possible, a large area of land which could be used for cattle, sheep and wool production, and to find, if possible, cattle in sufficient numbers which would justify the erection of a meat slaughtering plant and also select a site for the plant. Following the survey of Ethiopia, a special report was prepared for His Excellency Dedjasmach Asrat Kassa, Chief Advisory to Emperor Haile Selassie, on overgrazing and erosion in Ethiopia with suggestions for remedy. This report was submitted to the Emperor. The award was made for the special report prepared and for the survey and ground-work done to establish an improved livestock production and meatpacking program for Ethiopia.

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

Randall, Robert H.	July 11, 1960	Dominican Republic.	Pablo Duarte Order of Merit	For assistance and contributions in the science programs of that country.
		Brazil	Order of the Cruzeiro do Sul	In recognition for fostering of inter-American activities in the fields of history and geography.

CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
Crawford, Charles H.	May 31, 1960	Panama	Order of Vasco Nunez de Balboa	Fostering cordial relations between Panama and the United States.
Garrett, Whitman P.	Feb. 29, 1960	do.	do.	Do.
Marshall, James	Jan. 20, 1961	do.	do.	Do.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

Cabell, Charles (Lt. Gen.)	Jan. 31, 1962	Denmark	Danish—Kommander, 1st Grade Dannebrog.	Reason for award unknown.
		France	Legion of Honor, grade of officer.	Do.
		Iran	Boukhara rug, 7 feet 2 inches by 4 feet 9 inches.	Token of good will.
			Boukhara rug, 7 feet 2 inches by 4 feet 8 inches.	Do.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Harrison, Robert H.	July 31, 1960	Peru	Engraved silver plate.	Farewell token of appreciation from officials with whom he worked.
Judge, John J.	Oct. 31, 1961	France	Ordre du Merite Commercial (Chevalier).	Important contributions to the development of economic relations between France and the United States.
Miller, Clyde	Mar. 31, 1959	do.	French Cross of Commercial Merit (Croix du Merite Commercial).	In appreciation of effort and activity in connection with the "France Comes to You" exhibit.
Johnson, Robert S.	May 25, 1963	Philippines	Philippine Legion of Honor (Officer) Medal.	Services rendered to the Philippine Government during the rehabilitation of their roads and bridges.
Russell, William	Sept. 30, 1961	Italy	Award of Cavaliere in the Ordine al Merito della Repubblica Italiana.	No information of record.
Golden, Nathan D.	Mar. 29, 1963	France	Legion of Honor.	For outstanding service in promoting cultural relations between France and the United States.
		Federal Republic of Germany	Order of Merit, class 1, and certificate.	Reason for award unknown.

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Szymczak, M. S.	June 1, 1961	Belgium	Order of the Crown, degree of commander.	Awarded in recognition of his assistance to Belgium during the war.
		Poland	Commander's Cross with star, Order of Polonia Restituta.	Awarded in recognition of his interest in Poland and cooperation in developing closer relations between Poland and the United States.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Brand, Alonzo	Mar. 1, 1960	Thailand	Most Noble Order of the Crown of Thailand, 3rd class.	Reason for award unknown.
Sebrell, William H., Jr.	Aug. 1, 1955	Haiti	Officer de la Santa Publique.	Do.
Knott, Dr. Leslie W.	Sept. 1, 1962	Greece	Gold Cross of the Royal Order of George I.	Do.
Overholser, Dr. Winfred	Oct. 4, 1962	France	La Medaille de la France Liberee.	Do.
		do.	French National Order of the Legion of Honor.	Do.
		Haiti	Order Honneur et Merite.	Do.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

Speer, George Archibald	Sept. 30, 1959	Greece	Gold Cross of the Order of the Phoenix.	For services in the field of international housing.
-------------------------	----------------	--------	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Wirth, Conrad L.	Jan. 8, 1964	Netherlands	Order of Orange-Nassau, rank of commander.	Reason for award unknown.
------------------	--------------	-------------	--	---------------------------

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Arpaia, Anthony F.	Mar. 15, 1960	Italy	Stella della Solidarieta Italiana di 2a classe.	Reason for award unknown.
--------------------	---------------	-------	---	---------------------------

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Epstein, Fritz T.	Aug. 31, 1960	Germany	Cross of Merit, 1st class, of the Order of Merit of the Federal Republic of Germany.	Reason for award unknown.
-------------------	---------------	---------	--	---------------------------

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Deignan, Herbert G.	Jan. 31, 1962	Thailand	White Elephant (4th class) Santimala (peace medal).	Reason for award unknown.
				Do.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

[The following, tendered to personnel of the Department of State, were given as tokens of good will by the donor governments]

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
Ponbright, James C. H.	Apr. 30, 1961	Great Britain	Silver Jubilee Medal	
Daniels, Paul C.	Dec. 31, 1953	Bolivia	Condor de los Andes, grade of officer	
Denby, James O.	Apr. 30, 1951	France	Legion of Honor, Chevalier	
Gray, Cecil W.	Oct. 31, 1960	Mexico	Mexican Order of the Aztec Eagle	
Henderson, Loy W.	Jan. 31, 1961	Lithuania	Lithuanian Order of Gedeminas	
		do.	Lithuanian Independence Medal	
		Latvia	Order of the Three Stars	
		Saudi Arabia	Silver tea set presented by His Royal Highness Crown Prince Saud Alsaud, of Saudi Arabia	
		do.	Robe, with case, presented by King	
		do.	Gold watch, presented by King	
		Iran	Sword, presented by the Shah	
		do.	Rug, presented by the Prime Minister	
		do.	Rug, presented by the Shah	
Lacy, William S. B.	Oct. 31, 1961	Netherlands	Order of Orange Nassau, degree of officer	
Murphy, Robert D.	Oct. 31, 1959	Saudi Arabia	Robe, with case	
Patterson, Jefferson	Apr. 4, 1958	Japan	Pearl cuff links and tie bar	
		Italy	Officer of the Order of the Crown of Italy	
Reynolds Eugene S., Jr.	Dec. 10, 1949	El Salvador	6 silver coffee spoons	
Simmons, John F.	Jan. 31, 1957	Greece	Grand Cross of the Order of Phoenix	
		Germany	Grand Cross of Merit	
		Guatemala	Orden del Quetzal	
Thibodeaux, Ben H.	Jan. 31, 1960	France	Order of Agricultural Merit	
Trueblood, Edward G.	Aug. 31, 1958	Bolivia	Official of Order of Condor de los Andes	
Tuckerman, Gustavus	July 23, 1961	Poland	Gold Cross of Merit	
		U.S.S.R.	Camera (35 mm. Zorki-5) from commercial counselor of Soviet Embassy Vladimir S. Alkimov	
Turkel, Harry R.	May 31, 1961	Cuba	National Order of Merit Carlos Manuel de Cespedes, officer, from President Menditea as token of his Government's appreciation in connection with negotiation of trade agreement	
Warner, Percy	Dec. 31, 1961	Brazil	Order of Aeronautical Merit	
Warren, Fletcher	Dec. 31, 1960	Nicaragua	Presidential Medal of Merit	
Beaulac, Willard L.	May 31, 1962	do.	Medal of Merit	
Henderson, James E.	May 31, 1962	Saudi Arabia	Watch	
Howard, H. N.	Jan. 28, 1962	Greece	Order of the Phoenix, rank of commander	
Lennerts, Edwin	June 29, 1962	Germany	Silver cigarette case given by the President of Germany Theodor Heuss	
Mastandrea, Joseph	Mar. 6, 1962	Ethiopia	Cuff links with royal crest given by the Crown Prince	
Muccio, John J.	May 31, 1962	Bolivia	Comendador de la Orden de los Andes	
Parsons, Marsels C., Jr.	do.	Denmark	Diploma of insignia of Commander of the Order of the Dannebrog of Denmark	
Reams, R. Borden	do.	Ivory Coast	Commander in the National Order of Ivory Coast	
Sparks, Edward J.	do.	Chile	Medal and diploma order of "Al Merito" grade of officer	
Willard, Jack L.	Dec. 31, 1961	China	Stole	
Brenn, Harry A.	Dec. 31, 1961	Iran	Homayoun Medal (Second Order)	Reason for award unknown.
Lynch, Andrew G.	May 31, 1962	Somali Republic	Order of Somali Star, First Class	Do.
Rankin, Karl L.	May 31, 1961	China	Decoration	Do.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

U.S. COAST GUARD				
REAR ADMIRAL				
Perkins, Henry C. XXXX	July 1, 1960	Korea	Order of Military Merit, Ulchi, with Silver	For service as chief adviser to the Korean Coast Guard, which is now the Republic of Korea Navy.
		Italy	Al Merito della Repubblica Italiana (Commendatore)	For meritorious service in connection with rescue operations following collision between SS <i>Andrea Doria</i> and SS <i>Stockholm</i> in the Atlantic Ocean July 26, 1956.
CAPTAIN				
Davis, Harry E. XXXX	Oct. 1, 1958	Greece	Gold Naval Medal, 1st class	For distinguished services rendered to the Greek merchant marine.
Davis, Kenneth S. XXXX	July 1, 1959	Italy	Al Merito della Repubblica Italiana (Cavaliere Ufficiale)	For meritorious service in connection with rescue operations following collision between SS <i>Andrea Doria</i> and SS <i>Stockholm</i> in the Atlantic Ocean, July 26, 1956.
McGowan, Gordon P. XXXX	July 1, 1959	Korea	Order of Military Merit Ulchi	For service as adviser to the Korean Coast Guard, which is now the Republic of Korea Navy.
COMMANDER				
Henthorn, John R. XXXX	May 1, 1958	Portugal	Gold Medal of "Courage, Abnegation, and Humanity."	In recognition of services during the rescue of the crew of the Portuguese schooner <i>Gaspar</i> during a gale off Newfoundland Banks on Sept. 18, 1948.
Johnson, Vaino O. XXXX	July 1, 1959	do.	do.	Do.
LIEUTENANT COMMANDER				
Weber, John A. XXXX	Nov. 1, 1958	Norway	Norwegian Medal of Merit	For meritorious service in connection with the rescue of an injured seaman.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT—Continued

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
U.S. COAST GUARD—CON.				
LIEUTENANT COMMANDER—continued				
Horton, Comdr. Norman L. XXXX U.S. Coast Guard.	July 1, 1962.....	Portugal.....	Silver Medal of "Courage, Abnegation, and Humanity," with diploma.	In recognition of services during the rescue of the crew of the Portuguese schooner <i>Gaspar</i> during a gale off Newfoundland Banks on Sept. 18, 1948.
LeDoux, Lt. Philip G. XXXX U.S. Coast Guard.do.....	Italy.....	Al Merito della Repubblica Italiana (Cavaliere).	For meritorious service in connection with the rescue operations following collision between SS <i>Andrea Doria</i> and SS <i>Stockholm</i> in the Atlantic Ocean July 26, 1956. Do.
Lovell, Lt. Comdr. Lewis F. XXXX U.S. Coast Guard.	June 1, 1963.....do.....	Al Merito della Repubblica Italiana (Ufficiale).	Do.
Magee, Lt. (jg.) Roland J. XXXX U.S. Coast Guard.	July 1, 1962.....do.....	Al Merito della Repubblica Italiana (Cavaliere).	Do.
Olsen, Rear Adm. Carl B. XXXX U.S. Coast Guard.	July 1, 1963.....do.....	Al Merito della Repubblica Italiana (Ufficiale).	Do.
Richmond, Adm. Alfred C. XXXX U.S. Coast Guard.	June 1, 1962.....do.....	Al Merito della Repubblica Italiana (Commendatore).	In recognition for assistance lent by the U.S. Coast Guard to CIRM (International Radio-Medical Center) in carrying out its services of radio medical aid for seamen.
LIEUTENANT (J.G.)				
Kieffer, James W. XXXX	Oct. 1, 1959.....do.....	Al Valor di Marina.....	For meritorious service in connection with rescue operations following collision between SS <i>Andrea Doria</i> and SS <i>Stockholm</i> in the Atlantic Ocean July 26, 1956.
BMC (AN)				
Klingensmith, John E. XXXX U.S. SECRET SERVICE	Aug. 1, 1958.....	Haiti.....	Brevet de Merite.....	For outstanding service in training crew of the Haitian Coast Guard vessel <i>Vertieres</i> (CC-6), June 11-21, 1952.
Holmes, Rubert E.	Oct. 31, 1960.....	China.....	Order of the Cloud and Banner.....	In recognition of services rendered during Mme. Chiang Kai-shek's visit in the United States during 1943.
Nelson, Reuben L.	Aug. 31, 1958.....	Norway.....	St. Olav Medal.....	In recognition of service rendered during assignment to the protection of Her Royal Highness the Crown Princess Martha and the royal family during their stay in the United States during World War II.
Nicholson, Henry J.	Sept. 30, 1958.....do.....	Knight Cross II Class of the Royal Order of St. Olav.	In recognition of services rendered in a supervisory capacity during assignment to the protection of Her Royal Highness the Crown Princess Martha and the royal family during their stay in the United States during World War II.
BUREAU OF NARCOTICS				
Siragusa, Charles.....	Dec. 12, 1963.....	Italy.....	Order of Merit.....	Reason for award unknown

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

Llorens, Washington C.	May 31, 1963.....	Spain.....	La Orden del Merito Civil.....	In recognition of his cultural contributions to the Spanish language and literature.
-----------------------------	-------------------	------------	--------------------------------	--

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

Hager, Alice R.	July 31, 1957.....	Brazil.....	Order of the Southern Cross.....	For services to the Government of Brazil in the field of aviation.
----------------------	--------------------	-------------	----------------------------------	--

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Cook, Dr. Robert C.	Dec. 15, 1958.....	Philippines.....	Legion of Honor, Degree of Officer.....	Exceptionally meritorious and outstanding services to the Republic of the Philippines, during assignment at the Veterans' Administration Regional Office, Manila, Philippines.
Moore, Henry G.	Mar. 1, 1963.....do.....do.....	Do.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Weigert, Oscar.....	Mar. 31, 1963.....	Germany.....	Cross of the Order of Merit and Insignia.	Reason for award unknown.
Gross, John E.	Jan. 10, 1964.....	Norway.....	Royal Order of Saint Olav, grade of commander.	Do.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Erskine, Graves B., general, U.S. Marine Corps.	Military, July 1, 1953; civilian, Oct. 31, 1961.	Thailand.....	Prathamabhon (Knight Grand Cross of the Most Exalted Order of the White Elephant).	Presented in the name of the Kingdom of Thailand.
		Greece.....	Royal Order of King George I.....	Presented by His Highness, Crown Prince Constantine of Greece.
		Burma.....	Bronze statuette.....	Statuette of Gen. Van Boels presented by Prime Minister of Burma.
		Thailand.....	Tiger skull.....	Presented by Prime Minister and Minister of Defense, P. Pibulsonggram.
Cushing, Dr. E. H. Bryant, Floyd S.	Aug. 4, 1961 Jan. 20, 1961.....	Philippines.....	Legion of Honor, rank of commander.	Token of good will.
		Korea.....	Black inlaid mother-of-pearl jewelry box.	Presented by Minister of National Defense Chung Yul Kim.
		Taiwan.....	Evening bag.	Reason for award unknown.
		Korea.....	Tablecloth and napkins.	Presented by General Wang, Chief of General Staff.
	do.....	Cobra skins (2).....	Do.
	do.....	Brass jewelry box.....	Presented by Minister of National Defense Chung Yul Kim.
	do.....	Inlaid mother-of-pearl table.....	Presented by Gen. Sun Yup Paik, Army Chief of Staff.
	do.....	Black inlaid mother-of-pearl box.....	Presented by Mrs. Syngman Rhee.
	do.....	Brocade silk.....	Do.
	do.....	Ashtray.....	Presented by Minister of National Defense Chung Yul Kim.
	do.....	Cigarette box.....	Presented by President Syngman Rhee.
	do.....do.....	Presented by Minister of National Defense Chung Yul Kim.
		Pakistan.....	Plaque.....	Presented by Gen. Sun Yup Paik, Army Chief of Staff.
			Sandals (2 pair).....	Presented by Gen. Mohammed Ayub Khan.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
GENERAL				
Collins, J. Lawton, XXXXX	Mar. 31, 1956	Argentina	Order of General San Martin, degree of grand officer.	Received Argentine Minister of War in May 1948 and discussed with him matters pertaining to standardization of arms and other matters of joint interest to Argentina and the United States.
		Brazil	Order of Military Merit, degree of grand officer.	Assisted the Brazilian Minister of War in conferences in matters of joint interest to both Brazil and the United States during the Brazilian Minister's visit to the United States in April 1949.
		Chile	Medal of Military Merit, 1st class	For distinguished services rendered to the Chilean Army per citation dated June 2, 1949.
		Cuba	Military Medal, 1st class	Reason for award unknown.
		Iran	Order of Homayoun, 1st class	Do.
		Mexico	Military Merit Medal, 1st class	Do.
Hodes, Henry L., XXXXX	Apr. 1, 1959	Chile	Military Medal, 1st class	In recognition of his military virtues and outstanding activity in defense of democracy.
Magruder, Carter B., XXXX	June 30, 1961	Korea	Order of Merit for National Foundation Tanjang.	Reason for award unknown.
Schnuler, Cortlandt V. R., XXXXX	Oct. 31, 1959	France	Legion of Honor, grade of officer	In recognition and appreciation of his outstanding and meritorious service while serving as commander in chief, United Nations Command, commanding general, U.S. Forces, Korea, and 8th U.S. Army from July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1961.
White, Isaac D., XXXXX	Apr. 1, 1961	China	Order of the Cloud and Banner, 2d class.	Reason for award unknown.
		Japan	Order of the Rising Sun, 2d class	For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding service from July 1957 to February 1961 as commander in chief, U.S. Army, Pacific.
		Korea	Order of Merit for National Foundation Tanjang.	For services rendered to the Japanese Government while serving as commanding general U.S. Army Forces, Far East, and 8th U.S. Army.
			Taeguk Distinguished Military Service Medal with gold star.	In recognition and appreciation of the services rendered to the Republic of Korea while serving as commanding general, V Corps, commanding general, U.S. Army Forces, Far East, and 8th U.S. Army and commander in chief of the U.S. Army, Pacific.
		Thailand	Knight Grand Cross of the Most Noble Order of the Crown of Thailand.	In recognition and appreciation of his outstanding and exceptionally meritorious service while serving as commanding general, U.S. Army Forces, Far East, and 8th U.S. Army during the period July 25, 1955, to June 30, 1957.
Wyman, Willard G., XXXXX	Aug 1, 1958	Chile	Grand Star of Military Merit	In recognition of his valuable services rendered to the Minister of Defense of Thailand.
		Mexico	Medal of Military Merit, 1st class	For distinguished services rendered to the Army of Chile.
Clarke, Bruce C., XXXXX	May 1962	Belgium	Grand Officer of the Order of the Crown.	For his brilliant work in promoting a better understanding and a strengthening of the good relations existing between the armies of Mexico and the United States.
		France	Legion of Honor, rank of commander	As a token of good will.
		Germany	Grand Cross of the Order of Merit	In recognition of the eminent services that he rendered to France during the campaign which liberated their territory.
		Korea	Order of Service Merit, 1st class	In recognition of particular services rendered to the Federal Republic of Germany.
Decker, George H., XXXXX	October 1962	Colombia	"Del Merito Militar Antonio Narino" in the grade of "La Cruz De Gran Oficial."	In recognition and appreciation of services rendered while serving as deputy commanding general, 8th U.S. Army from October 1953 to July 1954.
		France	Cross of the Commander of the Legion of Honor.	In recognition of services rendered while serving as Chief of Staff, U.S. Army.
		Italy	Order of Merit of the Republic of Italy, degree of grand officer.	For services rendered to the French Government.
		Korea	Taeguk Distinguished Military Service Medal with gold star.	In recognition of services rendered while serving as Chief of Staff, U.S. Army.
		Peru	Orden Militar de Ayacucho, grado de gran oficial.	In recognition and appreciation of his outstanding and exceptionally meritorious service to the Republic of Korea while serving as commander in chief, United Nations Command, from July 1, 1957, to July 1, 1959.
		Thailand	Most Exalted Order of the White Elephant, 1st class.	In recognition of services rendered while serving as commander in chief, United Nations Command.
		Venezuela	Cruz de las Fuerzas Terrestres Venezolanas, primera clase.	In recognition of services rendered while serving as Chief of Staff, U.S. Army.
Eddleman, Clyde D., XXXXX	April 1962	Germany	Knight Commander's Cross of the Order of Merit of the Federal Republic of Germany.	In recognition of services rendered while serving as commander in chief, U.S. Army, Europe, during the period Mar. 31, 1957, to Oct. 20, 1960.
		Sweden	Knight Grand Cross of the Order of the Sword.	Do.
Palmer, Charles D., XXXXX	February 1962	France	Legion of Honor, grade of commander	Token of good will.
		Japan	Order of the Double-Rays of the Rising Sun.	For distinguished services rendered to the Ground Self Defense Forces of Japan while serving as commanding general, U.S. Army, Japan.
		Korea	Taeguk Distinguished Military Service Medal with silver star.	While serving as deputy commanding general, Army Forces, Far East, and 8th U.S. Army from October 1955 to June 1957, and as deputy commanding general, U.S. Army, Japan, from July 1957 to February 1958, General Palmer rendered distinguished service to the Republic of Korea.
McGarr, Lionel C.	June 30, 1963	Brazil	Order of Military Merit, grade of commander.	Reason for award unknown.
Ruffner, Clark L.	Nov. 1, 1962	Netherlands	Order of Orange Nassau, grade of grand officer.	Do.
LIEUTENANT GENERAL				
Arnold, William H., XXXXX	Feb. 1, 1961	France	Legion of Honor, grade of officer	For services rendered to the Government of the Republic of France.
Collier, John H., XXXXX	Oct. 1, 1958	China	Chinese Armored Force Combat Badge.	Being admired by the officers and soldiers of Chinese Armored Force for his glorious activity as a combat commander in ground combat against an armed enemy of allied nations during the period of 1942-45 in the European theater.
		Mexico	Order of Military Merit, 1st class	In recognition of his high military qualities and his praiseworthy actions in behalf of closer relations between members of the Mexican Army and members of the 4th Army of the United States of America.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—Continued

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
LIEUTENANT GENERAL—con.				
Harrison, William K., Jr., XXXXX	Feb. 28, 1957	Brazil	Order of Military Merit, grade of commander.	For services rendered while serving as commander in chief, Caribbean Command and in the interest of furthering good international relationship between Brazil and the United States.
		Chile	Military Medal of the Army, 1st class.	For distinguished services rendered to the Chilean Army.
		Panama	Order of Vasco, Nufiez de Balboa, grade of grand officer.	For services rendered while serving as commander in chief, Caribbean Command.
		Peru	Military Order of Ayacucho, grade of grand officer.	Given in recognition of his position as commander in chief, Caribbean Command, and to express the gratitude of the Peruvian Government for courtesy shown the Minister of War during his recent visit to the Caribbean Command.
Harold, Thomas L., XXXX	June 30, 1961	Chile	Estrella al Merito Militar	For services rendered while serving as the commanding general, USARCARIB.
		Ecuador	Abdon Calderon, 1st class.	Do.
		Paraguay	Order Del Merito Militar, grade of grand officer.	Do.
		Peru	Military Order of Ayacucho, grade of commander.	Do.
Lawton, William S., XXXXXX	June 1, 1960	China	Order of Cloud and Banner	In recognition of his meritorious service to the Government of the Republic of China.
Mathewson, Lemuel, XXXXXX	Apr. 30, 1958	Denmark	Knight Commander of the Order of Dannebrog, 1st class.	Reason for award unknown.
Read, George W., Jr., XXXXXX	Aug. 1, 1960	Greece	Grand Cross of the Royal Order of the Phoenix.	For services rendered to Greece while serving as commander, Allied Land Forces, Southeastern Europe, from July 21, 1955, to Aug. 22, 1957.
Swing, Joseph M.	Jan. 5, 1962	France	Officer of the Legion of Honor	Reason for award unknown.
		Brazil	Order of Military Merit, grade of grand officer.	For his enlightened understanding of the needs of the armies of the Western Hemisphere in orienting the training of various Brazilian officers and by his participation in the effort for united defense of the democratic world.
Young, Robert N., XXXXXX	Sept. 30, 1957	Chile	Medal of Military Merit, 2d class	For distinguished services rendered to Chile.
Booth, Donald P., XXXXXX	March 1962	Japan	Order of the Rising Sun, 2d class	For service as High Commissioner of Ryukyu Islands in solution of military land problems.
		Korea	Taeguk Distinguished Military Service Medal with Silver Star.	In recognition and appreciation of his outstanding service while serving as U.S. High Commissioner to the Ryukyu Islands, February 1957 to Feb. 10, 1961.
Cummings, Emerson L., XXXXXX	April 1962	do	Taeguk Distinguished Military Service Medal with silver star.	In recognition of services rendered to the Republic of Korea while serving with 8th U.S. Army.
Gaither, Ridgely, XXXXXX	May 1962	Brazil	Order of Military Merit, grade of grand officer.	For services rendered while serving as commander in chief, Caribbean Command, and to further enhance the good will existing between the Armed Forces of Brazil and the United States.
		Panama	Lt. Col. Alfredo Lezcano Gomez.	In recognition of services rendered to the Panamanian National Guard.
		Peru	Military Order of Ayacucho, grade of grand officer.	For services rendered while serving as commander in chief of the Caribbean Command, and for the purpose of enhancing the relationship which exists between the armies of Peru and the United States.
			Cross of Aeronautical Merit, grade of grand officer.	For services rendered while serving as commander in chief, Caribbean Command, and to further enhance the excellent relationship which exists between the Armed Forces of Peru and the United States.
O'Neill, Edward J., XXXXXX	April 1962	France	Legion of Honor, degree of officer	In recognition of services rendered while serving as commanding general, U.S. Army Communications Zone, Europe.
		Vatican	Order of Saint Gregory the Great	He deserved well of the good and growth of the Catholic Church and its institutions and proclaimed a knight of the Order of Saint Gregory the Great, military class.
Trudeau, Arthur G., XXXXXX	July 1962	Japan	Order of the Rising Sun, 3d class	Reason for award unknown.
		Korea	Taeguk Distinguished Military Service Medal.	In recognition and appreciation of his meritorious service while serving as commanding general, 7th Infantry Division. He distinguished himself by heroic achievement in Korea in a position of responsibility and international consequence during the period Mar. 21, to Oct. 13, 1953.
			Taeguk Distinguished Military Service Medal with silver star.	For the outstanding and exceptional meritorious service rendered to the Republic of Korea while serving as commanding general, I Corps (Group) from Oct. 16, 1956, to Feb. 3, 1958.
		Sweden	Knight Commander of the Order of the Sword.	Token of good will.
MAJOR GENERAL				
Brasfield, William M., XXXXXX	June 1962	Japan	Order of the Sacred Treasure, 3d class.	Reason for award unknown.
		Korea	Taeguk Distinguished Military Service Medal.	In recognition and appreciation of his outstanding and exceptionally meritorious service while serving as chief of staff, 8th U.S. Army from Nov. 5, 1953, to Dec. 15, 1959.
Clarke, Christian H., Jr., XXXXXX	November 1962	do	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal with Gold Star.	In recognition and appreciation of his exceptionally outstanding and meritorious service during the period Apr. 25 to Dec. 6, 1955, while serving as chief of staff, I U.S. Corps in Korea.
		Mexico	Military Merit, 1st class.	For services rendered while serving as U.S. Army attaché to Mexico during the period Mar. 1, 1957, to May 1, 1958.
Draper, Philip H., Jr., XXXXXX	do	Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal with Gold Star.	In recognition and appreciation of his exceptionally outstanding and meritorious service while serving as assistant chief of staff, G-2, Army Forces Far East and 8th U.S. Army (Rear) during the period July 31, 1956, to June 30, 1957, and as assistant chief of staff, G-2, U.S. Army, Pacific from July 1, 1957, to July 31, 1958.
Heath, Louis T., XXXXXX	August 1962	Peru	Military Order of Ayacucho, grade of grand officer.	For services rendered while serving as chief of staff, Caribbean Command.
Howze, Robert L., XXXXXX	May 1962	China	Chinese Armored Force Combat Badge.	Being admired by the officers and soldiers of Chinese Armored Force for his glorious activity as a combat commander in ground combat against an armed enemy of Allied Nations during the period of 1942-45 in the European theater.
McGarr, Lionel C., XXXXXX	July 1962	Bolivia	Order of the Condor of the Andes, grade of grand master.	For services rendered to the Government of Bolivia while serving as Commanding General, U.S. Army, Caribbean.
		Chile	Military Medal, 1st class.	For distinguished services rendered to the Chilean Army while serving as commanding general, U.S. Army, Caribbean.
		do	Star of Military Merit	For distinguished services rendered to the Chilean Army.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—Continued

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
MAJOR GENERAL—continued				
McGarr, Lionel C., [XXXXXX]	July 1962	Guatemala	Cross of Military Merit, 1st class	For services rendered while serving as commanding general, U.S. Army, Caribbean, and for his high military abilities and his efficient cooperation in strengthening the bonds of fraternity of the Armies of the United States and Guatemala.
		Panama	Order of Vasco Nunez de Balboa, grade of grand officer.	For services rendered to the Government of the Republic of Panama.
		Paraguay	National Order of merit, grade of grand cross.	For services rendered to the Government of the Republic of Paraguay while serving as commanding general, U.S. Army, Caribbean.
		Peru	Military Order of Ayacucho, grade of grand officer.	For distinguished services rendered to the Government of Peru while serving as commanding general, U.S. Army, Caribbean.
		Venezuela	Cross of the Ground Forces of Venezuela, 2d class.	For services rendered to the Government of Venezuela while serving as commanding general, U.S. Army, Caribbean.
Powell, Herbert B., [XXXX]	January 1963	Chile	Star of Military Merit	For distinguished services rendered to the Army of Chile.
Russell, Sam C., [XXXXXX]	April 1962	Belgium	Commander of the Order of Leopold II.	Successful completion of training of the 1st Belgian Nike-Hercules Battalion, during period May to July 1959.
Steinbach, Richard, [XXXX]	July 1962	Brazil	Order of Military Merit, degree of cavalier.	Reason for award unknown.
Tobey, Frank A., [XXXX]	November 1962	Korea	Taeguk Distinguished Military Service Medal.	In recognition and appreciation of his outstanding and meritorious service while serving as senior chaplain, 8th U.S. Army, in Korea from Jan. 16, 1951, to Nov. 1, 1951.
Ward, Robert W., [XXXXXX]	May 1962	Netherlands	Order of Orange-Nassau with Swords, grade of commander.	In recognition of services rendered to the Netherlands while serving as NATO adviser.
Yeager, Walter B., [XXXXXX]	June 1962	Italy	Commander of the Order of Merit of the Italian Republic.	In recognition of services rendered to the Italian Government while serving as commanding general, 10th Infantry Division.
Biddle, William S., [XXXXXX]	Nov. 1, 1960	Korea	Taeguk Distinguished Military Service Medal.	For superior service to the Republic of Korea during the period May 1 to Oct. 30, 1959, while serving as senior member, United Nations Command Military Armistice Commission.
Binns, John J., [XXXX]	Nov. 1, 1959	do	do	For distinguished service rendered to the Republic of Korea while serving as Chief of Staff, U.S. Army Forces Far East and 8th U.S. Army from Feb. 9, 1956, to May 1, 1957.
Cooney, James P., [XXXX]	Sept. 1, 1960	France	Medal of Honor of the Military Health Service in Vermeil.	In recognition of services rendered while serving as Deputy Surgeon General, Washington, D.C.
Dasher, Charles L., Jr., [XXXXXX]	Aug. 1, 1960	Spain	Military Merit Medal with white distinctive.	Reason for award unknown.
Farrand, Edward G.	July 1, 1961	Brazil	Order of Military Merit, degree of commander.	In recognition of services rendered to the Brazilian Government.
Gard, Robert G., [XXXXXX]	Dec. 1, 1959	Korea	Taeguk Distinguished Military Service Medal.	Reason for award unknown.
Hains, Peter C., 3d, [XXXXXX]	June 1, 1961	Mexico	Mexican Order of Military Merit, 1st class.	For his magnificent labor in strengthening the bonds of friendship between members of the Mexican Army and members of the 4th Army of the United States of America.
Harmony, John W., [XXXXXX]	Nov. 1, 1959	Korea	Taeguk Distinguished Military Service Medal.	In recognition and appreciation of his outstanding and exceptionally meritorious service rendered to the Republic of Korea while serving as Chief of Staff, U.S. Army Forces Far East and 8th U.S. Army from Oct. 3, 1955, to Feb. 8, 1956.
Harper, Joseph H., [XXXX]	Dec. 1, 1959	Ethiopia	Grand Cordon of the Distinguished Order of the Star of Ethiopia.	As "a further token of happy relations which exist between our two Governments and our respective armed forces."
Hays, Silas B., [XXXXXX]	Aug. 1, 1959	France	Gold Medal of Honor of the Military Medical Service.	For services rendered while serving as Director of the Medical Services of the U.S. Army.
Hendrix, Raleigh R., [XXXXXX]	Oct. 1, 1961	Japan	3d class Order of the Rising Sun.	In recognition of services rendered while serving as chief of staff of the U.S. Forces in Japan.
		Netherlands	Order of Orange-Nassau, grade of commander.	In recognition of rescue and relief operations of the U.S. military relief organization during the flood in Holland in February 1953.
Johnson, Harry W., [XXXXXX]	Feb. 1, 1961	China	Chinese Armored Force Combat Badge.	Being admired by the officers and soldiers of Chinese Armored Force for his glorious activity as a combat commander in ground combat against an armed enemy of Allied Nations during the period of 1942-45 in the European theater.
		France	Legion of Honor, grade of officer.	As deputy commander of the ComZ for more than 1 year, you have been able to establish a most favorable climate for excellent Franco-American cooperations. The active part you played during the Normandy landing and the subsequent battles for the freedom of Europe in the years 1944 to 1945.
Lindquist, Roy E., [XXXXXX]	July 1, 1960	Greece	Cross of Commander of the Royal Order of Phoenix.	Reason for award unknown.
Mason, Stanhope B., [XXXXXX]	Sept. 1, 1961	Korea	Taeguk Distinguished Military Service Medal.	For distinguished service rendered to Korea while serving as commanding general, 24th Infantry Division.
McClure, Robert A., [XXXX]	May 31, 1956	Iran	Iranian Merit Decoration grade I, type I.	For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of service during the period May 30, 1953, to May 15, 1954.
McGaw, Edward J., [XXXX]	Mar. 1, 1961	Iceland	Order of the Falcon with star, grade of grand commander.	Reason for award unknown.
Mead, Armistead D., [XXXXXX]	July 1, 1961	Korea	Uchi Distinguished Military Service Medal with gold star.	In recognition and appreciation of his exceptionally outstanding and meritorious services to the Republic of Korea while serving as assistant division commander, 3d Infantry Division, Nov. 10, 1950, to Oct. 15, 1951.
Medaris, John B., [XXXXXX]	Feb. 1, 1960	Argentina	Order of General San Martin, degree of commander.	Served as U.S. aide and tour director for the Argentine Minister of War during his visit to the United States in April and May 1948, and, as such, was constantly with the Minister for a period of approximately 2 months.
Olmsted, George H., [XXXXXX]	Apr. 1, 1961	France	Legion of Honor, grade of officer.	Reason for award unknown.
Partridge, Richard C., [XXXXXX]	Mar. 1, 1959	Chile	Insignia of Military Professor.	As a token of gratitude to officers of the U.S. Army who have acted or are acting as teachers of Chilean officers.
		Mexico	Military Medal, 1st class.	Reason for award unknown.
			Merito Militar, 1st class.	For his meritorious work as a soldier in the struggle for democracy.
Phillips, James H., [XXXXXX]	Sept. 1, 1958	Iran	Royal Order of Crown, grade 3.	For participation in the burial ceremonies of the late Reza Shah.
Robinson, Bernard L., [XXXXXX]	Oct. 31, 1957	France	Legion of Honor, grade of officer.	For services rendered to the Government of the Republic of France.
Ryan, Cornelius E., [XXXX]	June 30, 1957	do	Cross of the Commander of the Legion of Honor.	For services rendered from May 1946 to August 1947 in Berlin.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—Continued

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
MAJOR GENERAL—continued				
Ryan, Partick J., XXXXXX	Oct. 31, 1958	France	Chevalier de la Legion d'Honneur	For outstanding services rendered to the Government of the Republic of France.
Schow, Robert A., XXXXXX	do	do	Legion of Honor, grade of commander	In recognition of services rendered to the French Government while serving as Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence.
		Peru	Military Order of Ayacucho, grade of commander	For meritorious service. As recognition by the Government of Peru of his merits.
		Portugal	Medal of Military Merit, 1st class	In appreciation of services rendered to the Portuguese Government.
		Spain	Grand Cross of the Order of Military Merit with white badge	In recognition of the merits of the Assistant Chief of Staff, Intelligence, U.S. Army, to reward his services to Spain.
		Thailand	Knight Grand Cross of the Most Noble Order of the Crown of Thailand	In high recognition of the valuable service rendered to Thailand in strengthening the relationship between the United States and Thailand and the assistance and guidance in the training of officers in the Royal Thai Army.
Timberman, Thomas S., XXXXXX	Apr. 1, 1960	do	Order of the White Elephant, 2d class	Reason for award unknown.
Tulley, David H., XXXXXX	May 1, 1961	Chile	Santimela (Peace) Medal	Do.
		Japan	Star of Military Merit	For the distinguished services rendered to the Army of Chile.
		Italy	Order of the Sacred Treasure	In recognition of services rendered while serving as commanding general, U.S. Army, Japan.
Willems, John M., XXXXXX	Dec. 31, 1961	Italy	Military Order of Italy, degree of cavalier	As artillery commander and then as chief of staff of a higher unit during the Italian campaign, he showed outstanding capacity of command and conspicuous talent for organization and tactics. By his brilliant qualities, displayed in many confidential missions, and proved to be a valuable element for a higher unit headquarters. He unremittingly developed efficient action for the reorganization of the Italian Army, per citation in diploma dated May 29, 1949.
		Peru	Order of Malta, 1st class	Reason for award unknown.
		Portugal	Military Order of Ayacucho, grade of grand officer	In the performance of duty, demonstrating a high degree of cooperation and friendship toward the Peruvian Armed Forces, contributed immeasurably to the strengthening of the prevailing links of solidarity between the Peruvian and the U.S. Armed Forces.
Zimmerman, Wayne C., XXXXXX	Jan. 31, 1956	Iran	Military Merit Medal, 1st class	In the performance of duty while serving as Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence.
			Decoration of Honour, 1st grade	For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of service during the period May 6, 1951, to May 2, 1953, while serving as chief, U.S. military mission with the Imperial Iranian Army.
			Decoration of Merit, 1st class, 1st type (Liaghat)	For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of service as chief of mission.
			Homayun Decoration, 2d grade	He rendered services of exceptional value to the Iranian Army while serving as chief, U.S. military mission with the Imperial Iranian Army.
BRIGADIER GENERAL				
Ammerman, James F., XXXXXX	Aug. 1, 1960	China	Special Collar Order of the Cloud and Banner	In recognition of his outstanding contribution to the Government of the Republic of China during the bombardment of Chinese Communists upon the Klinken complex.
Berry, John A., XXXX	July 1, 1961	Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal with gold star	For exceptionally outstanding and meritorious service rendered to Republic of Korea Army from Jan. 24, 1950, to Feb. 22, 1960, as Deputy Chief of Staff for Administration, 8th U.S. Army.
Bethune, Philip H., XXXXXX	Aug. 1, 1961	Mexico	Military Merit, 1st class	For services rendered while serving as U.S. Army attaché to Mexico.
Broom, Thad A., XXXXXX	July 1, 1960	Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal with gold star	For distinguished service for his assistance in the development of the Republic of Korea Army during his period of assignment as Quartermaster, 8th U.S. Army.
Brown, Robert Q., XXXXXX	Aug. 1, 1961	do	do	For meritorious service in Korea during the period Aug. 27, 1956, to Dec. 1, 1957, while serving as commanding general, I Corps (group), Artillery.
Colby, Joseph M., XXXX	Oct. 1, 1959	France	Legion of Honor, grade of officer	For services rendered to the Government of the Republic of France.
Coleman, Frederick W., III, XXXXXX	Sept. 1, 1958	do	Medaille de la Reconnaissance Française	Reason for award unknown.
Coolidge, George W., XXXXXX	Aug. 1, 1959	Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal with gold star	In recognition and appreciation of his exceptionally outstanding and meritorious performance of duty as assistant division commander, 1st Cavalry Division, during the period Dec. 17, 1957, to Jan. 21, 1959.
Eastwood, Harold E., XXXXX	July 31, 1952	do	Presidential Medal	In recognition and appreciation of his outstanding and exceptionally praiseworthy service while serving as executive officer of the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency from Dec. 1, 1953, as its Deputy Agent General from May 16, 1956, and as Administrator of the Agency from Sept. 15, 1958, to Mar. 26, 1960.
Fields, Kenneth E., XXXXXX	Apr. 30, 1955	Iran	Decoration of Merit, 2d class, 1st type	In recognition of services rendered.
Hannigan, James P., XXXXXX	July 31, 1959	Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal with gold star	In recognition and appreciation of his exceptionally outstanding and meritorious service to the Republic of Korea while serving as commanding general, 8th U.S. Army Support Command, and concurrently as Assistant Chief of Staff, G4, 8th U.S. Army, during the period June 11, 1957, to Aug. 31, 1958.
Hardenbergh, Elmer P., XXXXXX	Dec. 28, 1960	France	Legion of Honor, grade of chevalier	For meritorious service rendered while serving as Chief of Control Service in the American Army in Europe.
Hughes, Oliver W., XXXXXX	Aug. 31, 1954	Greece	Greek War Cross, class III	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof.
Jewett, Richard L., XXXX	Aug. 1, 1961	Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal with gold star	In recognition and appreciation of his exceptionally outstanding and meritorious service rendered to the Republic of Korea from Aug. 15, 1959, to July 30, 1960, while serving as engineer officer, 8th U.S. Army in Korea.
Kreidel, Francis A., XXXXXX	June 30, 1957	Iran	Lyaghet (Merit), 2d degree, type I	As assistant of the chief of the advisory mission to the Imperial Iranian Gendarmerie for exceptional performance of outstanding service during the period May 30, 1948, to Mar. 20, 1950.
McAnsh, Andrew T., XXXXXX	June 1, 1960	Brazil	Order of Military Merit, degree of officer	Cooperated intellectually and materially in a highly efficient manner while serving with the U.S. military mission with the Staff College from July 19, 1951, to Mar. 30, 1954.
		Korea	Taeguk Distinguished Military Service Medal	As Deputy Chief of Staff for Administration 8th U.S. Army during period Jan. 23, 1957, to Oct. 12, 1957.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—Continued

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
BRIGADIER GENERAL—CON.				
McNally, Edward J., XXXX	Aug. 1, 1959	Greece	Knight's Order of Phoenix	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof.
Munson, Frederick P., XXXXX	July 31, 1956	France	Legion of Honor, grade of commander	For services rendered while serving as U.S. Army attaché.
O'Connor, William W., XXXXX	June 30, 1956	Guatemala	Cross of Military Merit, 1 class	As a member of the U.S. Army mission to Guatemala, in appreciation of the personal merit and as a demonstration of the bond and accord between the U.S. Army and the National Army of the Revolution of Guatemala, in virtue of the importance and efficiency of the services rendered to the Armed Institution.
Schewe, Marion W., XXXXX	July 1, 1961	Korea	Ulehi Distinguished Military Service Medal with gold star	In recognition and appreciation of his exceptionally outstanding and meritorious service to the Republic of Korea while serving as special assistant to the Acting Chief of Staff, 8th U.S. Army, during the period June 19, 1957, to July 1, 1957, and as Deputy Chief of Staff, Plans and Operations, 8th U.S. Army from July 2, 1957, to Oct. 1, 1958.
Sladen, Fred W., Jr., XXXXX	Aug. 1, 1959	do	do	For exceptionally meritorious service to the Republic of Korea as Chief of Staff, I U.S. Corps (group) during the period July 12, 1956, to Sept. 25, 1957.
Smith, C. Coburn, Jr.	Aug. 1, 1961	France	Commander of the Legion of Honor	In recognition of services rendered while serving as military attaché to France.
Van Wagoner, Lou G., XXXXX	Apr. 1, 1960	Korea	Ulehi Distinguished Military Service Medal with gold star	For exceptionally meritorious services rendered to Korea.
Vogel, Herbert D., XXXXX	Aug. 31, 1954	Thailand	Order of the Crown of Thailand	Reason for award unknown.
Whipple, William, XXXXX	Aug. 1, 1960	France	Legion of Honor, grade of officer	For services rendered to the French Government.
Woodward, William P., XXXXX	Oct. 31, 1959	do	do	For promoting Franco-American relations.
Bork, Lester S., XXXXX	June 1962	do	Croix de Guerre with palm	In recognition and appreciation of services rendered while in charge of the 4th Bureau (G-4) of the Department of the Army.
Kromer, Philip F., Jr., XXXXX	August 1962	Korea	Ulehi Distinguished Military Service Medal with gold star	For services rendered as engineer, U.S. Army Forces, Far East, and 8th U.S. Army from June 1956 to June 1957, and subsequently as engineer, U.S. Army, Japan, United Nations Command—8th U.S. Army (rear).
Ogden, Milton L., XXXXX	July 1962	Bolivia	National Order of the Condor of the Andes, grade of commander	In recognition of superior military qualities and efficient work while serving as deputy commanding general, U.S. Army, Caribbean.
Waite, Frederick G., XXXX	October 1962	Peru	Military Order of Ayacucho in the grade of commander	For meritorious conduct in performance of service during tour of duty in the Canal Zone, U.S. Army, Caribbean.
		Korea	Ulehi Distinguished Military Service Medal with gold star	In recognition and appreciation of his outstanding and exceptionally meritorious service rendered to the Republic of Korea Army during the period Oct. 8, 1958, to Nov. 5, 1959, while serving as ordnance officer, 8th U.S. Army.
Willing, Alexander M., XXXXX	November 1962	Japan	Order of the Rising Sun, 3d class	In recognition of his service to the Japanese Government while serving as chief of staff and commanding general, U.S. Army, Japan.
Fuqua, Stephen O., Jr.	July 31, 1963	Iran	Persian rug	Reason for award unknown.
COLONEL				
Allicorn, Ford E., XXXX	August 1961	Turkey	Aeronautical Badge	For successfully completing 820 hours and 21 weeks of pilot training. Served as the American adviser to the Turkish Government in the organization and conduct of the Aviation school during the period Aug. 3, 1950, to July 29, 1952.
Allison, Daniel W., XXXXX	October 1960	Greece	Distinguished Service Medal	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof.
Anderson, Woodrow W., XXXX	July 1961	Ecuador	Abdon Calderon, 2d class	For important services rendered to the Armed Forces of Ecuador.
Barschdorf, Milton P., XXXXX	August 1959	Bolivia	Condor of the Andes, grade of commander	Rendered valuable services to the national army, and helped to strengthen the relations between the North American and Bolivian Armies during his period of service in this country.
Baya, George E., XXXXX	June 1963	Venezuela	Cross of the Ground Forces of Venezuela, 2d class	For excellent work performed as the head of the North American military mission.
Belanger, Gerard A., XXXXX	December 1959	Greece	Gold Cross of the Royal Order of George I	Reason for award unknown.
			Distinguished Service Medal	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and valuable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof.
Benner, John G., XXXXX	Mar. 31, 1957	Paraguay	National Order of Merit	For services rendered to the Government of the Republic of Paraguay, while assigned as assistant chief of the military mission to Paraguay.
Boatwright, John R., XXXX	Nov. 30, 1946	Philippines	Distinguished Conduct Star	For acts of conspicuous courage and gallantry during World War II in the Philippines while commanding the 53d Infantry Regiment, 51st Division.
Bowman, Alfred C., XXXXX	Apr. 1, 1960	San Marino	Degree of Knight, Grand Officer of the Equestrian Order of St. Agata	Reason for award unknown.
Boyd, Harry R., XXXX	Aug. 1, 1960	France	Chevalier of the Legion of Honor	In recognition of services rendered while serving in Europe.
Branch, Goodman S., XXXXX	Mar. 1, 1959	Paraguay	National Order of Merit	In recognition of services rendered to the Paraguayan Government.
Brinkley, Thomas M., XXXXX	Aug. 31, 1954	Guatemala	La Cruz del Merito Military de la Clase	In recognition of his timely and effective collaboration as head of the mission of the United States of America in Guatemala and his outstanding personal merits.
			Citation in General Orders of the Bronze Star	Reason for award unknown.
Brophy, Francis J., XXXX	Aug. 1, 1961	Brazil	Order of Military Merit, degree of cavalier	Do.
Brown, J. Trimble, XXXX	Mar. 31, 1956	Japan	Order of the Sacred Treasure, 3d class	In appreciation for his outstanding services rendered to the National Safety Agency of Japan.
Brown, Sidney G., Jr., XXXXX	Aug. 1, 1960	Portugal	Medal of Military Merit, 1st class	For duties performed as chief of the SHAPE mission to Portugal during the period Mar. 10, 1953, to May 17, 1955.
Brownlee, Laurance H., XXXXX	Aug. 31, 1959	Korea	Chungmu Distinguished Military Service Medal with gold star	For services rendered while serving as a member of the U.S. military advisory group to the Republic of Korea during the period Oct. 18, 1952, to Feb. 6, 1954.
Bruce, Charles O., XXXXX	May 31, 1959	Panama	National Order of Manuel Amador Guerrero, rank of knight commander	For distinguished services rendered to the Government of the Republic of Panama.
Buie, Walter D., XXXXX	Aug. 31, 1954	Greece	Distinguished Service Medal	For rendering competent invaluable services as a member of the American military mission in Greece.
Burnett, John W., XXXXX	July 7, 1961	Brazil	Order of Military Merit, grade of officer	For services rendered to the Government of the Republic of Brazil.
Caldwell, Ross R., XXXXX	Dec. 1, 1960	Greece	Distinguished Service Medal	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—Continued

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
COLONEL—continued				
Carlson, Gunnard W., XXXXX	Jan. 1, 1959	France	Legion of Honor, grade of knight	Reason for award unknown.
Channon, James A., XXXX	Dec. 1, 1958	Greece	Distinguished Service Medal	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof.
Chilson, Francis A., XXXXXX	Aug. 31, 1960	Guatemala	Cross of Military Merit, 3d class	For enthusiastic and effective work performed at Escuela Politecnica and Escuela de Arteria, Guatemala.
Chotas, Matthew E., XXXXXX	Oct. 31, 1960	Greece	Distinguished Service Medal	Reason for award unknown.
Cole, James V., XXXXXX	May 31, 1955	Peru	Military Order of Ayacucho, grade of officer	For services rendered to the Government of the Republic of Peru while serving as chief of mission.
Courser, Malcolm W., XXXX	July 21, 1961	Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal	For performance of exceptionally meritorious service during the period May 1955 to Aug. 20, 1956, while serving as commanding officer of the Ascom City Area Command and the 55th U.S. Quartermaster Depot.
Cowan, Edward T., XXXXX	July 31, 1959	Thailand	Knight Commander of the Most Noble Order of the Crown of Thailand	Reason for award unknown.
Dalton, Kenneth W., XXXXXX	Apr. 30, 1960	Italy	Croce al Merito di Guerra	Do.
Davis, Ray L., XXXX	Nov. 3, 1960	Netherlands	Order of Orange Nassau with the swords, grade of commander	For services rendered to the Government of the Netherlands.
Davissou, Henry L., XXXX	Sept. 1, 1961	Greece	War Cross, class C with crown	For services rendered during the Greek Revolution from May 1948 to May 1949 while serving as adviser to the Greek X Mountain Division.
Dawson, Gordon E., XXXXXX	Aug. 1, 1961	Italy	Order of Merit of the Republic of Italy, grade of officer	For services rendered as U.S. Army attaché, Rome, Italy, from July 8, 1953, to July 10, 1956.
Dedi, Charles A., XXXX	Sept. 30, 1960	Brazil	Cross of Military Merit with crown, 1st class	Do.
Dorn, George W., XXXXXX	July 1, 1960	Korea	Order of Military Merit, grade of officer	Reason for award unknown.
Dueker, Fred E., XXXX	Dec. 31, 1960	Iran	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal with silver star	For outstanding and meritorious service during the period Nov. 23, 1956, to Feb. 28, 1958, while serving as assistant chief of staff, G-4, I Corps (Group).
Dyer, Fred C., XXXXXX	Nov. 30, 1957	do	Medal of Honor, 3d grade	For satisfactory services in the gendarmerie.
Edmunds, James B., XXXX	June 30, 1953	Brazil	Decoration of Merit, 2d class, 1st type	For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of service during the period from May 6, 1950, to Apr. 6, 1952.
Finley, Glenn S., XXXXX	Aug. 31, 1954	Greece	Order of Military Merit, grade of officer	For services rendered to the Government of the Republic of Brazil.
Goodwin, Arthur C., Jr., XXXXXX	Apr. 1, 1960	Portugal	Cross of the Commander of the Royal Order of the Phoenix	In recognition of his service rendered to Greece, while serving as chief of staff of the U.S. military mission to Greece.
Gray, Ernest R., Jr., XXXX	Jan. 31, 1960	Korea	Knight's Order of Phoenix	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof.
Grealey, Brendan McK., XXXXXX	Aug. 1, 1959	Peru	Medal of Military Merit, 1st class	In recognition of services rendered while serving as chief of SHAPE training mission to Portugal for the period May 2, 1955, to May 5, 1958.
Greene, Alphonse A., XXXXXX	do	Chile	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal	For outstanding and meritorious service in the development of the Republic of Korea Army during the period Nov. 15, 1956, to Feb. 24, 1958, while serving as secretary of the general staff, Headquarters I Corps (Group), U.S. Army.
Grizzard, Harry M., XXXX	July 31, 1956	Greece	Military Order of Ayacucho, grade of officer	Reason for award unknown.
Hale, Maurice W., XXXX	Oct. 31, 1956	Peru	Estrella al Merito Militar	For distinguished services rendered to the Army of Chile while serving as chief, U.S. Army missions, U.S. Army, Caribbean.
Haley, Charles L., III, XXXX	Sept. 1, 1959	Venezuela	Distinguished Service Medal	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof.
Hallaren, Mary A., XXXX	July 1, 1960	France	Military Order of Ayacucho, degree of commander	Reason for award unknown.
Harper, Neal W., XXXXXX	Sept. 1, 1960	do	Cross of the Venezuelan ground forces, 2d class	In recognition of his services as Army attaché to Venezuela during the period Nov. 17, 1952, to July 6, 1955.
Harris, Edward M., XXXXXX	Oct. 1, 1961	Spain	Legion of Honor, grade of chevalier	As a token of gratitude for the eminent services rendered to the allied cause during the last World War and for her faithful friendship to France.
Hoover, Warren H., XXXXXX	Aug. 1, 1961	Cuba	Legion of Honor, grade of knight	For services rendered to the Republic of France.
Janaio, Maximiano S., XXXXXX	Aug. 20, 1960	Philippines	Medal for Military Merit, 3d class with white distinctive	For services to Spain.
Kane, O'Neill K., XXXXXX	June 30, 1954	Ecuador	Distinguished Service Medal	For acts and accomplishments rendered to the Government of the Republic of Cuba, while assigned as chief of the U.S. Army mission to Cuba.
Kidwell, Francis E., XXXXXX	July 31, 1954	Greece	Legion of Honor, degree of commander (1st bronze anahaw leaf)	For exceptionally meritorious service in the Philippine Army as Assistant Chief of Staff, G-4, from Mar. 31 to Oct. 20, 1945, and for valuable services to the Filipino people as operations officer, Construction Corps of the Philippines, U.S. Army from Oct. 1945 to the early part of 1947.
King, Archibald, XXXX	Aug. 31, 1942	Brazil	Abdon Calderon, 1st class	As chief of the U.S. mission to Ecuador for 2 years, rendered important services to the Ecuadorean Armed Forces.
Kouns, Charles W., XXXX	Sept. 1, 1961	do	Knight's Order of Phoenix	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof.
Leslie, Robert C., XXXX	Oct. 1, 1959	Mexico	Order of Military Legal Merit	In recognition of services rendered to the Brazilian Government.
Lindley, Ara G., XXXX	Mar. 1, 1961	Belgium	Order of Military Merit, grade of cavalier	Organized, completed administrative details for, and acted as tour director for the official visit of Maj. Gen. Estillac Leal, Minister of War of Brazil, during the period May 2-20, 1951.
Loomis, Frederick H., XXXXXX	Oct. 31, 1961	Greece	Decoration of Military Merit, 2d class	For outstanding contribution as an English instructor at the Mexican War College.
Mabee, Richard W., XXXXXX	Dec. 31, 1960	Finland	The Military Cross, 1st class	In recognition of services rendered to the Belgian Army within the domain of MAAC-BELUX.
			Greek War Cross, class III	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof.
			Order of the White Rose, grade of commander	For services rendered while serving as Army attaché.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—Continued

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
COLONEL—continued				
Martin, Paul M., XXXXX	June 30, 1954	Belgium	Order of Leopold, grade of officer	As a token of good will.
Matthewson, Merton K., XXXXX	Mar. 28, 1955	Greece	Distinguished Service Medal	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof.
McAfee, Broadus, XXXX	Jan. 31, 1959	Netherlands	Commander in the Order of Orange-Nassau with swords.	For services rendered while serving as Army attaché.
McBride, Clyde R., XXXXX	Aug. 1, 1961	Peru	Military Order of Ayacucho, grade of officer. Military Order of Ayacucho, grade of commander.	Reason for award unknown.
McClelland, Charles B., Jr., XXXXX	Aug. 1, 1959	Iran	Medal of Merit, 2d grade, 1st class. Decoration of Honor, 2d class. Pas (Reward) Medal, 3d class. Taj Decoration, 3d grade.	For performance of duty, demonstrated in a high degree of cooperation and friendship toward the Peruvian Armed Forces and have thereby contributed immeasurably to the strengthening of the prevailing links of solidarity between the Peruvian and the U.S. Armed Forces. For commendable services rendered in guidance and reorganization of the Imperial Iranian Gendarmerie. For services rendered while serving as chief of the U.S. advisory mission to the Imperial Iranian Gendarmerie and adviser to the commanding general of the Imperial Gendarmerie.
McGrath, Albert W., XXXXX	Apr. 30, 1961	Greece	War Cross, 3d class	In recognition of the meritorious services while serving as chief of the advisory mission. For services rendered while serving as chief of the American advisory mission to the Imperial Iranian Gendarmerie.
McNaul, Winfield H., XXXX	Apr. 5, 1961	Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal with silver star.	As a member of the American military mission in Greece, rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof.
Mills, John V., XXXXX	Aug. 31, 1955	Greece	Distinguished Service Medal	For meritorious service during the period July 20, 1956, to Nov. 28, 1957.
Moore, Harold H., XXXXX	June 30, 1961	do	do	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof.
Morrison, John T., XXXXX	Dec. 31, 1957	France	Chevalier de l'Ordre de la Santa Publique.	As a member of the U.S. Expeditionary Forces in Greece, rendered valuable services to the Greek Army.
Morse, Henry P., XXXXX	Nov. 30, 1960	Greece	War Cross, class III	For services rendered while serving as administrator of public health, Maryland.
Neal, Ralph M., XXXX	May 31, 1954	Belgium	Military Cross, 1st class	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof.
Olson, Clarence H., XXXX	May 1, 1960	Philippines	Legion of Honor, degree of officer	In recognition of services rendered to the Belgian Army within the domain of MAAG-BELUX.
O'Neill, John T., XXXX	May 1, 1961	Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal with silver star.	In recognition of exceptionally meritorious and distinguished service to the Republic of the Philippines while serving as assistant director of the American Legion National Legislative Commission from 1950 to 1959.
Owen, Jack S., XXXXX	July 31, 1961	Greece	Order of Phoenix	For meritorious service in positions of the highest trust and responsibility while serving as deputy commander, 8th U.S. Army Support Command, and later as Commanding officer, U.S. Army, Seoul Area Command, from May 24, 1957 to Mar. 14, 1958.
Palmer, Raymond D., XXXXX	Aug. 31, 1954	Cambodia	Officer of the Order of Agricultural Merit.	For services rendered to the Greek Army and in furthering the good relations between the 2 armies.
		China	Order of the Cloud and Banner	For services rendered as assistant director of the construction project, National Highway No. 4.
Peddicord, Everett D., XXXX	Jan. 31, 1958	Greece	Military Cross, class A	For services rendered while serving as U.S. Army attaché in Thailand during the period April 1953 to November 1954.
Penniman, Charles D., XXXX	Nov. 30, 1961	France	Knight of the Legion of Honor	For his vigilant interest which contributed immeasurably to the glorious success of A Corps, which has liberated Grammos from the bandits and relieved Greece from their malicious intentions.
Pierce, James R., XXXX	June 3, 1958	Iran	Lyaghet (Merit), 2d degree, type 1	In recognition of the services rendered while serving as commanding officer, 11th Transportation Terminal Command, from Oct. 2, 1956, to Aug. 8, 1959.
Poinier, Norman E., XXXXX	July 31, 1959	Brazil	Order of Military Merit, degree of officer.	As chief, U.S. military advisory mission to the Imperial Iranian Gendarmerie, for exceptional performance of outstanding service during the period June 25, 1948, to Mar. 20, 1950.
Pumpelly, James W., XXXX	Mar. 31, 1957	Ecuador Panama	Abdon Calderon, 2d class. Orden de Vasco Nunez de Balboa	For rendering advice and assistance to the staff of the Brazilian Command and General Staff School and to the Brazilian War College.
Reed, Charles B., XXXXX	Aug. 1, 1960	Mexico	Military Merit, 2d class	Reason for award unknown. For services rendered to the Government of the Republic of Panama.
Roller, Harry G., XXXXX	July 31, 1957	Greece	Greek War Cross, class III	For services rendered while serving as U.S. representative of Joint Mexico-United States Defense Commission, an instructor at the Mexican War College and assistant Army attaché, also for his efforts in furthering closer relations between the Mexican Army and the Army of the United States.
Roy, Paul A., XXXX	July 31, 1960	Belgium	Cross of Officer of the Order of Leopold.	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof.
Sanders, Walter C., XXXX	Oct. 1, 1961	Ecuador	Abdon Calderon, 1st class	In recognition of exceptional services rendered to the Belgian Army while serving as Army attaché from 1954 to 1957.
Schenken, Carlton G., XXXX	Mar. 1, 1959	France	Silver Medal of Reconnaissance Française.	Reason for award unknown.
Schlele, George C., XXXX	Mar. 2, 1961	Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal with silver star.	For services rendered from May 15, 1950, to December 1951 in the ETO at which time had frequent contact with various officials in the French Government.
Schmelzer, John F., XXXXX	Aug. 1, 1961	Panama	Lieutenant Colonel Alfredo Lezcano Gomez Medal.	Colonel Schlele distinguished himself by exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding service to the Republic of Korea during the period from Feb. 13, to Aug. 16, 1953, as the senior adviser of the 21st Republic of Korea Infantry Division.
Schull, Herman W., Jr., XXXXX	July 31, 1957	Peru	Order of Ayacucho, degree of officer	For meritorious services to the National Guard, Republic of Panama.
Schultheis, Leo J., XXXXX	June 1, 1961	Greece	Distinguished Service Medal	Reason for award unknown.
			Gold Cross of the Order of George I	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—Continued

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
COLONEL—continued				
Sharp, John R., [REDACTED]	Dec. 18, 1957	Greece	Distinguished Service Medal	As a member of the U.S. Army group in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof.
Shoemaker, Paul S., [REDACTED]	Aug. 9, 1957	Costa Rica	do.	Distinguished himself by his excellent spirit of cooperation and by his advice has performed distinguished services for the police force of Costa Rica.
Shore, Moyers S., [REDACTED]	Sept. 1, 1961	Panama	Order of Vasco Nunez de Balboa, grade of commander.	For distinguishing himself in war action in Australia, New Guinea, and on Luzon, and entry of the Armed Forces of the United States into the occupation of Japan. He also won esteem in difficult and important tasks, while assigned to the investigations department in Panama.
Shuder, Russell M., [REDACTED]	do.	Korea	Chungmu Distinguished Military Service Medal with gold star.	Distinguished himself by exceptionally meritorious service to the Republic of Korea during the period Dec. 13, 1954, to Feb. 16, 1956, while serving as Chief, Communications Division Office of the United Nations Economic Coordinator for Korea.
Slade, Todd H., [REDACTED]	Aug. 1, 1958	Mexico	Cross and plaque, Lieutenant General Ignacio Comonfort, Military Merit, 1st class.	For distinguished services.
Smith, Philip E., [REDACTED]	Jan. 31, 1960	Iran	Decoration of Merit, 3d class, 1st type.	For his enthusiastic, active, and effective work of bringing the Army of the United States and the Army of Mexico closer together.
Smith, Philip J., [REDACTED]	Dec. 31, 1959	Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal with silver star.	In recognition of services rendered the Iranian Army.
		Sweden	Swedish Red Cross in silver	For service rendered to the Republic of Korea during the period Nov. 20, 1955, to July 4, 1956.
Spangler, Richard S., [REDACTED]	Aug. 1, 1961	Iran	Decoration of Merit, 3d class, 1st type.	In recognition of his meritorious service on behalf of the Swedish Red Cross.
Stanley, John B., [REDACTED]	Dec. 31, 1960	Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal with silver star.	In recognition of the services rendered to the Iranian Army.
Steinbeck, Paul W., [REDACTED]	Aug. 22, 1959	Bolivia	Condor de Los Andes, degree of comandante.	For meritorious service during the period April 1953 to Feb. 15, 1958, while serving as commanding officer of the U.S. Army Command reconnaissance activities, Pacific Command.
Stalzenmuller, William B., [REDACTED]	July 1, 1960	Iran	Decoration of Honor, 3d grade	In recognition of his services as U.S. military attaché in La Paz, and for his aid to Bolivia during the Trinidad flood of 1947 in which he participated in several hazardous airplane flights ascertaining conditions in the flood areas, per letter dated Nov. 24, 1948, from the U.S. military attaché, La Paz, Bolivia.
			Decoration of Honor, 2d grade	For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of service during the period Jan. 2, 1952, to Dec. 6, 1953, per citation.
Stevens, Vernum C., [REDACTED]	July 31, 1954	do.	Decoration of Merit, 2d grade, 1st type.	For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of service during the period Jan. 2, 1952, to June 8, 1953, while serving as engineer adviser to the Imperial Iranian Army.
			Merit Decoration, 2d class, type I, 2d award.	For exceptionally meritorious conduct in performance of service during the period June 9, 1953, to May 15, 1954, while serving as chief of staff and deputy chief of U.S. military mission with the Iranian Army, per citation.
Stodter, John H., [REDACTED]	June 30, 1954	Ecuador	Abdon Calderon, 1st class	For exceptionally meritorious conduct in performance of service during the period June 9, 1953, to May 15, 1954, while serving as chief of staff and deputy chief of U.S. military mission with the Iranian Army.
Taylor, James B., [REDACTED]	Apr. 30, 1956	Greece	Distinguished Service Medal	In recognition of the important services rendered to the Ecuadorian National Army as chief of the military mission of the U.S. Army to Ecuador, per decree dated July 12, 1949, signed by Galo Plaza, President of the Republic of Ecuador.
Taylor, William N., [REDACTED]	Oct. 1, 1960	Italy	Order of Merit of the Italian Republic, degree of officer.	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof, per Greek royal decree dated Feb. 8, 1950.
Timmerman, Fred, [REDACTED]	Sept. 30, 1954	Greece	Distinguished Service Medal	For services rendered while serving as assistant chief of staff for logistics and administration of the headquarters of the Allied Ground Forces of South Europe.
Titus, George F., [REDACTED]	Mar. 31, 1956	do.	Military Cross	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof, per Greek royal decree dated Feb. 8, 1950.
Trail, Harry E., [REDACTED]	Apr. 1, 1961	Cuba	Order of Military Merit, 2d class	Reason for award unknown.
Troxler, Paul D., [REDACTED]	Aug. 1, 1960	Greece	Gold Cross of George I.	Rendered meritorious services to the benefit of our country and particularly to the Army, cooperating with the closer existing friendly relations of both governments.
Truly, Merrick H., [REDACTED]	Aug. 1, 1961	Korea	Chungmu Distinguished Military Service Medal with Gold Star.	Award made on Mar. 30, 1949, in recognition of services rendered in the construction and expansion of military and civil airfields in Greece, per letter dated Apr. 1, 1949, from the Office of District Engineers, Grecian District, Athens, Greece.
Vincent, Stewart T., [REDACTED]	Aug. 31, 1954	Colombia	Orden de Boyaca, grade of commander.	For the outstanding performance in a position of great trust and responsibility as Assistant Chief of Staff, G2, Army Forces Far East and 8th U.S. Army during the period Jan. 27, 1956, to Apr. 19, 1957.
Vivas, Joseph R., [REDACTED]	June 1, 1959	Peru	Military Order of Ayacucho, grade of officer.	As chief of the U.S. Army mission to Colombia, in the accomplishment of his mission contributed with exemplary brilliancy, intelligence, and devotion to solving the important military problems and the training of many officers of the Colombian Army, for whom his advice and teaching have been of great benefit. For decree from the President of the Republic of Colombia and signed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs in charge of the War Office.
Wallace, Herbert C., [REDACTED]	July 23, 1958	Iran	Decoration of Honor, 3d class	Reason for award unknown.
Webber, Donald B., [REDACTED]	Aug. 1, 1961	Argentina	Order of General San Martin, degree of commander.	In recognition of his services while a member of the U.S. military mission, Imperial Iranian Gendarmerie.
				As assistant military attaché to Argentina he has been the main contact between the U.S. military attaché and the Argentine Minister of War because of his command of Spanish and his excellent personal relations with Argentina. He was assistant tour director with the Argentine Minister of War during the latter's visit to the United States in April and May 1948.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—Continued

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
COLONEL—continued				
Williamson, William E., XXXXXX	Jan. 31, 1958	France	Legion of Honor, rank of chevalier	In recognition of services rendered while serving as military attaché assistant to Ambassador of the United States in Paris. Reason for award unknown.
Wilson, Conson D., XXXXXX	July 31, 1954	Brazil	Order of Military Merit, grade of officer.	For outstanding service and exceptionally meritorious achievement as the engineer, 8th U.S. Army in Korea, from May 1, 1957, to July 27, 1958. Reason for award unknown.
Wirak, Louis R., XXXXXX	Aug. 1, 1961	Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal with silver star.	In recognition of services rendered while serving with Headquarters Allied Forces, Southern Europe.
Wood, Lincoln XXXXXX	Aug. 1, 1959	Iran	Medal of Eftekhâr, 2d grade	For his work in drawing together the Armed Forces of the United States and Mexico, per diploma from Secretary of National Defense, Nov. 23, 1951, Mexico, D.F.
Adams, James Y., XXXXXX	August 1962	Greece	Royal Order of George I	In recognition of services rendered while serving as military attaché.
Anderson, Joseph C., XXXXXX	September 1962	Mexico	Order of Military Merit, 2d class	For services rendered while serving as Army attaché to Finland.
Clarkin, Thomas R., XXXXXX	March 1962	Argentina	Orden de Mayo al Merito Militar, rank of comandante.	In recognition of services rendered while serving as Chief of Staff, SETAF.
Cochran, Avery M., XXXXXX	September 1962	Finland	Order of the White Rose, grade of commander.	For his exceptionally meritorious conduct, untiring efforts, willingness and attention to duty for the period July 30, 1948, to Jan. 14, 1951. Colonel Crane served as medical and veterinary adviser to the Iranian Army.
Conran, Richard J., XXXXXX	November 1962	Italy	Officer of the Order of Merit of the Italian Republic.	For services to the progress of the country and for his outstanding deeds.
Crane, Francis S., XXXX	July 1962	Iran	Honor Decoration, 3d degree	For services rendered in connection with his service as a staff member of the Legal Department, National Catholic Welfare Conference, from 1946 to 1960. Reason for award unknown.
Ebel, Henry W., XXXX	September 1962	Venezuela	Order of Francisco de Miranda, 2d class.	In recognition of his service to Japan in the field of community relations while a member of Headquarters, U.S. Army, Japan.
Allred, Vincent C., XXXXXX	July 1962	Vatican	Knight of the Order of Saint Gregory the Great.	For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding service to the Republic of Korea during the period from Oct. 9, 1955, to Nov. 23, 1956, as the commanding officer, Headquarters, Seoul Area Command.
King, Archibald, XXXX	April 1963	Brazil	Medal of High Distinction of the Order of Merit of Military Jurisprudence of Brazil.	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof.
Elterich, John A., XXXX	April 1962	Japan	Third Order of Merit of the Sacred Treasure.	For his personal merits and his effective assistance rendered to the national army.
Golden, Joe E., XXXX	August 1962	Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal.	In recognition of service performed during tour of duty as commanding officer, U.S. Army, ASCOM Area Command, in Korea from Aug. 15, 1957, to Mar. 30, 1959.
Halada, Roland J., XXXX	July 1962	Greece	Greek War Cross, class III	In recognition of services rendered while serving as U.S. Army attaché.
Hanford, Thomas B., XXXXXX	January 1962	Guatemala	Guatemalan Cross of Military Merit, II class.	For services rendered while serving as assistant Army attaché.
Hill, John L., XXXX	February 1962	Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal with silver star.	For services rendered while serving as U.S. Army attaché. Has rendered valuable services and attentions to members of the Chilean Army which have contributed to the mutual understanding and advantage of both organizations and thus was of direct benefit to continental harmony.
Hunt, Richard J., XXXXXX	August 1962	Netherlands	Order of Orange, Nassau with the Swords, degree of commander.	Token of good will.
Kohls, Carl W., XXXXXX	July 1961	France	Order of the Black Star	For services rendered while serving as U.S. Army attaché.
McKee, Gregg L., XXXXXX	April 1962	Portugal	Order of Military Merit, 2d class	Has rendered valuable services and attentions to members of the Chilean Army which have contributed to the mutual understanding and advantage of both organizations and thus was of direct benefit to continental harmony.
McNulty, William A., XXXXXX	August 1962	Iran	Honor Decoration, 2d class, grade I	Token of good will.
Matthews, Willis S., XXXX	December 1962	Chile	Military Medal, 2d class	For exceptionally meritorious conduct of outstanding service to the Republic of the Philippines in his capacity as Army attaché from Apr. 22, 1957, to March 1960.
Mayetta, Frank R., XXXXXX	April 1962	France	Order of the Black Star	In recognition of the services rendered to the Republic of Bolivia in connection with the joint cartographic program.
Miller, Henry L., XXXX	June 1962	Philippines	Legion of Honor, degree of officer	For outstanding services rendered to the Brazilian Army.
Robertson, Robert R., XXXXXX	November 1962	Bolivia	Condor of the Andes, grade of officer	In recognition of the outstanding services rendered to the Army of Chile while serving as Director of the Inter-American Geodetic Survey in connection with the joint cartographic program.
		Brazil	Medal of the Pacificator	For services rendered while serving as Director of the IAGS in connection with the joint cartographic program.
		Chile	Military Medal, 2d class	In recognition of services rendered to the Republic of Colombia while serving as Director of the Inter-American Geodetic Survey.
		Colombia	Order of Military Merit Antonio Nariño, grade of commander. Order of Boyaca, grade of commander.	For services rendered while serving as Director of the IAGS in connection with the joint cartographic program.
		Cuba	Distinguished Service Medal	In recognition of services rendered to the Republic of Colombia while serving as Director of the Inter-American Geodetic Survey.
			Orden del Merito Vial, commander	For services rendered while serving as Director of the IAGS in connection with the joint cartographic program.
		Dominican Republic	Order of Merit of Duarte, Sanchez and Mella, grade of officer.	In consideration of outstanding service rendered to the National Highway Service.
		Ecuador	Abdon Calderon, 2d class	For services rendered while serving as Director of the IAGS in connection with the joint cartographic program.
			Abdon Calderon, 1st class	In recognition of the services rendered by the Inter-American Geodetic Survey while Colonel Robertson was serving as Director of the IAGS to the Republic of Ecuador in connection with the joint cartographic program.
		El Salvador	Jose Matias Delegado National Order, grade of comandante.	In recognition of the outstanding services rendered while serving as Director of the Inter-American Geodetic Survey.
		Guatemala	Order of the Quetzal, grade of commander.	In recognition of the services rendered while serving as Director of the Inter-American Geodetic Survey.
		Haiti	National Order of Honor and Merit	In recognition of the services rendered to the Republic of Haiti in connection with the joint cartographic program.
		Mexico	Military Merit, 2d class	In recognition of his magnificent cooperation in the development of the cartographic work in Mexico and his interest in bringing close friendly ties between the personnel of the Military Institute of Mexico and the United States.
		Peru	Military Order of Ayacucho, grade of officer.	In recognition of the services rendered while serving as Director of the Inter-American Geodetic Survey in connection with the joint cartographic program.
Scherer, Karl L., XXXXXX	August 1962	Greece	Cross of Brigadiers of Our Order of Phoenix	Reason for award unknown.
Still, Daniel E., XXXXXX	June 1962	Guatemala	Cross of Military Merit, 3d class	For recognition of meritorious collaborationist work accomplished with a view to improving the National Army and as a sincere demonstration of friendship toward the Army of the United States.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—Continued

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
COLONEL—continued				
St. John, Lawrence R., XXXXX	August 1962	Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal with silver star.	In recognition and appreciation of his exceptionally outstanding and meritorious service while serving as engineer officer of the I U.S. Corps and commanding officer of the 2d Engineer Group (Construction) during the period Feb. 7, 1958, to Mar. 3, 1959.
Tate, Ferdinand J., XXXXX	do	Colombia	Order of Merit General Jose Maria Cordoba, grade of commander.	In recognition of outstanding services and assistance in the mapping of Colombia and as technical adviser to the military commissions working in the areas of the Ecuadorian border, Tumaco, and Buenaventura while assigned as Director, U.S. Army Inter-American Geodetic Survey.
Tate, Ferdinand J., XXXXX	do	Peru	Military Order of Ayacucho, grade of officer.	In recognition of outstanding services and assistance in the mapping of Peru while assigned as Director, U.S. Army Inter-American Geodetic Survey.
Tyner, St. Elmo P., XXXXXX	October 1962	Korea	Chungmu Distinguished Military Service Medal with gold star.	He distinguished himself by exceptionally meritorious service during the period Mar. 1, 1952, to Sept. 30, 1952, while serving as senior adviser to I Republic of Korea Army Corps.
		Paraguay	Orden del Merito Militar, grade of comandante.	In recognition of services rendered while serving as chief of U.S. Army mission.
Warner, Gordon G., XXXXX	August 1962	Ecuador	Medalla Infanteria.	Do.
		Abdon Calderon de Clase		In recognition of services rendered while serving at U.S. Army attaché to Ecuador.
King, Archibald	April 1963	Peru	Order of Ayacucho, degree of officer.	Reason for award unknown.
		Brazil	Medal of High Distinction of the Order of Merit of Military Jurisprudence of Brazil.	
Bartlett, William T.	Oct. 30, 1962	Bolivia	Condor de los andes, grade of official.	Reason for award unknown.
Pritchard, James R.	July 31, 1963	Netherlands	Order of Orange-Nassau, grade of commander.	Do.
Schafer, Philip	June 30, 1963	do	Greek Gold Cross Order of George I.	Do.
Setliffe, Truman H.	do	France	Legion of Honor, rank of knight.	Do.
Clark, Roger W.	Feb. 1, 1964	Greece	Distinguished Service Medal.	Do.
LIEUTENANT COLONEL				
Bakalian, Aram, XXXX	July 1962	do	do	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and valuable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof.
Chandler, Eli C., XXXXXX	August 1962	Guatemala	Order of the Quetzal, grade of commander.	For outstanding services performed while serving as Chief of the Inter-American Geodetic Survey in connection with the cartographic program in Guatemala.
Costolo, Hal P., XXXXXX	May 1962	France	Silver Medal of Honor in Sports and Physical Education.	For services rendered while serving as a representative to the Conseil International de Sport Militaire.
Day, Alfred K., Jr., XXXX	October 1962	Iran	Decoration of Honor, 3d class.	For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of service during the period Aug. 2, 1953, to June 29, 1954, while serving as assistant G-3 adviser to the Imperial Iranian Army.
Duncan, Joseph G., XXXX	March 1962	Mexico	Military Merit, 2d class.	Reason for award unknown.
Durfee, Donald L., XXXXXX	July 1962	Brazil	Order of Military Merit, degree of cavalier.	Do.
Eubanks, C. A. Holmes, XXXXXX	April 1962	Greece	War Cross, class III.	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof.
Farouhar, William R., XXXXXX	May 1962	Peru	Order Militar de Ayacucho, grado de oficial.	In recognition of services rendered to the Peruvian Government.
Gates, Chester M., XXXXXX	June 1962	Iran	Decoration of Merit, 3d class, 1st type.	For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of service during the period from Mar. 7, 1951, to Mar. 21, 1952. He rendered services of exceptional value to the Iranian Army while serving as adviser to Armor School and armored units.
Gelardi, Anthony, XXXXXX	August 1962	China	Air Force Distinguished Service Medal.	In recognition of meritorious contributions to the construction of the Kungkuang Air Base.
Goodwin, Walter P., XXXXXX	do	Italy	Cross for War Merit.	For service rendered with the 88th Division in Italy during World War II.
Gorham, Frank W., XXXX	December 1962	Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal.	For meritorious service as commanding officer, U.S. Army port, Inchon, during the period June 20, 1957, to Aug. 22, 1958.
Granson, Nicholas, XXXXXX	do	Greece	Gold Cross of the Order of George I.	Reason for award unknown.
Hart, Harry L., XXXX	July 1962	Chile	Military Medal, 3d class.	Do.
Henderson, Lester J., XXXX	December 1962	Korea	Chungmu Distinguished Military Service Medal with gold star.	In recognition and appreciation of his exceptionally outstanding and meritorious service while serving as officer in charge of construction, Republic of Korea Arsenal, during the period May 28, 1957, to June 1, 1958.
Hicks, Fred C., XXXX	June 1962	do	Chungmu Distinguished Military Service Medal with silver star.	For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding service during the period June 30, 1955, to Oct. 2, 1956, while serving consecutively as commanding officer, executive officer and operation officer of the 8222d Army unit.
L'Homme, Jacques M., XXXXXX	February 1962	Iran	Merit Decoration, 2d class.	For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of service during the period Mar. 20, 1954, to Apr. 15, 1955, while serving as adviser to G-2 of the Imperial Iranian Army.
Lininger, John B., XXXXXX	December 1961	Vietnam	National Order of Vietnam, grade of officer.	For services rendered while serving as assistant military attaché.
McPherran, Paul L., XXXXXX	September 1961	France	Order of the Black Star.	Reasons for award unknown.
Meade, Stephen J., XXXXXX	December 1962	Iran	Honor Medal, 3d class, 1st grade.	For services rendered while serving as assistant U.S. Army attaché in Iran.
		Syria	Order of Merit Medal, 1st class.	"In recognition of his good services", per citation signed by the Syrian Prime Minister, Muhsein el Barazi, July 16, 1949.
Mercado, Felix V., XXXXXX	July 1962	Paraguay	National Order of Merit, grade of cavalier.	For services rendered to the Armed Forces of Paraguay as a member of the U.S. Army mission to Paraguay for period of Mar. 23, 1952, to Oct. 25, 1954.
Miller, Luther R., XXXXXX	do	Korea	Chungmu Distinguished Military Service Medal with gold star.	Distinguished himself by exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding service while serving as the Deputy to Assistant Chief of Staff, G-2, U.S. Army Forces, Far East and 8th U.S. Army, during the period Oct. 7, 1955, to Dec. 17, 1956.
Northern, Edward D., XXXX	November 1962	Peru	Military Order of Ayacucho, grade of officer.	Reason for award unknown.
Pray, Lee H., XXXX	June 1962	Greece	Commander of the Royal Order of the Phoenix.	Conferred upon Colonel Pray by His Majesty, the King of the Hellenes, in recognition of the efficient assistance he gave His Majesty during his visit to Austria.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—Continued

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
LIEUTENANT COLONEL—CON.				
Slagle, Halbert J., XXXXX	July 1962	Iran	Iranian Merit Decoration, 3d class	For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of service during the period June 9, 1953, to May 13, 1954, while serving as adviser to signal section Imperial Iranian Army.
			Decoration of Honor, 3d grade	For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of service during the period June 1, 1953, to June 8, 1953, while serving as adviser to signal section, engineer department, Imperial Iranian Army.
Sokol, Arnold, XXXXX	October 1962	Colombia	Military Order General Jose Maria Cordoba, grade of officer.	For services rendered with the Colombian Army during the period Oct. 27, 1954, to Feb. 1, 1955.
Rager, Edward E., XXXXX	July 1962	Iran	Decoration of Merit, 3d grade, 1st rank.	Reason for award unknown.
Starkey, Arthur W., XXXXX	do.	do.	Merit Decoration, 2d class, 1st type	For exceptional meritorious conduct in the performance of service during the period Dec. 7, 1953, to June 23, 1955, while serving as engineer adviser to the Imperial Iranian Army.
Street, Frank L., XXXXX	September 1962	Ecuador	Abdon Calderon, 1st class	For valuable services rendered to the national armed forces during the period of time he has remained in Ecuador as a member of the U.S. Army mission to Ecuador.
		Mexico	Military Merit, 2d class	In recognition of services as assistant Army attaché, American Embassy, Mexico City.
Wainhouse, Edward R., XXXXX	December 1962	Greece	Distinguished Service Medal	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof.
Anestos, Tash P., XXXX	Apr. 30, 1961	do.	Battalion of King George I, Gold Cross of Knight without swords.	For services rendered to Greece.
Barton, Dorsey, XXXX	Aug. 31, 1956	do.	Greek War Cross, class III	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and valuable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof, per Greek royal decree dated Feb. 8, 1950.
Bennett, Arden L., XXXX	Nov. 30, 1958	Brazil	Honoris Causa	For important services rendered to the chemical warfare department, as director of the courses for Brazilian officers given in the Chemical Corps School in 1947, 1948, and 1949, per diploma dated Aug. 28, 1952.
Biersteker, Nicholas C., XXXXX	Feb. 1, 1961	Greece	Distinguished Service Medal	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and valuable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof, per Greek royal decree dated Dec. 8, 1950.
Booth, Maynard B., XXXX	Nov. 30, 1960	Japan	Japan Ground Self-Defense Force Aviation Badge.	For services rendered in training of Japan ground self-defense force pilots.
Burgger, Vernon W., XXXX	Apr. 1, 1959	Thailand	Santimale (Peace) Medal	In appreciation of the services rendered to Thailand by his cooperation and assistance during the war, per letter dated Oct. 31, 1949, from the Royal Thai Embassy.
Bush, Weaver L., XXXXXX	Aug. 1, 1960	Greece	Distinguished Service Medal	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and valuable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof, per royal decree dated Feb. 8, 1950.
Cassidy, Frank P., XXXXXXXX	Feb. 28, 1957	Colombia	Order of Boyace	For services rendered in connection with the Colombian geodetic mapping program during the period July 5, 1949, to Apr. 1, 1953, per decree No. 411 dated Feb. 19, 1953.
Chiaromonte, Julio, XXXXXXXX	Feb. 1, 1961	Greece	Greek Military Cross	"Because being liaison officer with the A.Q. branch, he did, with unsparing effort, the best he could to meet the shortages in equipment. Because during the Grammos operations, he has shown courage and bravery by being in continual action within the division areas, and he has exposed his life several times to danger." (Citation in Greek Order of the Day, dated Nov. 27, 1948, signed by Maj. Gen. T. H. Pentzopoulos.)
Clark, Carroll H., XXXXXXXX	Oct. 31, 1957	France	Legion of Honor, grade of chevalier	In recognition of the great and distinguished services rendered by Colonel Clark who was always present on the battlefields during the war 1939-45 and in whom France found under all circumstances a true and devoted friend.
Coeyman, William M., XXXXXXXX	July 1, 1960	Greece	Greek War Cross, class II	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof, per Greek royal decree dated Feb. 8, 1950.
Collin, Jonas E., II, XXXXXXXX	Aug. 1, 1961	do.	War Cross, class III	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and valuable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof, per Greek royal decree dated Feb. 8, 1950.
Condon, John F., XXXX	May 1, 1960	France	Reconnaissance Francaise	2 documents dated Oct. 31, 1951, and Nov. 2, 1951, for outstanding services rendered to France.
		Iran	Decoration of Merit (Leyaghat), class 2, type 1.	For the appreciation of his services to the Imperial Iranian Gendarmerie during the period from July 5, 1947, to June 20, 1949. Per citation signed by Brigadier General Golpira, commanding general, Imperial Iranian Gendarmerie.
Cranford, James R., XXXXXXXX	July 31, 1960	Greece	Gold Cross of Our Order of King George I.	For services rendered in promoting cordial relations between the United States and Greece while serving as assistant Army attaché.
Cundiff, Paul L., XXXXXXXX	June 30, 1960	Belgium	Military Cross, 1st class	For rendering great services to the Belgian Army with his special competence in the field of ordnance, per decree dated Dec. 2, 1954.
Davis, James A., XXXXXXXX	do.	Greece	Distinguished Service Medal	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and valuable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly thereof, per Greek royal decree dated Feb. 8, 1950.
Decker, Frederick J., XXXXXXXX	Apr. 30, 1957	Iran	Merit decoration, type I, grade III	In recognition of the services rendered while serving with the U.S. mission with the Imperial Iranian Army. From Oct. 8, 1952, to Apr. 4, 1954.
Dever, Bernard A., XXXXXX	Feb. 28, 1958	Greece	Military Cross, class C	Because acting as liaison of the allied mission attached to X Mountain Division rendered valuable services for the successful outcome of the Grammos operations, having risked many times their lives. (Citation in Greek Order of the Day, dated Dec. 31, 1948, signed by Lt. Gen. T. H. Tsakalotos, CG, A Army Corps.)
Dodge, Howard D., XXXXXX	Dec. 1, 1959	Iran	Lyaghet (Merit), 3d degree, type 1	As personnel adviser to the Imperial Iranian Gendarmerie for exceptional performance of outstanding service during period Aug. 25, 1948, to Mar. 20, 1950, per citation in General Orders dated May 14, 1950, signed by Major General Coupal, commander, Imperial Iranian Gendarmerie.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—Continued

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
LIEUTENANT COLONEL—CON.				
Ford, Edgar, XXXXXXX	Nov. 30, 1959	Greece	War Cross, class III	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof, per Greek royal decree dated Feb. 8, 1950.
Forsythe, Erwin F., XXXX	Aug. 1, 1960	Iran	War Cross, 3d grade	Reason unknown.
Freeman, Gerald M., XXXXXXX	Nov. 30, 1960	Portugal	Iranian Honor Medal, 3d class, 1st grade	For services rendered while serving as assistant U.S. Army attaché in Iran.
Fry, Thomas C., XXXXXXX	Mar. 31, 1960	Italy	Medal of Military Merit, 2d class	During the period Sept. 23, 1952, to Oct. 1, 1953, Colonel Freeman contributed greatly to the improving of the production of ordnance items in Portugal, increasing good relations between the Portuguese and American Governments and strengthening the comradely ties existing between the 2 armies.
Garton, Edward R., XXXXX	May 31, 1961	Belgium	Cross for War Merit	For service rendered with the 88th Division in Italy during World War II, per letter dated Jan. 4, 1949, from the chief of the Italian economic mission in Trieste.
Gray, Jack K., XXXXXXX	May 1, 1959	Philippines	Military Cross, 1st class	For services rendered to Belgium.
Greer, Harold E., XXXX	July 1, 1961	Thailand	Legion of Honor (officer)	For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding service to the armed forces of the Philippines particularly to the 14th Battalion Combat Team, Philippine Expeditionary Force to Korea as commanding officer of the 160th Field Artillery Battalion, 45th Infantry Division, U.S. Army.
Hall, Graham S., XXXXXXX	Jan. 31, 1957	Iran	Royal Thai Army Airborne Badge and Ranger Fourragere	For service rendered while serving as adviser to 1st Army of Thailand from May 1, 1954, to May 17, 1956.
Harvey, Murray L., XXXXXXX	July 1, 1961	Germany	Merit Decoration, 3d class of the 1st type	For exceptionally meritorious conduct in performance of service rendered to the Iranian Army. Major Hall served as the adviser to Transport Department of the Iranian Army.
Hay, James, XXXXXXX	Oct. 31, 1954	Mexico	For qualifying as a German parachutist.	
Hess, Frederick W., XXXXXXX	June 1, 1961	France	German Parachute Qualification Badge	For meritorious service rendered to the Government of the Republic of Mexico.
Holmes, Lester L., XXXXXXX	June 1, 1961	Greece	Military Merit, 2d class	In recognition of services rendered while serving as chief, U.S. Army Liaison Group to CCFPA, July 1957 to July 1960.
Huckings, John H., XXXX	Apr. 1, 1960	Korea	Honorary Corporal of the French Army Artillery	"Because during the operations in Roumeli and until now, following continuously their units in order to insure the necessary assistance by personal appreciation of the situation, they proved to be valuable advisers and they have shown the same interest they would have shown for their own armies. They always advanced as far as the most advanced fighting elements in order to transmit their experiences to the fighting forces representing always a touching self-sacrifice and disregard of the constant danger. By their behavior they have acquired the love of all the soldiers and officers of the units. For all these services to our country." (Citation in Greek Order of the Day, dated Sept. 16, 1948, signed by CG, A Army Corps.)
Huggins, Edward J., XXXXXXX	Dec. 31, 1960	Brazil	Greek Military Cross	In recognition and appreciation of his exceptionally outstanding and meritorious service as civil affairs officer, 1 Corps (Group), U.S. Army, during the period Feb. 10, 1957, to Apr. 25, 1958.
Hutchison, Aubrey D., XXXXXXX	July 31, 1960	Thailand	Order of Military Merit, degree of cavalier	No information available as to the exact reason why the Government of Brazil decorated Major Huggins. Diploma dated Feb. 18, 1952.
Izquierdo, Osvaldo M., XXXXXXX	Mar. 1, 1960	Chile	Order of the White Elephant, 3d class	Reason for award unknown.
Janota, Erwin J., XXXXXXX	Oct. 31, 1960	Greece	Santimala (Peace) Medal	Do.
Johnson, Kenneth A. L., XXXXXXX	Jan. 31, 1957	do	Military Medal, 3d class	Do.
Kim, Youn P., XXXX	July 1, 1961	Korea	Distinguished Service Medal	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the organization and training thereof, per Greek royal decree dated Feb. 8, 1950.
LeVey, Arthur E., XXXX	Nov. 30, 1958	Peru	do	For rendering competent invaluable services as a member of the American military mission in Greece, per diploma dated Jan. 22, 1952.
Lewis, James W., XXXXXXX	Nov. 30, 1960	Brazil	Chungmu Distinguished Military Service Medal with Silver Star	For exceptional and outstanding meritorious service while serving as a member of the Army Security Agency, Far East, during the period Nov. 1, 1950, to July 17, 1952.
Lishness, Arthur R., XXXXXXX	Nov. 13, 1958	Mexico	Military Order of Ayacucho, grade of officer	Diploma dated Dec. 9, 1951, for merits mentioned in par. "a" of article 40 of Register of the Order of the Decoration of Military Order of Ayacucho.
MacIntyre, John K., XXXX	Aug. 30, 1960	Korea	Order of Military Merit	For services rendered to the Brazilian Government while Major Lewis was a member of the Joint Brazilian-United States Military Commission from July 1948 to March 1951.
McDaniel, Oliver H., XXXXXXX	Dec. 24, 1960	Greece	Military Merit, 2d class	Awarded to him for his magnificent cooperation in the military cartographic works carried out in Mexico.
Martorani, William, XXXXXXX	May 31, 1960	Paraguay	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal	In recognition and appreciation of his exceptionally outstanding and meritorious service in Korea during the period Mar. 6, 1957, to May 20, 1958, while serving as commanding officer, U.S. Army Seoul Area Command.
Melton, Eugene P., XXXXXXX	Aug. 31, 1964	Iran	War Cross, class III	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof, per Greek royal decree dated Feb. 8, 1950.
Milam, Robert M., XXXXXXX	Jan. 31, 1960	Guatemala	National Order of Merit, grade of commander	For rendering outstanding services to the Armed Forces of the Nation and is deserving of the national gratitude, per decree dated Apr. 17, 1953.
Miller, Clifford L., XXXXXXX	Oct. 1, 1960	Iran	Iranian Decoration of Merit, 3d class, 1st type	For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of service as finance adviser to the Iranian Army and as such rendered services of exceptional value to the Iranian Army.
			Cross of Military Merit, 2d class	For his military merits, his constant valuable and efficient cooperation in the military training of Guatemalan troops in the artillery branch and as a demonstration of admiration and recognition to the Armed Institution of Guatemala.
			Decoration of Merit	For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of service during the period from Nov. 5, 1948, to Apr. 16, 1952, while serving as adviser to the cavalry school, per citation.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—Continued

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
LIEUTENANT COLONEL—CON.				
Mix, Stanley M., XXXXXX	Jan. 31, 1961	Venezuela	Cross of the Venezuelan Ground Forces, 3d class.	In recognition of services rendered to the Venezuelan Army while serving as adviser to the Venezuelan Infantry School.
Moore, Russell R., XXXXXXX	July 1, 1961	Greece	War Cross, class III	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof, per Greek royal decree dated Feb. 8, 1950.
Moushegian, Richard, XXXXXX	Jan. 23, 1960	Iran	Honor Decoration, 3d class, grade I	For services rendered while serving as assistant U.S. Army attaché in Iran during the period Jan. 6, 1953, to Jan. 2, 1955.
Mullane, Walter R., XXXXXX	May 1, 1960	Peru	Military Order of Ayacucho, grade of officer.	For services rendered to the Government of the Republic of Peru.
Muratti, Jose A., XXXXXXX	June 30, 1960	Chile	Military Medal, 2d class	For rendering distinguished services to the Army of Chile.
Nielsen, Ray, XXXX	Aug. 31, 1958	Colombia	Order of Merit Jose Maria Cordoba, grade of officer, insignia of service.	For services rendered while serving as officer in charge of the Colombia project, Inter-American Geodetic Survey.
Pacheco, Edward F., XXXXXXX	Nov. 30, 1960	Bolivia	Order of the Condor of the Andes, grade of caballero.	Per citation dated Oct. 19, 1952. "For his meritorious service as engineer instructor." Diploma for civil engineer dated Feb. 13, 1951, from the Ministry of National Defense, for successful completion of civil engineer course at the military school of engineering.
Phair, Tom S., XXXXXX	Aug. 1, 1961	Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal.	In recognition and appreciation of his exceptionally outstanding and meritorious service during his tour of duty in Korea from Aug. 15, 1953, to Mar. 30, 1959, while serving as chief of Korean desk, J-2, United Nations Command, and later serving as assistant chief of staff, G-2, 7th U.S. Infantry Division.
Poynter, Vernon L., XXXXXXX	Feb. 29, 1960	Netherlands	Order of Orange-Nassau, grade of officer.	For his meritorious, exemplary, and humanitarian service as chief of the Army helicopter unit that assisted during the 1953 flood crises in the Netherlands.
Pratt, Sherman W., XXXXXXX	Dec. 31, 1959	Iran	Iranian Honor Decoration, grade II, class II.	For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of service during the period Nov. 3, 1953, to May 11, 1954, while serving as adviser of mountain warfare, Imperial Iranian Army.
Raleigh, Robert C., XXXXXX	Mar. 1, 1961	Korea	Merit Decoration, 1st class, grade 2. Chungmu Distinguished Military Service Medal with gold star.	Reason for award unknown. He distinguished himself by exceptionally meritorious service during the period June 10, 1955, to May 1, 1956, while serving as deputy chief of staff and as staff secretary of the United Nations Command Military Armistice Commission.
Rettagliata, John B., XXXXXX	June 30, 1961	Italy	To the Merit of the Italian Republic, degree of officer.	In recognition of services rendered to the Italian Government.
Samdahl, Leo B., XXXXXX	Aug. 1, 1960	Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal.	For exceptionally outstanding service in connection with military operations against enemy espionage activities in Korea during the period Aug. 6, 1956, to Oct. 10, 1957.
Sanders, Charles A., XXXXXXX	Aug. 31, 1956	do	do	In recognition and appreciation of his exceptionally outstanding and meritorious service rendered to the Republic of Korea during the period Oct. 25 to 27, 1950, while serving as adviser to the Republic of Korea 10th Regiment, 8th Republic of Korea Division.
Sanders, Henry I., XXXXXX	Nov. 1, 1960	Peru	Military Order of Ayacucho, grade of officer.	Diploma dated Mar. 31, 1952, for meritorious service mentioned in clause "b2 of art. 40 of regulations of the order."
Scott, Thomas M., Jr., XXXXXX	July 1, 1960	Iran	Decoration of Merit, 1st class, 3d grade.	For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of service during the period Nov. 6, 1952, to Aug. 29, 1953, per citation.
Slakes, Glenn A., XXXXXX	do	Colombia	Shield of the War College.	Decree dated Dec. 13, 1952, for rendering efficient services as adviser and professor to the War College.
Spencer, Robert D., XXXXXXX	Nov. 1, 1961	Greece	War Cross, class III	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof, per Greek royal decree dated Feb. 8, 1950.
Steffey, William G., XXXXXX	June 30, 1961	Paraguay	National Order of Merit, grade of commander.	For services rendered to the Armed Forces of Paraguay while serving as assistant chief of the U.S. Army mission.
Sweeney, James L., XXXXXX	July 1, 1961	Jordan	Independence Medal.	In recognition of services rendered while serving as U.S. Army tour director for the U.S. visit of Prince Mohammed during the period Feb. 29, to Mar. 31, 1960.
Tallackson, Emanuel F., XXXXXX	Mar. 30, 1956	Iran	Independence Medal, 3d class. 3d Class Honor Decoration.	Do.
Thompson, Nathan P., XXXXXXX	July 1, 1960	Greece	War Cross, class III	For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of services rendered to the Iranian Government while serving as the mission motor officer and assistant motor transport adviser for the Iranian Army.
Tillinghast, Lewis G., XXXXXXX	Mar. 22, 1961	do	Distinguished Service Medal.	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof, per Greek royal decree dated Feb. 8, 1950.
Towery, Luther E., XXXXXXX	June 1, 1960	France	Honorary Conductor, 1st class, of the French 6th Regional Company of Transportation.	For rendering competent invaluable service as a member of the American military mission in Greece, per diploma dated Jan. 22, 1952.
Vigli, Fred, XXXX	May 1, 1961	Panama	Order of Vasco Nunez de Balboa, grade of commander.	In recognition of his work and public relations with the French headquarters at Metz from March 1957 to November 1959.
Wachholz, Paul F., XXXXXXX	Sept. 30, 1961	Peru	Military Order of Ayacucho, grade of knight.	In recognition of services rendered while serving as instructor in tactics to Panamanian students at USARCIB School.
Waggoner, Clinton A., XXXXXX	Aug. 28, 1959	Brazil	Order of Military Merit, degree of cavalier.	For the promotion of good relations between the United States and Peru.
Whitman, Orlando O., XXXXXXX	Mar. 31, 1957	Greece	Golden Cross, Order of King George I.	Reason for award unknown.
Whitmore, Ralph L., XXXXXXX	Oct. 1, 1960	France	Chevalier de l'Ordre des Palmes Academiques.	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof, per Greek royal decree dated Feb. 8, 1950.
Wood, George W., XXXXXX	Feb. 1, 1961	Sweden	Medal of Merit of the Swedish Red Cross in silver.	For services rendered while serving as chief of public information with headquarters, USAREUR, communications zone.
		Italy	Cross for War Merit.	In recognition of his meritorious services on behalf of the Swedish Red Cross.
				For services rendered with the 88th Division in Italy during World War II, per letter dated Jan. 4, 1949, from the chief of the Italian economic mission in Trieste.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—Continued

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
LIEUTENANT COLONEL—CON.				
Wyse, Ralph M., XXXX	June 30, 1957	Iran	Third Class Merit Decoration, grade 1	For exceptionally meritorious conduct, untiring efforts, willingness, attention to duty, and cooperation rendered to the Iranian Army while serving as Armored School adviser to the Iranian Army during the period of Sept. 9, 1948, to Mar. 5, 1951.
MAJOR				
Anderson, Brooks D., XXXXXX	May 1, 1961	Panama	Order of Vasco Nunez de Balboa, grade of commander.	For services rendered in connection with military police activities in Panama.
Appling, Robert K., XXXXXXX	Feb. 29, 1960	Italy	Star of Italian Solidarity, 2d class	For his contribution to the reconstruction of Italy.
Bonaventura, Charles M., XXXXXXX	Aug. 1, 1961	Ecuador	Abdon Calderon, 1st class	For services rendered while serving as chief of the Inter-American Geodetic Survey.
			Parachutist insignia	In consideration of his ample collaboration with the Mechanized and Parachute School to carry out in a successful manner the 1st course in parachuting.
Carroll, Winton A., XXXX	Oct. 31, 1959	Netherlands	Order of Orange-Nassau, grade of chevalier.	For his contribution to the Netherlands flood disaster operation.
Colson, Guy L., XXXXXXX	Mar. 30, 1959	Philippines	Legion of Honor, grade of officer	For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding service rendered to the Armed Forces of the Philippines, particularly to the 14th Battalion Combat Team, Philippine Expeditionary Force to Korea.
Flint, George, XXXXXX	Aug. 31, 1956	Greece	War Cross, class III	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof, per Greek royal decree dated Feb. 8, 1950.
Fries, Josephine, XXXX	June 30, 1960	Norway	Medal of Merit	For services rendered while serving as an Army nurse in the European theater of operations during World War II.
Hilliard, Emerson E., XXXXXXX	Mar. 1, 1961	Greece	Distinguished Service Medal	For invaluable services to the Armed Forces of Greece as a member of the American military mission, per citation dated Jan. 22, 1952.
Johnson, Robert E. L., Jr., XXXXXXX	Mar. 27, 1957	Brazil	Order of Military Merit, degree of cavalier.	Reason for award unknown.
Oyee, Robert J., XXXXXXX	Apr. 21, 1961	Greece	Cross of Officer of the Royal Order of the Phoenix	The Greek decoration was conferred upon him by His Majesty the King of the Hellenes in recognition of the efficient assistance he gave His Majesty during his recent visit to Austria.
Kohl, William A., XXXXXXX	Oct. 31, 1960	do.	Distinguished Service Medal	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof, per Greek royal decree dated Feb. 8, 1950.
Martin, John J., XXXXXXX	Mar. 31, 1961	Japan	Japan Ground Self-Defense Force Aviation Badge.	For services rendered in training of Japan ground self-defense force pilots.
Quesada, Antonio, XXXXXXX	Nov. 30, 1960	Nicaragua	Meritorious Service Award	For efficient work and valuable cooperation given to the cadets and officers of the national army during the courses of military specialty, per special order No. 96, Military Academy of Nicaragua, dated Sept. 26, 1952.
Russell, William E., XXXX	Jan. 31, 1961	Korea	Chungmu Distinguished Military Service Medal with gold star.	For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding service in connection with military operations against enemy intelligence activities in Korea during the periods Apr. 22, 1952, to Apr. 4, 1953, and Feb. 17, 1956, to Jan. 20, 1957.
St. Onge, Joseph A., XXXXXXX	Feb. 28, 1959	Ecuador	Abdon Calderon, 2d class	In recognition of services rendered to the educational, cultural and military progress of the Republic of Ecuador.
Stawinsky, Johann, XXXX	Oct. 31, 1960	Korea	Chungmu Distinguished Military Service Medal with silver star.	In recognition and appreciation of his outstanding and exceptionally meritorious service rendered to the Republic of Korea during the period Sept. 15, 1958, to Aug. 1, 1959.
Torres, Jose M., XXXXXXX	January 1957	Nicaragua	Meritorious Service Award	For efficient work and valuable cooperation given to the cadets and officers of the national army during the courses of military specialty, per special order No. 96, Military Academy of Nicaragua, dated Sept. 26, 1952.
Vasquez, Ricardo V., XXXXXXX	November 1960	do.	do.	Do.
Frankville, Dominick D., XXXXXXX	May 1962	Luxembourg	Cross of Honor and Military Merit in silver.	For services rendered to the Government of Luxembourg while serving with the 36th Fighter Bomber Wing, 1st Infantry Division.
Gibson, Forest S., XXXX	June 1962	Iran	Merit Decoration, 3d grade	For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of service during the period Aug. 24, 1952, to May 15, 1954 while serving as adviser, Arsenal Department, Imperial Iranian Army.
Olivari-Amill, William, XXXXXXX	November 1962	Ecuador	Abdon Calderon, 3d class	In recognition of his outstanding accomplishments in connection with the operations of the USARCABIB School, Fort Gulick, C.Z., during his period of duty as a staff officer in that headquarters.
CAPTAIN				
Kieffer, Charles F., XXXXXXX	November 1960	Nicaragua	Honorary Wings of Military Pilot	In appreciation of his meritorious collaboration and approach work on behalf of the Air Force of Nicaragua.
Marquez, Victor, XXXXXXX	do.	do.	Meritorious service	For efficient work and valuable cooperation given to the cadets and officers of the national army during the courses of military specialty, per special order No. 96, Military Academy of Nicaragua, dated Sept. 26, 1952.
Ruiz, Luis, XXXXXXX	do.	Panama	Order of Vasco Nunez de Balboa, grade of knight.	For important services rendered to the Government of the Republic of Panama.
Arnold, David S., XXXX	May 1962	Greece	War Cross, 3d class	As a liaison officer with the commando groups from the 10th of June up to the 1st of November 1949, he took part in all operations carried out by the commando groups, exposing himself repeatedly to all dangers, and because he entirely disposed of himself for the purpose of Greece, which purpose he considered as one interesting his country. (Citation in Greek Order of the Day, Mar. 25, 1949.)
			War Cross, class III	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof, per Greek royal decree, Feb. 8, 1950.
Brake, William P., XXXX	September 1962	Pakistan	Army Flying Brevet	For service with Air OP Squadron No. 1 at Pakistan Headquarters, Rawalpindi, Pakistan from Mar. 1 to June 1, 1958, as mobile training chief, flight.
Chun, Richard S., XXXX	August 1962	Korea	Chungmu Distinguished Military Service Medal	For exceptionally and outstanding meritorious service as a member of the 60th Signal Service Co. during the period from Oct. 17, 1950, to Mar. 28, 1953.
CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER				
Campbell, George L., XXXXXXX	May 1961	do.	Award for Defense	Awarded medal for his assistance as company commander of 609th Ordnance Company, in directing the evacuation and rescue of over 750 civilians at Heunde, Pusan, on Sept. 17, 1950. Also in recognition of other community assistance projects.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—Continued

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER—continued				
Casas, Guillermo, XXXXXXXX	September 1960	Colombia	Military Cross "Antonio Marino"	In recognition of services rendered to the Colombian Government.
King, Paul W., XXXXXXXX	May 1960	Ecuador	Abdon Calderon, 2d class	For invaluable service to the Instituto Geografico Milita during the period of his assignment by the Government of the Republic of Ecuador.
Stille, Walter H., XXXXXXXX	June 1959	China	Piliang Medal (class B)	For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of staff duty in Taiwan during 1958.
Tippit, James H., XXXXXXXX	July 1960	Ecuador	Abdon Calderon, 3d class	For distinguished services rendered with his signal specialties, while a member of the U.S. Army mission to Ecuador, per Ecuadorian general orders dated July 17, 1953.
WARRANT OFFICER				
Hungerford, Charles F., XXXXXXXX	March 1961	Korea	Wharang Distinguished Military Service Medal with gold star	For exceptionally meritorious service as helicopter pilot during the period Feb. 27 to Mar. 5, 1956.
SERGEANT MAJOR				
Wyatt, Cecil P., XXXXXXXX	May 1962	Greece	Parachutist Badge	In recognition of the combined participation of the 1st Airborne Battle Group, 327th Infantry, and the Hellenic parachute unit in the 1961 NATO exercise "Checkmate."
Malone, Thomas J., XXXXXXXX	June 1960	Argentina	Honoris Causa	For services rendered as a member of the U.S. Army mission to Argentina, assigned to duties which caused him to work closely with the Armored School of the Argentine Army.
MASTER SERGEANT				
Bass, Charles W., XXXXXXXX	June 1955	Greece	Distinguished Service Medal	As a member of the American Military Mission in Greece has rendered precious and valuable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof, per Greek royal decree dated Feb. 8, 1950.
Busbee, Howard L., XXXXXXXX	June 1960	do.	do.	Do.
Hornine, Russell O., XXXXXXXX	do.	Indonesia	Cigarette box, lighter, and certificate	In appreciation from the Indonesian Army, attesting to the outstanding professional ability and splendid spirit of cooperation of the team. (Ordnance mobile training team.)
Makymiec, Myroslaw A., XXXXXXXX	July 1961	Ethiopia	Gold medallion	As a token of appreciation of his work. Given by His Imperial Majesty, Haile Selassie I, Emperor of Ethiopia.
Rohde, William G., XXXXXXXX	June 1961	Mexico	Medal of Military Merit, 3d class	In recognition of outstanding services to the survey department of the Mexican Armed Forces while assigned to U.S. Army Inter-American Geodetic Survey.
Earhart, Thomas A., XXXXXXXX	August 1961	Greece	War Cross, class III	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof.
Hayes, Walter E., XXXXXXXX	September 1962	Greece	War Cross, class III	As a member of the American Military Mission to Greece has rendered precious and valuable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof.
O'Reilly, Hugh F., XXXXXXXX	March 1962	Japan	Order of the Sacred Treasure, 6th class	In recognition of his efforts in behalf of the Holy Family Home in Osaka, Japan.
Sekulski, Felix T., XXXXXXXX	February 1962	Argentina	Honoris Causa	For services rendered while assigned to mission duties at Armored School of Argentine Army.
Tyler, Grover C., XXXXXXXX	November 1962	Ecuador	Abdon Calderon, 3d class	As acknowledgment of services rendered to this country.
Ward, Johnnie K., XXXXXXXX	June 1962	Germany	German Parachutist Badge	Completed the requirements of the German Airborne School.
SERGEANT, 1ST CLASS				
Craig, Walter E., XXXXXXXX	July 1962	Indonesia	Cigarette box, lighter, and certificate	Expression of appreciation from the Indonesian Army, attesting to the outstanding professional ability and splendid spirit of cooperation of the team (Ordnance Mobile Training Team).
Hook, Bob J., XXXXXXXX	August 1954	Iran	Decoration of Merit, 3d class	For exceptional meritorious conduct in performance of service as assistant adviser to the Arsenal Department of the Imperial Iranian Army during the period July 12 to Sept. 10, 1953.
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, CIVILIAN				
Miller, George A.	May 1961	Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal with gold star	In recognition and appreciation of his exceptionally outstanding and meritorious service to the Republic of Korea Army while serving on a mission to help in the construction of an arsenal to manufacture ammunition for small arms.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

GENERAL				
Cook, Orval R., XXXX	May 31, 1956	France	Legion of Honor (grand officer)	For meritorious service.
		Italy	Ordine Al Merito della Repubblica Italiana (grande ufficiale)	Do.
Partridge, Earle E., XXXX	July 31, 1959	Japan	Order of the Rising Sun	For services as commander, Far East Air Forces.
		China	Cloud and Banner Medal	Do.
		Brazil	Order of Aeronautical Merit, grade of grand officer	For meritorious service.
Twining, Nathan F., XXXX	Sept. 30, 1960	Lebanon	De L'Ordre National Du Cedre, grand officer	Do.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE—Continued

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
GENERAL—COD.				
White, Thomas D., XXXX	June 30, 1961	France	Air Force pilot wings.	Token of good will.
		Chile	Air Force wings.	Do.
		Sweden	Great Cross of the Order of Swedish Sword.	For meritorious service.
		Belgium	Grand Cross of the Order of Leopold II.	Do.
		Paraguay	Order of Military Merit, grand official.	Do.
		Colombia	El Canciller de la Orden de Boyaca.	Do.
			Cruz del Merito Aeronautico "Antonio Ricaurte" (Gran Cruz).	Do.
		Portugal	Medal of Military Merit, 1st class.	Do.
		Uruguay	Air Force pilot wings.	Token of good will.
		Ecuador	Order of Aeronautical Merit (commander).	For meritorious service.
		Brazil	Order of Aeronautical Merit.	Do.
		Colombia	Honorary pilot wings.	Token of good will.
		China	Air Force wings.	Do.
		Italy	Ordine al Merito della Repubblica Italiana.	For meritorious service.
		Chile	Medalla Militar de Primera Clase.	Do.
		Philippines	Legion of Honor (commander).	Do.
		Korea	Order of Military Merit Taeguk with Gold Star.	Do.
Cabell, Charles P., XXXX	Jan. 31, 1962	Peru	Cruz Peruana al Merito Aeronautico.	Do.
		Denmark	Kommander, 1st Grad of Dannenberg.	Do.
Kuter, Laurence S., XXXX	July 31, 1962	France	Legion of Honor (officer).	Do.
		Thailand	Prathanabhorn (Knight Grand Cross) Most Noble Order of the Crown of Thailand.	Do.
		China	Medal of Cloud and Banner with grand cordon.	Do.
		Japan	2d class of the Order of the Rising Sun.	Do.
		Korea	Order of Military Merit Taeguk with gold star.	Do.
		Philippines	Legion of Honor (degree of commander).	Do.
		Thailand	Knight Commander of the Most Exalted Order of the White Elephant.	Do.
Norstad, Lauris, XXXX	Dec. 31, 1962	France	Legion of Honor (degree of commander).	Do.
		Morocco	Order of Ouissam Alouite Cherifien, 2d grade (grand officer).	Do.
		Greece	Cross of Grand Commander of the Royal Order of George I.	Do.
		Portugal	Great Cross of Aviz.	For meritorious service as Supreme Allied Commander Europe.
		Germany	Grand Cross of the Order of Merit.	Do.
		Greece	Grand Cross of the Royal Order of George I.	Do.
		Italy	Knight of the Grand Cross of the Order "On Merit of the Italian Republic."	Do.
		Belgium	Grand Cordon of the Order of Leopold.	Do.
		Norway	Grand Cross of the Royal Norwegian Order of St. Olaf.	Do.
		Netherlands	Great Cross of the Order of Orange-Nassau.	Do.
		France	Grand Cross of the Legion of Honor.	Do.
		Luxembourg	Grand Cross of the Order of the Crown of Chene.	Do.
Smith, Frederic H., Jr., XXXX	June 30, 1962	Japan	Order of Double Ray to the Rising Sun.	For meritorious service
		China	Order of Cloud and Banner.	Do.
		Korea	Order of Military Merit Taeguk with silver star.	Do.
		Argentina	Al Merito Aeronautico.	Do.
		Colombia	Cruz del Merito Aeronautico "Antonio Ricaurte."	Do.
		Chile	Grand Medal to the Military.	Do.
LIEUTENANT GENERAL				
Asensio, Manuel J., XXXX	Jan. 31, 1960	Colombia	Cruz del Merito Aeronautico "Antonio Ricaurte" (Gran Cruz).	For meritorious service.
Barcus, Glenn O., XXXX	July 31, 1960	France	Croix de Guerre with palm.	Do.
Craigie, Laurence C., XXXX	June 30, 1955	do	do	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Lindsay, Richard C., XXXX	Apr. 30, 1960	Greece	Royal Order of Phoenix.	For meritorious service.
		Italy	Royal Hellenic Air Force wings.	Token of good will.
		Turkey	Gran Commandatori di Repubblica.	For meritorious service.
		France	Italian Air Force wings.	Token of good will.
		France	Air Force pilot wings.	Do.
		Korea	Air Force wings.	Do.
Lynn, Roy H., XXXX	Aug. 31, 1959	Military Merit Taeguk Medal.		For meritorious service.
Myers, Charles T., XXXX	July 31, 1958	Croix de Guerre with palm.		For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Picher, Oliver S., XXXX	May 11, 1960	Greece	Cross of Commander of the Royal Order of George I.	For meritorious service.
Samford, John A., XXXX	Nov. 23, 1960	Italy	Ordine al Merito della Repubblica Italiana (commander).	Do.
		Thailand	Dvityabhorn (knight commander) Most Exalted Order of the White Elephant.	Do.
Todd, Walter E., XXXX	July 31, 1961	France	Legion of Honor, officer.	Do.
		Korea	Order of Military Merit Taeguk.	Do.
			Order of Military Merit Taeguk with silver star.	Do.
		Japan	Order of the Rising Sun.	Do.
		Thailand	Dvityabhorn (knight commander) Most Noble Order of the Crown of Thailand.	Do.
Tunmer, William H., XXXX	May 31, 1960	Saudi Arabia	Ornamental Sword and Dagger.	Token of good will.
		Italy	Ordine al Merito della Repubblica Italiana, grand ufficiale.	For meritorious service.
		Thailand	Air Force pilot wings.	Token of good will.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE—Continued

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
LIEUTENANT GENERAL—CON.				
Yates, Donald N., XXXX	Mar. 31, 1961	Brazil	Ordem do Merito Aeronautico	For meritorious service.
Rogers, Elmer J., Jr., XXXX	Dec. 31, 1961	Japan	Order of the Rising Sun (2d grade)	Do.
		Korea	Order of Military Taeguk	Do.
MAJOR GENERAL				
Agee, Walter R., XXXX	Apr. 30, 1959	Greece	The Order of Phoenix, Cross of Grand Commander	Do.
		Israel	Honorary flyers wings	Token of good will.
Anderson, Alvord V. P., Jr., XXXX	Nov. 30, 1960	Brazil	Air Force wings	Do.
			Order of Aeronautical Merit	For meritorious service.
Armstrong, Harry G., XXXX	Aug. 31, 1958	do	do	Do.
		France	Air Force Medical Service Medal of Honor	Do.
		Chile	Military Air Medal	Do.
Benson, Otis O., Jr., XXXX	June 15, 1961	Thailand	Dvitiyabhorn (knight commander)	Do.
			Most Noble Order of the Crown of Thailand	
		France	Air Force Medical Service Medal of Honor	Do.
Burnside, Merrill D.	Sept. 30, 1958	Korea	Military Merit Uchi Medal with gold star	Do.
Deichmann, Matthew K., XXXX	Apr. 30, 1959	do	Order of Military Merit Taeguk	Do.
Douglas, Robert W., Jr., XXXX	Feb. 28, 1957	Italy	Military Order of Italy	Do.
Glantzberg, Frederic E., XXXX	Sept. 12, 1959	France	Legion of Honor, grade commander	Do.
Grussendorf, Richard A., XXXX	Aug. 31, 1960	Greece	Knight Commander of the Royal Order of the Phoenix	Do.
Hale, Dudley D., XXXX	Feb. 28, 1958	France	Croix de Guerre with palm	For meritorious service.
Hood, Reuben C., Jr., XXXX	June 30, 1959	Korea	Pilot wings	Token of good will.
		Peru	do	Do.
		Ecuador	do	Do.
		Colombia	do	Do.
		Nicaragua	do	Do.
		Cuba	do	Do.
		Chile	do	Do.
		Brazil	do	Do.
		Peru	Aviation Cross, 1st class	For meritorious service.
		Chile	Military Medal, 1st class	Do.
		Mexico	Air Force wings	Token of good will.
		Bolivia	National Order Condor of the Andes	For meritorious service.
		Venezuela	Cross of the Venezuelan Air Force	Do.
		Uruguay	Honorary Military Aviator	Token of good will.
		Paraguay	Honorary Pilot Aviator	Do.
		do	National Order of Merit	For meritorious service.
		Panama	Order of Vasco Nufiez de Balboa, grade of gran official	Do.
		Colombia	Aeronautical Cross of Merit	Do.
		Ecuador	Abdon Calderon, 1st class	Do.
		Honduras	Pilot wings	Token of good will.
		Brazil	Order of Aeronautical Merit	For meritorious service.
Kennedy, William L., XXXX	Sept. 20, 1961	France	Legion of Honor, grade of officer	Do.
O'Hara, John J., XXXX	July 31, 1959	do	do	Do.
Pearsons, John W., XXXX	Aug. 31, 1959	Argentina	Pilot wings	Token of good will.
Ruestow, Paul E., XXXX	June 30, 1960	Korea	Uchi Military Merit Medal with gold star	For service as commander, Far East Air Logistic Forces.
Smith, George F., XXXX	July 31, 1958	France	Legion of Honor	For meritorious service.
Dahl, Leo P., XXXX	July 31, 1962	do	Croix de Guerre with palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Darcy, Thomas C., XXXX	Dec. 31, 1961	Brazil	Golf clubs, set, with bag	Token of good will.
		Argentina	Grand Officer of the Order of May	For meritorious service.
		Bolivia	Commander of the Order of the Condor of the Andes	Do.
		Argentina	Sword of San Martin	Token of good will.
		France	Croix de Guerre with palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Eaton, Robert E. L., XXXX	do	Greece	Cross of Senior Commander of the Order of Phoenix	For meritorious service.
Hutchinson, Donald R., XXXX	June 30, 1962	Iceland	Medal of the Order of the White Falcon	Do.
Lewis, Millard, XXXX	Sept. 30, 1962	Brazil	Order of Aeronautical Merit (grande official)	Do.
Suarez, Edward W., XXXX	July 31, 1962	Greece	Grand Order of the Phoenix	Do.
Tate, Robert F., XXXX	Nov. 30, 1961	Japan	Third Order of the Rising Sun	Do.
BRIGADIER GENERAL				
Cassady, George S., XXXX	Aug. 31, 1961	Portugal	Military Medal, 1st class	For service as commander of MATS, Azores.
Gregory, Hollingsworth F., XXXX	Oct. 31, 1958	France	Legion of Honor (officer)	For meritorious service.
Hamilton, Pierpont M., XXXXXXXXXX	Sept. 30, 1959	do	Medaille de L'Aeronautique	Do.
			Legion of Honor	Do.
Israel, Robert S., Jr., XXXX	July 31, 1958	do	Croix de Guerre with palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Johnson, Betrand E., XXXX	Mar. 15, 1961	Korea	Uchi Military Merit Medal with gold star	For meritorious service.
Keeler, George E., Jr., XXXX	July 31, 1959	France	Croix de Guerre with palm	For outstanding contributions toward the liberation of France during World War II.
Lee, William L., XXXX	do	do	Aviation Badge (pilot)	Token of good will.
Matheny, William A., XXXX	July 31, 1959	Greece	Distinguished Service Medal	For meritorious service.
Morse, Winslow C., XXXX	Nov. 30, 1959	Honduras	Meritorious Decoration	Do.
Nuckols, William P., XXXX	Nov. 15, 1957	Monaco	Order of Saint Charles, degree of officer	Do.
Ross, Stoyte O., XXXX	Mar. 31, 1960	Greece	Order of Phoenix, cross of commander	Do.
Schweizer, John M., Jr., XXXX	Oct. 31, 1959	China	Air Force Pilot Wings	Token of good will.
		Greece	Commander of the Royal Order of King George I	For meritorious service.
		Italy	Commendatore of the Order of Merit	Do.
		Belgium	Order of Leopold II	Do.
Smith, Harold L., XXXX	June 30, 1960	Portugal	Medal of Military Merit, 1st class	Do.
			Medal of Gold for Distinguished Services	Do.
Lessig, Cecil P., XXXX	June 30, 1962	Japan	Third Order of the Rising Sun	Do.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE—Continued

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
COLONEL				
Banks, Amberse M., XXXXXXXX	Mar. 31, 1955	France	Croix de Guerre with palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Barber, Rex T., XXXX	Mar. 31, 1961	Colombia	Cruz del Merito Aeronautico Antonio Ricaurte, grade of commendador.	For meritorious service.
Bates, Earl E., Jr., XXXX	Feb. 28, 1961	France	Croix de Guerre with palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Bell, Maynard W., XXXX	do	do	do	Do.
Biddlecome, Bruce D., XXXX	Aug. 31, 1959	do	do	Do.
Blauer, Clinton E., XXXX	Feb. 25, 1958	do	do	Do.
Brause, Jacob L., XXXXXXXX	July 31, 1954	Guatemala	Cross of Military Merit, 3d class	For meritorious service.
Brown, Bryan W., Jr., XXXX	June 30, 1961	Peru	Flying Cross	Do.
Burns, Edgar J., XXXX	June 30, 1958	Bolivia	Order of the Condor of the Andes Medal	Do.
Burroughs, Orval N., XXXX	June 26, 1961	Greece	Pilot Wings	Token of good will.
Carleton, Bert M., XXXX	June 15, 1959	China	Royal Order of George I.	For meritorious service.
Cassidy, Charles F., Jr., XXXXXXXX	Mar. 31, 1959	France	Order of the Cloud and Banner	Do.
Clark, James N., XXXXXXXX	July 31, 1954	China	Croix de Guerre with palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Cooper, Elven R., XXXX	Apr. 30, 1961	Philippines	Pilot wings	Token of good will.
Covington, William E., Jr., XXXX	May 31, 1957	Lebanon	Legion of Honor, degree of officer	For meritorious service.
Cox, Robert B., XXXX	July 31, 1961	France	De L'Ordre National Du Cedre (officer)	Do.
Daniel, James L., Jr., XXXX	Oct. 14, 1958	Ecuador	Croix de Guerre with palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Dietze, Herman V., XXXX	May 31, 1960	Brazil	Abdon Calderon, 1st class	For meritorious service.
Edris, Gordon L., XXXX	June 30, 1961	France	Ordem de Merito Aeronautico, grade of commendador.	Do.
Fagan, Franklin K., XXXXXXXX	Mar. 15, 1960	do	Order of Military Merit, degree of officer	Reason for award unknown.
Fawbush, Andrew T., XXXXXXXX	June 30, 1961	Brazil	Croix de Guerre with palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Fletcher, Eugene B., XXXX	Aug. 31, 1958	France	Order of Aeronautical Merit, grade of commander.	For meritorious service.
Freeman, Edmund F., XXXX	July 31, 1961	do	Mechanic wings	Token of good will.
Glassford, Pelham D., Jr., XXXX	June 30, 1961	Vietnam	Croix de Guerre with palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Green, George B., XXXX	Feb. 28, 1961	France	National Order of Vietnam	For meritorious service.
Gurney, Samuel C., Jr., XXXX	July 31, 1961	France	Air Force wings	Token of good will.
Hagins, Newton D., XXXX	Dec. 31, 1958	Laos	Royal Order of the Million Elephants and White Parasol	For meritorious service.
Hamilton, McHenry, Jr., XXXX	Oct. 31, 1958	Cambodia	Royal Order of Cambodia, degree of commander	Do.
Haney, George W., XXXX	July 31, 1960	France	La Croix de Chevalier du Merite Social	Do.
Hanley, Paul T., XXXX	July 31, 1961	Italy	Air Force Medical Service Medal of Honor	Do.
Harris, Lester S., XXXX	do	Korea	Flight Surgeon's wings	Token of good will.
Hild, Fred E., XXXX	June 30, 1961	China	Air Force Badge	Do.
Hills, John De P., XXXX	July 31, 1961	Italy	Air Force wings	Do.
Hinman, Harvey M., XXXXXXXX	Nov. 22, 1946	France	Aviation Cross	For meritorious service.
Hunter, Anthony G., XXXX	Sept. 14, 1959	do	Gold Cross of the Order of Phoenix	Do.
Hutchinson, Richard C., XXXX	Feb. 28, 1961	Guatemala	Order of Merit of the Italian Republic, grade of officer	Token of good will.
Klme, Duane L., XXXX	Mar. 31, 1961	France	Honorary pilot	For meritorious service.
Lampley, Harmon L., Jr., XXXX	July 31, 1961	Mexico	Ulchi Order of Military Merit with silver star	Do.
McCartney, John F., XXXX	Aug. 24, 1959	France	Pilot wings	Token of good will.
McKinnon, Samuel H., XXXX	July 31, 1961	do	Honorary military pilot wings	Do.
McShane, Joseph B., XXXXXXXX	June 30, 1960	Netherlands	Aviation badge	Do.
Mangum, Cledous M., XXXXXXXX	June 30, 1959	Korea	Croix de Guerre with palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Masson, John W., XXXX	July 31, 1961	Paraguay	do	Do.
Moore, John W., XXXX	Aug. 31, 1958	Brazil	Military Merit Medal	For meritorious service.
Mobley, Thomas L., XXXX	July 31, 1959	Greece	Air Force Wings and Defensores de la Republica Mexicana y Sus Descendientes	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Ott, Frederick W., XXXX	July 31, 1958	Argentina	Croix de Guerre with palm	Do.
Palmer, Sumner C., Jr., XXXXXXXX	Sept. 30, 1956	France	do	Do.
Parham, Harry C., XXXX	Jan. 28, 1960	do	do	Do.
Parsons, Charles E., Jr., XXXX	Aug. 31, 1961	China	Aviation Badge	Token of good will.
Perkins, Charles L., XXXXXXXX	Jan. 31, 1959	France	Croix de Guerre with palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Perkins, Nicholas T., XXXX	June 30, 1961	Yugoslavia	Pilot wings	Token of good will.
Peters, Frederick I., XXXX	May 31, 1960	Korea	Military Merit Chungmoo Medal with gold star	For meritorious service.
Pillet, Frederick A., XXXX	Mar. 31, 1959	Greece	Cross of the Commanders of the Royal Order of the Phoenix	Do.
Preston, William D., XXXX	Oct. 31, 1961	China	Aviator Militar Honoris Causa	Token of good will.
Ramage, Edwin M., XXXX	Aug. 31, 1958	Chile	Emblem, Staff Officer's School	Do.
Richer, Marcel A., XXXX	July 31, 1961	France	Honorary Air Force wings	Do.
Russell, Joseph G., XXXX	do	China	Medal of Aviation	For meritorious service.
Searles, Frederick W., XXXX	Apr. 30, 1960	Korea	Croix de Guerre with palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
			Ulchi Military Merit Order with silver star	Do.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE—Continued

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
COLONEL—Continued				
Smith, Richard H., XXXX	July 31, 1961	France	Croix de Guerre with palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Stefansson, Ragnar XXXX	Sept. 30, 1960	Iceland	Knight's Cross of the Order of the Icelandic Falcon	For meritorious service.
Stepp, Richard D., XXXX	July 31, 1961	Peru	Aviation Cross, 1st class	Do.
Stoltz, Albert E., XXXX	Dec. 31, 1958	France	Legion of Honor	Do.
Taylor, Henry J., XXXX	July 31, 1961	Italy	Ufficiale al Merito della Repubblica, knight officer	Do.
Taylor, Richard, XXXX	Jan. 31, 1961	Norway	Air Force wings	Token of good will.
Thompson, Glen C., XXXX	July 31, 1961	Bolivia	Condor de los Andes	For meritorious service.
Wadman, John F., XXXX	July 31, 1958	France	Pilot wings	Token of good will.
Ward, Thomas N., XXXXXXXX	Dec. 17, 1958	Brazil	Croix de Guerre with palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Ware, Everett H., XXXX	July 31, 1961	Netherlands	Order of Aeronautical Merit	For meritorious service.
Whitney, Robert, XXXX	Jan. 31, 1956	France	Order of Orange Nassau with swords	Do.
Will, Ray J., XXXX	July 31, 1960	Vatican	Croix de Guerre with palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Williams, Ernest F., XXXX	June 30, 1961	Brazil	Benemerenti Medal	For meritorious service.
Williams, Francis W., XXXX	do	Brazil	Order of Aeronautical Merit	Do.
		Chile	Military Medal, 2d class	Do.
		Brazil	Orden do Merito Aeronautico, comendador	Do.
Winstead, Joshua T., Jr., XXXX	Dec. 31, 1958	Ecuador	Abdon Calderon, 1st class	Do.
Wood, Randolph L., XXXX	July 31, 1961	do	Honorary pilot wings	Token of good will.
Woodworth, Lynn F., XXXXXXXX	Sept. 30, 1955	France	Aviation Badge	Do.
Camp, Kenneth L., XXXX	June 30, 1962	do	Croix de Guerre with palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Crabbe, Gerald W., XXXX	Oct. 1, 1962	Uruguay	Air Force wings	Token of good will.
		Colombia	Orden del Merito Aeronautico "Antonio Ricaurte"	For meritorious service.
		do	Colombian Air Force pilot wings	Token of good will.
		Greece	Royal Order of George I	For meritorious service.
		do	Royal Hellenic Air Force wings	Token of good will.
Dunn, Bruce C., XXXX	Dec. 1, 1962	Yugoslavia	Order of Partisan Star, 2d class	For meritorious service.
		France	Croix de Guerre with palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Fahy, Albert F., Jr., XXXX	Apr. 30, 1962	Chile	Medalla Militar de Tercera Clase	For meritorious service.
Forwood, William G., XXXX	do	Peru	Aviation Cross, 1st class	Do.
Gregory, Charles E., XXXX	do	El Salvador	Air Force pilot wings	Token of good will.
Johnson, Roberts P., Jr., XXXX	Dec. 1, 1962	China	Friend of China Medal	For meritorious service.
Katz, Bernard A., XXXXXXXX	Jan. 23, 1962	France	Medaille de l'Aeronautique	Do.
Layden, Lionel L., XXXXXXXX	Jan. 31, 1962	Portugal	Merito Militar, 2d class	Do.
Marchant, John C., XXXX	June 30, 1962	Great Britain	British Coronation Medal	Do.
Prochazka, Theodore V., XXXX	Dec. 31, 1961	France	Croix de Guerre with palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Randolph, Jack L., XXXX	July 31, 1961	China	Chinese Air Force wings	Token of good will.
Reynolds, John N., XXXX	June 30, 1962	do	Medal of Cloud and Banner, 5th class	For meritorious service.
Rogers, George W., XXXX	do	France	Aviation Badge	Token of good will.
		China	Medal of Cloud and Banner, 5th class	For meritorious service.
		do	Chinese Air Force wings	Token of good will.
Shachtman, Hyman, XXXX	do	Chile	Honorary pilot wings	Do.
Skilling, Byron W., XXXX	do	Netherlands	Order of Orange Nassau with swords, class of officer	For meritorious service.
Thompson, Matthew, XXXX	Apr. 30, 1962	France	La Croix de Chavalier Du Merite Social	Do.
LIEUTENANT COLONEL				
Albaugh, Harry M., XXXX	Nov. 30, 1960	Panama	Order of Vasco Nunez de Balboa, grade of gran master	Do.
Benson, Kenneth B., XXXX	June 30, 1958	France	Croix de Guerre with palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Bondurant, Wiley M., XXXXXXXX	July 31, 1961	do	Aviation Badge (observer)	Token of good will.
Bostick, John, XXXX	Feb. 29, 1960	Peru	Aviation Cross	For meritorious service.
Brodzinsky, Philip, XXXXXXXX	July 31, 1961	Greece	Silver Cross of the Royal Order of George I	Do.
Chamberlain, Carlton A., XXXXXXXX	Jan. 1, 1953	France	Croix de Guerre with palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Chick, Lewis W., Jr., XXXX	Sept. 30, 1958	Bolivia	Order of the Condor of the Andes	For meritorious service.
Clark, Linwood L., XXXXXXXX	July 1, 1960	China	Pilot wings	Token of good will.
		Korea	do	Do.
Colling, James H., XXXXXXXX	Apr. 30, 1961	Iran	Merit Medal, 3d class, 1st type	For meritorious service.
Cox, Thomas L., XXXX	May 31, 1961	Iraq	Gold medal	Do.
DeGroot, Edward B., Jr., XXXX	Jan. 31, 1960	France	Navigator Badge	Token of good will.
		do	Gold Medal of Physical Education and Sports	For meritorious service.
Fallon, Robert B., XXXX	Aug. 31, 1961	China	Honorary Insignia of the Combined Service Forces	Token of good will.
Fandel, William H., XXXX	July 31, 1961	Iran	Merit Medal, 3d class, 1st type	For meritorious service.
Grier, John C., Jr., XXXXXXXX	Oct. 31, 1960	Brazil	Silver Medal, Merito Santos Dumont	Do.
Hardeman, Milton L., XXXX	June 30, 1959	Norway	Haakon VII Liberation Cross	Reason for award unknown.
		France	Croix de Guerre with palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Hearn, Bunn, Jr., XXXX	July 31, 1961	do	Aviation Badge	Token of good will.
Heintz, Adam J., XXXX	Jan. 31, 1961	Colombia	Pilot wings	Do.
		do	Cruz de Merito Aeronautico "Antonio Ricaurte," grade of comendador	For meritorious service.
Henry, Noel P., XXXXXXXX	do	Belgium	Pilot wings	Token of good will.
		China	Aviation Badge	Do.
Holmquist, George W., XXXX	July 31, 1961	France	L'Ordre Franco-Outremerien	For meritorious service.
Johnson, Russel T., XXXXXXXX	Oct. 2, 1958	do	Aviation Badge	Token of good will.
Klapper, David D., XXXXXXXX	June 30, 1959	China	Cloud and Banner	For meritorious service.
Korona, Wilson B., XXXX	Oct. 31, 1961	France	Ivory name stamp	Token of good will.
Laborde, Edward, XXXXXXXX	Mar. 1, 1958	Spain	Aviation Badge	Do.
		do	Cruz de 2d Clase del Merito Aeronautico con distintivo blanco	For meritorious service.
LaBuda, Joseph E., XXXX	Apr. 30, 1960	Argentina	Aviador Militar "Honoris Causa"	Token of good will.
		Chile	Military Medal, 3d class, and engineer wings	For meritorious service.
Little, John E., XXXXXXXX	May 31, 1959	Iran	Merit Decoration, 3d class	For service as air adviser, Technical School.
Marshall, Leonard S., XXXX	Jan. 31, 1961	Nicaragua	Military pilot wings	Token of good will.
Moench, Carroll J., XXXXXXXX	do	Korea	Pilot wings	Do.
Moyzahan, Francis V., XXXXXXXX	Oct. 31, 1961	France	Medaille de l'Aeronautique	For meritorious service.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE—Continued

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
LIEUTENANT COLONEL—CON.				
Munger, Paul O., XXXXXXXX	Jan. 31, 1961	Belgium	Aviation Badge	Token of good will.
Paulin, Harold D., Jr., XXXX	July 31, 1961	France	Air Force wings	Do.
Plummer, Harry W., XXXXXXXX	Nov. 2, 1959	do.	Aviation Badge (pilot)	Do.
Prentiss, Vernon, XXXX	June 30, 1964	China	Pilot wings	Do.
Ridenour, George F., XXXXXXXX	Aug. 31, 1957	Norway	Haakon VII Liberation Cross	For meritorious service.
Ruhe, Harry A., XXXXXXXX	July 31, 1957	France	Croix de Guerre with palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Smith, Joseph C., XXXX	July 31, 1961	Norway	Knights Cross, 1st class, of the Royal Order of Saint Olav	For meritorious service.
Smith, Robert N., XXXX	Oct. 31, 1960	Paraguay	National Order of Merit	Do.
Weigle, Graham, XXXX	June 5, 1958	France	Air Force wings	Token of good will.
Wolfe George W., Jr., XXXXXXXX	Apr. 30, 1961	Ecuador	Croix de Guerre with palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Adams, Frank L., XXXXXXXX	Nov. 1, 1962	Greece	Abdon Calderon	For meritorious service.
Bullard, Exum F., XXXXXXXX	July 31, 1962	Greece	Royal Order of Phoenix	Do.
Carpenter, George W., XXXX	May 1, 1962	Turkey	Aviation Badge	Token of good will.
Cooper, Harold M., XXXX	Oct. 1, 1962	Philippines	Legion of Honor (degree of officer)	For meritorious service.
Cushman, Charles V. B., XXXXXXXX	May 31, 1962	Libya	Grand Order of Independence of the Fifth Degree	Do.
Dowling, John H., Jr., XXXXXXXX	May 31, 1961	Peru	Aviation Cross	Do.
Goni, Frank X., XXXX	June 30, 1962	France	Medaille de l'Aeronautique	Do.
Halderon, Oliver K., XXXX	do.	Peru	Aviation Cross, 2d class	Do.
Harris, Oliver W., XXXXXXXX	Sept. 20, 1962	France	Croix de Guerre with palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Hartel, Robert L., XXXX	Nov. 1, 1962	Chile	Medalla Militar de Tercera Clase	For meritorious service.
Hood, Charles T., XXXX	Aug. 31, 1962	Guatemala	Cross of Military Merit, 1st class	Do.
Hughes, Phil, XXXX	Dec. 1, 1962	France	Air Force Pilot Badge	Token of good will.
Martin, George F., XXXXXXXX	Apr. 30, 1962	Iran	Iranian Merit Decoration, 2d class	For meritorious service.
McFarlane, John D., XXXX	Oct. 1, 1962	Korea	Order of Military Merit Chungmoo with silver star	Do.
Omsted, Kenneth A., XXXX	Aug. 31, 1962	France	Medaille de l'Aeronautique	Do.
Pettit, Weldon M., XXXX	June 30, 1962	Argentina	Orden de Mayo	Do.
Rethmann, Harold W., XXXXXXXX	Dec. 1, 1962	Panama	Aviador Military "Honoris Causa"	Do.
Sheldon, Benjamin M., XXXX	June 30, 1962	China	Order of Vasco Nunez de Balboa	Do.
Yates, Mortimer A., XXXXXXXX	Dec. 31, 1961	Iran	Chinese Air Force pilot wings	Token of good will.
MAJOR				
Anderson, Truman F., XXXX	May 31, 1960	France	3d grade Order of the Taj	For meritorious service.
Beck, Charles D., XXXX	Jan. 31, 1961	Greece	Royal Order of George I	Do.
Breece, Jean R., XXXX	Mar. 31, 1961	France	Air Force wings	Token of good will.
Fair, Gene R., XXXXXXXX	Feb. 28, 1961	Chile	Pilot wings	Do.
Fallon, Edward, XXXX	Dec. 31, 1960	Thailand	Air Force wings	Do.
Frank, Louis, III, XXXX	Mar. 31, 1960	France	Croix de Guerre with palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Garza, Hector J., XXXX	Oct. 31, 1960	Argentina	Air Force wings	Token of good will.
Henry, Oscar J., XXXXXXXX	Sept. 30, 1960	Belgium	Pilot wings	Do.
McIntee, Patrick, G., XXXXXXXX	Mar. 5, 1959	China	do.	Do.
Montgomery, Douglas M., XXXX	Jan. 31, 1961	France	Order of the Black Star, grade of officer	For meritorious service.
Moomaw, Lowell A., XXXXXXXX	Oct. 31, 1961	Uruguay	Air Force wings	Token of good will.
Nash, William J., XXXXXXXX	June 30, 1959	China	Medal of Pao Ting	For meritorious service.
Nichols, Donald, XXXXXXXX	Apr. 2, 1958	do.	Pilot wings	For meritorious service.
Quinones, Alphonse D., XXXX	July 31, 1960	Korea	Army and Navy decoration for Meritorious Service	Token of good will.
Scaffi, Anthony, XXXX	Feb. 27, 1961	Nicaragua	Honorary rank of colonel in Republic of Korea Air Force	Do.
Watley, James D., XXXXXXXX	Apr. 30, 1960	Argentina	Master parachute wings	Do.
Brown, James S., XXXXXXXX	Oct. 1, 1962	Italy	Pilot wings	Do.
Butler, William O., Jr., XXXXXXXX	June 30, 1962	Nicaragua	Observers wings	Do.
Cleri, Anthony J., XXXX	Nov. 1, 1962	Bolivia	Honorary pilots wings	Do.
Conaway, James T., XXXXXXXX	Aug. 31, 1961	France	Aviation Badge	Do.
Daniel, Harlan F., XXXX	Dec. 1, 1962	France	Order of the Condor of the Andes	For meritorious service.
Griffith, Ralph L., XXXXXXXX	July 31, 1962	Chile	Aviation Badge	Token of good will.
Hahus, Homer J., XXXXXXXX	Oct. 1, 1962	Greece	Air Force Aviation Badge	Do.
Minard, Craig F., XXXX	June 30, 1962	Belgium	Military Cross, class C	For meritorious service.
Richardson, W. S., XXXXXXXX	Oct. 1, 1962	Belgium	Belgium Air Force pilot wings	Token of good will.
Shine, Wilbur G., XXXX	Aug. 31, 1962	Mexico	Air Force wings	Do.
Wilmerding, William E., XXXXXXXX	Jan. 31, 1962	France	Pilot Badge	Do.
Aly, Joyce, XXXX	July 31, 1961	Peru	Air Force wings	Do.
Gibson, John E., XXXXXXXX	June 30, 1961	France	Aviation Badge	Do.
Molland, Leo M., XXXX	Mar. 7, 1961	Greece	Military Cross	For meritorious service.
Morin, Robert E., XXXXXXXX	Aug. 31, 1961	do.	Distinguished Service Medal	Do.
Reichard, Richard, XXXXXXXX	do.	China	Air Force pilot wings	Token of good will.
Howe, Gilbert, Jr., XXXX	Nov. 1, 1962	do.	do.	Do.
CAPTAIN				
Vanderbank, Harry E., XXXXXXXX	May 31, 1961	Netherlands	Order of the Orange Nassau	For meritorious service.
Johnson, Bruce D., XXXX	Nov. 28, 1962	Belgium	Aviation Badge	Token of good will.
CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER				
Rader, Robert N., XXXX	July 31, 1959	France	Navigator Badge	Do.
		France	Aviation Badge (observer)	Do.
		Belgium	Aviation Badge	Do.
		do.	do.	Do.
		Chile	Medalla Militar de Tercera Clase and Miembro Honoris Causa de la Fuerza Aerea de Chile	For meritorious service.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE—Continued

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
FLIGHT OFFICER				
Chitwood, Royce R., [REDACTED]	June 27, 1961	Iraq	Gold medal	For meritorious service.
CHIEF MASTER SERGEANT				
Valverde, Horace H., [REDACTED]	Apr. 30, 1962	Peru	Air Force wings	Token of good will.
MASTER SERGEANT				
Barker, James N., [REDACTED]	Oct. 31, 1960	Venezuela	Air Force Cross	For meritorious service.
Cronick, Albert, [REDACTED]	July 31, 1958	Iraq	Gold medal	Do.
Cunningham, Orville R., [REDACTED]	Feb. 28, 1957	Bolivia	Aviation Mechanic Badge	Token of good will.
Garcia, Anthony P., [REDACTED]	Aug. 31, 1958	do.	Order of the Condor of the Andes	For meritorious service.
Livingston, Dwain E., [REDACTED]	Sept. 30, 1960	Iran	Homayoun Medal	Do.
Parker, Robert M., Jr., [REDACTED]	Nov. 30, 1958	Mexico	Aircrew Badge	Token of good will.
Powman, Ralph M., [REDACTED]	June 30, 1959	Bolivia	Order of the Condor of the Andes	For meritorious service.
Prioreschi, Angelo V., [REDACTED]	Sept. 30, 1959	Brazil	Aircraft mechanic wings	Token of good will.
Rusakovskiy, Elton L., [REDACTED]	July 31, 1961	Norway	Haakon VII Liberation Medal	For meritorious service.
Bourgeois, Curtis M., [REDACTED]	Jan. 31, 1960	Italy	Solidarity Star, 3d degree	Do.
Britton, William W., [REDACTED]	Aug. 25, 1958	Korea	Hwarang Distinguished Military Service Medal	Do.
Charlton, John E., [REDACTED]	Feb. 28, 1961	Norway	Medal of Valor	Do.
Wouralls, James G., [REDACTED]	July 8, 1958	Greece	Gold Medal of the Royal Order of George I	Do.
Lundberg, Laurence W., [REDACTED]	Dec. 1, 1962	China	Mao Chi	Do.
McClurkin, Ernest J., [REDACTED]	Aug. 31, 1962	Korea	Order of Military Merit Hwarang	Do.
Podlish, Max, [REDACTED]	July 31, 1962	Greece	Gold Medal of the Royal Order of George I	Do.
Sylvester, Melvin W., [REDACTED]	Mar. 31, 1962	China	Chinese air photographer wings	Token of good will.
STAFF SERGEANT				
McNamara, Alexander T., [REDACTED]	Apr. 14, 1960	Italy	Solidarity Star, 3d degree	For meritorious service.
Downey, Kenneth G., [REDACTED]	June 30, 1962	do.	Italian Solidarity Star, 3d degree	Do.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

ADMIRAL				
Low, Francis S., [REDACTED]	Jan. 1, 1961	France	Legion of Honor (commander)	Token of good will.
		Italy	Al Merito della Repubblica Italiana (grand officer)	Do.
Wright, Jerauld, [REDACTED]	Mar. 1, 1960	do.	Grand officer of the Order of Merit	Do.
		Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit (grand officer), Distintivo Blanco	Do.
		Netherlands	Grand Cross in the Order of Orange-Nassau	Do.
		Brazil	Order of Naval Merit	Do.
		Belgium	Grand Cross of the Order of Leopold II	Do.
		Colombia	Grand Cross of the Order of Boyaca	Do.
		Portugal	Great Cross of Avis	Do.
		Morocco	1st Order (Grand Cross) of the Order of Ouissam Alaouite Cherifen	Do.
Hanlon, Byron Hall, [REDACTED]	Oct. 1, 1958	Brazil	Order of Naval Merit (commander)	Do.
Holloway, James L., Jr., [REDACTED]	Apr. 1, 1959	do.	do.	Do.
Good, Roscoe F., [REDACTED]	Mar. 1, 1958	Cuba	Order of Naval Merit, 1st class	In recognition of distinguished service.
		Japan	Order of the Double Rays of the Rising Sun	Token of good will.
		Korea	Order of Military Merit, Taeguk with silver star	For services rendered the Korean Navy.
Briscoe, Robert P., [REDACTED]	Jan. 1, 1959	Italy	Knight of the Great Cross of the Order of Merit of the Italian Republic	Token of good will.
		Greece	Grand Cross of the Royal Order of King George I	Do.
Hopwood, Herbert G., [REDACTED]	Sept. 1, 1960	Japan	Order of the Rising Sun (2d class)	For service as commander, Naval Forces, Far East.
		China	Medal of Pao Ting with grand cordon	During the Taiwan crisis of 1958.
		Korea	Order of Military Merit, Taeguk with gold star	Token of good will.
		Philippines	Philippine Legion of Honor (commander)	Do.
Burke, Arleigh A., [REDACTED]	Aug. 1, 1961	Peru	Naval Cross of Merit	For services rendered to the Peruvian Navy.
		Ecuador	Order of Abdon Calderon, 1st class	Token of good will.
		Japan	1st class of the Order of the Rising Sun	Do.
		Portugal	Grand Cross of the Military Order of Avis	Do.
		Korea	Order of Military Merit Taeguk with gold star	Do.
		Argentina	Grand Master of the Order of May for Naval Merit (Grand Cross)	Do.
		Brazil	The Grand Cross of Naval Merit	Do.
		Chile	Medalla Militar de la Armada de Primera Clase	Do.
		Cuba	Order of Naval Merit, 1st class	Do.
		France	Grand Officer of the Legion of Honor	Do.
		Greece	Grand Cross of the Order of George I	Do.
		Italy	Cavaliere di Gran Croce dell'Ordine al Merito della Repubblica Italiana	Do.
		Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit (Grand Cross) Distintivo Blanco	Do.
		Spain	Grand Cross of Naval Merit	Do.
		Thailand	Most Exalted Order of the White Elephant, 1st class (Knight Grand Cross)	Do.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY—Continued

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
ADMIRAL—continued				
Burke, Arleigh A.—Continued.	Aug. 1, 1961	Germany	Distinguished Service Cross with star.	Token of good will.
		Sweden	Grand Cross of the Royal Swedish Order of the Sword.	Do.
		Brazil	Naval Order for Services of Distinction.	Do.
		Colombia	Grand Cross of the Order of Boyaca.	Do.
		Belgium	Grand Cross of the Order of Leopold II.	Do.
		Mexico	Special merit.	Do.
		Paraguay	Order of Military Merit (grand officer).	Do.
		Denmark	Grand Cross of the Order of Dannebrog.	Do.
		Norway	Grand Cross of Olav.	Do.
		Netherlands	Great Cross of the Order of Orange-Nassau.	Do.
		Philippines	Legion of Honor (chief commander).	Do.
		Colombia	Naval Order "Almirante Padilla" (grand officer).	Do.
Will, John M., XXXX	July 1, 1958	Netherlands	Order of Orange-Nassau with Swords (commander).	For cooperation with the Dutch Navy operating out of west Australia.
VICE ADMIRAL				
Bledsoe, Albert M., XXXX	Sept. 1, 1958	Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit (grand officer).	For service as commandant, 15th Naval District.
		Panama	Order of Vasco Nuñez de Balboa.	Do.
		Chile	Military Medal, 1st class.	Occasion of a visit to Santiago, Chile.
Moore, Walter E., XXXX	Mar. 1, 1959	Korea	Order of Military Merit Taeguk.	For service as commander, Amphibious Task Force 90.
		Greece	Royal Order of the Phoenix (knight commander).	For service as chief of Navy section, Joint U.S. Military Air Group to Greece.
Callaghan, William M., XXXX	Mar. 1, 1957	Japan	Order of the Rising Sun, 2d class.	For service as commander, naval forces, Far East.
		Korea	Order of Military Merit Taeguk with silver star.	Do.
Von Heimburg, Earnest H., 34574.	July 1, 1958	Brazil	Order of Naval Merit (grand officer).	For service as chief, U.S. naval mission to Brazil.
Roper, John W., XXXX	May 1, 1958	Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit.	Token of good will.
Combs, Thomas S., XXXX	Apr. 1, 1960	Spain	Order of Naval Merit (grand officer).	Do.
Ingersoll, Stuart H., XXXX	July 1, 1960	Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit (grand officer) Distintivo Blanco.	Do.
		China	Grand Cordon of the Order of the Precious Tripod.	For service as commander, 7th Fleet commander of the U.S. Taiwan Defense Command.
		Brazil	Order of Naval Merit (grand officer).	Token of good will.
Hickey, Robert F., XXXX	July 1, 1959	Portugal	Military Merit, 1st class.	Do.
Sabin, Lorenzo S., XXXX	Mar. 1, 1961	Japan	Order of the Rising Sun, 3d class.	Do.
		Korea	Military Merit of Taeguk with silver star.	For services during the Korean conflict.
		France	Legion of Honor (commander).	For his participation in Operation Passage to Freedom in Indochina.
Schindler, Walter G., XXXX	Oct. 1, 1959	Chile	Military Medal.	For services rendered as chief of naval mission to Chile.
Jarrett, Harry B., XXXX	July 1, 1959	China	Collar Order of the Cloud and Banner.	For service as senior military attaché at the U.S. Embassy at Taiwan.
Orem, Howard E., XXXX	Dec. 1, 1961	Liberia	Star of Africa (grand commander).	Token of good will.
		Germany	Grand Merit Cross with star.	Do.
Sanders, Harry (n), XXXX	May 1, 1957	Ecuador	Abdon Calderon, 1st class.	Do.
Gillett, Robert M., XXXX	Mar. 1, 1958	Denmark	Danish Red Cross Medal.	For service with the Danish Red Cross in Korea.
Hedding, Truman J., XXXX	Jan. 1, 1959	China	Cloud and Banner Medal.	For service as chief of staff to commander in chief, Pacific Fleet.
Kivette, Frederick N., XXXX	Oct. 1, 1961	do.	The Medal of Pao Ting.	For service as commander, 7th Fleet.
			Order of the Precious Tripod.	Reason for award unknown.
Marshall, William J., XXXX	May 1, 1959	Italy	Order of Merit of the Italian Republic.	For services to the Italian Navy.
		Brazil	War Service Medal.	For outstanding performance as captain of an escort vessel.
Moore, French R., XXXX	Dec. 1, 1958	do.	Order of Naval Merit (commander).	For service as medical officer to the U.S. naval mission to Brazil.
Sears, Harry E., XXXX	Aug. 1, 1958	Spain	Order of Naval Merit, 3d class.	Token of good will.
Espe, Carl F., XXXX	May 1, 1962	Argentina	Order of Naval Merit (grand officer).	Do.
		France	Legion of Honor (commander).	Do.
Pirie, Robert B., XXXX	Nov. 1, 1962	Brazil	Order of Naval Merit (grand officer).	Do.
Smoot, Roland N., XXXX	June 1, 1962	China	The Cloud and Banner Medal with grand cordon.	For service as commander, U.S. Taiwan Defense Command.
			The Medal of Pao Ting.	For participation in the Taiwan Straits crisis.
REAR ADMIRAL				
Clark, Thurston B., XXXX	July 1, 1962	France	Legion of Honor (chevalier).	Token of good will.
		Morocco	Ouissam Alaouite.	For service as commander, U.S. naval activities, Port Lytauey.
Crawford, George C., XXXX	Nov. 1, 1962	Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit (grand officer).	For service as commander, submarine force, U.S. Atlantic Fleet.
Nation, William M., XXXX	July 1, 1962	Japan	Third Order of the Rising Sun.	For service as commander, fleet air, Japan; commander, naval air bases, Japan.
Stone, Ellery W., XXXX	Feb. 1, 1958	Italy	Grand Officer of the Order of the Crown of Italy.	Communication assistance rendered during Balboa flight in 1933 as a civilian.
			Gold Medal to Protectors of Public Health.	Token of good will.
Halloran, Edward R., XXXX	Jan. 1, 1958	Panama	La Estrella de la Fundacion Internacional Jose Gabriel Duque.	Do.
Hartman, Charles C., XXXX	Apr. 1, 1960	Mexico	Special Merit.	Do.
		Argentina	Grand Master of the Order of May for Naval Merit (grand officer).	Do.
		Brazil	Order of Naval Merit (commander).	Do.
		Ecuador	Abdon Calderon, 1st class (1955).	Do.
		Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit.	Do.
		Ecuador	National Order for Merit, rank of commander.	Do.
Glass, Richard P., XXXX	June 1, 1958	Greece	Royal Order of George I (knight commander).	For service as chief of U.S. naval mission.
Pihl, Paul E., XXXX	Mar. 1, 1958	Finland	Officers' Cross of the White House.	For service as U.S. naval attaché.
Kelley, Marion R., XXXX	June 30, 1959	Italy	Order of Merit.	Token of good will.
Kniskern, Leslie A., XXXX	Apr. 1, 1958	Argentina	Order of Naval Merit (grand officer).	Do.
		France	Legion of Honor (commander).	Do.
		Chile	Military Medal for Distinguished Service, 2d class.	For service to the Chilean naval mission.
Solomons, Edward A., XXXX	Apr. 1, 1961	Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit (grand officer) Distintivo Blanco.	Token of good will.
Davis, Burton, XXXX	Aug. 1, 1957	China	Order of Cloud and Banner.	Do.
Withington, Frederic S., XXXX	Apr. 1, 1961	Japan	The Second Order of the Sacred Treasure.	For assistance in developing the Maritime Self-Defense Force.
Latimer, Samuel E., XXXX	Sept. 1, 1958	Argentina	Order of Naval Merit (commander).	Token of good will.
		Chile	Military Medal of the Navy, 2d class.	For service to the Chilean Navy.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY—Continued

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
REAR ADMIRAL—CON.				
Parks, Lewis S., XXXX	July 1, 1960	Chile	Medalla Militar de la Armada de Primera Class.	Token of good will.
Champlin, Jackson S., XXXX	July 1, 1955	Brazil	Order of Naval Merit (commander)	Do.
Peltier, Eugene J., XXXX	Feb. 1, 1962	do	do	Do.
Walker, Edward K., XXXX	Nov. 1, 1958	Chile	Military Order, 2d class	Do.
Hogan, Bartholomew W., XXXX	Mar. 1, 1961	Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval merit (grand officer).	Do.
		France	Medal of Honor	Token of gratitude from the Medical Service of the French Navy.
Strauss, Lewis L., XXXX	Feb. 1, 1956	Belgium	Order of Leopold (grand officer)	Token of good will.
Clarke, Ralph S., XXXX	July 1, 1961	China	The Medal of Pao Ting	Do.
Dudley, Paul L., XXXX	do	Saudi Arabia	Gifts: Arab ceremonial robe and gold Longine wristwatch.	Do.
Fullinwider, Ranson, XXXX	Sept. 1, 1959	Argentina	Order of the Liberator San Martin (knight commander).	U.S. naval attaché at Buenos Aires.
Greytak, John J., XXXX	June 30, 1957	France	National Order of the Legion of Honor (chevalier).	Token of good will.
Stelter, Frederick C., Jr., XXXX	Feb. 1, 1961	Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit (commander).	For service to the Peruvian Navy.
Briggs, Harold M., XXXX	July 1, 1961	Brazil	Order of Naval Merit (commander)	Token of good will.
		Ecuador	Abdon Calderon de Primera Clase	Do.
		Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval merit (grand officer).	Do.
		Colombia	Naval Order Almirante Padilla (grand officer).	Do.
			Order of San Carlos (grand officer)	Do.
Harris, William S., XXXX	June 30, 1957	Mexico	Special Merit	Do.
Banister, Alan B., XXXX	July 1, 1958	Ecuador	Abdon Calderon, 1st class	Do.
		Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit knight commander).	Do.
Keeler, Frederick S., XXXX	July 1, 1959	Colombia	Order of Boyaca (commander)	For service to the Colombian Navy.
Coffin, Harry N., XXXX	do	Chile	Military Medal, 2d class	Token of good will.
Howerton, Charles C., XXXX	Oct. 1, 1959	Argentina	Order of Naval Merit	U.S. naval attaché and naval attaché for Air.
			Piloto Aviator Naval Honoris Causa.	Do.
Adkins, James A., XXXX	Nov. 1, 1959	Brazil	Order of Naval Merit (officer)	Token of good will.
Foster, Walter M., XXXX	do	Chile	Military Medal, 2d class	For service to the Chilean Navy.
Sanchez, Henry G., XXXX	do	Spain	Cross of Naval Merit	Token of good will.
Andrews, Richard S., XXXX	do	Brazil	Medal of Naval Merit	Do.
			Marechal Souza Aguiar	Do.
Hunter, Raymond P., XXXX	do	Netherlands	Order of Orange Nassau (commander)	Do.
Norvell, William C., XXXX	Sept. 1, 1959	Japan	Third Order of the Sacred Treasure	Do.
DeMetropolis, George (n), XXXX	Nov. 1, 1959	Greece	Royal Order of George I (officer)	Do.
Johnsen, William H., XXXX	do	Liberia	Order of the Star of Africa (commander).	Presidential inaugural ceremonies, 1952.
Walpole, Kinloch C., XXXX	do	Greece	Royal Order of the Phoenix (commander).	For service rendered to the Royal Hellenic Navy.
Roscoe, David L., XXXX	do	Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal.	Token of good will.
Sheeley, William R., XXXX	Aug. 1, 1961	Italy	Order of Naval Merit (commander)	Do.
Jukes, Herbert L., XXXX	Nov. 1, 1959	Greece	Royal Order of George I	For services as technical engineer officer with U.S. naval mission.
Garrison, Malcolm E., XXXX	do	Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit (commander).	Token of good will.
Haskins, Enrique D., XXXX	Jan. 1, 1959	France	Legion of Honor (knight)	For service as U.S. Naval attaché, Paris, France.
de Florez, Luis, XXXX	Sept. 1, 1955	Spain	Grand Cross of the Order of Naval Merit, distintivo blanco.	Token of good will.
Fleck, Francis E., Jr., XXXX	Nov. 1, 1959	Japan	Order of Merit 3d class	Member of the staff, commander, Naval forces, Far East.
DuBois, Thomas H., XXXX	Apr. 1, 1958	Colombia	Naval Order Admiral Padilla (officer)	Token of good will.
Ashley, James H., Jr., XXXX	Nov. 1, 1959	Korea	Military Order of Merit, Ulchi, with gold star.	For service as chief, U.S. Naval Advisory Group, Korea.
Coffin, Albert P., XXXX	do	Chile	Military Medal of the Navy, 3d class	For service to the Chilean Navy.
Shaw, James C., XXXX	Feb. 1, 1958	Netherlands	Order of Orange-Nassau (commander)	Token of good will.
Benitez, Rafael C., XXXX	July 1, 1959	Cuba	Order of Naval Merit	Do.
Bull, Carl E., XXXX	Nov. 1, 1959	Chile	Naval Military Medal, 3d class	For service to the Chilean Navy.
		Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit (commander).	Token of good will.
CAPTAIN				
Mabley, Louis C., XXXX	July 1, 1961	Sweden	Royal Order of the Sword	Do.
Gjoerloff, George O., XXXX	Mar. 1, 1959	Ethiopia	Star of Ethiopia, 1st class	Do.
McMillan, Carl H., XXXX	Oct. 1, 1958	Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit (commander).	For service as medical officer to the U.S. naval mission to Peru.
Sullivan, Emmett J., XXXX	June 30, 1957	Brazil	Order of Naval Merit	For service to the Brazilian Navy.
Enright, George P., XXXX	July 1, 1958	Greece	Cross of Commander of the Royal Order of the Phoenix.	For service as U.S. naval attaché to Greece.
Wakeman, Philip F., XXXX	Aug. 1, 1958	Colombia	Naval Order Almirante Padilla	Token of good will.
Brookings, Robert S., II, XXXX	July 1, 1962	China	Army-Navy-Air Force Medal, class A, grade 2.	For service as commanding officer, U.S. Naval Support Activity, Taipei, China.
Collett, James D., XXXX	do	Spain	The Cross of Third Class of the Order of Naval Merit with distintivo blanco.	Token of good will.
Dimitrijevic, William J., XXXX	do	Brazil	Navy Distinguished Service Medal	Do.
Ferrara, Maurice, XXXX	do	Philippines	Legion of Honor (officer)	For service as commanding officer, U.S.S. Gar (SS-206) during November-December 1944.
Fleck, Thomas M., XXXX	do	China	The Medal of Cloud and Banner	For service in the Taiwan area in 1958.
Fletcher, Francis O'C., Jr., XXXX	Apr. 1, 1962	Mexico	Special Merit	For service as naval attaché (1955-57).
Grell, Theodore A., XXXX	July 1, 1962	Greece	Royal Order of the Phoenix (golden cross).	Token of good will.
Higgins, Donald C., XXXX	do	Israel	UZI Submachinegun	For service as naval attache, Tel Aviv, Israel.
Hydeman, Earl T., XXXX	do	China	The Medal of Cloud and Banner	For service in the Taiwan Strait area in 1958.
Wiesner, Frederick C., XXXX	Oct. 1, 1957	Germany	Distinguished Service Cross	Token of good will.
Archer, Stephen M., XXXX	Mar. 1, 1962	Greece	Royal Order of George I (commodore)	Do.
Whichard, Rogers D., XXXX	Nov. 1, 1961	France	Academic Palms Medal (academic officer).	Do.
Jones, Alvin A., XXXX	Apr. 1, 1962	Brazil	Order of Naval Merit (officer)	For service rendered the Brazilian Navy.
Kipp, John M., XXXX	July 1, 1962	China	Chinese Air Force pilot wings	Token of good will.
Kirkpatrick, Claude S., XXXX	do	Japan	The Third Order of the Sacred Treasure	Do.
Lewis, Hugh Howard, XXXX	do	Portugal	Medal of Military Merit	For service as U.S. naval attaché and naval attaché for Air, Lisbon, Portugal.
Loyall, Julius A., XXXX	do	Brazil	Navy Merit of Honor (officer)	For assistance rendered during visit of Brazilian training ship to California.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY—Continued

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
CAPTAIN—continued				
McAllister, Joseph D., XXXX	July 1, 1962	Philippines	Philippine Legion of Honor (officer)	For service to the Filipino people.
McDonald, Edwin A., XXXX	do.	Belgium	Order of Leopold	For service in the Antarctic during Deep Freeze 4.
Pugsley, Edmond B., XXXX	Nov. 1, 1962	Brazil	Order of Naval Merit (officer)	For service as operations officer of the U.S. naval mission to Brazil.
Ross, James G., XXXX	July 1, 1962	Ethiopia	The Most Distinguished Star	Token of good will.
Ryan, Paul B., XXXX	do.	Cuba	Order of Naval Merit	For service as U.S. naval attaché and naval attaché for air.
Salmon, Nelson D., XXXX	do.	China	The Medal of Cloud and Banner	Token of good will.
Scott, George W., XXXX	Sept. 1, 1962	Brazil	Order of Naval Merit (officer)	For service to the U.S. naval mission to Brazil.
Sommer, Harold A., XXXX	July 1, 1962	do.	do.	For service as a member of the U.S. naval mission.
Spangler, John G., XXXX	do.	Japan	Order of the Sacred Treasure, 3d class	Token of good will.
Spencer, Edward C., XXXX	do.	Philippines	Legion of Honor (officer)	Do.
Warren, Shields, XXXX	Oct. 1, 1959	Brazil	Order of the Southern Cross (commander)	Do.
Wayne, Charles, XXXX	July 1, 1962	Ethiopia	Distinguished Order of the Star	Do.
Whiteford, William R., XXXX	May 1, 1959	Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit (commander)	Do.
McElroy, John H., XXXX	July 1, 1959	France	Legion of Honor	Do.
Fuetsch, Bernhart A., XXXX	July 1, 1960	Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit (commander)	Do.
Briner, Richard R., XXXX	do.	France	Cross of the Legion of Honor (officer)	Rescue assistance.
Koepke, Lyle L., XXXX	do.	Panama	Order of Vasco Nunez de Balboa	Token of good will.
May, Leo G., XXXX	do.	Japan	Order of the Sacred Treasure, 3d class	Do.
Harris, David A., XXXX	do.	Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit (commander) Distintivo Blanco.	Do.
Ellis, Edward B., XXXX	Sept. 1, 1960	Lebanon	Honorary Gold Medal for Merit	Do.
Gurnette, Byron L., XXXX	July 1, 1961	Monaco	Order of Saint Charles (commander)	Do.
Robertson, Edward L., XXXX	May 1, 1959	Colombia	Order of Naval Almirante Padilla	For service as professor in the Colombian Naval War College.
Vredenburg, James B., XXXX	July 1, 1960	Cuba	Order of Naval Merit, 2d class	Token of good will.
Cooper, Robert W., XXXX	June 1, 1961	Japan	Order of the Sacred Treasure, 3d class	For assistance in developing the Maritime Self Defense Force.
		Chile	Medalla Militar de la Armada de Tercera Clase.	For service to the Chilean Navy.
		Finland	Order of the White Rose (commander)	Token of good will.
Wilber, Donald T., XXXX	July 1, 1961	Japan	The Third Order of the Sacred Treasure	Do.
		Greece	The Cross of Brigadiers of the Order of George I.	Do.
Payson, Harold, Jr., XXXX	do.	Cuba	Distinguished Service Medal	Do.
Foster, Edward L., XXXX	July 1, 1960	Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit (commander)	Do.
Williams, Henry, Jr., XXXX	Jan. 1, 1961	Brazil	Order of Naval Merit (commander)	For service to the Brazilian Navy.
Ribble, George B., Jr., XXXX	July 1, 1961	do.	Air wings	Token of good will.
Gates, Thomas S., XXXX	Dec. 1, 1953	Spain	Grand Cross of Naval Merit	In rendering service to Spain.
		Argentina	Grand Master of the Order of May for Naval Merit (grand cross)	Token of good will.
		Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit (grand cross), distintivo blanco.	Do.
		Brazil	Order of Naval Merit (grand officer)	Do.
Johnson, John H. S., XXXX	July 1, 1960	Japan	The Third Order of the Sacred Treasure	Do.
Roudebush, Jack, XXXX	Sept. 1, 1959	Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit (commander)	Do.
Pitts, Ray M., XXXX	Oct. 1, 1960	Venezuela	Francisco de Miranda	For service as chief of U.S. naval mission to Venezuela.
Munson, Henry G., XXXX	Mar. 1, 1961	Brazil	Order of Naval Merit (commander)	Token of good will.
Moncure, Samuel P., XXXX	Jan. 1, 1962	Portugal	Order of Prince Henry (grand officer)	Do.
Williams, Paul D., XXXX	July 1, 1960	Italy	Order of Merit of the Republic (chevalier)	Do.
Arthur, Lionel A., XXXX	do.	Chile	Military Medal of the Navy	For service as a member of U.S. naval mission to Chile.
Shook, Kenneth S., XXXX	Dec. 1, 1959	Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit (commander)	For service to the Peruvian Navy.
Brittan, Theodore H., XXXX	July 1, 1960	China	The Medal of Cloud and Banner	During the Formosa Straits crisis.
Foster, Everett J., XXXX	do.	Chile	Al Merito Bernardo O'Higgins (commander)	For service as chief, U.S. naval mission to Chile.
			Military Medal, 3d class	Token of good will.
Johnson, Joseph E., XXXX	Jan. 1, 1959	Brazil	Naval Merit of Honor (officer)	For service with the Brazilian Navy communication service.
Eppes, Marion H., XXXX	July 1, 1961	Greece	Golden Cross of the Royal Order of George I.	Token of good will.
Sullivan, William A., XXXX	do.	do.	Order of King George I.	Tour of duty at Athens, Greece.
McDonald, Harold W., XXXX	do.	Japan	The Third Order of the Sacred Treasure	Token of good will.
Austin, Marshall H., XXXX	do.	Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit (knight commander)	Do.
Parunak, Aram Y., XXXX	do.	Japan	The Third Order of the Sacred Treasure	Do.
McElrath, Robert W., XXXX	do.	China	The Medal of Cloud and Banner	For services in the Taiwan Strait area.
Holman, William G., XXXX	Feb. 1, 1961	Netherlands	Orange-Nassau Medal	For service as assistant naval attaché.
Oelheim, Bennett C., XXXX	July 1, 1961	Belgium	Order of Military Cross, 1st class	Do.
Scheve, Carl J., XXXX	July 1, 1960	Brazil	Order of Naval Merit (officer)	For service to the Brazilian Navy.
Putman, Charles F., XXXX	Aug. 1, 1961	do.	do.	Do.
		Spain	Cross of Naval Merit, 3d class, with white distinctive.	Token of good will.
Brantley, William L., XXXX	Aug. 1, 1960	Chile	The Military Medal, 2d class	Do.
Nylund, Harvey R., XXXX	Jan. 1, 1959	Brazil	Order of Naval Merit (officer)	Do.
Butcher, Harry C., XXXX	Dec. 1, 1953	France	Medal of Liberation of France	For service as war correspondent during World War II.
Daly, George K., XXXX	June 1, 1960	do.	Croix de Guerre with silver star	Token of good will.
Oard, Harry C., XXXX	July 1, 1961	Peru	Peruvian Cross of the Order of Naval Merit (commander)	Do.
Gerber, Marvin L., XXXX	Aug. 1, 1961	Argentina	Order of Naval Merit (commander)	Do.
Lowther, Robert D., XXXX	July 1, 1961	Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit (commander)	For service to the Peruvian Navy.
Enzweiler, Joseph M., XXXX	Feb. 1, 1958	do.	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit (officer)	Do.
Hunsaker, Dr. J. C.	Oct. 31, 1947	Great Britain	Honorary Commander of the Civil Division of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire.	Reason for award unknown.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY—Continued

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
COMMANDER				
Sears, Richard D., Jr., XXXX	Nov. 1, 1957	France	Legion of Honor (chevalier)	Token of good will.
Chapman, George H., Jr., XXXX	July 1, 1960	Philippines	Legion of Honor (officer)	Do.
Bailey, Benjamin F., XXXX	do.	Greece	Royal Order of George I (officer)	Do.
Thomas, Robert H., XXXX	do.	Korea	Order of Military Merit, Uchi	Do.
Bierer, Howard T., XXXX	do.	Greece	Gold Cross of the Order of George I	Do.
Atherton, Harry S., XXXX	Sept. 1, 1959	Brazil	Order of Naval Merit (officer)	Member of naval mission to Brazil.
Bartlett, Wilson R., XXXX	July 1, 1961	Chile	Military Medal, 3d class	For service to the Chilean Navy.
Shilling, Samuel G., XXXX	July 1, 1960	Cuba	Order of Naval Merit, 2d class	Token of good will.
Baczinski, Frank J., XXXX	Nov. 1, 1956	Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit (commander)	For service to the Peruvian Navy.
Michels, Ralph J., XXXX	July 1, 1960	Venezuela	Order of Francisco de Miranda, 2d class	For service as chief, U.S. naval mission to Venezuela.
Winiecki, Frank G., XXXX	Apr. 1, 1959	Greece	Royal Order of King George I (officer)	For service to the Royal Hellenic Navy.
Cooper, Thomas V., XXXX	Mar. 1, 1957	Korea	Order of Military Merit, Chung Mu, with gold star	Token of good will.
Fey, William L., Jr., XXXX	June 1, 1960	Thailand	Order of the White Elephant	Do.
Bates, Langford W., XXXX	July 1, 1960	Ecuador	Abdon Calderon, 1st class	Do.
Heine, Heinrich, Jr., (n) XXXX	June 1, 1961	Philippines	Legion of Honor (officer)	Do.
Miller, Steward C., XXXX	Jan. 1, 1958	Ecuador	Abdon Calderon, 2d class	Do.
Kelley, George A., Jr.	June 1, 1955	Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit (knight commander), distintivo blanco	Do.
Smith, Roger F., XXXX	July 1, 1960	Argentina	Medal and Antarctic Insignia of the Argentine Navy	For service as nava adviser to the Argentine Naval War College.
James, John C., XXXX	July 1, 1961	Brazil	Order of Naval Merit (officer)	For service to the Brazilian Navy.
Baker, Wyane D., XXXX	July 1, 1960	China	The Medal of Pao Ting	Crisis in the Taiwan Straits.
Smith, Ralph C., Jr., XXXX	July 1, 1961	Greece	Royal Order of the Phoenix (officer)	Token of good will.
McIntyre, Arthur G., XXXX	July 1, 1959	Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit (knight commander)	Do.
Brown, Pride C., Jr., XXXX	Mar. 1, 1961	France	Legion of Honor (chevalier)	Do.
Johnson, Donald H., XXXX	July 1, 1961	Spain	Order of Naval Merit (knight)	Do.
Taylor, Harold A., XXXX	Aug. 1, 1961	Brazil	do.	For service to the Brazilian Navy.
Arey, Richard W., XXXX	July 1, 1962	Portugal	Medal of Military Merit, 2d class	Token of good will.
Chay, Donald S., XXXX	do.	Ecuador	Order of Prince Henry (commander)	Do.
Davis, James E., XXXX	Nov. 1, 1953	Brazil	Abdon Calderon, 2d class	For services rendered to the Ecuadoran Navy.
Gay, John W., XXXX	Aug. 1, 1962	do.	National Order of the Southern Cross (officer)	For service as commanding officer, Naval Air Facility Fortaleza, Brazil.
Laing, Fred, XXXX	July 1, 1962	Peru	Order of Naval Merit (knight)	For services rendered to Brazilian Navy.
McDonald, James J., XXXX	do.	France	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit (commander), distintivo blanco	Token of good will.
McKinney, Grange B., XXXX	Sept. 1, 1962	Spain	Legion of Honor (chevalier)	For service as assistant naval attaché and assistant naval attaché for air in Paris.
Metke, Harry D., XXXX	Sept. 1, 1962	Brazil	Naval Cross of Merit, 2d class	Token of good will.
Miller, Anthony J., XXXX	Sept. 1, 1962	Korea	Order of Naval Merit (officer)	Promotion of good will between United States and Brazil.
Moran, James O'D., XXXX	Nov. 1, 1961	Panama	Order of Military Merit, Chung Mu, with gold star	Token of good will.
Park, Ernest S., XXXX	June 1, 1962	Brazil	Order of Vasco Nunez de Balboa	Do.
Rychly, Vladimir I., XXXX	Oct. 1, 1962	Germany	Order of Naval Merit (knight)	Do.
Stahl, Robert B., XXXX	Aug. 1, 1962	Portugal	Cross of Merit, 1st class	Do.
Wangaard, Lars, Jr., XXXX	July 1, 1962	Peru	Order of Prince Henry (commander)	Do.
Wyatt, Micajah R., XXXX	Sept. 1, 1962	France	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit (commander) distintivo blanco	Do.
LIEUTENANT COMMANDER				
Dixon, Earl L., XXXX	July 1, 1962	China	Legion of Honor (knight) (1959)	For services as assistant naval attaché for air, Paris.
Hunt, Joe H., XXXX	May 1, 1962	Peru	Medal of Pao Ting	For services on Kinman during the crisis in the Formosa Straits.
O'Hara, H. Richard, XXXX	December 1951	Greece	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit (commander), distintivo blanco	Token of good will.
Manning, George C., XXXX	June 30, 1939	Brazil	Silver Cross of the Royal Order of the Phoenix	Do.
Wannemacher, Charles R., XXXX	June 1, 1958	Peru	Brazilian Naval Order for Services of Distinction	Do.
Snook, Norman A., XXXX	Mar. 1, 1958	Brazil	Peruvian Cross of the Order of Naval Merit (commander)	Do.
O'Connor, James V., XXXX	July 1, 1960	Greece	Order of Naval Merit (knight)	For service to the Brazilian Navy.
Walker, John B., XXXX	Mar. 1, 1958	Peru	Royal Order of George I (member)	Token of good will.
Beer, James H., XXXX	do.	Brazil	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit (commander)	Do.
Reynolds, Raymond M., XXXX	July 1, 1961	do.	Order of Naval Merit (knight)	For service to the Brazilian Navy.
Mallek, Robert A., XXXX	Oct. 1, 1961	do.	Order of Aeronautical Merit (commander)	Token of good will.
Jones, Forrest M., XXXX	June 1, 1960	Philippines	Order of Naval Merit (officer)	Do.
Reynolds, Bruce H., XXXX	Jan. 1, 1962	Brazil	Legion of Honor (officer)	Do.
Bailey, Ira V., XXXX	July 1, 1960	China	Order of Naval Merit (chevalier)	Do.
Epps, Edward W., XXXX	Feb. 1, 1960	do.	Army, Navy, and Air Force Medal A, second grade	Rescue assistance.
Horn, Leslie E., XXXX	July 1, 1959	Korea	do.	Do.
Burt, Robert A., Jr., XXXX	Dec. 1, 1960	Brazil	Order of Military Merit, Chung Mu, with silver star	Token of good will.
CHIEF BOATSWAIN				
Williams, Richard A., XXXX	Oct. 1, 1962	Brazil	Order of Naval Merit (knight)	For service to the Brazilian Navy.
ENLISTED				
Symmes, Clifton C., XXXX	Mar. 1, 1961	China	The Armed Forces Medal of Merit	Taiwan Straits crisis in 1958.
Carlisle, Judd F., XXXX	July 1, 1960	Ecuador	The Armed Forces Medal of Merit	Taiwan Straits crisis in 1958.
CIVILIAN				
Malanot, Elmer W.	Feb. 29, 1960	Jordan	Abdon Calderon, 3d class	Token of good will.
Wood, Gilbert J.	May 31, 1958	do.	do.	Do.
			Longines watch and photograph of King Hussein	For service in transferring a shipment of U.S. Army equipment to the Jordan Arab Army at Aqaba.
			Longines watch	Do.

U.S. MARINE CORPS

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
GENERAL				
Ersine, Graves B.	July 1, 1953	Thailand	Prathamabon Knight Grand Cross of the Most Exalted Order of the White Elephant.	Reason for award unknown.
MAJOR GENERAL				
Jerome, Clayton C., [XXXX]	July 1958	Chile	Al Merito Grade of Grand Official	For service as aide to the President of Chile during his visit to United States in early 1950.
Jack, Samuel S., [XXXX]	July 1961	Korea	Order of Military Merit, Taeguk	For service to Republic of Korea as commanding general, 1st MAW, Sept. 22, 1955, to June 30, 1956.
Dawson, Marion L., [XXXX]	July 1962	do	Order of Military Merit	For service to Republic of Korea as commanding general, 1st MAW, Aug. 25, 1954, to Sept. 13, 1955.
BRIGADIER GENERAL				
Hittle, James D., [XXXX]	March 1958	France	Medal Merite Combatant	Token of good will.
South, Hamilton D., Jr., [XXXX]	April 1958	Brazil	Order of Naval Merit (grade of commander).	For service as assistant naval attaché and assistant naval attaché for air, naval aviator and administration officer at the Office of the Naval Attaché, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, September 1948 to November 1949.
Taxis, Samuel G., [XXXX]	November 1959	Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal.	For service as Assistant Chief of Staff, G-1, 1st MAW, July 28, 1955, to June 8, 1956.
Freuler, Herbert C., [XXXX]	June 1, 1959	Syria	Syrian Merit Medal (1st class)	For service to the Republic of Syria as Chairman, Israeli-Syrian Mixed Armistice Commission, U.N. Truce Supervision Organization, May 10, 1951, to Apr. 6, 1953.
Kirgis, Howard G., [XXXX]	Nov. 1, 1959	Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal.	For service to Republic of Korea while serving as Assistant Chief of Staff, G-4, 1st MAW, Sept. 12, 1955, to June 8, 1956.
Shofner, Austin C., [XXXX]	do	Brazil	Order of Naval Merit	For service rendered to the Brazilian Navy during his tour of duty as the Marine Corps member of the U.S. naval mission to Brazil.
COLONEL				
Hayden, Reynolds K., [XXXX]	Feb. 1, 1960	Peru	Cross of Naval Merit, grade of commander.	For services as U.S. naval attaché and U.S. naval attaché for air, Lima, Peru, March 1947 to June 1949.
McGlashan, Robert C., [XXXX]	Sept. 1, 1958	Thailand	Knight Commander of Crown of Thailand, 2d class.	For service to the Republic of Thailand as U.S. naval attaché and U.S. naval attaché for air, Bangkok, Thailand, Oct. 1, 1952, to Aug. 19, 1954.
Meek, Harold B., [XXXX]	February 1961	Brazil	Order of Naval Merit, degree of commander.	For service to Brazilian Navy as amphibious adviser to Brazilian Naval War College, U.S. Naval mission to Brazil, December 1951 to January 1954.
King, Howard E., [XXXX]	March 1960	do	Naval Medal for Distinctive Service	For service rendered to the Brazilian Navy during his tour of duty as Marine Corps member and Marine Corps adviser to Brazilian War College, U.S. naval mission to Brazil.
Smith, Sherman A., [XXXX]	June 1961	Spain	Cross of Aeronautical Merit 2d class, distinctive white.	For service in connection with flood relief operations conducted by Marine Helicopter units from the U.S.S. <i>Lake Champlain</i> at Valencia, Spain, Nov. 22, 1954.
Stonecliffe, David W., [XXXX]	July 1961	Brazil	Order of Naval Merit, grade of officer.	For service rendered to the Republic of Brazil.
Murray, James C., Jr., [XXXX]	July 1962	Thailand	Crown of Thailand Medal, 2d class.	For service as U.S. naval attaché and naval attaché for air, Bangkok, Thailand, Sept. 21, 1950, to Oct. 5, 1952.
LIEUTENANT COLONEL				
Donnell, John L., [XXXX]	July 1961	Greece	Gold Cross of the Order of King George I.	For service as planning officer, U.S. naval group, American mission to Greece, June to November 1949.
Hubka, Frank K., [XXXX]	July 1962	Philippines	Legion of honor (officer)	For service as commanding officer, Marine Barracks, U.S. Naval Base, Olongapo Zambales, July 5, 1952, to July 8, 1954.
Langstaff, Harold A., Jr., [XXXX]	do	China	Air Force pilot wings	For service during Operation Hunger, a Taiwan flood relief action, Aug. 10-20, 1959.
CAPTAIN				
Brockman, William A., [XXXX]	June 1961	do	Pao Ting (Order of the Precious Tripod) and Chinese Air Force pilot wings.	For service rendered from August to September 1958 during the crisis in the Taiwan Straits.
CWO, W-4				
Davis, Perry W., [XXXX]	July 1960	do	Air Force pilot wings	For service during Operation Hunger, a Taiwan flood relief action, Aug. 10-20, 1959.
		Haiti	Order of Honor and Merit	For service as adviser to the recruit depot and rifle range instructor of the armed forces of Haiti.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEY LAND TO PASCUA YAQUI ASSOCIATION, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6233) to provide for the conveyance of certain land of the United States to the Pascua Yaqui Association, Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress hereby finds that the Yaqui community has been in the United States for approximately forty years and has found itself faced with insurmountable problems as a result of urban encroachment upon that area which has been their home in the United States since their flight from Mexico to escape political persecution; the Congress further finds that the unique culture of the Yaqui which has made a great contribution to the southwestern part of this country is threatened unless the community life of the Yaqui can be maintained in a more suitable area, therefore, it is the purpose of this Act to assist the Pascua Yaqui Association, Inc., a non-profit corporation formed under the laws of the State of Arizona for the purposes of maintaining and enhancing the Yaqui culture as it is found in the State of Arizona and of aiding the Yaqui in meeting the problems which arise as a result of being a member of that community in the United States.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey without monetary consideration to the Pascua Yaqui Association, Inc., an Arizona corporation, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain real property more particularly described in section 3 of this Act subject to the following conditions:

(1) Such association shall use such property only in accordance with its corporate purposes set out in its original articles of incorporation.

(2) Title to such property shall be held by such association for the common benefit of all the members of such association and no part of such property shall ever be conveyed for the benefit of any private organization, association, group, or individual, except that a parcel of not to exceed fifteen acres may be conveyed to the county of Pima, State of Arizona, or a political subdivision thereof, for use as a site for a school.

(3) Such other conditions as the Secretary of the Interior shall deem necessary to protect the interest of the United States. If any condition imposed by this section is breached at any time, all of the real property conveyed under authority of this Act shall revert to the United States.

Sec. 3. The real property referred to in section 2 of this Act is more particularly described as follows:

Township 15 south, range 12 east, Gila and Salt River meridian, Arizona:

Section 13: Lot 4, west half southeast quarter;

Section 24: Lots 1, 2, west half northeast quarter, northwest quarter.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, through page 2, line 8, strike out all of section 1.

Page 2, line 9, strike out "Sec. 2. The" and insert "That the".

Page 2, line 12, after "United States" insert "except as otherwise provided by section 3 of this Act".

Page 2, line 13, strike out "section 3" and insert "section 2".

Page 3, line 7, strike out all of the line and insert: "Sec. 2. The real property referred to in section 1 of".

Page 3, strike out all of lines 11, 12, and 13 and insert:

"Section 24: Lots 1 and 2, the west half of the northeast quarter; and the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter, being a total of approximately 202.76 acres."

Page 3, after line 13, add a new section to read as follows:

"Sec. 3. Any patent issued under this Act shall contain a reservation to the United States of any of the following named minerals for which the land as of the date of issuance of patent is deemed by the Secretary of the Interior to be valuable or prospectively valuable: coal, native asphalt, solid and semisolid bitumen, and bituminous rock (including oil-impregnated rock or sands from which oil is recoverable only by special treatment after the deposit is mined or quarried), oil, gas, oil shale, phosphate, sodium, and potassium, together with the right of the United States, its lessees, permittees, or licensees to prospect for, mine, and remove them under applicable provisions of law."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

WILD ANIMALS—MEAT IMPORTS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 1839) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of wild animals and wild birds which are intended for exhibition in the United States, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1824)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1839) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of wild animals and wild birds which are intended for exhibition in the United States, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That (a) item

852.20 of title I of the Tariff Act of 1930 (Tariff Schedules of the United States; 28 F.R., part II, August 17, 1963) is amended to read as follows:

852.20	Wild animals (including birds and fish) imported for use, or for sale for use, in any scientific public collection for exhibition for scientific or educational purposes.....	Free	Free
--------	---	------	------

"(b) Headnote 1 of part 4 of schedule 8 of such title I is amended by striking out 'item 850.50,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'items 850.50 and 852.20.'"

"(c) The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the tenth day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

"Sec. 2. (a) It is the policy of the Congress that the aggregate quantity of the articles specified in items 106.10 (relating to fresh, chilled, or frozen cattle meat) and 106.20 (relating to fresh, chilled, or frozen meat of goats and sheep (except lambs)) of the Tariff Schedules of the United States which may be imported into the United States in any calendar year beginning after December 31, 1964, should not exceed 725,400,000 pounds; except that this quantity shall be increased or decreased for any calendar year by the same percentage that estimated average annual domestic commercial production of these articles in that calendar year and the two preceding calendar years increases or decreases in comparison with the average annual domestic commercial production of these articles during the years 1959 through 1963, inclusive.

"(b) The Secretary of Agriculture, for each calendar year after 1964, shall estimate and publish—

"(1) before the beginning of such calendar year, the aggregate quantity prescribed for such calendar year by subsection (a), and

"(2) before the first day of each calendar quarter in such calendar year, the aggregate quantity of the articles described in subsection (a) which (but for this section) would be imported in such calendar year.

In applying paragraph (2) for the second or any succeeding calendar quarter in any calendar year, actual imports for the preceding calendar quarter or quarters in such calendar year shall be taken into account to the extent data is available.

"(c) (1) If the aggregate quantity estimated before any calendar quarter by the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to subsection (b) (2) equals or exceeds 110 percent of the aggregate quantity estimated by him pursuant to subsection (b) (1), and if there is no limitation in effect under this section with respect to such calendar year, the President shall by proclamation limit the total quantity of the articles described in subsection (a) which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, during such calendar year, to the aggregate quantity estimated for such calendar year by the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to subsection (b) (1).

"(2) If the aggregate quantity estimated before any calendar quarter by the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to subsection (b) (2) does not equal or exceed 110 percent of the aggregate quantity estimated by him pursuant to subsection (b) (1), and if a limitation is in effect under this section with respect to such calendar year, such limitation shall cease to apply as of the first day of such calendar quarter; except that any limitation which has been in effect for the third calendar quarter of any calendar year shall continue in effect for the fourth calendar quarter of such year unless the proclamation is suspended or the total quantity is increased pursuant to subsection (d).

"(3) The Secretary of Agriculture shall allocate the total quantity proclaimed under paragraph (1), and any increase in such quantity pursuant to subsection (d), among supplying countries on the basis of the shares such countries supplied to the United States market during a representative period of the articles described in subsection (a), except that due account may be given to special factors which have affected or may affect the trade in such articles. The Secretary of Agriculture shall certify such allocations to the Secretary of the Treasury.

"(d) The President may suspend any proclamation made under subsection (c), or increase the total quantity proclaimed under such subsection, if he determines and proclaims that—

"(1) such action is required by overriding economic or national security interests of the United States, giving special weight to the importance to the nation of the economic well-being of the domestic livestock industry;

"(2) the supply of articles of the kind described in subsection (a) will be inadequate to meet domestic demand at reasonable prices; or

"(3) trade agreements entered into after the date of the enactment of this Act ensure that the policy set forth in subsection (a) will be carried out.

Any such suspension shall be for such period, and any such increase shall be in such amount, as the President determines and proclaims to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this subsection.

"(e) The Secretary of Agriculture shall issue such regulations as he determines to be necessary to prevent circumvention of the purposes of this section.

"(f) All determinations by the President and the Secretary of Agriculture under this section shall be final."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the title of the bill be amended to read as follows: "An Act to provide for the free importation of certain wild animals, and to provide for the imposition of quotas on certain meat and meat products."

W. D. MILLS,
HALE BOGGS,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
THOS. B. CURTIS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HARRY F. BYRD,
RUSSELL B. LONG,
G. A. SMATHERS,
JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
FRANK CARLSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1839) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of wild animals and wild birds which are intended for exhibition in the United States, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The bill as passed by the House provided for the free importation of wild animals and wild birds imported specially for exhibition.

SENATE AMENDMENT

The Senate amendment to the text of the bill struck out all after the enacting clause and inserted new text to impose quotas on imports of certain meat and meat products.

The first section of the Senate amendment would add a new headnote to the Tariff Schedules of the United States.

Paragraph (a) of the new headnote provided basic quotas on imports of five categories of meat and meat products:

(1) Cattle meat, fresh, chilled, or frozen.

(2) Goat and sheep meat (except lamb), fresh, chilled, or frozen.

(3) Lamb meat, fresh, chilled, or frozen.

(4) Sausages (other than sausages in chief value of pork).

(5) Beef or veal, prepared or preserved (except sausages).

The quotas were on a quarterly basis and were to apply to each calendar quarter beginning after December 31, 1964.

Paragraph (b) of the new headnote provided for increases in the quotas imposed by paragraph (a) if the average price received in the United States for the animals from which the quota articles are produced equals or exceeds 90 percent of the average parity price for such animals for a 6-month period and the domestic slaughter of such animals for such period exceeds the base amount specified in the amendment. An increase in quota would be in the same ratio as the increase in the domestic slaughter over the base amount specified and would apply for the second and third calendar quarters following the 6-month period.

Paragraph (c) provided exceptions. Subparagraph (i) provided that the operation of the new headnote shall be suspended with respect to any period which the President declares to be a period of national emergency. Subparagraph (ii) provided for the suspension of (or increase in) a quota where, because of a natural disaster to the livestock in the United States from which the quota articles are produced, the U.S. supplies thereof are inadequate to meet demand at reasonable prices to domestic consumers. Subparagraph (iii) provided that any individual entry having an entry weight of 25 pounds or less shall not be taken into account.

Paragraph (d) provided for the prororation of a quota for a calendar quarter on a monthly or more frequent basis where determined by the Secretary of Agriculture as being necessary to prevent the disruption of the orderly operation of the market.

Paragraph (e) required that the weight taken into account for quota purposes be the weight used for customs purposes.

Paragraph (f) authorized the President, whenever he deems it necessary to prevent the entry, at any port of entry in the United States, of excessive quantities of articles in any quota category, to prescribe (within the overall quota for the period) maximum quantities of such articles which may be entered at such port of entry during such period.

Section 2 of the Senate amendment provided that no trade agreement or other international agreement heretofore or hereafter entered into by the United States shall be applied in a manner inconsistent with the requirements of the first section.

CONFERENCE SUBSTITUTE

Under the conference agreement, new text is substituted for both the text of the bill as passed by the House and the text of the Senate amendment.

Subsection (a) of the first section of the conference substitute amends the Tariff Schedules of the United States to permit the free entry of wild animals (including birds and fish) imported for use, or for sale for use, in any scientific public collection for exhibition for scientific or educational purposes.

Subsection (b) of the first section makes a technical conforming amendment and subsection (c) provides that the amendments made by the first section shall take effect on the tenth day after the date of enactment of the bill.

Section 2 of the conference substitute relates to provisions for the imposition of quotas on certain meat and meat products.

Subsection (a) provides that it is the policy of the Congress that the aggregate quantity of the articles specified in items 106.10 (relating to fresh, chilled, or frozen

cattle meat) and 106.20 (relating to fresh, chilled, or frozen meat of goats and sheep (except lambs) of the Tariff Schedules of the United States which may be imported into the United States in any calendar year beginning after December 31, 1964, should not exceed 725,400,000 pounds; except that this quantity shall be increased or decreased for any calendar year by the same percentage that estimated average annual domestic commercial production of these articles in that calendar year and the two preceding calendar years increases or decreases in comparison with the average annual domestic commercial production of these articles during the years 1959 through 1963, inclusive.

Subsection (b) of section 2 provides that the Secretary of Agriculture, for each calendar year after 1964, shall estimate and publish—

(1) before the beginning of such calendar year, the aggregate quantity prescribed for such calendar year by subsection (a), and

(2) before the first day of each calendar quarter in such calendar year, the aggregate quantity of the articles described in subsection (a) which (but for section 2) would be imported in such calendar year.

In applying paragraph (2) for the second or any succeeding calendar quarter in any calendar year, actual imports for the preceding calendar quarter or quarters in such calendar year shall be taken into account to the extent data is available.

Paragraph (1) of subsection (c) provides that if the aggregate quantity estimated before any calendar quarter by the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to subsection (b) (2) equals or exceeds 110 percent of the aggregate quantity estimated by him pursuant to subsection (b) (1), and if there is no limitation in effect under section 2 with respect to such calendar year, the President shall by proclamation limit the total quantity of the articles described in subsection (a) which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, during such calendar year, to the aggregate quantity estimated for such calendar year by the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to subsection (b) (1).

Paragraph (2) of subsection (c) provides that if the aggregate quantity estimated before any calendar quarter by the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to subsection (b) (2) does not equal or exceed 110 percent of the aggregate quantity estimated by him pursuant to subsection (b) (1), and if a limitation is in effect under section 2 with respect to such calendar year, such limitation shall cease to apply as of the first day of such calendar quarter; except that any limitation which has been in effect for the third calendar quarter of any calendar year shall continue in effect for the fourth calendar quarter of such year unless the proclamation is suspended or the total quantity is increased pursuant to subsection (d).

Paragraph (3) of subsection (c) requires the Secretary of Agriculture to allocate the total quantity proclaimed under paragraph (1), and any increase in such quantity pursuant to subsection (d), among supplying countries on the basis of the shares such countries supplied to the U.S. market during a representative period of the articles described in subsection (a), except that due account may be given to special factors which have affected or may affect the trade in such articles. Paragraph (3) also requires the Secretary of Agriculture to certify such allocations to the Secretary of the Treasury.

Subsection (d) of section 2 provides that the President may suspend any proclamation made under subsection (c), or increase the total quantity proclaimed under such subsection, if he determines and proclaims that—

(1) such action is required by overriding economic or national security interests of the

United States, giving special weight to the importance to the Nation of the economic well-being of the domestic livestock industry;

(2) the supply of articles of the kind described in subsection (a) will be inadequate to meet domestic demand at reasonable prices; or

(3) trade agreements entered into after the date of the enactment of the bill insure that the policy set forth in subsection (a) will be carried out.

Any such suspension shall be for such period, and any such increase shall be in such amount, as the President determines and proclaims to be necessary to carry out the purposes of subsection (d).

It was the understanding of the managers both on the part of the House and of the Senate that the overriding economic interests of the United States referred to in paragraph (1) include largely trade and balance-of-payment considerations. If, for example, the President could expand U.S. exports for dollars significantly, or prevent a drastic decline in such exports, by suspending or increasing meat import quotas, this would be in the overriding national economic interest. If a balance-of-payments deficit were to threaten U.S. fiscal integrity, and if the situation could be materially improved by suspending or increasing quotas, this would be in the overriding national economic interest. Speaking directly of agriculture, if other importing countries were in retaliation prepared to adopt tight restrictions covering a wide range of U.S. agricultural export products, and if the effect would be to reduce U.S. agricultural exports in an amount disproportionate to gains to the cattle industry, the overriding national economic interest might be served by suspending or increasing quotas.

It was the understanding of the managers both on the part of the House and of the Senate with respect to paragraph (2) that in determining whether or not consumer prices of beef are reasonable the primary consideration will be current prices in relation to prices over the immediately preceding years. If the prices received by farmers and ranchers for beef cattle in the current year unduly exceed and are expected to continue to exceed unduly through the end of the calendar year average prices over the preceding five years, and if furthermore, these prices result in comparable or greater increases in the retail prices of beef, as reflected in reports of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, a basis would be established for suspending quotas. Due consideration would be given, however, to increases in production costs experienced by livestock producers.

It was the understanding of the managers both on the part of the House and of the Senate with respect to paragraph (3) that trade agreements would accomplish the same policy set forth in section 2 if they establish conditions that over a reasonable period of time assure a pattern of world trade in beef, veal, and mutton that results in U.S. imports of these meats in amounts consistent with subsection (a).

Subsection (e) provides that the Secretary of Agriculture shall issue such regulations as he determines to be necessary to prevent circumvention of the purposes of section 2. The conferees particularly had in mind the possibility that the form or packaging of articles included under a quota might be altered in an effort to avoid quota controls. Examples might be (1) the dicing of boneless beef (so that it would, but for such regulations, be entered as a prepared product rather than as fresh, chilled, or frozen), or (2) the packaging of fresh, chilled, or frozen beef or veal in some type of air-tight container.

Subsection (f) provides that all determinations by the President and the Secretary of Agriculture under section 2 shall be final.

Authority to control imports by port of entry has not been included under the con-

ference substitute. The conferees recognize that it would be most difficult to administer controls on this basis. However, the problem to be dealt with in this area is the undue concentration of imports in particular ports of entry. It would be hoped that the President could alleviate any such problems that exist through consultations with supplying countries.

W. D. MILLS,
HALE BOGGS,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
THOS. B. CURTIS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MILLS (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we shall take such time as is required to explain the conference report, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement of the managers on the part of the House be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that H.R. 1839, as unanimously passed by the House on February 26, 1963, provided for the free importation of wild animals and wild birds which are intended for exhibition in the United States. A similar measure had been passed by the House in the 87th Congress, but received no consideration in the other body and died at adjournment of that Congress.

The other body passed H.R. 1839 on July 28, 1964, with amendments, the first of which was adopted in the Senate Committee on Finance and added to the bill provisions that would impose import quotas on certain meat and meat products. The second amendment, which was adopted on the floor of the other body, struck from the measure the provisions relating to the free importation of wild animals and wild birds, which was the substance of the House-passed bill.

Mr. Speaker, it will also be recalled that 1 week ago today, the House adopted a resolution disagreeing with the amendments of the other body and requesting a conference. At that time grave concern was expressed by many Members of the House, including the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], who called up the resolution at the direction of the Committee on Rules, that the amendments of the other body relating to meat imports were a nullity.

This question arose from the section of the bill which suspended the operation of the quotas during a period of national emergency. Since we are at present still in the period of national emergency declared by President Truman at the time of the Korean war, many Members of the House who were both learned in the law and very desirous of helping the domestic meat industry, expressed the opinion that this provision would completely nullify the measure as approved by the other body. In other words, it was believed that the bill, by its own terms, would prevent the meat import quotas from going into effect because of the presently existing period of national emergency.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that there was also indicated in the debate on Tuesday last on the resolution to send H.R. 1839 to conference, some displeasure on the part of Members with regard to the procedures utilized by the other body with respect to this measure. Here again was presented a situation in which the subject matter of the House-passed bill; that is, the dutiability of certain wild animals and birds, was completely stricken from the measure, and there was added, by the other body, the unrelated provisions on the subject of meat imports.

In accordance with assurances given on the floor, the conference committee has worked long and hard during the past week, and it is believed that the managers on the part of the House have been successful in bringing back a meaningful and greatly improved measure that will be effective in dealing with the problem of meat imports and will also do much to preserve the prerogatives of the House in matters of this kind.

In the first place, the substance of the provisions relating to wild animals and birds, which was the sole subject of the bill as passed by the House, has been restored in modified form. It will be recalled that under present law wild animals, including birds and fishes, imported for use in any scientific public collection for exhibition for scientific or educational purposes are admitted duty free. H.R. 1839, as passed by the House, would have extended this duty-free treatment to such articles brought into the country by any importer for exhibition. The conference committee has recommended that present law still obtain, except that the duty-free treatment be extended to imports for sale for use in scientific public collections. In other words, this provision would still apply only with respect to those wild creatures that are intended for exhibition in and will be housed in public zoological collections for scientific or educational purposes.

With respect to the amendments of the other body relating to quotas on meat imports, the conferees have maintained the fundamental purpose of the many bills that have been referred to the Committee on Ways and Means on this subject, but have made modifications and improvements that will render the bill effective in offering the protection desired by the domestic meat industry and, at the same time, less potentially damaging to our vital foreign trade in other agricultural and industrial commodities.

First of all, the quotas agreed upon by the conferees are based on the average annual imports for the years 1959-63, which in terms of pounds is 725,400,000. This is an aggregate figure covering the articles specified in items 106.10—relating to fresh, chilled, or frozen cattle meat—and 106.20—relating to fresh, chilled, or frozen meat of goats and sheep, except lambs—of the tariff schedules of the United States.

As was true in the many House bills introduced on this subject, there is also provided in the bill as approved by the conferees a growth factor which will ad-

just the quota to take into account increased or decreased domestic production. The bill would provide that the 725,400,000-pound figure will be increased or decreased for any calendar year by the same percentage that estimated average annual domestic commercial production of these articles in that calendar year and the 2 preceding calendar years increases or decreases in comparison with the average annual domestic commercial production of these articles during the years 1959 through 1963, inclusive.

The conferees have also agreed upon a different method for triggering the quotas. The procedure utilized would be just as effective as the automatic quotas provided in the bill as passed by the other body, but will be less offensive to important trading partners of the United States, with whom we enjoy a favorable balance of trade.

The conference committee was particularly desirous of developing a provision that would offer essentially the same protection as intended by the bill passed by the other body, but which would substantially lessen the potentially damaging consequences that inhered in that measure. We believe the provision, recommended by the conferees, which requires the President to proclaim the above-discussed quotas in effect whenever the Secretary of Agriculture's quarterly estimate of the level of imports equals or exceeds 110 percent of the quota calculated for a particular year, is a provision that satisfies these requirements. It is vastly more preferable than the measure of the other body, both from the standpoint of the domestic industry and our world trade relations.

The bill also directs that the quotas proclaimed by the President shall be allocated among supplying countries on the basis of the shares such countries supplied to the United States during a previous representative period. There was no comparable provision in the bill passed by the other body and the managers on the part of the House consider this a distinct and necessary improvement.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the bill enumerates three categories of circumstances upon the occurrence of which the President may suspend or increase quotas previously proclaimed. The quotas may be suspended or increased if the President determines and proclaims that:

First, such action is required by overriding economic or national security interests of the United States, giving special weight to the importance to the Nation of the economic well-being of the domestic livestock industry;

Second, the supply of articles of the kind described in subsection (a) will be inadequate to meet domestic demand at reasonable prices; or

Third, trade agreements entered into after the date of the enactment of this act insure that the policy set forth in subsection (a) will be carried out.

The bill that has resulted from the long and concentrated labors of the conference committee was one that was developed after consultation with representatives of the domestic meat industry

and the interested agencies of the Federal Government. We wish to acknowledge the splendid cooperation of both of these groups given the committee during the period involved in its deliberations.

Mr. Speaker, what this, the conference agreement, would provide is a fixed quota for the major beef, veal, and mutton items which would be increased in the future in the same ratio that commercial production in the United States increases in the future, as compared with the average commercial production in the 5-year base period of 1959-63. For example, in the 5-year base period U.S. commercial production of beef, veal, and mutton were as follows:

	Pounds
1959-----	14,197,000,000
1960-----	15,446,000,000
1961-----	15,937,000,000
1962-----	15,917,000,000
1963-----	16,938,000,000

The annual average commercial production for these 5 years was 15,687 million pounds.

The U.S. commercial production in 1963 was 16,938 million pounds; in 1964, it was estimated at 18,500 million pounds, and in 1965, it was tentatively estimated at 19,400 million pounds. The annual average commercial production for these 3 years would then be 18,279 million pounds.

The commercial production in the 3-year period 1963-65 exceeded the annual average commercial production in the base period 1959-63 by 16.5 percent.

Applying this percentage increase to the 725,400,000 pounds specified in the bill, the import quota if needed in 1965 would be established at 845,100,000 pounds. This would compare with actual imports of 1,049 million pounds of these products in 1963.

Mr. Speaker, permit me to advise the Members of the House that I have in my possession telegrams from those who represent the cattlemen of the United States through their organization, the American National Cattlemen's Association, and those who represent the feeders of the Nation through the National Livestock Feeders' Association, completely endorsing the conference report and expressing their hope that this measure will be agreed to by the House and the other body and that it may then become law.

I am also advised by representatives of the agencies of government to which I have referred that they will not recommend to the President of the United States that he veto this legislation if it is passed. I thus have every reason to expect and believe that if the House approves this conference report and the Senate does likewise, as I think it possibly will sometime today, it will receive favorable action by the President himself.

Mr. Speaker, on the floor when the rule was being considered I said if it were possible to bring these groups together it probably would be a miracle. I think we should change the word, because I would not characterize it as a miracle. What we can say is that it is the result as much as anything else of what I found to be a cooperative attitude and spirit on the

part of the people representing the advocates of the legislation, and the departments of Government involved in the legislation. I have never known people who perhaps in the beginning were any farther apart in their positions and in their desires. Nor have I known any groups of hardworking, conscientious people who did more to bring their own points of view to the middle ground in the hope there could be a joining of the thinking and resolution of the very complex and difficult problems involved.

So, Mr. Speaker, I feel we owe a deep debt of gratitude in this instance to those who have worked in trying to bring about the compromise which we have here. They did it, of course, under the direction of the conference group. They did it, of course, in full keeping with the hope the conference group had that we would be able to bring back something to the House that would be satisfactory to the proponents and certainly acceptable to those in Government. That we have done.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the great work that the conferees have done in this rather difficult and somewhat delicate area. I am delighted to have the assurance of our distinguished chairman that we have finally consulted with and obtained the favorable attitude on the part of domestic producers and of the agencies of government involved.

But I wonder if at the time the attempt was made to elicit the views of the domestic importers of beef in the first instance, there was also any effort made to obtain the views of responsible and respectable representatives of the consumers of the United States.

Mr. MILLS. Yes; that has been done. We have been in contact with many segments of our society. We have received a cross section of views on this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ASPINALL). The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, let me assure you that what we have done in this conference report is to accomplish the purposes and objectives of the proponents of the legislation in a way different from that proposed in the Senate amendment, but accomplishing the same broad objective. It should be borne in mind that the basic quota fixed by the Senate proposal is approximately 6.7 percent of the domestic slaughter during the base period.

That will be the percent of our domestic commercial production in any future year under the provisions of the conference report. It may be greater or it may be less in total pounds in a future year, depending entirely upon whether or not there is a growth in the domestic commercial production of this type of meat in the United States. Rather than have that tied to consumption or some figure on which we are not as well informed, we have tied this to domestic slaughter

here in the United States. What we refer to as domestic commercial production means that domestic slaughter which goes on in the packinghouses. It does not, of course, include slaughter on the farm, which is largely home consumption meat.

This is different from the Senate amendment fundamentally in this respect. Under the Senate amendment we would have legislated a quota that would have gone into effect on January 1, 1965, whether the imports of meat at that particular time justified a prescribed limitation or not. The bill itself has a rather technical, complicated triggering device, as we call it, that puts it into effect when the need arises. There is no "may" about it. It is mandatory, and it is effected, of course, by the growth formula which is in the bill. The conference report puts it into effect when the situation demands this quota. Maybe we will never have this quota under this device in effect. We will not have it unless imports rise above the prescribed quota plus the growth which is allowed within the conference report.

If there are, for example, large shipments into the United States in future years, such as there were in 1963, over and above previous years, then this would go into effect. Many of our people have felt that those increased shipments resulted from an undue portion of meat produced outside the United States being brought into the country.

There are some features of this that I am satisfied will interest the consumers that were not in the bill which passed the Senate. We have enumerated in this conference report, Mr. Speaker, specific circumstances under which the President of the United States may undo the proclamation previously taken imposing this basic quota. In further response to the inquiry from my good friend from New York, we have set this out in the conference report on page 2, wherein we say that:

The President may suspend any proclamation made under subsection (c)—

Which is his authority to proclaim the quota—

or increase the total quantity proclaimed under such subsection, if he determines and proclaims that—

(1) Such action is required by overriding economic or national security interests of the United States, giving special weight to the importance to the Nation of the economic well-being of the domestic livestock industry;

(2) The supply of articles of the kind described in subsection (a) will be inadequate to meet domestic demand at reasonable prices; or

(3) Trade agreements entered into after the date of the enactment of this act insure that the policy set forth in subsection (a) will be carried out.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what we are saying is this: In the process of providing for a quota to go into effect, we are doing it in a way to best assure the consumer of the United States that there will not be price increases in meat of an unreasonable nature due to the limitation upon imports of this meat.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, we are saying this—and the cattlemen have been, I think, eminently fair in their willingness to compromise the Senate provision in this respect. We are not saying we will put the best interest of those in the cattle industry above the national interest of all the American people. If it comes to the point where the protection of the cattle industry from these imports is running contrary to the overriding national interest of the rest of the United States, then the President may act to suspend that which he has previously proclaimed.

But let me point out now that whenever the President proclaims the quota to be in effect, it is in effect for only 1 calendar year. This will be reviewed on the basis of each year's situation. If he has a quota in effect by proclamation and he decides to suspend it for any one of these reasons which are set forth here, then, of course, it can be suspended for the remainder of that calendar year. But the whole of the problem will be looked at and reviewed and reconsidered as a result of this triggering device on a calendar year basis and every year separately. It will not be as the Senate provision provided, once in effect and then except in a rare situation, remain in effect whether it is needed or not.

The provision we have here will interfere less, and I think eliminate problems we otherwise would have had in the so-called Kennedy round of negotiations wherein we are seeking greater access to the export of agricultural and industrial products from the United States.

We have accomplished, therefore, the broad purpose of the Senate amendment but we have done it in a way, Mr. Speaker, that will bring to us less dire consequences as a result of the accomplishment of this purpose.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. First, I desire to compliment the gentleman and his colleagues on the conference committee and the staff for what I think is a very reasonable and acceptable compromise bill. I notice in reading the conference report that lamb is omitted from the bill whereas in the Senate version, lamb was included on the same basis for quota purposes as was true of beef and mutton. Will the gentleman for the record explain why that was done?

Mr. MILLS. I am glad my friend from Texas raised that point. I meant to say something about it. Lamb was included in the Senate version but it is excluded from the first conference report for several reasons.

First, the lamb that we import goes into fresh table use and it is consumed as chops or as leg of lamb. It does not go into manufactured products like hamburger and hotdogs and other processed meat. In contrast, most beef that is imported does go into manufactured products where it tends to compete with our own beef.

Therefore, while mutton is included in the bill because, like imported beef, it is used in these manufactured meat products, lamb is not included.

The second reason is that it seems as if lamb imports for the year 1964 will be no more than 1 to 1½ percent of our table supply. Beef imports, however, as the gentleman from Texas knows, increased to about 10 percent or some say 11 percent of our total supply in 1963.

Finally, the prices to our domestic producers of lamb appear to be firmer, at least compared to cow beef.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has again expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Those prices are now at a level, I am told, of about \$21, which is perhaps at one of the highest levels lamb prices have been in 4, 5, or 6 years.

There has been an upward trend, I believe we would all admit, in this connection in the past 4 years. We were of the opinion that lamb meat needed to be treated as a separate matter and not to be brought into this legislation, which primarily endeavors to try to do something to alleviate the situation as to cows and cow meat in the United States.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ULLMAN. I congratulate the gentleman from Arkansas for bringing us a bill. He not only did what he told the House he would do, but he has met this very difficult problem in a way which, in my opinion, will satisfy the problem of the industry, will not harm our tariff negotiations, and will not adversely affect the consumers of this country.

I have some specific questions to ask the gentleman.

First, in section 2(a) we define meat products covered by the bill as coming under sections 106.10 and 106.20 of the tariff schedule. I should like to have some assurance from the chairman of the committee that whereas in those sections ground meat may not be covered—it is considered by the conference committee to come under this bill and under the quota specifications of this legislation wherever it might be found in the Customs Code.

Mr. MILLS. Actually what we are talking about in the subsection (a), where we set the policy of the Congress, is that meat which comes in under 106.10 and 106.20. That is specified in the Tariff Act as being fresh, chilled, or frozen cattle meat and fresh, chilled, or frozen meat of goats and sheep—and then we provide "except lambs."

It is because of the possibility that there might be some deliberate, designed attempt to circumvent the purpose of the Congress and the legislation itself that we added a proviso which is on page 3 of the report, subsection (e), which is:

The Secretary of Agriculture shall issue such regulations as he determines to be

necessary to prevent circumvention of the purposes of this section.

For example, if a country which is a major supplier of cattle meat decided it would get around this quota by merely grinding the meat there and shipping it over here in some form designed to circumvent these two particular sections, then it would be expected that the Secretary of Agriculture would use this authority to include that within the total we are making possible for importation under this conference report.

Mr. ULLMAN. I thank the gentleman. That answers that question. Now I have a question with regard to section 2(c) (1), (2), and (3).

First the conference report declares it the policy of the Congress that imports shall be at the 5-year level plus a growth factor.

Under the provisions of the bill the Secretary will make an annual computation of the overall quota of beef which can come into the country then, on a quarterly basis, he will make an estimate in advance as to whether imports are expected to exceed that level for the next 3 months.

Is it not true that in any given quarter the imports could exceed the amount allowed by more than 10 percent?

Mr. MILLS. On a quarterly basis, yes; that is entirely true. I call the gentleman's attention to this fact: When once the imports at any time come in, in such amounts as to trigger this device and to bring the quota into existence, then the quota itself, giving proper consideration to the growth factor, comes into play for the entire calendar year.

So the limitation is with respect to the entire calendar year. There would have to be then a leveling so that in all quotas remaining in the year imports would not come in at this very high level to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. ULLMAN. The gentleman's understanding, then, is that in no instance would this overall import exceed this annual quota estimate?

Mr. MILLS. That is clear in the bill, once quotas are set.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to start with the main question which concerns me since there is so little time to ask questions in the remaining time left.

What I want to know is: Is the purpose of this bill to raise prices or not?

Mr. MILLS. The purpose of this bill is to create a circumstance in which the price of cow meat—and we are talking largely here about cow beef as distinguished from grain fed Choice and Prime meat that we eat in the form of steaks and so on—wherein the price of that meat, which today is down to approximately \$12 or \$13, as I recall it, compared to a price at this time last year of around \$15 and compared to a price in 1962 of around \$16—could be increased somewhat because of the adverse effect these imports have had on cattlemen.

Again, though, we are also attempting to protect here against the rise of that price to such levels to the producer as would result in undue increases in consumer prices. In other words, what we are trying to do is to restore a degree of stability here to the price received by producers within the cattle industry that does not now exist but without bringing about unreasonable prices to consumers. We think we have taken precautions in the conference report to do that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ASPINALL). The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 additional minutes.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means many of the questions which concern the consumer. Unfortunately his time has just about run out. I wanted to know whether or not it would raise the price to the consumer. The questions I had would have led up to that point. If I may be permitted to pursue some of them, does "reasonable prices" refer to prices for all meats or just hamburgers and hotdogs?

Mr. MILLS. Let me say to my good friend from Missouri, for whom I have the very greatest respect and a very genuine affection, that I know she is very greatly interested in the consumer at all times, as I am myself, but let me tell you this: The price to the consumer is not always the result of the price of an agricultural product rising at the producer's level. It is not always that. There are many, many reasons why prices may rise for the consumer besides merely the price rise of the producer. Now, we cannot protect against all of those eventualities and considerations, but we have protected against the price to the producer rising to such levels as to reflect itself in unreasonable prices to the consumer. This would mean the price of all kinds of meat.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. If the chairman will listen to me here, the reason I wanted to ask these questions was that you are tying retail prices on certain types of processed meats from low-quality beef to the overall price of farmers for high-quality steers. Is that not true?

Mr. MILLS. No, we are not. If we can do that and if we can succeed in doing that, then, of course, I doubt the cattlemen themselves would be for this legislation, because you would have the price of processed beef so far up in the marketplace, if you tied that price of cow meat to steer meat, that you would not have anybody buying red meat in processed form but they would turn to some other kind of meat for consumption.

Let me tell you those who produce cattle are just as concerned about unreasonable prices on any type of meats as the consumers, very frankly. They have a right to be concerned, too. If they are not concerned, the consumer will turn from the consumption of so-called red meat to the consumption of some other kind of meat. Do not think

that this is a noncompetitive situation. This is a highly competitive situation in the marketplace. I think I can assure my friend from Missouri that we have safeguarded, we have protected the consumers' interests here as well as the interests of everyone else. We are concerned about consumers just as we are about the producers of meat.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the conference report.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation before us. I am a cosponsor in the House of Representatives of the many bills introduced to offer a measure of protection to the livestock industry from excessive foreign imports. While the compromise agreement before us should certainly help the situation, and I will vote for passage of this legislation, I feel it necessary to express to my colleagues a deep disappointment that lamb has been deleted from the provisions of this legislation. I know that some of my colleagues who served on the conference committee expressed similar concern that the administration insisted that import restrictions on lamb not be included. It is difficult to understand the administration's position on this, since the heavy volume of lamb imports from foreign countries has been a serious problem to this vital industry for some time.

The effect of today's action will leave lamb unprotected, and lamb producers can therefore look forward to not only a continuing problem from excessive imports, but an intensified problem because protecting beef but not lamb will no doubt stimulate increased lamb exports from New Zealand and Australia to partly compensate for losses in beef exports.

It was, and continues to be my hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress will do something positive to help protect the lamb producers of our Nation.

In support of the need for import restrictions on lamb, I ask unanimous consent to place at this point in the RECORD, a statement by Edwin E. Marsh, executive secretary of the National Wool Growers Association:

NECESSITY FOR RETAINING LAMB IN MEAT IMPORT QUOTA BILL

Members of the 20 sheep and lamb producer organizations composing the National Wool Growers Association, operating in a 23-State area where over 70 percent of the Nation's lambs are grown, feel very strongly that it is highly essential for quotas on both lamb and mutton to be included in H.R. 1839.

In 1957 dressed lamb imports to the United States totaled 1,800,000 pounds. In each subsequent year with one exception, lamb imports have increased and for the calendar year 1963 totaled 19 million pounds, an 860 percent increase in 7 years. The 1 year that lamb imports fell off slightly from the previous year was 1961 and the reason for this was that domestic lamb prices were so depressed and below costs of production that New Zealand apparently found it more profitable to ship its competing dressed lamb to other markets.

The tariff duty on dressed lamb was reduced 50 percent in 1948. At 3.5 cents per pound it is now so tragically low that it could not begin to meet differences in pro-

duction costs here and abroad. As a result of this low tariff the price United States wholesalers pay for foreign lamb is considerably below the price domestic producers must receive to meet their costs of production. In recent years many domestic producers have not met their production costs and have progressively gone further in debt. USDA data shows a wide variation between costs of foreign lamb landed at east coast ports and domestic lamb prices for the same period. In some years foreign lamb has been landed here at approximately 50 percent of the price of domestic lamb during the same period. Without the slightest doubt this price differential does create an adverse influence on our domestic lamb market which will only be further aggravated unless some limitations are placed on the amount of cheaply produced lamb that can come in here.

While percentage-wise lamb imports may not seem high compared to domestic production, the impact of the foreign product is much greater by reason of the fact that most of it lands in New York City which is also the price setting point for lamb in a wide area of the United States. When a few too many pounds of lamb hit the New York market, the market there drops and the drop is immediately reflected in other major markets of the Nation.

Furthermore, our industry faces a unique distribution problem with lamb. While beef is consumed in volume all over the United States, over 70 percent of the lamb consumed here goes to outlets in only three areas of the United States; namely, the New York-New England area, the Chicago area, and the west coast. Statement has been made that we should have more lamb in this country even if we have to import it, because there are areas where consumption is small. Despite the fact that the U.S. industry has engaged in extensive organized promotional efforts, the fact is that the market for lamb has not widened to any appreciable extent and there is definitely a limit on the amount of lamb that can be marketed profitably. Experience has shown that when the available supply of lamb increases beyond the market potential of the principal lamb-consuming areas, the price decreases, in some cases sharply. This causes rather severe economic difficulties for the sheepmen of the United States because over two-thirds of their total income is from the sale of lambs while less than one-third is from the sale of wool. For example, in 1959, 1960, and 1961 domestic lamb production increased. Lamb imports also increased during those years. As a result, the average farm price of lambs dropped from \$21 per hundred pounds in 1958 to \$18.70 in 1959; \$17.90 in 1960; and \$15.80 in 1961. The lamb market is very sensitive to increased supplies.

The price drops above have caused further liquidation in 1962 and 1963. Production, therefore, is down at present and lamb imports to date this year are down considerably from what would be permitted if quotas were established on the basis of average yearly imports for the past 5 years. Domestic lamb prices are now stronger and we know that the decrease in imports has been a factor in this stronger market. If reasonable quotas could now be established, growers here could continue their operations with the confidence that there will be reasonable limitations on the amount of lamb which can be brought into the United States when market conditions abroad render it expedient for the exporting nations to use this country as a "dumping ground."

Statement has been made that mutton should be in the bill, because mutton, also, competes with cow beef, both being used for processed meats. This is true. By the same token lamb must be retained in the meat

import quota bill because imported lamb, coming in here in both carcass and cut form, competes directly with production of domestic lamb.

Packers and retailers have stated repeatedly to domestic growers that the price variation between foreign and domestic lamb exerts a continual downward pressure on the market. Unless tariff increases are possible to more nearly equalize this price variation, then the only hope of the domestic industry is the control of the volume of imports.

A recent release out of New Zealand stated meat trade sources reported that New Zealand lamb shipments to the United States would be discontinued for the balance of this year. We checked this report with the New Zealand Trade Commissioner's office here in Washington and are advised there is no truth in this report and that they expect to continue to sell lamb here as usual.

In many of our semiarid regions sheep and lambs are the only livestock that can survive and make use of the sparse vegetation. This is true in the West and Southwest particularly, where sheep production is one of the important industries in the economy of these areas. In fact, a number of rural areas in the West and Southwest depend on the sheep industry as an important source of income for taxes to provide schools, roads, and other necessities, as well as to support the industries of those communities through purchases of supplies for sheep ranching and farming operations. Therefore, in these areas, the sheep industry is extremely important to the economy and serves as a full-time occupation and means of livelihood for many of its residents. These are the areas hardest hit when imports cause a lowering of domestic lamb prices.

In conclusion, future control of imports of both lamb and mutton through quotas is vital to the economic health of our domestic sheep industry. The industry itself badly needs and wants this type of control. Furthermore, we point out that the Senate, in its wisdom, included lamb quotas in the bill they passed by a vote of 72 to 15, indicating the sentiment of that body for reasonable lamb quotas.

EDWIN E. MARSH,
Executive Secretary,
National Wool Growers Association.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am going to be brief because there are many people I know who want to get their 2 cents worth in, or a few words at least in, on this subject.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may include my remarks in the RECORD following those of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER], when he discussed the exclusion of lamb in this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that those Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks in the RECORD following the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin on the subject matter of this conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on this conference report with rather mixed emotions. I think we have to admit at the outset that those who were the proponents of quota restrictions encompassed in the Senate amendment must recognize that that proposal has had most of its teeth extracted. Maybe a little history would be helpful both in terms of what we have here before us, the situation that the conferees confronted, and also the situation as it relates to consumers' prices.

First let us point out that the Senate adopted a quota provision that imposed quotas on the basis of a 5-year average. The total for beef and mutton would have been 725 million pounds per year, allocated on a quarterly basis. That was approved by the Senate by a vote of 72 to 15 with the leadership of both parties in the Senate voting for it. One of the things that was very amazing to me was the silence of the administration's spokesmen at that time with respect to the merits or demerits of the amendment adopted by the Senate. They were very quiet and they were quiet until it appeared as if this body might accept the Senate amendment. And then the State Department and Agriculture went to work. The words that they used to describe the Senate amendment ran a whole gamut of adjectives from irresponsible, a violation of GATT, and everything else.

But, let me point this out. The Secretary of Agriculture advised the Committee on Ways and Means and advised the conferees that even if the Senate amendment went into effect it would not produce a reduction in the anticipated importation of beef into this country either this year or next year, or at any time in the future that he could foresee.

So, Mr. Speaker, all this talk about the Senate amendment increasing the price of hamburgers and sausage and all the rest, is frankly just an effort to pull a lot of wool over the eyes of the people. The administration admitted that even the Senate amendment would not have acted to restrict imports below the amount of beef that will be shipped into this country, so that even the Senate bill would have no effect on prices.

Now, what has happened? The cattle people have agreed to accept the compromise that has been worked out. But I believe we must recognize that under

this bill the likelihood of restrictions ever being brought into play, and a quota being placed on beef imports, is rather far-fetched. It will only happen in the most unusual circumstances, possibly such as a recurrence of the situation that caused the great flood of beef in the years of 1961, 1962, and 1963; namely, when the Western European market was closed to the normal exports of New Zealand and Australian beef. What happened when they could not ship beef to Western Europe? They came into the American market and dumped it here. It is admitted that we had an unusually large influx of foreign beef coming into this country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this bill might prevent a recurrence of that kind of situation, but that is the only type of situation that I can foresee where this bill could possibly have any effect, and then only if the President decided that none of the three criteria exists for suspending its effect at that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ASPINALL). The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. So that what we really have here is, I believe, a guarantee possibly against a recurrence of the situation that existed in 1961, 1962, and 1963. But, mark this: You use as your quota to determine how much could come in, first, a 5-year average, which amounts to 725.4 million pounds, and then you add a growth factor which, as we were told, would represent another 6-percent increase in that figure. Then the President still does not impose a quota until the imports are estimated to be 110 percent of that figure. So, imports must exceed 116 percent of the 1959-63 average insofar as next year would be concerned, before the quota would even come into effect, and then it would not necessarily come into effect unless the President decided that three other conditions did not exist.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield very briefly to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. Was not the evidence before our committee clear that the state in the exporting countries is such now that no quota would be imposed at least until 1966?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The point was that it is not anticipated that there will be the volume of imports coming into this country which would produce an importation in excess of 725 million pounds a year.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. I hope my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], will make it completely clear to everyone, including our mutual friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH], that there may not ever be a quota imposed under this bill.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. That is the point I have been trying to make. Even if the Senate amendment had been adopted the quota would have been meaningless because it would not have restricted the intended imports.

Mr. MILLS. That is right.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. To whom does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I am not yielding to anyone right now.

In adopting this conference report there is even less likelihood of a quota ever being imposed because of a new growth factor which is added to the base. Then, the imports must exceed 110 percent of that base. That is the very point I have been trying to make. If you have an idea that the quotas will go into effect, you are wasting your time. The only time the quotas would come into effect is possibly a recurrence of the kind of a situation that we had when the Western European markets were closed to Australian and New Zealand beef, and they, therefore, turned to the United States and dumped it here. You would be protected under this conference report against a recurrence of that situation, but that is all it will do.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. This presents an analogy to a court of equity. Equity should not be a vain thing. If the gentleman tells us these quotas will never be imposed, then they should not be provided by law.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The quotas are not likely to be imposed. But, I think that we should protect our own source of supply, and our consumers' source of domestic supply, against the disrupting factor of a dumping such as occurred in these years 1961 to 1963, particularly, as a result of the international marketing provision.

Mr. KEOGH. We have laws to prevent the dumping of articles into the United States.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. There is now no authority to impose quotas on beef, and this bill would give the President that authority.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Section 227 of the act of 1935—this is an agricultural act—provides for the imposition of quotas, restrictions and tax on imports under certain terms and conditions. I would like to ask the gentleman if the conference report now before us in any way repeals existing law?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. It does not. The administration entered into a voluntary agreement with Australia and New Zealand.

Mr. WHITTEN. The act goes much further than that, but the gentleman's answer is that it does not affect that provision.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I do not believe it is clear to the Members of the House who are listening to this debate just how much beef and mutton, percentagewise, according to our production, will be permitted to be imported into the United States if this conference report is made the law of the land.

Can the gentleman clarify that?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. To a degree, yes, but it is always going to be a moving figure. Beef imports, we were told, could reach about 7.5 percent of domestic consumption before the quotas could be imposed. If consumption and domestic production keeps going up, the import allowance will be a higher figure, but the percentage will be in that range.

Mr. JENSEN. I can understand that, but the provisions of this law will be administered—

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Let me explain to the gentleman. I can understand his question.

We set up a basic amount that can come in, 725,400,000 pounds, plus a growth factor, plus even an estimate of 110 percent of that figure; but once that is estimated, the imports will reach that figure, and these estimates are made on a quarterly basis, the President has no other alternative except to put the quota into effect, unless he finds certain conditions under which he can then suspend the quota. There is always the authority in the President, once having put quotas into effect, to suspend them. This points up how unlikely it is that there will be an imposition of quotas under this act.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. COLLIER. I take this time merely to take note of the fact that there is in some quarters among our colleagues here a rather belated concern over consumer prices, those who voted for the sugar bill, the cotton-wheat bill, and the Coffee Agreement Act. I am happy that now this belated concern comes to the surface.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN. I would like to take note of the fact that there has been a lot of talk about the ground meat. About 18 months ago they discovered a lot of mule meat and horse meat, ground, in circulation in Ohio. Several years ago a thousand pounds or a thousand tons of kangaroo meat, ground, was sold throughout Ohio. No wonder we read articles about our being jumpy these days.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Let me conclude.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. SHORT. The President's authority to establish quotas is the key provision in this bill as far as the livestock people are concerned and as far as the effectiveness of the bill is concerned. The language in the Presidential authority is quite broad. Could the gentleman give the Members of the House some idea as to whether or not in his opinion the President can suspend the quota, because of the indication that was recently received I think from Australia that if this bill is passed today retaliatory measures will be taken by Australia?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. There is not only that likelihood that quotas can be suspended on the basis of the threat to retaliate, but also on the basis that it would interfere with other negotiations that were going on if this law were in effect today and the quotas were in effect, the President could suspend them on the theory they were interfering with the Kennedy round of GATT negotiations. So here again some of the teeth that were in the amendment as it came from the Senate have been removed.

Mr. SHORT. I think it would be most inappropriate on the part of Australia, because imports have increased from \$18 million to \$507 million.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. As far as Australia and New Zealand are concerned, I think they did not contemplate importing into this country any more than the amount which would come in under its formula in this bill.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, the livestock producers and feeders of this country have often sought relief from almost completely unrestricted imports through what would seem to be the proper channel—the Tariff Commission. The results have not been satisfactory, partly because the authority of the Commission did not extend to the type of relief desired, but mostly because our State Department could always be counted upon to oppose any effort of a domestic industry to secure relief. The industry has felt they would be no more successful under the escape clause provisions of the Trade Expansion Act.

Having had this experience, it was only natural that the livestock industry—principally the cattlemen—came to Congress when prices dropped so dramatically in 1963. I will not take time to detail the losses experienced by feeders and cattle producers, but the losses were spectacular. In appraising the situation the cattlemen recognized that our cattle population was at an alltime high and beef production was at an alltime high. This pointed to the necessity for cutbacks in production and feeding. The industry has done this in the past and they were ready to put their own house in order again. It is significant that there was no clamor for Federal assistance in the way of price supports or production controls. Cattlemen have strenuously resisted any attempt to include

that industry under the umbrella of Federal supply management and price fixing.

In appraising their price situation, however, it became apparent that there was another factor over which the cattleman had no control. This was the factor of imports which had been rising spectacularly during the past few years.

The U.S. share of all world beef imports increased from one-fourth in 1950 to 51 percent in 1962 and 54 percent in 1963. This increase has been caused by an increase in import restrictions in other major world markets. The United States is the only major beef market without any quantitative restrictions and a very nominal fixed import duty.

Over a billion pounds of beef and veal—product weight—were imported by the United States in 1963, an increase of 20 percent over 1962 and equal to 11 percent of U.S. production. This is in sharp contrast to 1956 when imports were equal to only 1.6 percent of U.S. production. In the case of Australia, the largest supplier of beef imports, the increase since 1958 has been from less than 18 to 517 million pounds.

Now what did the livestock industry set out to do? They have never suggested completely shutting off imports as some editorials have inferred. They attempted to establish a quota for imports at a reasonable level that would only be operative when the domestic oversupply was such as to severely depress prices. They determined that an average of the last 5 years' imports would be fair, since that would include 1963 with the highest level in history. In fact each of the 5 years, with exception of 1960 equaled or exceeded all previous import levels—1960, at 5.9 percent of our total production had only been exceeded in 1958. The approach, in effect, guaranteed the importing countries a high level of imports regardless of domestic prices or supply.

Bills were introduced in Congress as long as a year and a half ago. Seventy odd Members of the House have introduced beef import legislation. The Senate by a vote of 72 to 15 passed a beef import bill that would impose positive restrictions on imports regardless of price or supply. This is the bill, H.R. 1839, on which we are considering the conference report.

We are today faced with, as I see it, three choices: first, no legislation; second, the Senate bill; or third, the bill in the form worked out by the conference committee.

I urge the adoption of the conference report as the only means of securing legislation that could be helpful. I say could be, because how this bill works will depend almost entirely on the disposition of the President to provide some reasonable protection to the livestock industry. This conference report is a compromise for the cattle people who wanted a workable provision in the bill to remove import restrictions when protection was not necessary. This has been provided. Many of us thought it indefensible to pass legislation which would restrict imports when domestic

prices were high, as beef is a comparatively high-cost item for low-income consumers at best.

For the administration perhaps too much latitude has been provided to suspend quotas—certainly there is more discussion than many of us think desirable.

This is the chance we take.

As I see it this legislation is the best we can get at this time. If it does not result in providing some relief to the livestock industry it will be because it is not administered with a view of providing reasonable protection from excessive imports, to the largest segment of our agricultural industry.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of acceptance of the conference report. I am sure that you are well aware that I was among the first to introduce legislation which would broaden the base upon which the imports of beef and other livestock into this country was computed. At that time, I had hoped that this could be accomplished, however, it appears that this was not attainable.

While the recommendation of the House-Senate conferees on H.R. 1839 does not completely solve the situation which the cattle industry of California now faces, I do believe that it is acceptable, both to the industry and to the administration. Certainly there is no question but what the language recommended by the conferees will help our domestic livestock industry.

The need for some sort of import protection for the domestic industry has been recognized, I feel, not only by the industry of our own United States, but also by the nations of Australia and New Zealand. This is reflected in the voluntary reduction of livestock imports. This was a step which we all hailed and appreciated, however, it was the feeling of the cattle industry and the State of California that the 5-year base should be accepted.

I read here the resolution adopted by the California State Legislature on this subject:

Whereas the beef cattle industry in California and the United States is suffering severe price and economic damage from beef and veal imports into the State and the Nation; and

Whereas these beef and veal imports imported into the United States in 1963 set an all time record of nearly 2 billion pounds, of which 23 million came through the four Pacific coast ports during a single month, which is equivalent to almost 54,000 head of grown cattle; and

Whereas beef and veal imports have had a rapid growth over the last decade, particularly subsequent to the modification of the United Kingdom-Australian meat agreement in October 1958, from 2.4 percent in 1953 to 11 percent in 1963; and

Whereas continued price depression will inevitably result in removal of capital from California and the United States to foreign countries with concurrent employment losses; and

Whereas the production potential of beef in certain low-cost producing countries exporting beef to California and the United States is virtually unlimited; and

Whereas since cattle raising and cattle feeding uses approximately 42 percent of the total tonnage of all foodstuffs and byprod-

ucts of countless agricultural crops produced in California and the United States, the industry is essential to the growth and welfare of the State of California and the American economy; and

Whereas the meat agreement negotiated between the Government of the United States and the Governments of Australia, New Zealand, and Ireland establishing quotas, to limit their beef, veal and mutton imports into this country to the 1962-63 average level, about 6 percent below the record level of 1963, does little to alleviate the depressed conditions in the cattle industry: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States is requested to establish quotas on imports of beef and beef products into the United States with principal exporters at levels substantially below the record-breaking beef import years of 1962 and 1963; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and each Member of the California delegation in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, this indicates the feeling of my own State of California on this important matter. May I also say that the conference report brought before us today is not a matter of quick decision or hasty action. It comes to us as a result of detailed investigation and consideration not only by legislative bodies, but also by independent agencies not connected with the industry.

You will recall that the Senate Finance Committee held comprehensive studies of the matter and at its request the Federal Tariff Commission held formal hearings on the matter. While the Commission made no recommendation, the comprehensive report did provide the committee with a general description of the operations of the American cattle and beef industry, the consumption picture and much other information.

These statistics indicated that at least one-half of the increased American use of beef over the past several years has been taken over by foreign imports, which led the committee to the conclusion that foreign meat imports have played "an important part in creating the distressed market conditions in the cattle industry."

In conclusion I want to commend the efforts of the Departments of Agriculture and State in trying to solve the problem through administrative action. They have helped considerably, but I do believe that legislative action is required to complete the task. This proposal, as I said before, is not a complete solution, but it is a start in the right direction. I support acceptance of the conference report. Thank you.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the likely effect of this bill is to damage seriously our image abroad and at the same time provide no help whatever to hard-pressed cattlemen.

This legislation is a cruel hoax. It is called a bill to limit beef imports, but it does no such thing. It provides the President with a loophole so vast he could

drive a giant herd of imported cattle through it.

The President has made it plain he will not rescind the voluntary import agreements he has negotiated with Australia, New Zealand and Ireland. He has said repeatedly he would veto any legislation requiring him to do so.

This legislation is so constructed that he can let it become law and still do exactly as he wishes in regard to beef imports. It is a plain and pure scheme to help the political position of Senators and Congressmen, particularly those on the Democratic side, who are embarrassed and outraged at the way President Johnson has mishandled the beef situation.

It will help politically only with those cattlemen who fail to read the legislation itself. Those who examine this verbiage will recognize it as a hoax.

Imports will continue, unaffected by this legislation. President Johnson long ago made the deal on beef imports. He tied his own hands and he knows it. That is why he exclaimed the other day that he would not let a "bunch of cowpokes" ruin his foreign policy.

Although ineffectual for U.S. cattlemen, it very likely will damage our position abroad. Some of the people abroad, like those at home, may not recognize this as a hoax.

They may interpret it as a repudiation of the President's agreement on imports. Thus, it may set in motion retaliation against our products, farm and otherwise, in foreign markets and increase the problems of our negotiators under the Trade Expansion Act.

The tragic drop in beef prices had its origin in the massive dumping of Government corn—over 2 billion bushels in all—by the Kennedy-Johnson administration in 1961 and 1962. This dumping action drove down market prices so low it triggered abnormal cattle feeding. This year cattlemen reaped the bitter harvest of this unwise action by the administration as prices tumbled.

This irresponsible dumping should not be permitted to occur again. Nor should a President ever negotiate voluntary import quotas at the unrealistic levels approved by this administration.

What is needed is not new legislation, particularly a hoax of this kind. The need is for a new President, one who will in the future act more responsibly to protect the interests of cattlemen and all other Americans.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, it looks to me that there is an element of fairness in this so called beef-quota conference report to the domestic producer.

One thing appears certain and that is that pricewise the domestic beef producer is not apt to profit very much.

The American market is the best market in the world. It is so because American per capita income is high. This enters into every cost of the American beef grower as he pays out wages, taxes, machinery and supply costs and all that it takes to do business in America. To me it is a rule of thumb that since the American producer does his part to build

the American market he is entitled to a protection in that market. We are not here, today, talking about the protection of a tariff. We talk of quotas that may be imposed. Certainly if, under the pressure to do everything possible for freer world trade, the American producer is asked to share his own market he is entitled to know the exact amount of that sharing.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I support the conference report on H.R. 1839, and the effort which it makes to safeguard our domestic cattle industry.

The conference measure apparently presents the best available compromise of opposing views on the highly controversial question that confronts us.

I hope and trust this measure, through wise administration, will enable our vital domestic cattle industry to thrive and flourish, without doing grave injury to foreign policy objectives that are also vital to our Nation's best interests.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, at last, after 5 years of talking, Congress has finally recognized the adverse effects of agricultural imports on the U.S. farm economy.

It was over 5 years ago when I first warned of the coming adverse effects of unwarranted imports, and I support the amendment before us today to limit the steadily increasing amounts of fresh, chilled or frozen meats entering this country in direct competition with domestic producers.

I support this amendment even though it does not go nearly far enough toward a complete solution of the problem. This is not the final answer. It is only a very weak beginning.

The greatest significance of our discussion and action today is the precedent we are establishing in finally recognizing that imports have become real problems for our farmers.

Now is the time to carry out my suggestion of last March for the complete study and review of our entire foreign policy in regard to the relationship between agricultural imports and falling prices paid to domestic producers of farm commodities.

This amendment on beef and other meats is only a first step. It now must lead to a consideration of all agricultural imports and their effect on the total agricultural economy.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, it is rare indeed when any member of this body votes for a measure with which he agrees 100 percent. We all realize that in any comprehensive measure we must accept things with which we agree and some things with which we disagree.

Yet I doubt that there have been few measures before us which have occasioned as many doubts even among its supporters as this conference report (H. R. 1839) today, but I can see no hope of adopting any better legislation before Congress adjourns.

The objective is simple: to set up effective restrictions on meat imports to keep from flooding domestic markets to the great disadvantage of our own meat producers.

But the means established by this conference report has so many loopholes and is so complex that it is openly conceded that import restrictions on meat may never be imposed under this bill.

Even if the restrictions are imposed, there are a variety of circumstances under which the President would have the authority to remove them and the President has opposed this legislation so how much assistance he will give in enforcing the purpose of it is doubtful. Only time will tell.

Many fail to see the danger to our farm economy unless something is done to regulate meat imports. In addition this importation of foreign meats is increasing our balance-of-payments deficit which now has reached a dangerous all-time high.

Of course the administration has intervened because it does not wish to risk the displeasure of Australia, New Zealand, Brazil, Argentina and other countries which sent meat to the United States.

It is such considerations which have made of this legislation such a hodge-podge.

The thinking of this conference report reflects largely the philosophy of the State Department, rather than the farmer and it is diplomatic rather than economic or agricultural considerations which govern its direction.

I will support the conference bill, Mr. Speaker, but with great reluctance. I still favor the objectives of this legislation, but I have little faith in the vehicle which purports to take us there. Because I believe that the President will allow the thinking of the State Department rather than the interest of American agriculture to dictate his actions in the enforcement of this legislation.

Without the sympathetic administration of this legislation by the President this legislation will be useless. I am hopeful but not confident.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned when any segment of the economy experiences economic difficulties which adversely affects the income of those earning their living in the particular industry.

No one who has lived in New England in the past two decades could possibly feel otherwise.

Let me state that I am aware that our cattlemen have been faced with difficult adjustment problems during the past year or two and during those times when total supplies of beef were so large in ratio to the market that prices for cattle declined.

These problems do not, I think, justify immediate action by the House in determining the best solutions, for the simple reason that unwise legislation with respect to beef imports might have serious and adverse consequences on a number of groups in this country.

First, the legislation before us, which sharply reduces imports, provides little opportunity for such imports to increase during the next several years and would threaten prices paid by American consumers for hamburgers, frankfurters,

and other products made from manufacturing beef from our own production and imports. Since these products are important elements in the diets of our middle- and low-income families, the burden of higher retail prices would be prohibitive.

I could not, in good conscience, wish this possibility upon the residents of western Massachusetts—an area where certain communities have suffered through a slow and persistent economic decline. No serious effort has been made to study and limit the excessive imports of products too numerous to mention, a situation which affects this area.

Secondly, this bill also affects producers of other agricultural products. There are efforts now taking place before the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT—to open world markets for agricultural imports.

If legislation were enacted with respect to beef imports, in the interests of equity it would seem appropriate that attention also be given to imports of woolen textiles, shoes and other products made from agricultural raw materials. As I have stated repeatedly, American producers of these raw materials have been seriously concerned for several years with regard to the increasing level of imports, but have been unsuccessful in obtaining any genuine form of relief.

Thirdly, the public generally—by having the benefits of the products that will meet their demands—is also harmed.

One other factor, which has already been mentioned. The principal countries affected will be Australia and New Zealand. These governments are cooperating fully with the United States in present efforts to bring about more liberal trade terms in Western European markets.

These considerations all suggest the need for careful assessment of consequences before determining whether legislation is needed at this time. I, Mr. Chairman, stand with the American consumer.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report on H.R. 1839 for several reasons. H.R. 1839 went to the other body providing for the free importation of wild birds and animals for exhibition purposes. The other body used this vehicle to initiate tariff legislation, which under the Constitution is a prerogative of the House. The other body struck out all after the enacting clause and by a vote of 72 yeas to 15 nays they adopted legislation imposing mandatory quotas on imports of beef, mutton, lamb, and meat products. The quota provision provided that no quarterly imports of these products could exceed the quarterly amount of the 5-year period, 1959–63.

The formula adopted in conference is based upon the same 5-year period, with certain adjustments. First, there is a growth factor added to the 5-year average which is predicated upon the average production of the preceding 3-year period, including 1962 and 1963, when beef production reached its highest point. For example, the Secretary of Agriculture

stated that beef production in 1963 alone increased 7 percent over 1962, and 1962 increased over the preceding year. In addition, quotas will not be invoked unless imports exceed 110 percent of the 5-year average plus this growth factor. In effect, imports for the year 1965—the first year to which the formula applies—must equal about 116 percent of the 5-year average if this bill is to have any effect—about 1 billion pounds. Imports will not reach that figure.

Second. As reported by your conferees, the bill excludes lamb and excludes sausage, canned meats, and other products. The latter was included in the Senate bill in order to close a possible loophole in the quota. It may be that this situation can be dealt with administratively. However, it cannot be said that lambgrowers have not been faced with increased imports of a magnitude equal to the imports of beef. In a hearing before the Tariff Commission, which has been notably unsympathetic to the plight of American industry, the lamb producers presented a sufficient case in order to convince two members of the Commission that they were entitled to relief under the escape clause. In a divided opinion, they were denied relief.

We should not just take cognizance of the beef people, because they are more numerous, and sweep the lamb problem under the rug. The lambgrowers are entitled to equal treatment.

Third. Finally, and what in my mind is most significant, the President is entitled to ignore the provisions of this act, if he finds such action to be in the overriding economic interest of the United States. Just what does this mean? This means that if the President finds that the current GATT negotiations will be adversely affected by the imposition of quotas, or if any country is about to retaliate against other products because of the imposition of quotas, he can suspend the quotas. If we are to believe what the State Department has told the committee, such conditions already exist. I did not give much weight to these statements. But, let us not fool ourselves. Under this clause, there will never be any quotas imposed. The very basis upon which the State Department opposed the Senate can be cited as a basis for suspending any quotas.

Fourth. The Senate amendment was substantially the same as bills introduced by 70 Members of this body, including 6 members of the Ways and Means Committee, of which I was one. Actually, there are more than 100 bills pending before this body dealing with the importation of meat into the United States. Seventy-two Members of the other body favored mandatory restrictions. In the face of these facts, which certainly reflect the will of the Congress, I see no reason for accepting a watered down bill which has been written by the State Department and rammed down the throats of the cattlemen. I dare say that the cattlemen who have been cajoled into accepting this measure will, one of these days, wake up to the fact that they have

been sold a bill of goods without substance.

Therefore, since the conferees were not willing to come back to the House with a bill which would have any teeth in it, I propose that the House accept the Senate amendment.

Mr. MONTROYA. Mr. Speaker, it pleases me to see the action taken by my colleagues in the House and the Senate in considering a just and forward looking quota system on imports of beef, veal, and mutton.

The beef cattle industry—which plays a vital role in the economy of my State of New Mexico and in many neighboring States—has been faced with a critical situation. In New Mexico, beef cattle sales are responsible for about 50 percent of our total agriculture cash receipts. Those receipts amount to about \$114 million per annum. Such receipts account for the fact that agriculture ranks second in dollar sales among our basic State industries—first, mineral resources; third, manufacturing.

It is naturally of major concern to us when so large a market becomes economically depressed and sharp price drops of \$3 to \$4 per hundredweight alive, are clear indication that there is something basically amiss. Figured in prices of 1960, when 553,145,000 pounds of cattle, alive, were marketed in New Mexico, a loss of \$4 per hundredweight equals an overall loss to the State of \$22,125,800. So during a price slump, the livestock producer suffers a direct loss, the business community and, indeed, the entire State suffers indirect but quite substantial revenue losses.

A very basic cause for our depressed market, according to the Department of Agriculture and many of my colleagues, has been the rise in imports as a percentage of our domestic production of beef, veal, mutton, beef cattle and calves, which in 1962 was 10.6 percent as compared with 3.9 percent in 1957. That is an increase of almost 7 percent in only 5 years. Relating imports to consumption, we find similarly that they currently represent almost 11 percent of our total consumption; this is compared with less than 4 percent in 1958—here we have an increase in excess of 7 percent in less than 3 years.

When imports of the first 8 months of 1963 equal 122 percent of those of the previous year when, in 1962, Choice slaughter steers at Chicago averaged \$27.67 per hundredweight and fall in May of 1963 to \$22.61 and when in November 1962 Choice steers at Chicago sell for \$30.13 per hundredweight, but by May of 1963 have fallen to \$22.61 per hundredweight, there is no logical reason to further allow excessive foreign imports.

As we speak of becoming more efficient and interdependent under the Trade Expansion Act for world commerce, we swiftly realize that in the area of beef trade the United States is unwittingly furthering every other Nation's beef stability but her own. In international trade, as it relates to cattle, we owe no further concessions, but rather are justly due preferred treatment to compensate

for the extensive losses already incurred at the cattle market.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned over the unfair treatment which cattlemen have been receiving in the area of foreign trade.

Our beef industry has suffered from considerably lower production expenses in such countries as Australia, New Zealand, and Argentina. All of these countries have been able to export to the United States about 80 percent of the beef which we import annually. Moreover, relative to our Western nations, a far smaller proportion of American agricultural output enjoys the benefits of nontariff import controls. France accrues benefits of 74 percent; West Germany, 93 percent; Italy, 63 percent; Australia, 41 percent; New Zealand, 100 percent; and the United Kingdom comes closest to our humble level with 37 percent outdoing us by 11 percent.

So, while our Nation's imports and quota controls have been steadily falling, those of other nations have risen or remained stationary.

But now we have an opportunity to right the wrong. We have an opportunity and an obligation to afford our livestock producers with proper protection from foreign imports and cutrate prices.

I strongly urge that we impose some restraints on a virtually unlimited importation of beef. It is vital that realistic guidelines be established to afford proper income protection to the world's best cattle producer—the American cattleman. We have the opportunity to establish these guidelines; I urge that we do so with prompt consideration and passage of this measure.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in my view the conference report accompanying H.R. 1839 offers a partial solution, to correct long-standing abuses inflicted on our domestic livestock industry by excessively high levels of beef and other meat imports.

In the district I have the honor to represent, the great Panhandle of Texas, virtually every citizen stands behind the enactment of legislation to effect a result in keeping with the best interest of our country.

Our country is cattle country. But, in a sense, all America is cattle country, with each farmer and each rancher permitted by our system to do his best to supply the expanding needs of our expanding population for fresh meat.

Too long have our farmers and ranchers suffered the crippling effects of foreign importation. The facts of the situation are well known and often repeated and I do not mean to dwell on statistics again because the effects of the situation are obvious; a level of imports permitting foreign meat suppliers to provide upward of 11 percent of domestic requirements is disastrously high.

It is clearly true also that in order to export agricultural commodities we must be willing to accept imports. But surely less damaging balances can be found than those presently affecting our domestic livestock people—and as a solid

step toward this goal I support the conference report.

In this legislation we are given the tool by which further damage can be prevented, by which the tide can be turned, and a great segment of our economy protected.

It has long been my conviction that the future of American cattlemen was not going to be bright until something was done to correct the problem of unrestricted imports. The potential for increasing beef production in the countries which supply most of our imports—Australia, New Zealand, Mexico, Canada, Central America—is almost unlimited.

Failure of the Congress to act on this matter could serve only to increase the enthusiasm of foreign livestock producers until the United States became the destination of every additional pound of meat they produced.

The conference report recognizes that the United States can absorb normal imports without being badly hurt. It recognizes also that we cannot stand unlimited imports; that our own livestockmen are due to suffer a depressing loss of incentive; that the structure of our markets will surely reflect further foreign inroads in American consumption habits to the detriment of our own people, farmers and consumers.

Our farmers and ranchers are producing more and better food products—including meat—than ever before. And even though their costs are mounting steadily, our farmers are getting lower prices than 16 years ago.

This legislation can serve as a partial answer. I am not sure that any of us can accurately foretell whether this step is all that will be needed. For example, I believe that a sound followup would be enactment of legislation to provide for labeling of beef and meat products from abroad, so that consumers can know the

point of origin of the meat they purchase.

I have introduced legislation providing that imported meat and meat products sold in interstate commerce be labeled as to the country from which they came. I will continue to urge our colleagues to adopt this or similar legislation.

But first we must now, in this session, do something about the basic problem, the levels of these imports. Our cattle producers, our livestockmen of all kinds, have served our people well. They have asked little of their Congress.

Let us enact this legislation.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the conference committee upon keeping their collective word and bringing us a bill providing import quotas on beef and other meat. I know the committee has had a most difficult task trying to write a bill satisfactory to the cattlemen of the United States and not too objectionable to the trade policy of the administration.

Nevertheless, I support this resulting H.R. 1839 somewhat reluctantly, because I expected more protection. But inasmuch as the cattlemen's organizations are advising us of their pleasure at this compromise, I suppose I should be satisfied, too. To be sure, it is more than a sentiment in the right direction; it is a large step. I am sure the provisions of H.R. 1839 will deter a mushrooming again of beef imports such as occurred in 1961, 1962, and 1963.

It seems to me that restricting these imports to the last 5 years' average and allowing imports only a very small proportion of the growing U.S. market is a reasonable compromise on this very difficult problem.

I now read into the RECORD at this point a comparison of principal provisions of the Senate amendment and conference report.

IMPORT QUOTAS ON BEEF, ETC.—H.R. 1839

COMPARISON OF PRINCIPAL PROVISIONS OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT AND CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate bill and its effect

1. Basic quota: Imposes a basic quota of the average yearly imports of beef, veal, mutton, and lamb for the 5-year period 1959-63.

2. Separate quotas for each meat.

3. Growth factor: Allows a complex growth factor only in years when domestic beef sells for 90 percent of parity or more.

This limitation effectively prevents any growth factor.

4. Date of imposition of quota:

January 1, 1965.

This would result in an immediate violation of U.S. agreements with Australia, New Zealand, and Ireland by which these countries voluntarily agree to reduce imports. We

The House bill and its effect

1. Basic quota: Same, but does not include lamb.

This gives the cattle industry the basic protection they want.

Lamb imports are needed to help meet U.S. consumer demand.

2. Aggregate quota for total of all meats. This is easier to administer and fairer to exporting countries.

3. Growth factor: Allows exporters a growing share of U.S. market in proportion to the increase in domestic beef production over the base period. (Uses average of a 3-year period to measure growth of U.S. production.)

This allows exporting allies a reasonably fair share in growth of U.S. market.

4. Date of imposition of quota: Only after Secretary of Agriculture has estimated for a future calendar year that imports will be 110 percent or more of the quotas plus allowed growth. Then the President shall proclaim the quota limitation.

We can avoid violation of our agreements with Australia, Argentina, and Ireland.

IMPORT QUOTAS ON BEEF, ETC.—H.R. 1839—Continued

COMPARISON OF PRINCIPAL PROVISIONS OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT AND CONFERENCE REPORT—CON.

The Senate bill and its effect—Continued

sell these countries \$256 million more than they sell us.

Meat supplying countries would be entitled to retaliate to the extent of about \$100 million against U.S. exports of tobacco, cigarettes, cotton, wheat, automobiles, farm machinery, airplanes, chemicals, and other products.

It would hurt Australia and New Zealand, ANZUS and SEATO allies who furnish us vital military facilities and who buy our military equipment. It would hurt Ireland, over one-half of whose exports to the United States are beef. It would hurt the Alliance for Progress by reducing the earning power of our Latin American neighbors.

It would undermine the U.S. negotiating position in the Kennedy round. A main goal is to expand access for U.S. agricultural exports. Imposition of quotas required by the Senate bill would drastically hurt our ability to help U.S. exports. Success in agricultural negotiations in the Kennedy round is essential to the whole negotiation. Without it, we cannot help U.S. industrial exports either. U.S. farm exports provide more than 949,000 jobs (13.2 percent of total U.S. farm employment) and account for one of every 4 acres harvested. U.S. farmers need increased exports.

5. Safety clause: Not effective in time of national emergency declared by the President.

Since a national emergency declared in the Korean conflict is still in effect, the Senate bill would probably not be in effect at all.

Other provisions

6. Imports are to be controlled by ports of entry.

This would require unequal treatment of various U.S. ports and would probably be unconstitutional.

7. Canned, cured, and prepared meats are under the quota.

These are essentially foods not produced in the United States. Imports have not been rising. Restrictions would hurt Argentina, Uruguay, Paraguay, and Brazil.

8. No such provision.

The House bill and its effect—Continued

We can hope to avoid retaliation which would hurt agricultural and industrial exporters.

We could hope to avoid hurt to these allies by having time to work out new agreements with them.

We could avoid imposition of quotas until our Kennedy round negotiations are completed. We would have time to negotiate new voluntary agreements on meat imports in the Kennedy round (or collateral to it).

The provision requiring the estimate to be 110 percent allows some leeway so that the whole machinery of quotas will not have to go into effect just because an estimate is a few percentage points above the allowable imports.

5. Safety clause: The President may suspend or increase the quota if:

(a) required by overriding economic or national security interests (giving special weight to the well-being of the livestock industry);

(b) meat imports are inadequate to meet domestic demand at reasonable prices;

(c) the policy of the act is carried out by trade agreements.

6. No requirement.

7. Not covered.

No harm to U.S. producer. No harm to supplying allies.

8. Regulations: Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to issue regulations to prevent circumvention of the purposes of the act.

Since canned and processed beef is not covered, this assures the cattle industry the quota will not be circumvented, for example, by freezing beef in cans.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Arkansas, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. MILLS], for bringing to the House this conference report on the bill (H.R. 1839). It is a report that makes a constructive contribution toward the solution of a very difficult problem.

I want to associate myself with the gentleman from Arkansas, Chairman

MILLS, in the resolution of this issue, and to assure him of my support of the course our conferees have recommended to bring needed relief to our American beef cattle farmers, stockmen, and beef producers.

I favor the principle of reciprocal trade, but no trade policy is sound or fair unless it takes into full account the general welfare of our own economy. What is required is the kind of balanced con-

sideration that has guided the authors of this conference report.

The amendments to this bill recommended by the gentleman from Arkansas, Chairman MILLS, and the other House conferees are fully warranted by the critical situation existing in our important cattle industry.

The proposals contained in this report are well designed to substantially ameliorate conditions that have disturbed and distressed one of our country's major industries. I support this legislation in the public interest.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the quota on meat imports authorized by the Senate amendment to H.R. 1839 is a very important restriction and one which will tend to solve a long-term problem of the domestic beef industry in the United States. The economic losses being incurred by cattle feeders and producers are not to be minimized and certainly there is every reason to believe such losses will rise to even greater heights unless a remedy is found very soon. We cannot continue to import large quantities of a product which we raise domestically in such abundance. The economy of the agricultural industry will be even more disastrous if we do not enact H.R. 1839. I urge adoption of the conference committee report.

It is not the intent or purpose of the cattlemen to completely cut off imports of meat and meat products, but I agree with the industry that the proposed quota system would provide the only recognizable method for fair competition between our producers and foreign producers.

The beef-cattle industry is the very basis of a sound and healthy agricultural economy. If the beef-cattle industry were destroyed, the whole agricultural economy would disintegrate because approximately \$20 of every \$100 of agricultural income stems from the sale of cattle or calves. The beef industry has experienced tremendous growth since 1940. In 1940 the gross income from the sale of cattle and calves amounted to only \$1.4 billion. In 1963, the income was \$8.3 billion, an increase of \$7 billion which emphasizes that the beef industry is exceedingly important to the whole economy of the United States and any development which adversely affects the beef-cattle industry will be felt throughout the entire structure of our economy.

The recent agreements of Australia and New Zealand are not realistic approaches to a solution of our problem, and will be ineffectual, to say the least. Such agreements cannot present lasting solutions. The imports should have been limited to an average of the years 1958-63 so as to take in the low years of imports instead of basing the agreements on the highest years' average.

And these agreements are completely opposite to the way these countries treat the United States. Australia, the largest exporter of beef and veal and mutton to the United States, prohibits imports of cattle and sheep and hogs and pork products from the United States under health

restriction. New Zealand prohibits imports of most meats and packinghouse products. Ireland restricts all livestock and meat products by import license and its tariffs are extremely high.

The last agricultural census showed that we had about 4 million farms in the United States and 2½ million of those farms had cattle and calves upon them.

These farms use 1 billion acres of land in pasturing those cattle. One billion acres of pastureland. We do have a huge production plant. There is absolutely no doubt about the ability of the American cattle farmer to produce to fully supply America's beef requirements.

Argument has been presented that imports are not the cause for the recent depressed market for fed beef. This is ridiculous. Much of the imported beef is used as roasts and lower grade steaks and is in further competition with fed beef because about 20 to 25 percent of the carcass of the fed beef is used as ground beef. These imports have depressed the price of beef at least by \$3 to \$4 per hundredweight and the situation can only get worse, not better, if something is not done.

After much concentrated research and study I am convinced that our only solution is to establish a system of import quotas to a volume that would not unduly affect prices on the U.S. market.

The record will show that we imported enough beef last year to feed the entire population of the United States for a full month. We did this when we had enough beef domestically produced to fill an entire year's supply, and more.

We in the Congress cannot let these imports destroy a vital industry to our Nation's economy. To permit the American livestock industry to succumb to lower levels as a result of excessive imports would be to arbitrarily precipitate a condition which would further ravage an already "sick" industry.

Mr. Speaker, adoption of the conference committee report is imperative.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I presented the rule which would send this bill to conference. At

that time I made some rather extended remarks on the parliamentary situation with which we were confronted. I called to the attention of the House that if I had any thought that the Senate amendment would do the job that it was claimed it would do, I would ask the House to vote down the previous question and adopt an amendment which would agree to the Senate amendment and send the bill to the President without further congressional action. But I then pointed out that due to the national emergency clause in the Senate amendment, the Senate amendment was meaningless and inoperative.

Therefore, I suggested that the House adopt the resolution and send the bill to conference. This suggestion was based upon the statement of the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER], that he would use his best offices in conference to work out something that would give the needed relief or at least some relief to the cattle people.

Mr. Speaker, I have studied this report of the conferees as fully as I have had an opportunity to do. And, I regret to say that due to the provisos in the conference agreement giving the executive department the power to make the agreement inoperative under certain circumstances, it is my conviction that there is little hope for relief from these imports in the bill. However, Mr. Speaker, we are confronted with a situation where we either vote for the conference report, with the hope that the desire of the Congress for some relief will be recognized by the executive department, or we have nothing. Therefore, I am voting for the report.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the formula in this bill provides that when domestic production increases and imports would be less needed by consumers and do more harm to producers, the supply of imports can increase. When the domestic supply reduces and imports could increase, the supply that can be imported is reduced. This is an upside

down formula that works the wrong way for both consumers and producers. This makes it more sure that the President will have to suspend the quotas.

So all this legislation really does is to embarrass our negotiators and risk loss of agricultural markets. It is likely to set off a round of trade restrictions that can do nothing but reduce our exports and we now export 60 percent of our wheat, 40 percent of our beans, 50 percent of our rice and 20 percent of our Iowa corn. Iowa alone exports \$250 million worth of farm products. The best way to solve the agricultural problems is to find markets for our idled acres rather than reduce sales for these products. Decreased exports of feed grains would mean that more grain would need be fed in the United States and this would really produce excess supplies of meat.

Australia seems to be a target for many comments. They exported \$300 million worth of goods to the United States last year and purchased \$600 million worth from us. Twenty-three percent of all their imports came from the United States. Our purchase from them amounted to \$1.50 per person in the United States while their purchases from us amounted to \$55 per person and included a great deal of farm machinery. Reduction of their purchases from the United States would mean reduced employment at such places as Charles City, Iowa, Des Moines, Iowa, and Racine, Wis., where farm machinery is under production that will go to Australia unless they reduce purchases from us. Unemployed people do not buy enough meat to help cattle markets. The Republican ranking member on the committee said the quotas will not go into effect, which means that the principal thing the bill is likely to do is to be interpreted as a slap by the United States, causing such countries as Australia to turn to Canada or other sources of supply.

If this bill passes, the long list of quota bills now pending before the Ways and Means Committee can expect consideration. A list of these bills is as follows:

IMPORT QUOTA BILLS OTHER THAN ON MEAT

Alphabetical list of Members of the House who have introduced bills now pending before the Committee on Ways and Means which would impose import quotas on products other than meat

Author	Bill No.	Item	Author	Bill No.	Item
Abele, Homer E.	H.R. 8823	Residual fuel oil.	Clausen, Don H.	H.J. Res. 404	Softwood lumber.
Ashbrook, John M.	H.R. 8890	Do.	Colmer, William M.	H.R. 1775	Hardwood plywood.
Aspinall, Wayne N.	H.R. 6269	Lead and zinc.	Curtin, Willard S.	H.R. 9860	Lead and zinc.
	H.R. 9855	Do.	Dent, John H.	H.R. 8619	Residual fuel oil.
Baker, Howard H.	H.R. 8614	Residual fuel oil.	Denton, Winfield K.	H.R. 8621	Do.
	H.R. 11627	Lead and zinc.	Edmondson, Ed.	H.R. 6371	Lead and zinc.
Baring, Walter S.	H.R. 9890	Do.		H.R. 9856	Do.
Battin, James F.	H.R. 9943	Do.		H.R. 8620	Residual fuel oil.
Bennett, Charles E.	H.R. 7181	Softwood lumber.	Fallon, George H.	H.R. 8952	Do.
Bennett, John B.	H.R. 8019	Iron ore.	Flood, Daniel J.	H.R. 8622	Do.
Berry, E. Y.	H.R. 6271	Lead and zinc.	Gray, Kenneth J.	H.R. 8623	Do.
	H.J. Res. 257	Softwood lumber.		H.R. 9970	Lead and zinc.
Bow, Frank T.	H.R. 8615	Residual fuel oil.	Hall, Durward G.	H.R. 6276	Do.
Bray, William G.	H.R. 8616	Do.		H.R. 9907	Do.
Brotzman, Donald G.	H.R. 6393	Lead and zinc.		H.J. Res. 288	Softwood lumber.
	H.R. 9895	Do.		H.J. Res. 258	Do.
Burton, Laurence J.	H.R. 6275	Do.	Hansen, Julia Butler	H.R. 9881	Lead and zinc.
	H.R. 9859	Do.	Harding, Ralph R.	H.J. Res. 259	Softwood lumber.
	H.R. 8617	Residual fuel oil.	Harris, Oren	H.R. 8624	Residual fuel oil.
Byrnes, John W.	H.R. 7436	Lead and zinc.	Harrison, William Henry	H.R. 8653	Do.
Chenoweth, J. Edgar	H.R. 6408	Do.	Harsha, William H.	H.R. 8613	Do.
	H.R. 9803	Do.	Hays, Wayne L.	H.R. 8625	Do.
	H.R. 6323	Do.	Hechler, Ken	H.R. 4175	Thermometers.
Clark, Frank M.	H.R. 9861	Do.	Herlong, A. S., Jr.		
	H.R. 8618	Residual fuel oil.			

See footnote at end of table.

Alphabetical list of Members of the House who have introduced bills now pending before the Committee on Ways and Means which would impose import quotas on products other than meat—Continued

Author	Bill No.	Item	Author	Bill No.	Item
Horan, Walt	H.R. 9864	Lead and zinc.	Perkins, Carl D.	H.R. 8635	Residual fuel oil.
	H.R. 6270	Do.	Price, Melvin	H.R. 8636	Do.
Huddleston, George, Jr.	H.J. Res. 256	Softwood lumber.	Pucinski, Roman C.	H.R. 587	General quotas.
Ichord, Richard	H.R. 8626	Residual fuel oil.	Quillen, James H.	H.R. 9870	Lead and zinc.
	H.R. 7100	Lead and zinc.		H.R. 8211	Do.
	H.R. 11006	Do.		H.R. 10014	Do.
Jarman, John	H.R. 10438	Residual fuel oil.	Reid, Charlotte T.	H.R. 8637	Residual fuel oil.
Jennings, W. Pat.	H.R. 8627	Do.	Rhodes, George M.	H.R. 8638	Softwood lumber.
Johnson, Harold T.	H.R. 6277	Lead and zinc.	Rivers, Ralph J.	H.J. Res. 291	Residual fuel oil.
	H.R. 9857	Do.	Rooney, Fred B.	H.R. 8639	Do.
	H.J. Res. 260	Softwood lumber.	Roudebush, Richard L.	H.R. 1139	General quotas.
Kee, Elizabeth	H.R. 8208	Residual fuel oil.	St. George, Katharine	H.R. 4341	Residual fuel oil.
King, Carleton J.	H.R. 10442	General quotas.	Saylor, John P.	H.R. 8640	Do.
King, Cecil R.	H.R. 10545	Lead and zinc.		H.R. 9872	Lead and zinc.
Langen, Odin	H.R. 9388	Agricultural and forestry goods.		H.R. 9003	Residual fuel oil.
Lloyd, Sherman P.	H.R. 6340	Lead and zinc.		H.R. 9879	Lead and zinc.
	H.R. 9862	Do.		H.R. 819	Residual fuel oil.
McDade, Joseph M.	H.R. 8630	Residual fuel oil.		H.R. 8641	Do.
McIntire, Clifford G.	H.R. 6746	Agricultural and forestry goods.		H.R. 125	Petroleum, residual fuel oil.
	H.J. Res. 307	Softwood lumber.		H.R. 7990	Lead and zinc.
Mathias, Charles McC., Jr.	H.R. 8629	Residual fuel oil.		H.R. 9867	Do.
May, Catherine	H.J. Res. 261	Softwood lumber.		H.R. 8681	Residual fuel oil.
Montoya, Joseph M.	H.R. 6278	Lead and zinc.		H.R. 8642	Do.
	H.R. 9865	Do.		H.R. 8643	Do.
Moore, Arch A., Jr.	H.R. 8632	Residual fuel oil.		H.R. 822	Shrimp.
Morgan, Thomas E.	H.R. 1067	Do.		H.R. 6439	Lead and zinc.
	H.R. 8612	Do.		H.R. 9868	Do.
Morris, Thomas G.	H.R. 6272	Lead and zinc.		H.R. 11677	Do.
	H.R. 9871	Do.		H.R. 6857	Do.
Morton, Rogers C. B.	H.R. 8631	Residual fuel oil.		H.R. 9869	Do.
Multer, Abraham J.	H.R. 527	Chocolate, confectionery.		H.R. 7082	Agricultural and forestry goods.
Natchez, William H.	H.R. 8633	Residual fuel oil.		H.R. 10950	Dairy products.
Norblad, Walter	H.J. Res. 262	Softwood lumber.		H.J. Res. 265	Softwood lumber.
Nygaard, Hjalmar C.	H.J. Res. 263	Do.		H.R. 8680	Residual fuel oil.
O'Brien, Leo W.	H.R. 6343	Lead and zinc.		H.R. 6274	Lead and zinc.
O'Konski, Alvin E.	H.R. 3723	Hardwood plywood.		H.R. 9858	Do.
Olsen, Arnold	H.R. 6723	Lead and zinc.		H.R. 9278	Residual fuel oil.
	H.R. 9866	Do.		H.R. 6784	Lead and zinc.
	H.R. 8634	Residual fuel oil.		H.R. 9880	Do.
	H.J. Res. 281	Softwood lumber.			
Pelly, Thomas M.	H.J. Res. 264	Do.			

NOTE.—The above list is of quota bills only. It does not include the authors of some 400 tariff bills, the majority of which would impose higher duties on a variety of products, which are pending before the Committee on Ways and Means.

Lobbyists for various other items have been looking for a breakthrough and this would reduce total exports. Last year our exports totaled \$22 billion and imports totaled \$17 billion of products which we produce in the United States. We export three times as many as we import. Reducing imports to United States would reduce exports from the United States even more. Over two-thirds of the imports to the United States are products we do not produce.

Some people now say this bill is designed only to affect cow meat prices. Six months ago when the drive for this bill started, cow meat was above world market prices in the United States and were not below average cow meat prices in United States but Choice cattle were lower. Then they blamed imports for the Choice cattle problem. Choice cattle today sold for \$26.25 per hundred in Chicago compared to \$20.50 last June. So now, they change the argument. We have had entirely too much politics and emotionalism and not enough sober thought and analysis on this bill.

If the negotiations going on in Geneva fail, we will need an effective set of laws—not this kind of legislation.

If our negotiators would approve this kind of agreement, the same people who are pressuring for this bill would practically call our negotiators traitors. If they cannot negotiate a better agreement for U.S. interests than this bill, they will have failed.

I am convinced this bill is bad for U.S. interests and especially Midwest agricultural interests.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it is distinctly encouraging to note that legislative

relief for the problem of beef imports into the United States is now at hand. This legislation has survived a long and circuitous route. It has been threatened with Presidential veto; it has run the gauntlet of a hostile State Department which apparently cannot look upon the problems of the American producer with concern; it has survived parliamentary delaying tactics inspired by those who oppose the proposal.

The fact is that beef prices to the producer are down. A principal source of revenue to a great many American farmers has been severely cut. Imports of cattle have grown significantly since the market was first tapped by foreign producers, and each year as imports have grown a corresponding number of American cattle were not sold or disposed of.

This simply means a reduced standard of living for the American farmers who depend wholly or in part on beef cattle for their revenue. Since relief is not forthcoming from those responsible within the Government, the Congress has no choice but to take the matter into its own hands. My only quarrel with this legislation is that it has not been enacted earlier. Sometimes, it seems impossible for our Government to comprehend the fact that other countries zealously guard the interests of their own people. This is proper, but our Government has an equal responsibility to guard the interests of American producers in whatever field they may work. That is the situation which requires the enactment of protective legislation today.

Record level imports combined with high domestic production have sent the prices of domestic beef to dangerously

low levels, causing millions of dollars of losses to our Nation's economy. Florida's beef cattle producing industry, one of the most important to our State's economy, has been very adversely affected. Amazingly, much of the import problem has been brought about through the use of foreign aid to stimulate cattle production in other countries.

In 1963 imports of beef and veal amounted to well over 1½ billion pounds or roughly 11 percent of our total production. Converting these imports to live cattle equivalents, they amount to over three million head of cattle or roughly four times the total beef cows in the State of Florida, on January 1, 1964. Had these cattle been produced in the United States, they would have consumed many millions of pounds of feed grains, thus relieving some of the storage cost to the Government, not to mention the contributions they would have made to the local and State economies.

In 1957 imports of beef and veal on a carcass weight equivalent basis was only 376 million pounds and had risen to 1,679 million pounds, an increase of over four times as much in only 6 years. Paradoxically, the United States is the biggest producer of beef and veal; yet in 1963 we imported over 56 percent of the total exports of beef and veal in world commerce. We have the highest dollar market in the world for beef and veal, and the lowest degree of tariffs of any of the major beef producing countries.

Historically, the cattle industry has been able to cope with the cattle cycle, but we have never had the combination of record domestic production and record

imports. Certainly, it is time that this country recognizes that in order to meet our many commitments at home and abroad we must maintain our basic industries, of which cattle is one. Other countries afford reasonable degrees of protection from unfair competition from abroad and the cattle industry requests no more or less than this. A realistic policy should be our guide and equity our goal in international trade.

In view of the concern of the Federal Government at the present time for the unemployment and poverty problems which are interrelated, I should think the efforts of Congress to protect American producers would be welcomed and strongly supported.

I would hope that in the months ahead in addition to providing the legislative relief that is needed to create fixed import quotas, there will be a firm review of the inspection procedures at port facilities with a view to establishing a method of firmer control over distribution of beef imports; that there will be a careful examination of requirements for handling, slaughtering, processing of meats in foreign countries; and that there will be a careful review of benefits such as special tax situations or transportation rebates on beef imports. It is known that quality standards are much more relaxed in most foreign countries than in our own. A lack of vigilance on our part can mean the admission of inferior or of unsanitary products, or even the introduction of dangerous disease and insect pests.

A correction of the present situation will strengthen the American market for beef, will encourage a resumption of expenditures for improvements on cattle farms, will expedite the acquisition of needed equipment and the employment of additional personnel. There will be stabilization of the entire beef cattle industry. It is an industry which is much too important to the American economy to receive the cavalier treatment heretofore accorded it.

To those who are concerned that a restriction on beef imports would result in higher prices for the consumers for quality beef, let me say that it has been made unmistakably clear that prices to housewives in the markets have varied but little in recent years, and there is no indication that import quotas would result in higher prices to the consumer. It is important to note that the American housewife would be better insured of a quality product for the price she is paying than at present.

Cattlemen generally feel that they cannot survive unless some action is taken to provide protection from foreign competition. The action here is fully justified. Perhaps even more significantly, it creates an important precedent for action by the Congress when American producers and American workmen have their sources of livelihood threatened by foreign competition.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, may I repeat, some years ago kangaroo meat was imported into the United States from Australia and sold in the great State of Pennsylvania as hamburger meat. At that time I placed in the Con-

GRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled, "Are You Jumpy These Days." Then, not long ago, I noticed that horsemeat was being imported from abroad and being sold in Ohio for ground beef. I say the consumers should be protected from such fraud.

If the American consumer has been eating kangaroo meat from abroad, it is entirely possible that he has been eating mule, donkey, billy goat, and there is no telling, Mr. Speaker, what other kinds of animals have been imported into our country and labeled as ground beef and sold to our housewives.

Some of the dear ladies who have been by the office demanding cheap meat for the consumer might well ponder the possibility that they have been eating spaghetti sauce or meatballs made from kangaroo or donkey.

Mr. Speaker, I only call this to the attention of the House in order to prove how easily our Nation can be flooded with anything foreign.

If the American cattleman would take his cattle and give them away at the auction barns, there would be little difference in the price the consumer would pay in the great cities of Chicago, New York, Philadelphia, Boston, and the other large cities of this country. The American cattle farmer receives only a few cents a pound for the choice cuts of steak, roast, and ground beef sold to the housewives of the large cities. At the present time, the cattlemen are receiving nothing at all from the sale of their cattle. They are giving them away at a loss. It is the processing, the packing, the transporting, the rent and labor costs that are being passed on to the housewife.

Mr. Speaker, go with me to the sale barns of this country any day, and I can show you cattle being sold for 7, 8, and 9 cents per pound on the hoof, and some of the better grades for only 17 and 18 cents—cattle that costs the cattleman 25 cents per pound to place on the market. If this trend of falling cattle prices to the cattlemen continues, it could lead to Government controls of the production of cattle and price supports; and then my good friends in the large cities would howl with the resulting increases in prices to the consumer. Limiting imports of cheap grades of beef and other meats sold for beef is the best protection the American housewife has against cheap products and high prices.

In the lifetime of even the young Members of this House, we have seen our farm population dwindle from 35 to 40 percent of the total population down to around 10 percent today. A smaller portion of our population now lives on the farm than in any major civilization of the world. This is dangerous to our very way of life and our very form of government.

The raising of livestock accounts for more than 50 percent of the income of the American farmers. It is free of price supports and Government controls.

Mr. Speaker, let us keep it that way by restricting the foreign, slave-labor imports of beef. This bill is a step in the right direction and I will support it.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this legislation. No one in this Congress desires more than I to lend an attentive ear to the demands of American businessmen who claim injury through an abnormal volume of imports.

At the same time, this Congress, 3 years ago, through the trade bill, declared as its policy a reduction of tariff barriers and an increase in freedom of international trade.

In the trade bill, the Congress also took away the traditional procedure for relief which was provided by the "escape clause" and the "peril point" section.

Now we are met with a unilateral attempt to repeal this legislation for the benefit of one industry.

I do not dwell now on the validity of the meat industry's claim for relief. Neither do I emphasize the undoubted price increase which will flow from this bill and its effects on the lower strata of our population. I also pass over the potentially damaging effects on countries such as Argentina, Australia, and New Zealand, whom we are in various ways trying to assist.

My main question is, Why should there be discrimination among industries? We have seen the harmful effects of imports in the watch industry, the bicycle industry, the rubber footwear industry, and the needle industry, to mention only a few. If we are to consider relief by the application of quotas or otherwise, let us extend it to all industries equally and not limit it to those which are related to the farm.

This is highly discriminatory legislation and I oppose it.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, in my view the conference report has not removed the danger of the Senate amendments to H.R. 1839. Under the new set of provisions, circumstances could still produce the automatic imposition of quotas. And I am not convinced that in future periods these circumstances will warrant the application of quantitative restrictions.

The fact remains that, despite the acceptance of a growth formula in the conference report, the maximum amount of specified meat articles permitted into the United States after December 31, 1964, is set at 725,400,000 pounds annually. This is in reality a quota-quota. Any set figure such as this is arbitrary.

The quota may or may not be applied, dependent upon an equally arbitrary percentage formula. A base period of years is prescribed, and future figuration, no matter how fundamental the changes in world production, trade patterns, and consumption, is inevitably computed on this base period.

In essence, although the wholly injurious character of the Senate proposals is somewhat modified, the essentials are not altered. I remain unconvinced that conditions prevailing in the cattle industry warrant this preferential treatment. In my estimation most of the arguments against the Senate amendments are still relevant.

The price decline experienced by the cattleman is not substantially enough related to imports in order to justify a

remedy as damaging, and as consequential as quantitative restrictions.

I was and remain vigorously opposed to the measure adopted by the Senate.

The Tariff Commission in its report to the Senate Finance Committee listed a number of other relevant considerations. The slump in beef prices can be attributed to increases in cattle, increases in the size of beef animals, the availability and comparatively lower cost of other meat, and increases in the number of animals slaughtered. These, and quite possibly other factors, have caused the prices of choice fed steers at Chicago to drop in 1962 and again in 1963. Imports may have played a role, but it would be foolhardy to strike back drastically at this element merely because it represents the easiest remedy from the domestic point of view.

To oppose the imposition of tariffs or quotas does not mean that I am unsympathetic to the cattle industry and its evident distress. Means must be found whereby the industry can regain its health, but not at the expense of other economic sectors and not at the expense of damaging this country's position in the forthcoming trade negotiations which, if successful, can mean growth and prosperity to the whole stage of American industry, including agriculture.

Last February, the voluntary meat agreements with Australia and New Zealand were announced. These two countries are the principal suppliers of beef to this country. Australia agreed to limit its exports of beef, veal, and mutton to the United States. Exports to this country this year will reflect the average level reached during the 1962-63 period.

It is evident that these accords have already had a strong effect. In the first 4 months of this year, beef imports decreased by 34 million pounds compared to the level of importation recorded over the same period in 1963. Beef and veal imports decreased by 11 percent. Australia advised our Government that shipments of veal, beef, mutton, and lamb in 1964 should drop by 170 million pounds, or 29 percent of the 1963 total.

Testifying before the Ways and Means Committee on June 4, the Secretary of Agriculture stated:

Taking all our suppliers of beef and veal together, it now appears that shipments from these countries destined for the United States in this calendar year will be about one-fourth below 1963.

And in 1963, total imports of beef and veal reached 1.7 billion pounds, representing 9 percent of domestic consumption. Beef imported as live cattle brought imports to 10.7 percent of domestic consumption.

It must be stated that most of our imports consist of low beef quality. The United States produces the finest and choicest beef in the world; but this is not the grade which imports largely consist of. In 1962, imports reached a record level, but cattlemen also received the highest prices for their beef in a decade.

We must acknowledge that most imports are of a quality mainly used for hamburgers, frankfurters, and variety

meats. There is no doubt that if import quotas were imposed, consumers in the years ahead would be facing substantial increases in the price of such popular food items.

The Senate amendment did not take into account the potential for growth. Arbitrary computations as provided in the conference report, furthermore, cannot in reality substitute for the free competitive price mechanism, and the growth of consumption cannot be properly estimated. Total beef consumption this year is running 13 percent above 1963. Undoubtedly, with the annual rise in population and other factors, the markets for beef and other meats will continue to grow. Quotas are an inherently discriminatory trade practice which leave no room for such basic realities.

Most important of all, the level of imports thus far suggests that in achieving a scale consistent with the 1959-63 average, the goal of the quota proponents will have been reached. World supply, particularly in Europe, is down. Imports to this country have already been reduced, and our domestic consumption continues to rise.

A further important variable is the forthcoming trade negotiations. It is essential that the United States be in a strong position. We have repeatedly insisted, and rightly so, that the Common Market countries offer a fair and reasonable bargaining on all varieties of agricultural produce. This policy, so important for our whole agricultural community, will be seriously jeopardized if these quotas on meats are imposed; they will put us into an absurd and wholly contradictory situation; they will unquestionably weaken our power to secure meaningful agricultural accommodations from European countries where agriculture is an intensely sensitive agenda item, heavily enmeshed in the hard cold facts of internal politics.

Moreover, meat import quotas are an obvious violation of GATT, to which we have lawfully subscribed. Member countries will have a right to retaliate. This will injure the affected American industries, completely innocent of the whole affair, who will experience the misfortune of an export trade demolished unwittingly.

The simple truth is that American industry, taken as a whole, cannot in the final analysis gain by the imposition of quotas on one product. In the end other interests will suffer. These are the facts of international trade. The irony here is that the legislation, because of other variables, cannot in the long run solve the distress affecting cattlemen. The import level has already fallen to the objective desired through quotas.

I cannot, Mr. Speaker, associate myself with either the immediate or potential imposition of quotas on beef and other meat products. It is a dangerous piece of legislation which, in the final analysis, can do more harm than good.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, while I shall vote for adoption of the conference committee report on meat imports, I feel compelled to express a deep personal regret that the conferees did not accept the language that was adopted by the Sen-

ate before the Johnson administration was able to water down this bill.

However, being entirely realistic, I must confess that a half loaf is better than nothing at all for I am too well aware of the disinterest on the part of the Johnson administration and its lack of sympathy for the American cattle raisers and some of their pressing problems that have placed the American cattle industry on the brink of ruin.

It is very evident by virtue of this watered down version before us today that the Johnson administration has once again sided against the domestic cattle producer. Mr. Johnson must indeed be proud of the fancy footwork done by his Secretary of Agriculture in carrying out his instructions to "torpedo" the meaningful amendment voted earlier by the Senate.

I am well aware that in accepting this compromise, that the legislative cards have been stacked against those of us who have been waging a continuing struggle to alleviate the ruinous conditions that have been prevailing in the American domestic livestock industry. Press accounts give credit to the Secretary of Agriculture for wielding the scalpel so well that the net result is a watered down version of what was once a strongly worded Senate version which, up until today, offered a real ray of hope for our hard-pressed cattlemen.

I am only surprised that we wound up with any bill at all. Reliable stories were being circulated that the administration wanted to bail out some of its party stalwarts who voted against the American livestock producer when they voted to kill an earlier meaningful meat import restriction measure that was offered and supported so unanimously by Senate Republicans. These reports called for giving those Democratic Senators another chance to get off the hook on which they placed themselves by supporting the Johnson administration in voting against the American livestock producer. The idea was for the Senate to pass a restrictive meat import bill as an amendment to one already passed by the House of some minor proportion. Then the bill was to be killed in conference or at a minimum, the meat import amendment was to be removed, so that when the measure reached President Johnson's desk, he would not have to show again his hand that he could care less as to what happened to the American cattleman.

Naturally, in the face of the many cries of the minority Members here in the House of Representatives that this foul play was underway, the administration's cards had to be played a little differently. But the net result, in my estimation, comes out the same; namely, that this bill is not going to change much of anything. It leaves too much to the discretion of the President and his Secretary of Agriculture. We already know what their attitude happens to be. They would not do anything that might hurt their foreign friends, even if it meant restoring to American farmers the former vigorous economy that prevailed for much of the domestic cattle industry before cattlemen were

beset with the disastrous effects that fell upon them as a result of these excessive meat imports.

Mr. Speaker, thanks to President Johnson and Secretary Freeman, even if they enforce the provisions of this bill, the watered-down version calls for allowing continued heavy foreign importations of Australian and New Zealand meat at a rate that is 185 percent over and above the already high rate of meat importations from these two countries that existed back in 1961.

As a further example of the handiwork of the Johnson administration, I need only point out to you that President Johnson and Secretary Freeman have once more guaranteed in this measure to foreign exporters, just as they did in the secret Executive agreement they negotiated, a fixed share of the growth of our domestic consumption by the formula set forth in the language of the conference report.

I never cease to be amazed by the inconsistent attitude of the administration which on the one hand will express the hope that our domestic economy will continue to expand, but on the other hand, they tell us that any expansion in the agricultural economy through increased domestic cattle production is taboo. If the American farmer must increase his production to meet rising costs and more competitive conditions, the administration says this is wrong but at the same time, it proposes in the language of this measure to set forth a mathematical formula which, for all intents and purposes, guarantees to Australia and New Zealand a fixed share of our domestic economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is about time that the administration gave up its designs to place the American cattleman in a regimented economy. And I think it is high time that the administration recognized that livestock raising accounts for a substantial portion of farm income. One need only take note of the fact that the farming population in the United States has seen an actual net farm income drop of \$340 million from 1962 to 1963 and a further drop of about \$650 million expected in 1964. This will put net income for the current year \$92 million below the last Eisenhower year—even though there has been an increase of more than \$1 billion in Government payments to farmers. How much longer can the Johnson administration deny the fact that these are crucial times for the American domestic cattle raiser?

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's explanation of why lamb was omitted. It is true that percentage-wise, as the gentleman has pointed out, the case for inclusion of lamb may not appear to be urgent. At this point, since the report is not subject to amendment, debating the issue relating to lamb would serve no useful purpose.

The gentleman from Arkansas has made it clear that had the imports of lamb been comparable to that of beef, percentage-wise, his position and that of the conference would have been different. For the record I do want to register my disappointment that lamb was

not included, and briefly set forth my reasons.

Even though lamb is now coming in at an average annual rate of about 2½ percent of our consumption, that does not tell the entire story. It has been higher in the past, and we may expect it to increase in the future. In fact, only a few years ago the rate was on the order of 3½ percent.

What we do know is that during the past 6 years lamb imports, in various forms, have increased by 860 percent.

We also know that Government statistics confirm the fact that there has been a marked decline in lamb prices during the years of excessive imports.

We also know that our cost of production is twice as much as it is in the countries that export this lamb to this country.

Mr. Speaker, along with others I brought these facts to the attention of the conferees, along with other pertinent reasons. I further pointed out that since most of this meat comes from New Zealand and Australia, protecting beef but not lamb may be expected to stimulate an increase in lamb exports, to help offset any loss in beef exports.

I also pointed to the fact that in 1960 the Tariff Commission held extensive hearings under the escape clause with respect to lamb imports. Two of the members of that Commission filed a minority or dissenting report, holding that evidence proved substantial damage to our domestic lamb industry and they recommended a quota and import fee to offset this.

The conferees were also informed that lamb feeder organizations report that many lamb feeders have gone out of business because of imports. This has served to reduce outlets to consumer trade because the bulk of lambs are fattened by these feeders before marketing. Imports and threat of imports serve to disrupt normal marketing processes, making feeding operations hazardous and less profitable. Faced with no limitation on imports the industry is plagued by constant danger of seasonal upsurge in these imports which can—and has in many instances—been disastrous to our feeders as well as growers.

In other words, the lamb industry is damaged not only by a sudden upsurge in imports but also by the danger and the threat—which hangs over the market—of dumping operations which, at a critical time in the marketing, could drive domestic lamb prices down substantially. The real danger and damage is simply not reflected in the relatively low percentage figure of 2½ percent of our annual consumption.

Mr. Speaker, again I wish to commend the conference committee, even though I regret the omission of lamb and some other changes in the measure. But it was a compromise and the subject is controversial and difficult. The result is certainly better than nothing, and may indeed prove to be quite beneficial. The enactment of this law should add stability to the beef and mutton industry in this country.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to oppose this con-

ference report which would have the effect of imposing import quotas on certain meat and meat products.

This legislation is certain to result in higher prices to the consumer. The controlled import levels would raise the prices of both domestic production as well as that part of import qualified to enter our markets.

It is a nice scheme of price control at higher levels. American meat production should be able to compete with foreign production because of the countless Government aids and supports which contribute to meat production.

Although it is true that cattlemen are having special problems resulting from this year's production, these problems are related to internal market conditions and marketing excesses. It is foolhardy for this Congress to legislate under circumstances unique to this year's business. There is not sufficient evidence to attribute these problems to the low levels of import which have not been proved to be a permanent market factor.

Under these circumstances, we are legislating a price windfall to cattlemen both here and abroad who have larger profits to reap from a controlled marketing economy.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, Congressman CURTIS, and others who oppose adopting this conference report. Although I feel the beef industry may be entitled to some relief from a flood of imports, I strongly oppose relief being granted to but one section of our country and but one section of our economy in this manner.

For more than 3 years, the administration has solemnly promised to the wool manufacturers of America that quotas or quantitative restrictions on the import of wool manufactures would be granted. Although similar relief was given to cotton—plus outright subsidies in the wheat-cotton bill—promises to the wool manufacturers have been flagrantly violated.

It seems strange that a vital industry, such as wool manufacturing still is in spite of its trials and tribulations, is not being granted relief that has been promised, and all of a sudden the beef interests are given protective quotas. It is my understanding there are more than 200 quota bills in the Ways and Means Committee but none of them are being acted upon. Perhaps the best explanation behind this interest in protecting beef while ignoring such critical and important industries as the wool manufacturing industry, the fisheries industry, the textile industry, the shoe industry, the electronic industries to mention a few is that beef is of particular importance to the State of Texas. It appears that this legislation bears an unmistakable brand.

The all too brief debate that we have been allowed here indicates that this legislation will not even be of much help to the cattle industry. If so, it is indeed a hoax on the cattlemen. If not, then it is certainly a hoax on the consumer who once again is being victimized by the very administration that keeps

prating about measures to protect the consumer. The steadily rising price of coffee, sugar, and bread may now be matched by further increases in the price of meat to the consumer.

In addition, it should be pointed out that this legislation is also discriminatory in that it fails to protect the poultry and dairy industry. Although the cattlemen may be entitled to relief, it is unfair to single them out in this manner at a time when many industries throughout the Nation, and in New England, in particular, are in need of sound and sensible relief from excessive imports. As I have said before here in the House, our tariff structure should be reformed to reflect wage differentials between our Nation and those with whom we compete. In addition, our tariffs should reflect and take into account subsidies—direct or indirect—given by foreign governments to manufacturers who export to the United States. Wage differential and subsidy factors are needed to make our tariff structures more meaningful and constructive and to thus foster and increase healthy and fairly competitive foreign trade.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor of the House today to urge my colleagues to join with me in voting for the conference report on the measure before us, H.R. 1839, which would limit cattle, goat, and sheep imports into the United States.

I regret there is need for this legislation. However, I do not feel that the agreement reached earlier by the State Department with Australia and New Zealand has gone far enough in limiting importation of these meat products.

For this reason I personally introduced two bills which would establish import quotas and protect the domestic livestock industry of our great Nation.

While the bill before us today is not as extensive or as strong as the measures I introduced, nevertheless, I feel it is a step in the right direction and intend to give it my full support.

There are those today who have heard state that there is no reason to pass this legislation—that our livestock producers are not in need of this type of protection.

Let me just quote briefly from some of the letters I have received from Idaho cattlemen.

From Mr. Lowe L. Rudd of the Rudd Hereford Ranch, St. Anthony, Idaho, comes this report:

Here at the ranch we have a triple activity in cattle. We hurt in each phase. I'm selling fat steers for \$50 to \$60 less than I have in them. Our breeding cattle are swinging along the same line. We brought all of our bulls home as did half of the other consigners at the Idaho Falls and Blackfoot purebred sales. People need them but are afraid to buy.

And from Mr. Frank A. Titus, a cattleman from Jerome, Idaho:

Because I live on a farm and feed cattle and because I have just marketed my feeders at a substantial loss, I am real worried about the effects of heavy beef imports into this country. I think that the cattle industry is hurting from an oversupply of cattle on the domestic market and the effects of these imports are just disastrous.

Also from the Heiss Farms at Jerome, Idaho, comes this expression of concern:

As a breeder of Charolais and Charbray cattle I am very concerned over the extremely heavy beef imports into this country and its disastrous effects on the cattle industry.

It is my belief, as well as other cattlemen, that the only way to save the industry from complete ruin is to put a substantial curb on beef imports from other countries by immediately imposing reasonable quotas on the shipment of foreign beef into the United States.

It is unnecessary for me to point out to my colleagues that approximately one-third of the value of total U.S. farm and ranch production is represented by meat from cattle, hogs, and sheep, and cattle alone accounted for nearly 23 percent of the receipts from farm marketing in 1962.

I do sincerely regret that lamb has been omitted from the provisions of this bill. I feel that is one of the areas in which the bill is weak. Our sheep industry has been shortchanged by the elimination of lamb.

Should this industry continue to suffer from imports and the Congress fail to take remedial action, I predict that not only our agricultural economy but the economy of our entire Nation will suffer.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of this bill.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report to the bill, H.R. 1839, which I consider singularly important to an important segment of the American economy.

We know that what we are discussing here is the importation of meat and meat products into these United States from foreign lands. The fact that we are importing meats into this country is not of itself bad, but the quantity we are now importing seriously affects our economy, or rather an important segment of that economy.

The continued increase in beef imports, coupled with rising domestic production, has driven the price of cattle in this Nation down to where the American cattleman faces a crisis.

This year alone, approximately 11 percent of all meat consumed in this country will have come from foreign countries. Ranchers in these lands, favored by cheap labor and favorable taxes, seek an ever-increasing share of the lucrative U.S. meat market.

Imports in 1963 were equal to nearly 4 million head of cattle. Import poundage mixed with fat and fatty meats from cattle that was formerly sent to rendering plants, equals 3¼ million head of cattle.

This in itself is a serious matter, but let me point out further that more than 20 billion pounds of feed grains, largely surplus, would have been used if these cattle had been produced in the United States. More than 100 million man-hours of labor would have been required to produce, slaughter, and process these cattle. This represents a labor loss in the United States of \$6 to \$25 per head.

There is a loss of millions of dollars that would have been added to the American economy through associated industries.

We want to trade with foreign lands. Free trade is essential to all nations, but there must be a limit, there must be reasonable restrictions. The ever-increasing percentage of meats sold in this Nation coming from foreign lands is alarming, such imports should be reduced to a reasonable level.

We should not expect the American cattleman to pay the price for all other agricultural commodities which are exported from these shores. This is a valuable industry, and we need to see that it is allowed to be healthy.

American cattle producers just simply cannot compete with foreign producers and this is not their fault. They must pay heavier taxes, the equipment they must have was made by men paid higher wages than those of foreign producers. A report of five commissioners of agriculture stated that while on April 3, a difference of 1 cent existed between the cost of imported and domestic beef, yet the cost paid by the consumer represented nearly 20 cents per pound of profit for someone. There just is no comparison in the cost of production between the United States and foreign lands.

This measure is a good measure. It will help to maintain a great American enterprise, it will allow for the continuance of a large international trade in meat and meat products. It is a good measure and I urge its adoption.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on the bill providing for quotas on imports of certain meat and meat products. I wish to state very frankly that I had hoped the conferees would agree to the Senate bill. However, I realize that this is all that we can get at this time. I feel that the passage of the bill as agreed upon is a victory for our domestic livestock industry. We are not getting what we had hoped for, but the passage of this legislation is recognition of the fact that our cattle producers have suffered heavy losses on account of these imports, and at last Congress is doing something to help.

I am disappointed that lamb is omitted from the conference report. It is true that mutton remains in the bill, but our lamb producers are very unhappy over this omission.

As has been stated, it is not certain that any quotas will ever be established on imports of beef, veal, mutton, and other meat products, however, the bill does offer some hope for relief. I do not like the provision which gives the President the power to suspend any quotas that might be established. It is possible that our cattlemen are not getting very much under this measure. However, we are taking a step in the right direction by approving this conference report, even though it is much less than what we had expected.

Mr. Speaker, I have been working for some time to obtain quotas on these imports, and I have several bills pending at this time. I am happy to support this conference report, and I hope the bill as agreed upon will be effective in curtailing these imports of beef and other meat products in the coming years.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I have received communications from Oregon on the subject of meat quotas. I have given the matter a great deal of thought. I certainly do not regard myself as a doctrinaire freetrader. I believe my voting record will substantiate this statement. However, I have supported extensions of the reciprocal trade act and supported the so-called Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

Mr. Speaker, the inseparable connection between imports and exports is beyond dispute. There have been devastating economic consequences when this country has legislatively attempted to ignore this connection.

Certainly it must be recognized that each major farming State has a vital investment in our agricultural exports. In fiscal year 1963 agricultural exports totaled \$5.1 billion compared to \$2.1 billion worth of competitive or semicompetitive agriculture products we imported in the same year.

During the fiscal year just past this figure may have risen to about \$6 billion. Now, Mr. Speaker, it should be realized that meat and livestock exports are included in this amount. During calendar 1963, such exports carried a dollar value of \$364.2 million—an increase of about \$45 million above 1962. A call to the Department of Agriculture a few minutes ago brought forth the information that through the first 6 calendar months of this year, exports of meats from this country totaled 121.9 million product pounds, of which 25.1 million pounds represented beef.

We cannot expect our negotiators during the "Kennedy round" in Geneva to demand a loosening of the protective wall around the agriculture products of the Common Market countries while at the same time our national assembly is imposing import quotas on meat products.

Thus, if the conference report before us on H.R. 1839 is accepted, the GATT negotiations will be jeopardized. We can most likely expect retaliation from the six countries of the European Economic Community, the Common Market.

The Department of Agriculture in recent months, we may recall, has not been inactive. In early March of this year, Secretary Freeman announced a beef purchase program which has moved upwards of 160 million pounds of beef into channels leading to the needy. Long and short range programs are operating under the newly established National Cattle Industry Advisory Committee. Beef consumption at home is being encouraged as are beef exports. A voluntary import agreement between this country and major exporting countries, such as New Zealand, Ireland, Mexico, and Australia, has been put into effect. Under the impetus of such moves by Secretary Freeman, fed cattle prices, amounting to about \$20.50 a hundredweight in June 1964, rose to \$25 to \$26 at Chicago last week.

Moreover a study of the Tariff Commission, undertaken at the direction of the Senate Finance Committee, shows that rising imports do not necessarily mean falling domestic beef prices. For

example, the study sent to the Finance Committee June 30, shows that when imports increased by more than 400 pounds in 1961-62, prices rose. In 8 of the 13 years studied, the volume of imports and prices moved in the same direction rather than in opposite movements.

I suggest therefore that the conferees agreement be turned back.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I will reluctantly support the conference report on the bill, H.R. 1839, which allegedly restricts the importation of beef and certain other meat products from foreign countries.

I have listened carefully to the arguments in support of the conference report and I have yet to hear a legitimate reason why foreign lamb imports are not included under the purported restrictions.

Mr. Speaker, the freetraders in the executive branch of Government, including of course the State Department, have no intention of permitting real restrictions on foreign imports. This includes President Johnson.

The attempt to give at least some protection to American farmers and beef producers has long been a political football and Lyndon Johnson along with his lieutenants in Congress have made it just that. This milk-and-water legislation is a product of their political gimmickry.

I support this legislation only because it is impossible to obtain more effective action. I will vote for it in the hope, forlorn though it may be, that it will provide farmers and cattlemen some measure of relief.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, the matter before us relating to providing relief to our beef, dairy, and sheep industry frankly leaves me with mixed feelings. Every Member of this House, who will hear this problem without consideration for politics must admit to himself that these industries have really taken it on the chin. They are in serious need of remedial legislative action.

The conference report before us in my judgment can only be categorized as better than nothing. I will vote for it only for the reason that it is a step forward—it considers their problem and initiates recognition of the import quota concept as a necessary tool for negotiations as we proceed through this transition of developing free trade worldwide. I am not too optimistic about the financial relief it will provide to the cattlemen. Again, we find ourselves trapped in the position of not being able to amend, it is a take it or leave it proposition.

The administration, the Agriculture, and the State Departments have not given the American cattle, dairy, and sheep producers proper consideration by permitting the flood of imports to disrupt this industry. The lamb problem has been totally ignored.

Again, I want to repeat, I have no thought of jeopardizing the objectives of the trade expansion program but neither will I be silent when our own domestic producers are affected so seriously. The people have paid substantial taxes and have provided many jobs over the years and I can't for the life of me under-

stand why it need be so difficult to establish a workable and equitable formula of import quotas that would benefit all concerned.

This compromise, as included in the conference report is full of loopholes and opportunities where the administration can back off from taking a firm position to protect our domestic interests. I frankly believe the Congress should have adopted the bill as it left the Senate but there appears to be no alternative. I will reluctantly support this conference report but with a reminder that I will be watching the outcome and the relief to cattlemen in the future, as will many of my colleagues. With this being an election year in the Senate, we have found a lot of Johnny-come-lately friends. It will be interesting to see if this same enthusiasm and interest prevails after the election, should the need arise. For the sake of the cattlemen, I hope they are not the victims of a fast political maneuver. Only time will tell and I do not like to sound pessimistic but I would certainly like to see a stronger bill with less loopholes. I would feel substantially more confident for the future of the cattle industry.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I fear that the step the House is about to make is an unwise one and one that the country before long will have occasion to regret. I recognize the political pressures that exist in an election year, emanating from very powerful and articulate economic groups, and fear that those few who share my views of this problem may have occasion even sooner to regret their vote against this bill. Such considerations, however, should not temper our judgment on the merits of the proposal before us.

I shall vote "no" on the conference report. I do so with full acknowledgment of the masterful skill with which the gentleman from Arkansas has compromised the differences between the different parties.

I do so because this bill, in my opinion—shared, I might add by others—does absolutely nothing to relieve the distress of the cattle industry while adding immeasurably to our difficulties in expanding our trade abroad. You need only look at our balance-of-payment figures to realize how important that foreign trade is. You need only note the favorable balance-of-trade figures to realize how important that foreign trade is. You need only look at the figures on agricultural exports to realize that agriculture, more than any other single economic unit in the United States, stands to lose greatly by our failure to expand the export market.

I am not oblivious to the problems of the cattle industry. It is important to the economy of the United States and especially my State. And I am willing to take all proper and necessary steps to help them—Government purchases, changes in grading standards, loans, grants if necessary. But this bill is one that leads exactly nowhere as far as their problems are concerned.

Beef imports are now down to or below the quota called for in this bill. We have heard members of the conference

committee tell us this afternoon that the quota system will not be "triggered" this year, nor next—probably not in 1966 or, indeed ever. Then why pass it?

I have cattle in my district. I also have lumber and the lumber people have been having problems over the past few years—especially with Canadian imports into the eastern markets of the United States. They are handicapped by the provisions of the Jones Act which add to the shipping costs to the advantage of the Canadians. They have been aggressively seeking new markets abroad and, in a measure, are succeeding. Imports of American lumber to Australia are up 24.3 percent the first 6 months of this year over a corresponding period last year and Oregon has a substantial share of that market. Last year they were up 15 percent over 1962. Shipments of lumber to New Zealand from the United States are up 39.1 percent over the first 6 months of 1963. These are two major nations against whom this legislation is aimed. Does Oregon want New Zealand and Australia to raise quotas and keep our lumber out? No. We want to lower their trade barriers to expand our markets to furnish jobs for our lumber industry.

The production and marketing of pears is an important industry in my district. For a long time the industry has been working to break down the nontariff trade barriers imposed by the nations of Western Europe against our pears and other fresh fruit. I have worked on this during my tenure in the House. Very substantial progress has been made by the State Department and we look forward to sharing in a vastly increased export market in pears. More still remains to be done and we are making it vastly more difficult by the action taken here today. Pears mean jobs and income to my district.

The story could be repeated for many different items. Recall, if you will, the outrage which this Congress expressed at the trade barriers imposed by Western Europe against our poultry. Remember, if you will, that our agricultural exports totaled \$5.1 billion in fiscal 1962-63, of which \$3.6 billion was for dollars and the balance food for peace. For fiscal 1963-64 the total is expected to be over \$6 billion, of which \$4.3 billion will be exported for dollars. I repeat, agriculture has a big stake in our foreign trade.

I repeat also my willingness to help the cattlemen. I cannot, however support a bill which will do nothing to relieve their distress and which will do harm to others whom I represent.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, the comment of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. SHORT] which referred to Mr. Menzies' recent letter surely points to one of the weaknesses in the conference report.

As a matter of fact, it seems to me that the most obvious weaknesses in the conference report can be found in the language on page 7 of the "Statement of the Managers," beginning at the eighth line:

If a balance-of-payments deficit were to threaten U.S. fiscal integrity and if the situation could be materially improved by suspending or increasing quotas this would be in the overriding national economic interest. Speaking directly of agriculture, if other importing countries were in retaliation prepared to adopt tight restrictions covering a wide range of U.S. agricultural export products, and if the effect would be to reduce U.S. agricultural exports in an amount disproportionate to gains to the cattle industry, the overriding national economic interest might be served by suspending or increasing quotas.

Now, in the first instance, many Members of this House presently feel that a balance-of-payments deficit currently threatens U.S. fiscal integrity, to the second point, Mr. Menzies' letter speaks for itself. It is conceivable that these two facts under the language of the "Statement of the Managers"—which is after all legislative history of a most authoritative nature—could trigger a series of judgments which could render the law illusory at the very hour of its enactment. Let me remind the House that the language which I have quoted is intended to clarify the language of subsection (d) of paragraph 3 of the conference report and no standards are stated or implied in the act or in the "Statement of the Managers" which illuminate the phrases "materially improve," "tight restrictions," "a wide range of U.S. agricultural export products," "an amount disproportionate to gains to the cattle industry," or, for that matter, surrounding language.

We should not deceive ourselves about these weaknesses but rather recognize that we are for the effectuation of this act resting our outlook on the recurrent judgment of the President and his successors in office which is to say upon the judgment of those who advise Presidents in the first instance.

I also believe, with all due respect to statements made here previously, that the situation with respect to imported lamb is such that we have been in error to exclude it.

I must say, however, that on balance this bill is a most constructive work. In terms of the long future it may prove to be a better bill than one imposing strict import quotas which the other body was willing to impose and which have been acceptable to so many of us for so long. It has seemed to me throughout the past 2 years during which I have been intimately concerned with the progress toward this legislative goal, that our basic responsibility is to lodge control of the situation on this side of the oceans. To be sure, a threat of retaliation can suspend the operation of the law. However, assuredly this bill will not cripple the efforts of our friends with whom we trade. It will not drastically affect current trade practices anywhere in the world. But it does serve notice upon those with whom we trade and it does serve notice, and most earnestly sought

notice, to our domestic livestock producers of what the situation will be as time passes. Our friends will not be invited hastily to overexpand their livestock economy at the expense of the American livestock industry and our domestic producers will have some assurance of stability in the cattle cycle as a guide for capital investment. These seem to be most valuable things. As I have said on this floor before, the protection of the American livestock industry is the responsibility of this Congress. It is not the responsibility of the producers of any other nation. By the passage of this bill we are meeting this responsibility and although our action may have its weaknesses, the balance is on the side of strength and progress and in my opinion this represents a grassroots legislative victory of major proportions.

I congratulate the House conferees on pressing the matter to a conclusion.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH].

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I start off by assuring the membership of the House that no one is more conscious than I of the tremendous job that has been done by the conferees in this obviously difficult and somewhat delicate situation; but, Mr. Speaker, if it is not anticipated that these quotas will ever be imposed, then I raise the question of the propriety of imposing or establishing the machinery by which that can be done, particularly at this time, a most delicate time in the trade negotiations that are being conducted now in Geneva.

This in truth and in fact is a reversal of the trend this Congress has been following since 1935 through all the administrations that have intervened. It is a sorry day indeed when we serve notice on our perhaps declining number of friendly allies that they have to be on the alert in their normal commercial transactions for arbitrary restrictions and limitations that the Congress may with little if any notice impose on them.

I say, Mr. Speaker, this great body in which I have such great confidence should pause now and we should ask ourselves, "What damage, what great and lasting and permanent damage will we be doing to many if not all the segments of our own economy by placating, alleviating, and giving in to a selfish, predatory group which has manifested no concern for our overall national interest and in particular that of other segments of agriculture?"

That is what we are doing. We are pleasing them by giving them nothing, and one who is pleased in that manner is not worthy of the attention of this body.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEOGH. I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the statements made by the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, on August 14, I addressed a letter to my colleagues expressing my strong opposition to the action of the

other body in imposing rigid statutory import quotas on beef, veal, and mutton. On August 11, in connection with the consideration of the resolution under which the meat import quota bill was sent to a conference committee, I enumerated many reasons why I thought this legislation was not in the best interests of the United States. On August 15, I sent a further memorandum to my colleagues pointing out that we have a favorable balance of trade of \$5 billion, of which \$3 billion constitutes trade in agricultural products, and that we may well suffer retaliation not only on those agricultural products, such as wheat and feed grains, tobacco, rice, soybeans, and so forth, but also on our industrial products, if this legislation is enacted.

Mr. Speaker, I will not today burden the House with all of the arguments which I heretofore made against what I consider to be extremely unwise legislation. However, I wish to reiterate that I do not regard it to be in the best interests of the United States, because, first, it will not help the cattle producer; second, it can be expected to materially increase the cost of domestic meat prices in the cheaper grades of meat which are used most extensively by the American consumer; third, it will injure us in our negotiations under the forthcoming meetings; and fourth, in the form in which it was handled every Member of this House is foreclosed from offering any amendments to the legislation which is now before us. It is bad procedurally and it is bad in substance. I have heretofore pointed out that there are no less than 125 bills, introduced by 89 Members, pending before the Committee on Ways and Means which would impose import quotas in some form on products other than meat, and I have further pointed out that this list does not include more than 400 tariff bills the majority of which would impose higher duties on a variety of products, which are also pending before the Committee on Ways and Means. The authors of this other pending legislation have no consideration in the procedure under which we find ourselves today.

Our allies, Australia and New Zealand primarily, have reason for more than a passing interest in H.R. 1839, the legislation affecting importation of beef into the United States, and must fully realize how deep has been the controversy over this measure.

It further stands to reason that all beef exporting countries which ship to the U.S. market know that our consumer groups and others interested in maintaining good relations with our allies have fought bitterly against any measure which would hamper these allies, particularly over this meat import controversy.

Our beef-exporting allies must know of the valiant work done in this controversy by the Meat Importers Council, Inc., and other industrial and pro bono publico groups, to prevent legislation which would have been detrimental to all concerned.

For that reason, the record of this debate in the House should include an expression of the spirit behind the action

of the Congress—that it expects that no discrimination or retaliatory action will be taken in any of the beef exporting nations against any American-owned companies working within their borders.

By this, I do not mean to imply that any such retaliation or discrimination against American-owned companies working in Australia, New Zealand, or any other meat-exporting nation is to be expected. Yet, in fulfillment of our obligation as legislators, I feel that it would be remiss not to include this as being an important factor for the guidance of the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Agriculture in future dealings with our allies, on this and other matters of mutual interest.

This is legislation which should have full and complete hearings before the committee of the House of Representatives which, under the Constitution, is supposed to handle tariff and trade legislation—the Committee on Ways and Means. Under the procedure with which today we are confronted, there is not even an opportunity for an executive session by the committee for the offering of amendments—let alone the conduct of full public hearings which legislation of this nature requires.

Mr. Speaker, for the reasons which I have quite fully established, I am opposed to this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include an editorial that appeared in the well-known Boston Herald.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. I thank my colleagues.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, the editorial is as follows:

HIGH COST OF MEAT QUOTAS

House and Senate conferees are still wrangling over a Senate effort to attach beef quota legislation to a harmless House bill on the importation of wildlife.

The Senate amendment would limit beef imports after 1964 to the average annual amount brought in between 1959 and 1963. It would mean sharp cutbacks from 1964 import levels, and would theoretically increase the market for domestic beef.

Chief opposition to date has come from the State Department, which fears that the imposition of beef quotas by the United States will bring retaliations from other beef-producing nations and undermine our efforts to win a general lowering of trade barrier in the so-called Kennedy round.

Increasingly, however, another argument is being heard. This points to the effect quotas will have on the American consumer. Congressman JAMES BURKE, of Massachusetts, for example, has recently denounced the quota plan as a "raid on the pocketbook of the consumers."

Pointing out that domestic overproduction of fed beef, not imports, is the real cause of the cattle industry's trouble, he told the House:

"We cannot afford to restrict our meat imports to artificially low levels. We're not importing in any significant quantity the kind of beef that is important in our domestic production. That's the kind that was under continuing price pressure through 1963. We're importing a kind of beef we don't produce enough of at home. We're importing a kind of beef that's equivalent to the beef from our old cows and bulls. This beef is used for hamburgers, for manufactur-

ing hotdogs, sausages, luncheon meats. These are foods our children love. These are foods our poorer families can afford to eat more often than the big juicy beefsteak.

"The working family would be hardest hit as they would be forced into paying higher prices for meat products for the family."

So there are two strong reasons for turning down the Senate beef amendment. Whatever the result of the conference, the House should hold firm and refuse to go along with this dangerous experiment in protectionism. What we want is lower trade barriers and lower prices, not the reverse.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEOGH. I yield to the distinguished and most capable member of our committee, the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS].

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks and point out that the very theory of protection is to increase the domestic prices. In fact, this theory of protection has been a light that has failed—from McKinley to Kennedy. It temporarily increases domestic prices and it has always cost us our foreign markets. This will be true in this case, too. We are hurting our friends, and finally ourselves. Protection will result in a depressed domestic and world price on beef and other products.

I trust we are not sending up a signal that any group of lobbyists in this country can come in here among the 200 others that are seeking protection and ask for additional protection.

Mr. Speaker, of all the people involved in this operation, the beef producers of this country deserve protection the least. They are already getting favorable tax treatment, which is one of the reasons for our own tremendous beef production. We would be better advised to remove the capital gains treatment from breeder stock than to set up a quota restriction under which our best customers and our best friends can sell beef to us.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEOGH. I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the consumers of my district and of the Nation, I think this is mischievous legislation which its sponsors themselves will regret if it becomes law. We are inviting other countries—particularly those which sell us beef and sheep in fresh, chilled, or frozen form to retaliate immediately against American agricultural imports. We actually invite them to do so by the language in this report, for it says that if they threaten to retaliate or do retaliate, the President can immediately suspend these quota restrictions. How long would it take this Congress to act if some other government imposed restrictions on our products with a public notice that they would lift the restrictions the minute we started to retaliate?

But from the consumer aspect, the point here is that we are asked to deliberately raise the prices of all beef and all beef products merely because a substantial amount of foreign beef goes into hot dogs and commercial hamburger.

Why does not American beef compete for this market? They are not doing so.

Mr. Speaker, we are spending millions upon millions of dollars contributed by taxpayers, who in most instances live in cities, in order to support the American cattle industry by purchasing choice beef for the school lunch program and other surplus removal outlets. More money has been spent on beef under section 32 than on any other commodity. Now, you can say this is section 32 money that the taxpayer does not contribute to—that it comes from customs receipts. But who pays the customs receipts? The American consumer pays them in the cost of imported products—including imported meat. Between March 2 and June 19 we spent \$65 million to support the price of beef.

Mr. Speaker, this bill should be defeated. There have been no hearings by either the Ways and Means Committee or the Senate Finance Committee on the merits or justification for quota restrictions on low-grade beef and sheep carcasses. The National Commission on Food Marketing has a responsibility to study this matter objectively, and, as a member of that Commission, it would be my intention to be objective, but that is going to be hard to do if the Congress jams down our throats a mandatory quota without any hearings or investigation.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEOGH. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Is it not true that under the formula in this bill, when there is a big surplus of beef on the market and we do not need imports, the amount that is permitted to come in increases; and the supply decreases, and imports could be used to stabilize supplies then the supply that is permissible to come in also decreases? In other words, it is an upside down formula; is that not correct?

Mr. KEOGH. It would seem so, but I do not want to get into any argument on that.

Mr. Speaker, in their celestial abodes, there are residents whom we know and I shudder to think what the spirit of the great Cordell Hull is saying to the spirit of the great John Kennedy when they witness what this body, I know, is about to do.

Mr. Speaker, I have been around here long enough to know that when the motor in the juggernaut is started and when the gears are shifted into the go position, the best thing for a little boy from Brooklyn to do is to get out of the way. But, Mr. Speaker, today I am going to get out of the way of that juggernaut with the loudest resounding "no" that you have ever heard me utter.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I think it would be appropriate for me at this point to yield 2 minutes to the author of the bill, H.R. 1839, the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, I stood here in the well of the House and pleaded with my colleagues to be sure that they referred to H.R. 1839 as the Teague bill.

This was because I was proud to have been the father of such a clean, beautiful little fellow as 1839. Every one of you helped in his delivery because he emerged from this body by unanimous vote. He was prepared to do great things for boa constrictors and gorillas and their owners.

But in the course of events, my little baby was sent to the Senate pediatric hospital. He was horribly neglected there for a year and a half. During all of those months he was kept in dank closets and pigeonholes.

Then, recently, some of the eminent surgeons in the Senate hospital, headed by Drs. MANSFIELD and KEATING, I believe, decided to perform major surgery on poor little 1839.

The operation was a great success by the standards which prevail in the Senate hospital. My little fellow was completely gutted. All that remained of him was the identification number on his poor little wrist. He no longer even bore my name. His little shell, however, had been stuffed by the surgeons in the Senate hospital with all sorts of things entirely foreign to 1839, his heritage and ancestry.

This new creature was sent back to the House not bearing the slightest resemblance to the splendid little fellow who left here 3 years ago.

Our surgeons, Drs. MILLS, BYRNES, and CURTIS made heroic attempts at plastic surgery to restore 1839 to his original condition and character. But, alas, I fear they have failed.

Mr. Speaker, I must disclaim fatherhood of 1839 as he is before us today. I am willing to contribute a little to his support, but he is not mine—my blood no longer flows in his veins.

I suggest that Dr. Calver be asked to perform a blood test to determine whether Dr. MANSFIELD or some other person in the Senate hospital is the real father. Or perhaps it is Dr. MILLS. It could be Dr. BYRNES, but under all the circumstances, I suppose that is unlikely.

But I repeat, Mr. Speaker, "This child ain't mine."

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], a member of the conference committee.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is important that I point out to my colleagues that although I signed the conference report, in order to bring this matter to the floor, as the promise was, so that the House could work its will, I certainly do not recommend that anyone vote for it. I myself shall vote against it.

A great deal of what the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] said about the dire consequences to our country inherent in this bill is true. Indeed, what he said was exactly what the administration witnesses, including the Under Secretary of State, the Secretary of Agriculture, and Ambassador Herter, our chief trade negotiator, said.

I wish to repeat here what I said in the Ways and Means Committee and during the conference. This entire matter can be resolved within a very short time if the administration spokesmen will go back to President Lyndon John-

son and have him say publicly no more than what they have said to us about the dire consequences to our country if the bill passes and what we heard the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] say. Yet that word from the President has not been forthcoming.

This is either a hoax on the consumer or it is a hoax on the cattle owner—or perhaps it is a hoax on both. I do not wish to be a part of this kind of operation.

I wish to discuss procedures a bit. People seem concerned about the Constitution of the United States only when it pertains to something which is of concern to them. In the Constitution it is provided that tax measures—and this is a tax measure, having to do with tariffs—shall originate only in the House of Representatives. This is why I have been fighting the nongermane amendments which are tacked on to our tax bills when they come back from the other body.

This has gone to the extreme that the other body knocked everything out of the tax bill of the House except the number. I raised this question in conference. After knocking out everything but the number, can Members so violate the Constitution as to bring this matter back with nothing but a bill originating in the other body. It is no amendment to a House tax bill.

This is a question of procedures, which I know many do not pay much attention to, but this is important and it is basic.

Finally, I make the observation that perhaps something has happened which we and the public do not know about. Perhaps the cattle owners have not been as foolish as this sounds. Perhaps there is a deal which has been made under the table, just as there was so far as the textile people were concerned a few years ago. The only way we are going to find that out will be in the ensuing months.

I can state that under the provisions of the bill and the report there is an item which says that the President can suspend any quotas if such action is required by overriding economic or national security.

If any quotas go into effect—in accordance with the provisions of the bill—if anyone were to ask the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Agriculture or Mr. Herter whether in their judgment overriding economic circumstances did not now prevail, the answer of course would have to be "yes." And the quotas would be suspended.

I think this is a very sorry day not just for the House of Representatives but for the Congress and, I regret to say, for our Nation.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. First, I want to compliment the distinguished gentleman on his excellent statement. Now, I have one question. The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] made very strong statements to the effect that this conference report would pull the rug out from underneath U.S. negotiators in Geneva on tariff and trade problems.

Now the gentleman is a good spokesman for the administration and always has been. How can he say this, then, when other spokesmen for the administration on his side of the aisle take the position President Johnson would sign the conference report? How could he sign it if, in fact, it would pull the rug out from underneath the United States and its negotiators in Geneva?

Mr. CURTIS. I might say to the gentleman the administration leaders who were in our sessions said they felt this was a bad bill—almost the language that the gentleman from New York used—but they would reluctantly not advocate a veto.

The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means has already told us in his judgment the President apparently will not veto it. I think President Johnson has to answer to the country on this.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, permit me to advise my colleagues in conclusion of this debate that I and everyone else, I am sure, would have preferred that this legislation not rise and the circumstances that prompted it not have come about, but those who talk about reciprocal trade agreements and those who talk about world trade action should bear in mind that I, too, have been interested in promoting world trade. I think I can pardonably take credit for a little bit of the success that we have experienced legislatively in the passage of legislation of that nature. However, Mr. Speaker, at the same time let me point out that I deem it a responsibility as a Member of the House of Representatives ever to be mindful—ever to be mindful—of the overriding economic interests of the people of the United States as we seek to enlarge markets abroad.

Mr. Speaker, all we are trying to do here is to resolve a very knotty problem in a way that will give to those who need protection the protection they need without bringing into existence all of the dark consequences that would follow some other type of approach to providing that degree of protection or perhaps an unneeded and unwarranted degree. I want to assure my colleagues I feel they can justifiably support this conference report, having in mind the best interests of the consumers and having in mind the best interests of all of the people of the United States. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Does anyone on the minority side have a motion? If not, the Clerk will report the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. KELLY moves to recommit the conference report to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The motion to recommit was not agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 232, nays 149, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 236]

YEAS—232

Abbt	Fuqua	Patman
Abele	Gary	Pepper
Abernethy	Gathings	Perkins
Albert	Gonzalez	Pickle
Anderson	Gooding	Page
Andrews, Ala.	Grant	Poff
Andrews,	Gray	Purcell
N. Dak.	Griffin	Quile
Arends	Gross	Quillen
Ashbrook	Gurney	Randall
Ashmore	Hagan, Ga.	Reid, Ill.
Aspinall	Haley	Rhodes, Ariz.
Auchincloss	Hall	Rivers, S.C.
Baker	Halleck	Roberts, Ala.
Baldwin	Hansen	Roberts, Tex.
Barrett	Harding	Rogers, Colo.
Bass	Hardy	Rogers, Fla.
Battin	Harris	Rogers, Tex.
Becker	Harrison	Rooney, Pa.
Beckworth	Harsha	Roudebush
Beermann	Harvey, Ind.	Roush
Belcher	Hays	Saylor
Bennett, Fla.	Henderson	Schadeberg
Berry	Herlong	Schenck
Betts	Horan	Schwengel
Boggs	Horton	Scott
Bolton,	Huddleston	Secrest
Oliver P.	Hull	Selden
Bonner	Hutchinson	Senner
Bow	Ichord	Short
Bray	Jarman	Shriver
Brock	Jennings	Sikes
Bromwell	Jensen	Siler
Brooks	Johansen	Sisk
Brotzman	Johnson, Calif.	Skubitz
Brown, Ohio	Johnson, Pa.	Slack
Broyhill, N.C.	Johnson, Wis.	Smith, Va.
Broyhill, Va.	Jonas	Snyder
Bruce	Kastenmeier	Springer
Burkhalter	Kilgore	Stafford
Burleson	Knox	Staggers
Burton, Utah	Kornegay	Steed
Byrnes, Wis.	Laird	Stephens
Casey	Langen	Stinson
Cederberg	Latta	Stratton
Chamberlain	Lennon	Stubblefield
Chief	Lipscomb	Taft
Chenoweth	Lloyd	Talcott
Clancy	Long, La.	Taylor
Clark	Long, Md.	Teague, Calif.
Clausen,	McCulloch	Teague, Tex.
Don H.	McDade	Thomas
Clawson, Del.	McIntire	Thompson, La.
Collier	McLoskey	Thompson, Tex.
Colmer	McMillan	Thomson, Wis.
Cooley	Mahon	Trimble
Cramer	Marsh	Tuck
Cunningham	Martin, Nebr.	Tuten
Dague	Mathias	Udall
Davis, Ga.	Matsunaga	Ullman
Davis, Tenn.	Matthews	Van Pelt
Dent	May	Vinson
Denton	Meador	Waggonner
Devine	Michel	Watson
Dole	Mills	Watts
Dorn	Montoya	Weaver
Dowdy	Moore	Westland
Downing	Morgan	Wharton
Edmondson	Morris	White
Elliott	Morrison	Whitener
Everett	Moss	Whitten
Evins	Murray	Wickersham
Fascell	Natcher	Williams
Fisher	Nelsen	Willis
Flynt	Norblad	Wilson, Ind.
Foreman	O'Konski	Wright
Fountain	Olsen, Mont.	Young
Frelinghuysen	Olson, Minn.	
Fulton, Tenn.	Passman	

NAYS—149

Addabbo	Grabowski	O'Brien, N.Y.
Ashley	Green, Oreg.	O'Hara, Ill.
Ayres	Green, Pa.	O'Hara, Mich.
Barry	Griffiths	O'Neill
Bates	Grover	Osmer
Bell	Gubser	Ostertag
Boland	Hagen, Calif.	Patten
Bolling	Halpern	Pelly
Brademas	Hanna	Phillips
Broomfield	Hawkins	Pike
Brown, Calif.	Healey	Pillion
Burke	Hechler	Powell
Burton, Calif.	Hollifield	Price
Byrne, Pa.	Holland	Pucinski
Cahill	Hosmer	Reid, N.Y.
Cameron	Joelson	Reuss
Cleveland	Karsten	Rhodes, Pa.
Cohelan	Karth	Rich
Conte	Keith	Riehlman
Corbett	Kelly	Rivers, Alaska
Corman	Keogh	Robison
Curtin	Kilburn	Rooney, N.Y.
Curtis	King, Calif.	Rosenthal
Daniels	King, N.Y.	Rostenkowski
Dawson	Kirwan	Roybal
Derounian	Kluczynski	Rumsfeld
Derwinski	Kunkel	Ryan, N.Y.
Diggs	Leggett	St. Germain
Donohue	Libonati	St. Onge
Dulski	Lindsay	Schneebeli
Duncan	McDowell	Schweiker
Dwyer	McFall	Sibal
Edwards	Macdonald	Sickles
Fallon	MacGregor	Smith, Iowa
Feighan	Madden	Staeuber
Findley	Mailliard	Sullivan
Finnegan	Martin, Calif.	Thompson, N.J.
Fino	Martin, Mass.	Tupper
Flood	Milliken	Utt
Fogarty	Minish	Van Deerlin
Ford	Minshall	Vanik
Friedel	Monagan	Wallhauser
Fulton, Pa.	Moorhead	Weitner
Gallagher	Morton	Wildnall
Garmatz	Mosher	Wilson, Bob
Glaimo	Multer	Wilson,
Gibbons	Murphy, Ill.	Charles H.
Gilbert	Murphy, N.Y.	Wyder
Glenn	Nedzi	Younger
Goodell	Nix	Zablocki

NOT VOTING—49

Adair	Gill	Pirnie
Alger	Harvey, Mich.	Pool
Avery	Hébert	Rains
Baring	Hoeven	Reifel
Blatnik	Hoffman	Rodino
Bolton,	Jones, Ala.	Roosevelt
Frances P.	Jones, Mo.	Ryan, Mich.
Buckley	Kee	St. George
Carey	Kyl	Sheppard
Celler	Landrum	Shipley
Daddario	Lankford	Smith, Calif.
Delaney	Lesinski	Toll
Dingell	McClory	Tollefson
Ellsworth	Miller, Calif.	Whalley
Farbstein	Miller, N.Y.	Winstead
Forrester	Morse	Wyman
Fraser	Pilcher	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Shipley for, with Mr. Roosevelt against.
Mr. Forrester for, with Mr. Daddario against.

Mr. Winstead for, with Mr. Toll against.
Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Rodino against.

Mr. Pool for, with Mr. Delaney against.
Mr. Pilcher for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mrs. Kee for, with Mr. Farbstein against.
Mr. Rains for, with Mr. Carey against.

Mr. Landrum for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Jones of Alabama for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Mr. Hoeven for, with Mr. Morse against.
Mr. Alger for, with Mr. Pirnie against.

Mrs. Frances P. Bolton for, with Mr. Lesinski against.

Mr. Ellsworth for, with Mr. Ryan of Michigan against.

Mr. Reifel for, with Mr. Buckley against.
Mr. Smith of California for, with Mr. Lankford against.

Mrs. St. George for, with Mr. McClory against.

Mr. Kyl for, with Mr. Wyman against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Harvey of Michigan.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Tollefson.

Mr. Fraser with Mr. Whalley.

Mr. Gill with Mr. Hoffman.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Adair.

Mr. GUBSER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that those Members who spoke on the conference report just adopted may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material in the form of charts and so on.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, when the vote was taken on the conference report on H.R. 1839—meat importation bill—I was appearing before the committee on resolutions and platform of the 1964 Democratic National Convention to make a statement of my position on Federal aid to education.

I returned to the floor immediately following my appearance before the committee, but not in time to cast my vote on this bill. Had I been present I would have voted "no" on this anticatcatessen, anticonsumer legislation.

This bill is against the whole spirit and principle of international trade agreements based upon reciprocal considerations and I hope that the President will veto this legislation.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 1160. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1965, and for other purposes.

INTERNATIONAL COFFEE AGREEMENT ACT OF 1964

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 8864) to carry out the obligations of the United States under the International

Coffee Agreement, 1962, signed at New York on September 28, 1962, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1803)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8864) to carry out the obligations of the United States under the International Coffee Agreement, 1962, signed at New York on September 28, 1962, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6; and agree to the same.

W. D. MILLS,
CECIL R. KING,
HALE BOGGS,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
THOS. B. CURTIS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

HARRY F. BYRD,
RUSSELL B. LONG,
GEO. A. SMATHERS,
JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
FRANK CARLSON,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8864) to carry out the obligations of the United States under the International Coffee Agreement, 1962, signed at New York on September 28, 1962, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: Under the bill as passed by the House, the short title for the bill was the "International Coffee Agreement Act of 1963." Senate amendment numbered 1 strikes out "1963" and inserts "1964". The House recedes.

Amendment No. 2: This amendment adds a new section 4 to the bill providing that whenever the Congress finds, in a concurrent resolution agreed to by the two Houses, that there is an unwarranted increase in the price of coffee in the United States attributable, in whole or in part, to the application or operation of the International Coffee Agreement, 1962, the President shall cause a copy of such concurrent resolution to be transmitted to the International Coffee Council and the Executive Board established under chapter IV of such agreement. The new section 4 would also provide that if, after the expiration of 30 days after the transmittal of such concurrent resolution, the President finds that the Council has failed to make such adjustments of quotas, or to take such other action, as is necessary to remedy the situation, the President is authorized and directed to cause to be filed with the Secretary-General of the United Nations, in accordance with the provisions of article 68 of such agreement, written notice of with-

drawal of the United States from the International Coffee Agreement, 1962. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 3: The bill as passed by the House authorized the President to exercise any powers conferred on him by the bill through such agency or officer as he shall direct. Under Senate amendment numbered 3, the President would be authorized to exercise any powers and duties conferred on him by the bill, other than the powers and duties conferred by the new section 4 added by Senate amendment numbered 2, through such agency or officer as he shall direct. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 4, 5, and 6: These are clerical amendments. The House recedes.

W. D. MILLS,
CECIL R. KING,
HALE BOGGS,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
THOS. B. CURTIS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBERSTEIN].

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, as a result of testifying before the Democratic platform committee, I just missed the vote on the previous conference report. If I were present, I would have voted "nay."

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the conference report we are presently considering is in connection with the bill H.R. 8864 which passed the House on November 14, 1963, authorizing the President to carry out the obligations of the United States under the International Coffee Agreement, which was at an earlier date ratified by the Senate.

This matter comes back to the House today with certain amendments which have been adopted by the Senate, having passed that body very recently. The Senate has already, incidentally, adopted the conference report that we are now considering. H.R. 8864 as it passed the House, Mr. Speaker, was designed to provide, and only to provide, the necessary implementing legislation to enable the United States to meet its obligations under the agreement previously referred to, that was ratified by the Senate.

That agreement is now the law of the land Mr. Speaker, and it is questionable in my mind whether or not the American citizen and the consuming public can be fully protected from the past erratic behavior in coffee prices without our approving the implementing legislation which is involved in this bill and this conference report. The House conferees, therefore, urge its adoption.

Now let us look to see what we did. As the bill was passed, first, it would authorize the President to require all coffee entering the U.S. markets from member nations of this agreement and exports of this commodity to be accompanied by a certificate of origin or a certificate of re-export. That is the first thing the bill did.

Secondly, it would authorize the President to limit imports of coffee from

countries which have not joined in the agreement.

Third, it would authorize the President to require the keeping of certain records and statistics and other information as well as to take such other action as he may consider necessary to implement the obligations of the United States under the agreement.

Finally, it requires the President to submit an annual report to the Congress concerning the operation of the agreement not later than January 15 of each year.

The other body left essentially unchanged the language of the bill as it passed the House but added an amendment. This is the important amendment, the rest of them are clerical and technical and merely improve the language of the House bill. But this amendment, the one I am talking about that was added, provides that if Congress passes a concurrent resolution finding that an unwarranted increase in domestic coffee prices is attributable to the operation of this agreement, the President is directed to notify the International Coffee Council of this action and unless he determines that appropriate remedial action is taken by the Council within 30 days, the President then must initiate action under article 68 for our withdrawal from the agreement.

While there was some question raised initially about the constitutionality of this particular provision, it is now agreed, I think, by all the departments involved and others speaking as lawyers, that it does afford sufficient discretion and latitude for the President to act and would thus not constitute an invasion of his constitutional prerogatives nor change the agreement itself; because the agreement itself provides for the way for us to get out of the agreement.

What we are saying is that if the remedial action that we direct the President to obtain is not obtained then he must proceed to get action on withdrawal from the agreement within 30 days after the failure to get that remedial action.

In view of all this, and because the conferees of the other body were convinced that it affords protection, as were the House conferees, in addition to the protections already provided in the International Coffee Agreement for consumers, the managers on the part of the House have recommended in the conference report that the House recede and agree to the Senate amendment.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment was offered by the distinguished Senator from the State of Illinois, the minority leader of the Senate. Your House conferees, always interested as they are in avoiding increases in the price of imported articles to consumers or avoiding unduly increased prices of domestically produced articles, readily agreed to this, because it gives the Congress of the United States a greater degree of control over whether we remain in the agreement that has already been approved by the Senate, than did the bill as it passed the House. The Senate, which consented to the treaty, agreed to this amendment and we felt we should accept it.

Mr. Speaker, let me look specifically at the question of whether or not the agreement itself that was ratified by the Senate has brought about any abnormal, unreasonable increases in the price of coffee, to see whether or not the implementation of this agreement by this particular conference report will mean the establishment of unreasonable prices for coffee here in the United States.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we can take the original treaty date which was in the year 1962, or the date of the deposit of notice of ratification of the agreement in December 1963. The price of coffee was around 70 to 71 cents at retail. The price of coffee today is about 84 cents, or less, representing a recovery from abnormally low levels that prevailed previously.

Now, Mr. Speaker, permit me to contrast this present price with the price of coffee of \$1.25 a pound that prevailed back in the middle part of the 1950's when we had no agreement and long before anyone had thought in terms of the implementation of such an agreement.

Let us now look to see what is the current outlook for prices. Do we anticipate on the basis of the best information available—this is in the channels of trade as well as within the departments of Government—that there will be an increase beyond the current price of coffee? The current outlook, I am advised by those who know, Mr. Speaker, is for stable prices, and that would be for a period of time into the future. During that period of time there might even be a modest downturn in the price of coffee on the basis of the situation which exists throughout the world and under the agreement.

Now, this of course assumes—any prediction about agricultural production assumes—that there will be no great change due to droughts and other acts of nature. I want my friends to know that I am just as much concerned about the price of coffee as anyone. I may be more concerned than some people because I enjoy coffee. I drink my share of the product. I have a partner, my wife, who does considerable shopping for groceries, and I might say personally, if the price of something is a little bit unreasonable in her opinion, I hear about it.

I should also remind Members of the House that there is a mechanism in the coffee agreement, an arrangement if you please, whereby we can utilize, just as we did utilize earlier this year, to obtain additional shipments of coffee from the producing countries at any time we feel that those increased shipments are justified and needed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have gotten into a defense of the agreement itself rather than to talk strictly in terms of the implementing legislation. But permit me to say this in conclusion, and then I shall yield to other Members of the House. There was, as I recall, a record vote when this matter passed. Anyone who could justify a vote in November when this bill was up for consideration can today justify a vote for the conference report, for if a person was satisfied then that this implementing legislation should pass, he can take double

assurance from the adoption of the conference report today because all that is involved is this additional amendment that I have described that provides the opportunity for the Congress to trigger the withdrawal from the agreement in the event prices should act differently from what I think they will and reach unreasonable levels. I had not thought this assurance was necessary due to provisions to protect against this in the treaty but I am very willing to accept the Senate amendment as an added assurance.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I perhaps am more anxious to congratulate than to criticize. Therefore I seize this opportunity to say to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means that the pending conference report represents a studious, logical, and proper way for us to deal with an article of important international trade. It does it in a multilateral manner. It affords a kind of protection that our friendly allies need where this item is the most important item of their economy. Yet it affords to the domestic consumers the protection which we should give to them.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I say that our conferees have done their usual good job. They are now back on the right track on this pending conference report, and I am delighted to join in support of it.

Mr. MILLS. On behalf of all the members of the conference group, the managers on the part of the House and the managers on the part of the Senate, all of whom signed the conference report, making it unanimous, we thank the gentleman.

Mr. KEOGH. My only concern is that in connection with the previous conference report the chairman used the word "trigger." He used it again in connection with this.

Mr. MILLS. Yes.

Mr. KEOGH. I do not know exactly in what sense it was used.

Mr. MILLS. Not in any dangerous sense, I must assure the gentleman. But under this amendment adopted by the Senate the Congress can trigger the situation of our getting out of the agreement if the Congress wants to. Bear in mind this implementation is only for a limited period of time. The whole of this subject matter will have to be reviewed by October 1, 1965.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. First of all, let me say that a few minutes ago the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH], was deeply concerned about consumer prices. Now he gives his full-fledged support and endorsement to this proposal which im-

plements the International Coffee Agreement, which in turn has kicked coffee prices right on up.

Mr. MILLS. No. I do not yield on that point. If the gentleman has a question I will try to answer it.

I gave you a figure on the price of coffee. The agreement itself, and certainly the implementing legislation, the gentleman from Iowa had occasion to discuss when it was before the House. In my opinion none of that has had anything to do with the 13- or 14-cent increase in the price of coffee, because we are under that agreement to receive on the basis of a country-by-country allocation of a quota, such amount of coffee as we determine here we are going to need and consume. If there is no shortage of coffee coming into the United States as a result of an agreement, what is there about the agreement that would cause the price to go up?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I have the record here, and I am sure the gentleman has the record. When the bill was before the House, H.R. 8864, last November, the gentleman at that time told the Members of the House there would be no increase.

Mr. MILLS. I did not say there would not be. I said there would be no increase, in my opinion, in the price of coffee as a result of this legislation. I urged passage so as to give the assurance of stability to our consumers and our friends.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to quote the gentleman's words. I have them here.

Mr. MILLS. That was probably a 30-minute speech, and I do not know whether I have time to listen or not. I remember what I said, and I am saying the same thing now, that there is nothing about the agreement that we have entered into, in my opinion, and there is nothing about the implementing legislation that is involved in this conference report, that in any way would justify an increase in the price of coffee through these things and these things alone. The purpose of the agreement is simply to provide stability to coffee prices.

Mr. GROSS. At what point?

Mr. MILLS. I think we have it stabilized now.

Mr. GROSS. At 91 or 92 cents a pound? Sure.

Mr. MILLS. My friend from Iowa, coming from a great State that produces so many fine agricultural commodities, knows that there are many factors in the production of an agricultural commodity that determine how many pounds or bushels of that product there are going to be. There is no way we can legislate controls over weather in South America. There is no way we can legislate controls over these unknown factors that may do again just what they did in the middle fifties when they raised the price of coffee to the American people to \$1.25.

What I am saying is that there is nothing in this agreement, nothing in this implementing legislation, that in any way would be responsible for this sit-

uation now. The sole purpose of it is to bring about a stability in the price, the very thing for coffee and the producers of coffee that we have insisted on for agricultural products here in the United States, also the very thing we have just done for beef.

Mr. GROSS. On May 27 of this year the gentleman brought before the House a bill which would exempt soluble and instant coffee from tariff duty.

Mr. MILLS. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. At the time I asked the gentleman concerning the act of last November, H.R. 8864, and what would flow from that.

Mr. MILLS. I know what I said and I still stand on it. The gentleman does not need to bother to take my time to read what I said, because I remember quite well what I said. I say it again. I told the gentleman when this legislation passed that this agreement could not go into effect, I had been told, until the implementing legislation was passed. I find, however, that what I was told was incorrect. I was not in error, but what I was told was incorrect as to when it would go into effect.

The point is that the agreement has gone into effect, contrary to what I understood. What I am saying to the gentleman is this. If he is interested in protecting the consumer he had better vote now for this implementing legislation, because it provides ways for Congress to trigger getting out of the agreement if the prices do rise, as the gentleman from Iowa thinks they may, and as I think they will not, as a result of this legislation.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. As a representative from the only State in the Union which produces coffee, could I have the assurance of the gentleman that the adoption of this conference report will in no way affect the growers in Hawaii?

Mr. MILLS. It does not. The same situation prevails with respect to the conference report that prevailed with regard to the original House bill.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I interpret the gentleman's remarks to mean that the increase in the price of coffee is caused by the treaty.

Mr. MILLS. No, I did not say that. What I am saying is this: There are a number of factors that might contribute to price fluctuation of a commodity, and I do not believe that the treaty, and certainly not the implementing legislation before us, would cause an increase in the price of coffee. On the contrary, the implementing legislation, particularly as approved by the conferees with the amendment to which I have referred that was offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], affords opportunity to get out of the agreement not only when the President thinks we ought to get out of it but when the Congress thinks we ought to get out of it. That

is the virtue of the report we have brought back. We think it strengthens our position.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, let us recognize that underlying this conference report and underlying the legislation that it deals with, there is a treaty of the United States. It is known as the Coffee Agreement of 1962. It was signed in September of 1962 and was ratified by the Senate. So it is the law of the land, one of the highest laws in the sense that it is a treaty.

As far as I am concerned, I do not think it is wise to abrogate a treaty by the process that we would invoke here now if we turned down this conference report. We were told that the bill we passed in November was essential to carry out and implement the treaty that had already been entered into and ratified by the Senate. I am not saying it was a good treaty. I do not think that is the issue. But it is a treaty and I do not think the United States should abrogate its treaties except by going through the process provided in the treaty.

When we passed the legislation last November, it was to implement a treaty that had been entered into. It was supported on the floor of the House and passed by this House.

There are those who were opposed to the bill. They were opposed basically because of the fact they thought the treaty was a bad agreement, and would raise the price of coffee to the consumers in this country.

Now this bill comes back from the Senate with an amendment designed to protect against that contingency and to provide a mechanism for our legal withdrawal from the treaty obligation.

As a member of the conference committee, I have to support the conference. Certainly, this bill in its present form is much better than the bill that was passed by the House. Anybody today who is concerned that this agreement has raised the price of coffee must admit that the bill now before us, as provided in the conference report, is preferable to the bill as it passed the House. So I do not know how on that basis you can oppose the conference report as such.

Now let me suggest something. Let me suggest a procedure that should be followed by those who believe that the coffee agreement as contained in the treaty has caused an unreasonable increase in the price of coffee to the American consumer.

Pass this bill today—adopt this conference report. Send it to the President and then introduce the concurrent resolution that this bill authorizes—pass that concurrent resolution and start the procedure for withdrawal from the treaty.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PILLION. Does the gentleman think that there is any chance whatever of going through the procedure outlined in the Dirksen amendment; even if that cumbersome procedure were complied

with in the House and the Senate, does the gentleman think that the State Department would recommend action on the part of the President? This is just a face-saving device. This Dirksen amendment would no more be called into operation than has been the 90-day withdrawal provision contained in the treaty. That provision has never been called into operation. You cannot get the State Department to abrogate its own brain child here. That will never happen.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I would suggest that the gentleman read the amendment.

Mr. PILLION. I have read the amendment.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Well, the amendment does not leave anything to the discretion of the Department of State. The amendment says that if Congress passes a concurrent resolution and sends it to the President, that the President shall send a copy of that resolution to the International Coffee Council. After the expiration of 30 days following that transmittal, if the President finds that the Council has failed to make such adjustments of the quotas, or to take such other action, as is necessary in order to reduce the price of coffee, he is authorized and he is directed—and I consider that mandatory—to cause to be filed with the Secretary General of the United Nations in accordance with the provisions of article 68 of such agreement, written notice of withdrawal.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PILLION. The gentleman knows very well that the Congress has no power to compel the President to take that action. We have no mandamus powers. From whom will the President take his advice? It will be from the State Department.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Then the gentleman is saying the amendment is meaningless.

Mr. PILLION. That is correct. It is merely a device in order to make the bill look good; that is all.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. I can appreciate the concern of the gentleman from New York about whether this particular amendment—offered I am sure, in all sincerity by the distinguished Senator from Illinois, Mr. DIRKSEN—is constitutional and meaningful or not, for the reason that I also had some serious question about the amendment when I first read it.

I believe I can say in all accuracy that the Department of Justice looked at it and had the same reaction to it at the beginning, but upon further consideration and further study of the amendment by the same people within the Department of Justice—and by others who looked at it—it was decided this is within the jurisdiction and the prerogative of the Congress, to pass a concurrent res-

olution saying that certain conditions have arisen which, in our opinion, justify our using legal procedure to get out of a treaty and to direct the President to do it under the circumstances set forth.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PILLION. That is exactly where the power of Congress stops. We cannot compel the President to do anything further. As the gentleman knows, the State Department is bound by its own diplomatic and political considerations rather than the economic welfare of the American public.

Mr. MILLS. If the gentleman from Wisconsin will yield further, I answer "No," because the treaty which the Senate ratified already provides for the mechanism for getting out of it.

Mr. PILLION. It will never be used; the gentleman can be sure of that.

Mr. MILLS. I could not agree with that at all.

Mr. PILLION. The 90-day withdrawal provision will never be used.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I cannot yield further at this time. I accept that there is a difference of opinion as to whether the amendment is meaningful.

Mr. PILLION. I do not doubt the sincerity behind the Dirksen amendment, but I am talking about the practicality of putting that procedure into effectiveness. It just will not happen.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. If the majority of this House and the majority of the Senate believes that this agreement has unduly raised the price of coffee, these resolutions can be passed. The gentleman may say that is impractical, but it can be done.

Mr. PILLION. It has already raised the price of coffee. Is any resolution pending anywhere?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. This is what will give us the authority to make a resolution meaningful. The point of what I am saying to the gentleman is that if we should pass the conference report and adopt the Senate amendment, then we would set the stage for the concurrent resolution to be meaningful.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. That is the important point I was trying to stress a few minutes ago. Contrary to what I had been told—that the treaty agreement could not go into effect until this was passed—the treaty agreement is now in effect. If we want this added assurance of protection for the consumers under that treaty, we had better agree to the conference report.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI. First, I wish to point out I recognize that the chairman of the committee and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] are two of the greatest legislators in all of history. However, I should like to have this made clear.

As I understand the gentleman, what we are in effect being told is that we were misinstructed originally and that this action is necessary to protect the American consumer from a tragedy which has already befallen, a 22-percent increase in the price of coffee since the international coffee cartel started to operate. Is that the practical problem we face?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Let me say when this bill was before the Committee on Ways and Means last year, and I did not happen to be present at the time it was on the floor of the House in November, but I had very serious reservations and questioned at the time whether the agreement was a sound proposal for the United States to have agreed to. I still have serious question about it, but the thing that impresses me is that this is a treaty. This is not just a statute that we put on the books and then repeal. This is a treaty, and I think when we deal with treaties the integrity of the United States in all of its treaties is involved. In that course of events it seems to me we do not use a device such as would be used here to abrogate an agreement. You should use the recognized procedures provided for withdrawal from the treaty. Until we do withdraw, it seems to me, as one of the Members of this House, it is my responsibility to vote for such implementation as may be necessary to carry out the treaty agreement that we entered into. The conference bill now changes the course somewhat because we add an amendment which gives Congress something to say about adopting a legal course of withdrawal from the obligations of that treaty, and it is on that basis I support the conference report.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If the implementing legislation has any meaning at all, Congress had something to say about it last November and they have something to say about it today. If the implementing legislation means anything. If it does not, what are you in here with the legislation for?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will my friend from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Because the gentleman from Wisconsin is as well informed as he is on this legislation and was well informed on it but was not here on the day it was presented in November, as he pointed out, I have said that I had been told—and this I do not like—that this treaty could not be put into effect until this implementing legislation had been passed. That is what we said in November and that is what I had been told in November. But now this was put into effect by the deposit of the instrument of ratification in December. Somebody in the State Department who talked to me apparently did not make this clear to me but now this treaty is in effect. If there was an occasion in November for us to pass implementing legislation to try to protect the consumer, today there is more reason than ever for

adopting the conference report which consists of this amendment of the Senator from Illinois, Senator DIRKSEN.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Does not my friend agree to that?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I agree wholeheartedly, and the basic factor is that this amendment moves in the direction of doing something that can be helpful to those very people who are concerned about this agreement and this treaty raising the price to the consumer.

Mr. MILLS. Exactly.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. If you do not pass it, you do not have any mechanism whatsoever by which to do it. That is why I support the conference report.

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SECREST. Do I understand if we do not pass this legislation, we would be in the position of breaking a treaty or violating a treaty?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. No. I may have misspoken. That was certainly the position that was presented to us at the time it was before our committee, and I believed it. Apparently the State Department found some other way to implement the treaty without getting congressional implementation. But are we not further ahead to pass by statute Congressional implementation and maintain some control over it, which the Dirksen amendment added in the Senate gives us and which comes from the conference report?

Mr. SECREST. I wanted that clear, because I criticized the treaty breaking by Russia and many other countries, and I do not want to be in a position of voting to have the same thing happen in our own country. That is why I ask.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WAGGONER. It is a matter of fact that this Dirksen amendment involves the sole vehicle which the Congress can employ to remove the United States from this International Coffee Agreement if it does work to our detriment and coffee prices do become unrealistic to the American consumer. Is that not correct?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The gentleman is absolutely right. That is the whole issue we have before us today.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. PILLION. How about the procedure contained in the treaty itself which provides that we may withdraw within 90 days? That is the procedure in that treaty. We do not need this amendment.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. There is no question that there is authority to withdraw if the President uses it, but this gives us some leverage on the President.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri

[Mr. CURTIS], a member of the conference committee.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I agree with one aspect of what has been said about this conference report, that indeed it is a better bill than the one we sent to the Senate. That is why I signed the conference report. But I certainly do not agree with this talk that this legislation is not proper for the House to consider and reject if it wants to without impairing our treaty obligation, if this treaty needs implementation of this sort, as the committee was originally told when it was presented to us by the State Department. It was on the assumption that it did need implementation and I suspect it probably still does, even though the State Department has gone ahead in another way to implement it without the Congress. But if it does need implementation then it is still within our prerogative of the House if in its wisdom it thinks it is a good implementation or, even if it is not a good treaty. We are accustomed, many times, to passing authorization bills, authorizing a program, and when it comes to considering whether we want to vote any money, we take another look and decide that we do not want to do so.

In the debate on the previous bill I pointed out that it is a strange thing to me the concern that certain people express over constitutional powers and treaties and so forth, when it involves an issue that they are concerned about, but how they completely disregard over the bold letters of the Constitution if it is something that they are concerned about the other way. I am willing to debate the constitutionality of any and each issue as it comes up on its own bottom. I happen to think that it is the responsibility of every Member of the House to do exactly that. So if I thought this were unconstitutional, for us to reject an implementation of a treaty I certainly would not do so. When the bill was just before the House and the committee, I felt we had been placed in a delicate position by the State Department in moving ahead with a treaty without such advice on the part of the Senate or knowledge of the House, but the better cause of judgment was, regrettably, to support the treaty. In light of the State Department's subsequent action and the actual increase in coffee prices I have changed my views. The whole purpose of the legislation is for the House to exercise its judgment. So in that regard I cannot agree with my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin, nor the chairman of the committee.

Although I was one who reluctantly voted for this bill when it came to the floor of the House, I had minority views, pointing out its basic errors and spoke on the floor emphasizing its dangers. The very points I made then I think have come back to establish the truth of them. I said this was an international cartel agreement, with licenses and quotas, and the whole purpose of it was to increase coffee prices. Let us not kid the consumers. You can argue, and the gentleman from Arkansas has presented a fair argument, that in stabilizing prices you might have to increase them, but

over the long run the consumer will get the benefit from the stabilization. That is a fair thesis, but let us not kid the public by saying that that does not mean increasing the prices in its inception, because the whole purpose of this bill and the International Coffee Agreement was to increase the price of coffee to the producers in Brazil.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is partly what I objected to in the original debate on the bill, that there was I felt this misrepresentation instead of forthrightly saying "yes; in order to stabilize prices we think we have to increase them." The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] has presented a logical case, at any rate, although I do disagree with it. I disagree with it on the basis of the points I tried to make of what happens when you enter into these international cartel setups, quotas, and licenses wherein you produce a rigidity in production and distribution. In other words, the marketplace mechanism goes out. All of the inspiration to lower costs of production and make productivity increases are lost. These incentives disappear. You freeze the situation.

Mr. Speaker, this is contrary to American tradition. This is why I was opposed to the previous bill on meat quotas. This concept of moving to licenses and quotas stifles and damages the entire international trade situation, and I might say our own domestic market which is based upon the concept of competition. This is the reason we have antitrust laws to try to maintain a competitive market.

Mr. Speaker, we have here through this legislation gone to the retrogressive techniques that are employed in Western Europe and other nations around the world who notably have not achieved the standard of living which has been accomplished in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that it is about time to get back to fundamental American principles that involve the private marketplace, and get away—

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). The Chair will state to the gentleman from Missouri that he has been recognized for an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Permit me to finish my sentence. I was simply saying that we need to get back to the basic American concept of the use of the private marketplace and get away from the regressive system of cartels that we have seen exist in Western Europe, state trading, the very things that represent the antithesis of the American system.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman from Missouri has, I think, maintained a very consistent position with respect to the development of his thesis of these impediments to the freer flow of trade.

I believe all of us recognize that, but would not my friend agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] and me that certainly in this particular instance before the House, where we have this conference report, that the conference report itself is much to be preferred, even from the point of view of those who are concerned about the agreement, than what originally passed the House?

Mr. CURTIS. Well, I agree with the gentleman from Arkansas. I made that point in the very beginning, that there is this improvement because of the Dirksen amendment. But I would also say this, that those who feel as I do, who do not want to see any further implementing aspect to this treaty, in view of the State Department's moving ahead without even waiting for this bill to become law and the subsequent great increase in coffee prices, could still vote it down even though the conference report is preferable to the original House bill. So our position is that this represents an erroneous approach to international trade and consumer interests, and I do not want to assist the administration any further in carrying out this treaty.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. MILLS. I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Is it not fair to interpret the gentleman's position as being against the agreement itself?

Mr. CURTIS. Oh, yes.

Mr. MILLS. But if this legislation were defeated, since the agreement is presently in effect, we might or we might not be accomplishing the defeat of the agreement as a treaty?

Mr. CURTIS. That is true.

Mr. MILLS. But, certainly, would we not be eliminating some of the elements of protection of the consumer that we would otherwise have if this legislation is passed?

Mr. CURTIS. I want to agree in a very limited way with the gentleman, but I happen to also agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION], in the broader conclusion that the protection that is contained in the Dirksen amendment is quite limited in the key words that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] read over hurriedly, "When the President finds the council has failed, etc."

Any time you give the discretion to find something the President can find as he pleases. That is easy to do. So I do not think there is much protection in the Dirksen amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The price of coffee has gone up about 20 cents a pound. If this conference report is agreed to, and I hope it will not be, there would be nothing to prevent them from putting the price up 2 to 5 cents tomorrow, is there?

Mr. CURTIS. You can introduce a resolution and start the machinery. At one point when it comes to the discretion of the President, if he finds it or does not find it, it could easily rest there.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. It is within the provisions of our country to withdraw from the agreement, is it not?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes. I think that is in the agreement. The President has to do that, though. Here we are asked as a Congress to enable him to do certain things in the treaty and for those who might disagree with him this is one way to express our disagreement.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION].

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, no bill has ever been presented that contained more deliberate misrepresentations and misstatements of fact than this bill.

This bill, H.R. 8864, would implement the treaty known as the International Coffee Agreement. This treaty was signed on September 28, 1962. This bill would require the United States to police and prevent the importation of coffee originating from nonmember nations to the treaty.

The International Coffee Agreement is now in full force and effect. Its purpose is to reduce the supply of available coffee to the consumer nations by setting up restricted artificial quotas of exports, and thus drive the price of coffee up.

The treaty is, itself, self-executing. H.R. 8864 is not necessary for its functioning. The rejection of this conference report will not abrogate this treaty. The treaty is not a mandate upon Congress. It can refuse to appropriate funds.

For the coffee crop year 1963, ending October 1, 1963, the international cartel set a quota of 45.6 million bags for export to the consuming nations.

For the coffee crop year 1964, the quota allowed was 48.3 million bags.

On August 7 of this year—about 2 weeks ago—the quota established for 1965 is 48 million bags.

As a result of the scarcity of coffee, due to these restrictive quotas, the price of coffee has sharply increased to the American consumer.

Here are the retail prices for Maxwell House coffee—a popular brand—in one of the chain supermarkets in Washington: 69 cents per pound in June 1962—just before the treaty establishing quotas was signed; 71 cents per pound in June 1963—about the time the treaty began taking effect; 91 cents per pound in June 1964; 91 cents per pound in August 1964.

In the short space of 2 years, coffee prices have increased 22 cents per pound—a jump of 32 percent over the 1962 prices. A comparable increase in coffee prices has occurred throughout the Nation.

The quota for 1965 is less than the quota for the present coffee year 1964. If we add 3 percent to the demand by reason of population increase, the quota

for 1965 will be 1,700,000 bags less than 1964.

I predict that this shortage will increase coffee prices to the American housewife in the coffee year beginning October 1, 1964, to a range of somewhere between \$1 and \$1.25 per pound.

The American public will consume 3 billion pounds of coffee in this calendar year 1964. At 22 cents increase over 1962 prices, the American public will pay over \$660 million in higher coffee prices, during this calendar year alone.

This is rank profiteering. The international coffee cartel is a vicious monopoly. If a similar plan were to take place in the United States, it would constitute a civil and criminal conspiracy under the antitrust Sherman Act.

This scheme is an extortion, conceived, planned and successfully executed to allow foreign nations to profiteer at the expense of the American housewives.

I would like to briefly state a few of the more important objections to this bill, and to the treaty it would implement:

First. The coffee treaty is a world monopoly over coffee supply artificially and arbitrarily reducing the coffee supply below the coffee demand.

Second. The demand for coffee in the United States is relatively stable. The reduction of available supply has increased coffee prices from 69 cents per pound in 1962, to 91 cents per pound in 1964.

Third. The machinery for establishing quotas and resultant prices bear no relation to the cost of production. The quotas are established and designed to create artificial short supplies and increase prices to "all the traffic will bear."

Fourth. There is no world shortage of coffee supply. The carryover is about 70 million bags—a 1½ year's supply.

Fifth. The New York coffee wholesale market prices have increased about 15 cents per pound from June 1962 to now. This increase on 3 billion bags to be imported in 1964, means an additional deficit in our international balance of payments of \$450 million a year.

It is a drain upon our gold and dollar supply. This drain will further weaken the U.S. dollar.

Sixth. The Dirksen amendment added to H.R. 8864 in this conference report is a face-saving device to make this bill more palatable. It is a theoretical and impracticable procedure. It cannot cure or remedy the basic economic wrongs being inflicted upon the American public.

The Dirksen amendment will not be invoked any more than the 90-day withdrawal provision has been invoked under the treaty agreement. The State Department will see to that.

Seventh. This international cartel is not foreign aid. It is foreign bribery. All we have obtained from the Latin American coffee exporting nations is a weak, halfhearted, meaningless rebuke of Castro.

Eighth. The State Department has willfully misrepresented to this Congress the facts, the political implications, and the economic principles underlying the coffee treaty and H.R. 8864.

Ninth. H.R. 8864 would implement and perfect the scheme contained in the In-

ternational Coffee Agreement to artificially reduce the world coffee supply for the ultimate purpose of creating profiteering higher coffee prices.

This bill cannot be justified. This is the last chance for this Congress to express its disapproval of this nefarious scheme for extortion.

This conference report on H.R. 8864 should be defeated.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, this matter has been thoroughly discussed, I think. Let us bear in mind that what we are endeavoring to do in this agreement is certainly not to take advantage of American consumers nor to bring about unreasonable prices. What we are trying to do is bring about a degree of stability in coffee prices. If ever there was need for stability in the economies of the coffee-producing countries I think all of us must admit that that time is now. The inroads that we fear can be made in the areas of South America I am sure we would certainly be paving the way for if we did not move in the direction of co-operating in the stability of these prices and therefore bringing a degree of stability to their economy. We have put into this every safeguard that we can put in it, both in the agreement and in the implementing legislation, to protect the American housewife against undue price increases. What we want to do is to avoid a repetition of the high prices that occurred in the midfifties when the price reached \$1.25, but at the same time we want to avoid those depression prices that have occurred in the past because of the lack of such an arrangement as this. We have had in the past very high peaks and very low valleys in the price of coffee. We hope and believe that the treaty involved in this implementing legislation will bring a degree of stability which not only will benefit our consumers but just as important benefit our friends in South America.

Mr. Speaker, I feel very strongly that this is not only in the interest of these people whom we consider our friends, but this is in the interest of the American people themselves.

If we can help to stabilize this situation, I think we will do a great deal to help to reduce the flow of dollars from the Federal Treasury under some other programs that might come along.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and thirty-one Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 183, nays 194, not voting 53, as follows:

[Roll No. 237]

YEAS—183

Ashley	Gray	Olson, Minn.
Ashmore	Green, Oreg.	Patman
Aspinall	Green, Pa.	Pickle
Ayres	Griffin	Poage
Baker	Griffiths	Price
Baldwin	Hagan, Ga.	Purcell
Barrett	Hagen, Calif.	Quillen
Barry	Halleck	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bass	Hansen	Rhodes, Pa.
Beckworth	Harding	Rivers, S.C.
Bell	Hardy	Roberts, Tex.
Bennett, Fla.	Harris	Rogers, Colo.
Betts	Hawkins	Rogers, Fla.
Blatnik	Healey	Rogers, Tex.
Boggs	Hechler	Rooney, N.Y.
Bonner	Herlong	Rooney, Pa.
Brademas	Holland	Rostenkowski
Brooks	Hosmer	Roush
Broomfield	Huddleston	Roybal
Brown, Calif.	Hull	Ryan, N.Y.
Burkhalter	Ichord	St. Onge
Burleson	Jarman	Schneebell
Burton, Calif.	Jennings	Schwengel
Byrne, Pa.	Johnson, Calif.	Selden
Byrnes, Wis.	Johnson, Pa.	Senner
Cameron	Johnson, Wis.	Sibal
Casey	Karsten	Sickles
Chelf	Kath	Sikes
Clausen,	Kelly	Siler
Don H.	Keogh	Sisk
Cohelan	Kilgore	Slack
Cooley	King, Calif.	Smith, Iowa
Corman	Kirwan	Staebler
Davis, Ga.	Kluczynski	Staggers
Delaney	Leggett	Steed
Denton	Libonati	Stephens
Dorn	Long, La.	Stratton
Downing	McDowell	Stubblefield
Duncan	McFall	Sullivan
Edmondson	McMillan	Thomas
Edwards	Mahon	Thompson, La.
Elliott	Maillard	Thompson, Tex.
Everett	Matsunaga	Trimble
Evins	Matthews	Tuten
Fallon	Miller, Calif.	Udall
Fascell	Mills	Ullman
Finnegan	Monagan	Van Deerlin
Fisher	Moorhead	Vinson
Flynt	Morgan	Waggonner
Frelinghuysen	Morris	Watson
Friedel	Morrison	Watts
Fulton, Tenn.	Moss	White
Fuqua	Murphy, Ill.	Whitener
Gallagher	Murphy, N.Y.	Whitten
Garnatz	Murray	Wickersham
Gary	Natcher	Willis
Gathings	Nix	Wilson
Glaimo	Norblad	Charles H.
Gonzalez	O'Brien, N.Y.	Wright
Goodell	O'Hara, Ill.	Young
Grabowski	O'Hara, Mich.	Zablocki
Grant	Olsen, Mont.	

NAYS—194

Abbutt	Cederberg	Foreman
Abele	Chamberlain	Fountain
Abernethy	Chenoweth	Fulton, Pa.
Addabbo	Clancy	Gibbons
Anderson	Clark	Gilbert
Andrews, Ala.	Clawson, Del.	Glenn
Andrews,	Cleveland	Goodling
N. Dak.	Collier	Gross
Arends	Colmer	Grover
Ashbrook	Conte	Gubser
Bates	Corbett	Gurney
Battin	Cramer	Haley
Becker	Cunningham	Hall
Beermann	Curtin	Halpern
Belcher	Curtis	Hanna
Berry	Dague	Harrison
Boland	Daniels	Harsha
Bolling	Dent	Harvey, Ind.
Bolton,	Derounian	Hays
Oliver P.	Derwinski	Henderson
Bow	Devine	Horan
Bray	Dole	Horton
Brock	Donohue	Hutchinson
Bromwell	Dowdy	Jensen
Brotzman	Dulski	Joelson
Brown, Ohio	Dwyer	Johansen
Broyhill, N.C.	Farbstein	Jonas
Broyhill, Va.	Feighan	Kastenmeier
Bruce	Findley	Keith
Burke	Fino	Kilburn
Burton, Utah	Flood	King, N.Y.
Cahill	Fogarty	Knox
Carey	Ford	Kornegay

Kunkel	Osmer	Shriver
Laird	Ostertag	Skubitz
Langen	Passman	Smith, Va.
Latta	Patten	Snyder
Lennon	Pelly	Springer
Lindsay	Perkins	Stafford
Lippscomb	Philbin	Stinson
Lloyd	Pike	Taft
Long, Md.	Pillion	Talcott
McCulloch	Poff	Taylor
McDade	Powell	Teague, Calif.
McIntire	Pucinski	Teague, Tex.
McLoskey	Quie	Thompson, N.J.
Macdonald	Randall	Thomson, Wis.
MacGregor	Reid, Ill.	Tuck
Marsh	Reid, N.Y.	Tupper
Martin, Calif.	Reifel	Utt
Martin, Mass.	Reuss	Vanik
Martin, Nebr.	Rich	Van Pelt
Mathias	Riehlman	Wallhauser
May	Rivers, Alaska	Weaver
Meador	Robison	Weitner
Michel	Rosenthal	Westland
Milliken	Roudebush	Wharton
Minish	Rumsfeld	Whidart
Minshall	St Germain	Williams
Moore	Saylor	Wilson, Bob
Morton	Schadeberg	Wilson, Ind.
Mosher	Schenck	Winstead
Multer	Schweiker	Wyder
Nelsen	Scott	Younger
O'Konski	Secrest	
O'Neill	Short	

NOT VOTING—53

Adair	Gill	Nedzi
Albert	Harvey, Mich.	Pepper
Alger	Hébert	Pilcher
Auchincloss	Hoeven	Pirnie
Avery	Hoffman	Pool
Baring	Hollifield	Rains
Bolton,	Jones, Ala.	Roberts, Ala.
Frances P.	Jones, Mo.	Rodino
Buckley	Kee	Roosevelt
Celler	Kyl	Ryan, Mich.
Daddario	Landrum	St. George
Davis, Tenn.	Lankford	Sheppard
Dawson	Lesinski	Shipley
Diggs	McClory	Smith, Calif.
Dingell	Madden	Toll
Ellsworth	Miller, N.Y.	Tollefson
Forrester	Montoya	Whalley
Fraser	Morse	Wyman

So the conference report was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs.

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Rodino against.
Mr. Toll for, with Mr. Adair against.
Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Pirnie against.
Mr. Shipley for, with Mr. Smith of California against.
Mr. Roosevelt for, with Mr. Auchincloss against.
Mr. Daddario for, with Mr. McClory against.
Mr. Hollifield for, with Mr. Morse against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Avery.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Harvey of Michigan.
Mr. Ryan of Michigan with Mr. Tollefson.
Mr. Montoya with Mr. Hoeven.
Mr. Baring with Mrs. St. George.
Mr. Forrester with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Roberts of Alabama with Mr. Wyman.
Mr. Gill with Mrs. Frances P. Bolton.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Kyl.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Whalley.

Messrs. DUNCAN, RHODES of Arizona, HOSMER, GALLAGHER, and SENNER changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Messrs. MOORE and TAFT changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its disagreement with the Senate and ask for a further conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MILLS, KING of California, BOGGS, BYRNES of Wisconsin, and CURTIS.

INTEREST EQUALIZATION TAX ACT

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 8000) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose a tax on acquisitions of certain foreign securities in order to equalize costs of longer-term financing in the United States and in markets abroad, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1816)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8000) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose a tax on acquisitions of certain foreign securities in order to equalize costs of longer term financing in the United States and in markets abroad, and for other purposes having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, and 130, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 91: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

On page 30 of the Senate engrossed amendments, in the last line, strike out "section—" and insert "section—"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 104: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 104, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

On page 42, line 10, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "subparagraphs" and insert "subparagraph"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 110: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 110, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SUBCHAPTER B—ACQUISITIONS BY COMMERCIAL BANKS

"Sec. 4931. Commercial bank loans.

"SEC. 4931. COMMERCIAL BANK LOANS.

"(a) STANDBY AUTHORITY.—The provisions of this section shall apply only if the President of the United States—

"(1) determines that the acquisition of debt obligations of foreign obligors by commercial banks in making loans in the ordinary course of the commercial banking business has materially impaired the effectiveness of the tax imposed by section 4911, because such acquisitions have, directly or indirectly, replaced acquisitions by United States persons, other than commercial banks, of debt obligations of foreign obligors which are subject to the tax imposed by such section, and

"(2) specifies by Executive order that the provisions of this section shall apply to acquisitions by commercial banks of debt obligations of foreign obligors, to the extent specified in such order.

Such Executive order shall be effective, to the extent specified therein, with respect to acquisitions made during the period beginning on the day after the date on which the order is issued and ending on the date set forth in section 4911(d). Such Executive order may be modified from time to time (by Executive order), except that no such modification shall (A) have the effect of excluding from the application of subsection (b) or (c) a significant class of acquisitions to which such subsection applied under such Executive order or any modification thereof, or (B) subject any acquisition made on or before the date of issuance of such modification to the application of subsection (b) or (c).

"(b) DEBT OBLIGATIONS WITH MATURITY OF 3 YEARS OR MORE, ETC.—During the period in which an Executive order issued under subsection (a) is effective, and to the extent specified in such order (and any modifications thereof), sections 4914(b)(2)(A), 4914(j)(1)(A)(ii), and 4915(c)(2)(A) shall not apply.

"(c) DEBT OBLIGATIONS WITH MATURITY FROM 1 TO 3 YEARS.—During the period in which an Executive order issued under subsection (a) is effective, and to the extent specified in such order (and any modifications thereof), there is hereby imposed, on each acquisition by a United States person (as defined in section 4920(a)(4)) which is a commercial bank of a debt obligation of a foreign obligor (if such obligation has a period remaining to maturity of 1 year or more and less than 3 years), a tax equal to a percentage of the actual value of the debt obligation measured by the period remaining to its maturity and determined in accordance with the following table:

The tax, as a percentage of actual value, is:	
"If the period remaining to maturity is:	
At least 1 year, but less than 1 1/4 years.....	1.05 percent
At least 1 1/4 years, but less than 1 1/2 years.....	1.30 percent
At least 1 1/2 years, but less than 1 3/4 years.....	1.50 percent
At least 1 3/4 years, but less than 2 1/4 years.....	1.85 percent
At least 2 1/4 years, but less than 2 3/4 years.....	2.30 percent
At least 2 3/4 years, but less than 3 years.....	2.75 percent

For purposes of this title, the tax imposed under this subsection shall be treated as imposed under section 4911, except that, for such purposes, the provisions of section 4918 shall not apply.

"(d) EXCLUSIONS.—

"(1) EXPORT LOANS.—The provisions of subsection (b), and the tax imposed under subsection (c), shall not apply with respect to the acquisition by a commercial bank of a debt obligation arising out of the sale of personal property or services (or both) if—

"(A) not less than 85 percent of the amount of the loan is attributable to the sale of property manufactured, produced, grown, extracted, created, or developed in the United States, or to the performance of services by United States persons, or to both, and

"(B) the extension of credit and the acquisition of the debt obligation related thereto are reasonably necessary to accomplish the sale of property or services out of which the debt obligation arises, and the terms of the debt obligation are not unreasonable in light of credit practices in the business in which the United States person selling such property or services is engaged.

"(2) FOREIGN CURRENCY LOANS BY FOREIGN BRANCHES.—The provisions of subsection (b), and the tax imposed under subsection (c), shall not apply to the acquisition by a commercial bank of a debt obligation of a foreign obligor payable in the currency of a foreign country if, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate—

"(A) such bank establishes and maintains, for each of its branches located outside the United States, a fund of assets with respect to deposits payable in foreign currency to customers (other than banks) of such branch, and

"(B) such debt obligation is designated, to the extent permitted by this paragraph, as part of a fund of assets described in subparagraph (A) (but only after debt obligations of foreign obligors payable in foreign currency having a period remaining to maturity of less than one year held by such bank have been designated as part of such a fund).

A debt obligation may be designated as part of a fund of assets described in subparagraph (A) only to the extent that, immediately after such designation, the adjusted basis of all the assets held in such fund does not exceed 110 percent of the deposits payable in foreign currency to customers (other than banks) of the branch with respect to which such fund is maintained.

"(3) PREEXISTING COMMITMENTS.—The provisions of subsection (b), and the tax imposed under subsection (c), shall not apply to the acquisition by a commercial bank of a debt obligation of a foreign obligor—

"(A) made pursuant to an obligation to acquire which on August 4, 1964—

"(i) was unconditional, or

"(ii) was subject only to conditions contained in a formal contract under which partial performance had occurred; or

"(B) as to which on or before August 4, 1964, the acquiring commercial bank (or, in a case where 2 or more commercial banks are making acquisitions as part of a single transaction, a majority in interest of such banks) had taken every action to signify approval of the acquisition under the procedures ordinarily employed by such bank (or banks) in similar transactions and had sent or deposited for delivery to the foreign person from whom the acquisition was made written evidence of such approval in the form of a document setting forth, or referring to a document sent by the foreign person from whom the acquisition was made which set forth the principal terms of such acquisition.

"(e) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe such regulations (not inconsistent with the provisions of this section or of an Executive order issued under subsection (a)) as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section."

And the Senate agree to the same.

W. D. MILLS,
CECIL R. KING,
HALE BOGGS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

HARRY F. BYRD,
RUSSELL B. LONG,
GEORGE A. SMATHERS,
JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
FRANK CARLSON,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the

Senate to the bill (H.R. 8000) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose a tax on acquisitions of certain foreign securities in order to equalize costs of longer-term financing in the United States and in markets abroad, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The following Senate amendments made technical, clerical, clarifying, or conforming changes: 1, 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, 33, 35, 38, 39, 40, 44, 45, 48, 49, 50, 55, 56, 57, 59, 60, 61, 63, 67, 69, 72, 73, 75, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 99, 100, 101, 108, 109, 113, 115, 116, 118, 119, 123, 124, 125, 126, 128, and 130. With respect to these amendments the House recedes. The remaining Senate amendments are discussed below; except as otherwise indicated, the discussion of each amendment is set forth under the heading of the section in the new chapter 41 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (added by sec. 2(a) of the bill) to which it relates.

SECTION 4912. ACQUISITIONS

Amendment No. 5: In the House bill, section 4912(b) (1) exempted from the new interest equalization tax contributions made by an employee to a foreign pension or profit-sharing trust established by his employer, where such employee performs personal services for the employer on a full-time basis in a foreign country (and is not an owner-employee). The Senate amendment added language also exempting from the tax contributions made by an employer to such a trust established by him for the exclusive benefit of employees (not owner-employees) who perform personal services for him on a full-time basis in a foreign country. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 6: In the House bill, section 4912(b) (2) provided that certain transfers of money or other property to a foreign corporation or foreign partnership are deemed to be acquisitions of stock of a foreign corporation—taxable as such unless otherwise excluded—equal in amount to the actual value of the money or property transferred. The Senate amendment added a new subparagraph providing that if a domestic corporation or partnership transfers money or other property to (or applies money or other property for the benefit of) a branch office as to which an election to be treated as a foreign corporation or partnership (as described in the new sec. 4920(a) (5) (E), discussed below under amendments Nos. 103 and 104) is in effect, or if funds are borrowed by such branch office from a U.S. bank (other than a bank branch located outside the United States and lending such funds in the ordinary course of its business), the domestic corporation or partnership is deemed to have acquired stock of a foreign corporation or partnership equal in amount to the actual value of the money or property transferred or applied, or the funds borrowed. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 7 and 8: In the House bill, section 4912(b) (4) provided that an acquisition of stock or debt obligations of a foreign issuer or obligor in a reorganization exchange to which section 354, 355, or 356 of the code applies (or would apply but for sec. 367) is deemed to be an acquisition from the foreign issuer or obligor in exchange for its stock or debt obligations (and thus, pursuant to section 4914(a) (4), not treated as an acquisition for purposes of the tax or treated as subject to the limitations contained in section 4913(a)). The Senate amendments added a provision (1) extending the coverage of section 4912(b) (4) to an acquisition which is prevented from otherwise qualifying as such a reorganization exchange because the U.S. person receives money or other property (in addition to

voting stock) in the transaction, and (2) treating any transaction occurring before the date of enactment of the bill as having occurred on such date so that it may qualify as an exchange under section 354 or 356 pursuant to a reorganization under section 368(a) (1) (B), as amended by the Revenue Act of 1964. The House recedes.

SECTION 4913. LIMITATION ON TAX ON CERTAIN ACQUISITIONS

Amendment No. 11: In the House bill, section 4913(a) (3) (A) limited the tax, in cases where stock is acquired pursuant to the exercise of a right to convert a debt obligation, to the amount of tax which would have applied if the debt obligation had been treated as stock at the time of its acquisition reduced by any tax actually paid by the U.S. person exercising the right (or a decedent from whom he acquired the right) when he acquired the debt obligation. The Senate amendment permitted a similar reduction in cases where the acquisition of the debt obligation was nontaxable, as for example where the acquisition was from another U.S. person, equal to the amount of tax which would have been imposed if the acquisition had been subject to tax. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 12, 13, 14, and 15: In the House bill, section 4913(a) (3) (B) limited the tax, in cases where stock or a debt obligation of a foreign issuer or obligor is acquired by a shareholder pursuant to the exercise of an option or similar subscription right, to the exercise price specified in the subscription offer (rather than the difference between the market value of the securities at the time of exercise and the value of the right exercised) if the offering by its terms expires within 90 days from the date the rights involved are distributed. The Senate amendments made this limitation available to subsequent purchasers of the rights involved as well as to the shareholder himself, and also extended the limitation to any case in which such rights are in fact exercised within 90 days from the date the rights are distributed whether or not any termination date is specified in the offering. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 18: This amendment added to section 4913 a new subsection (c) to prevent the imposition of two taxes in certain transactions involving the acquisition by a U.S. person of stock or debt obligations of a domestic corporation or partnership which was formed or availed of by a foreign issuer or obligor to obtain funds in the United States. In such cases the acquisition is taxable (as though it were from a foreign issuer or obligor) under section 4912 (b) (3), and the domestic corporation or partnership may also be subject to tax if it transfers the funds received to the foreign issuer or obligor in return for stock or debt obligations. The Senate amendment in effect limits the tax on the two acquisitions to the larger of the amounts of tax which would otherwise be due. The House recedes.

SECTION 4914. EXCLUSION FOR CERTAIN ACQUISITIONS

Amendment No. 19: In the House bill, section 4914(a) enumerated several types of transactions which are not to be considered acquisitions of stock or debt obligations (and which are therefore not subject to tax). The Senate amendment added to this list of excluded transactions (in a new par. (5)) corporate distributions of stock or debt obligations to a shareholder, in complete or partial liquidation, in cases where the distributing corporation owned the securities involved on July 18, 1963, to the extent that the shareholder acquired his stock ownership in such corporation in a transaction not excluded from tax under section 4914(b), 4915, 4916, or 4917. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 23: In the House bill, section 4914(b) enumerated several types of

acquisitions which are not subject to tax. The Senate amendment added to this list of excluded acquisitions (in a new par. (4)) the acquisition of stock or debt obligations by a U.S. person doing business in a foreign country, if and to the extent that the acquisition is made (in conformity with such country's laws) as a substitute for the payment of tax to such country. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 24: This amendment added to the list of excluded acquisitions in section 4914(b) (in a new par. (5)) the acquisition of stock in a foreign cooperative housing corporation. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 29: This amendment added to the list of excluded acquisitions in section 4914(b) (in a new par. (10)) the acquisition of debt obligations in connection with the sale or liquidation of a wholly owned foreign corporation, to the extent provided in the new section 4914(g) (discussed below, under amendment No. 52). The House recedes.

Amendment No. 30: This amendment added to the list of excluded acquisitions in section 4914(b) (in a new par. (11)) the acquisition of debt obligations secured by real property located in the United States and arising out of the purchase of such property from U.S. persons, to the extent provided in the new section 4914(h) (discussed below, under amendment No. 53). The House recedes.

Amendment No. 31: This amendment added to the list of excluded acquisitions in section 4914(b) (in a new par. (12)) the acquisition by a U.S. person residing in a foreign country of stock of a foreign issuer which invests exclusively in the United States, to the extent provided in the new section 4914(i) (discussed below, under amendment No. 54). The House recedes.

Amendment No. 32: In the House bill, section 4914(c) (1) exempted from tax the acquisition from a foreign obligor of a debt obligation arising out of the sale of tangible personal property or services (or both) to such obligor by a U.S. person if payment of the debt obligation is guaranteed or insured (in whole or in part) by an agency or wholly owned instrumentality of the United States, such as the Export-Import Bank. The Senate amendment extended the exemption to any related debt obligation arising out of such a sale. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 34 and 36: In the House bill, section 4914(c) (2) exempted from tax the acquisition by a U.S. person of stock or a debt obligation arising out of the sale of tangible personal property or services (or both) to the foreign issuer or obligor if at least 30 percent of the purchase price is attributable to property produced in the United States, and services performed, by that particular person (and affiliated companies) and at least 50 percent of such price is attributable to property produced in the United States, and services performed, by U.S. persons generally. The Senate amendments also provided an exemption from tax, in situations of this kind, where at least 60 percent of the actual value of the stock or debt obligation acquired is attributable to property produced in the United States, and services performed, by the person making the acquisition (and affiliated companies) and 100 percent of such value is attributable to property produced in the United States, and services performed, by U.S. persons generally. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 37: This amendment added to section 4914(c) a new paragraph (3), exempting from tax the acquisition by a U.S. person from a foreign issuer or obligor of its stock or debt obligations in connection with the sale or license to such issuer or obligor of an interest in intangible personal property (such as patents, inventions, models, designs, copyrights, secret processes and formulas, good will, trademarks, trade

brands, franchises, etc.), with or without the performance of related services by such person or by affiliated companies, if at least 85 percent of the purchase price or license fee is attributable to property produced, created, or developed in the United States (and to the performance of any such related services) by such U.S. person or affiliated companies. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 41, 42, and 43: In the House bill, section 4914(c)(4) (redesignated as section 4914(c)(5) by amendment No. 39) exempted from tax the acquisition by a U.S. person of a foreign debt obligation received (as all or part of the purchase price) under a contract in which the foreign obligor agrees to purchase over at least a 3-year period ores or minerals (or derivatives thereof) extracted outside the United States by such person, by an affiliated company, or by a corporation at least 10 percent of the voting power of which is owned by such person if at least 50 percent of such voting power is owned by U.S. persons each of whom owns at least 10 percent. It also exempted from tax the acquisition of a debt obligation where the proceeds of the loan involved are to be used by the foreign obligor to install, maintain, or improve storage and other facilities relating to ores or minerals extracted outside the United States by such person, affiliated company, or 10-percent owned corporation.

The Senate amendments extended the exemption to any case where the ores or minerals involved are extracted by the U.S. person or an affiliated company, or by a corporation at least 10 percent of the voting power of which is owned by such person, such affiliated companies, or domestic corporations owning at least 50 percent of the voting stock of the U.S. person; the requirement that U.S. persons own 50 percent of the extracting company was eliminated. These amendments also extended the exemption to cases where the ores or minerals involved were obtained under a contract entered into on or before July 18, 1963, regardless of whether such U.S. person affiliated companies, or domestic corporations performed the actual extraction, and to cases where similar ores and minerals were obtained in exchange for ores or minerals so extracted or obtained. Finally, the provision exempting debt obligations arising out of loans to install, maintain, or improve storage and other facilities outside the United States was modified to reflect the changes discussed above, and was extended to cases where the installation, maintenance, or improvement involved is carried out by a person controlled by or controlling the obligor.

Amendments Nos. 46, 47, and 51: In the House bill, section 4914(e) exempted from tax certain acquisitions by a U.S. insurance company of stock or debt obligations of a foreign issuer or obligor where such company (1) establishes a fund or funds of assets with respect to foreign risks insured by such company under contracts the proceeds of which are payable in foreign currency, and (2) designates such stock or debt obligations (within a limit of 110 percent of the applicable allowable reserve) as part of such fund or funds. Various provisions were included to govern the method for making these designations, the conditions and limitations applicable to the selection of the particular stock and debt obligations to be designated, the manner in which the assets involved are to be valued, and other matters bearing upon the computation and allowance of the exemption.

The Senate amendments (in addition to rearranging much of the material in sec. 4914(e)) made several changes in the latter provisions:

(1) A new method was provided for the initial designation of stock and debt obligations as part of a fund of assets, permitting

certain foreign short-term debt obligations to be included and prescribing an order of priority to be followed in the designation. The date as of which such designation is to be made was changed from December 10, 1963, to July 18, 1963.

(2) The method of valuing designated assets was changed so that the value at which stock or debt obligation will be taken into account as a fund asset is its adjusted basis (within the meaning of sec. 1011 of the code) rather than its actual value.

(3) The provisions relating to designations to maintain a fund of assets on a current basis were changed to permit the designation of stock or debt obligations acquired after July 18, 1963, rather than only those acquired after December 10, 1963.

(4) A new provision was added to require, after the end-of-year permissive designation of additional assets, the designation (up to the limit of 110 percent of the applicable allowable reserve) of stock and debt obligations acquired during the year but excluded from the tax by reason of an Executive order issued under section 4917.

(5) A new provision was added to make it clear that a designation is ineffective, and the acquisition of the stock or debt obligations involved is accordingly not exempt from tax under section 4914(e), to the extent that as a result of such designation the fund of assets would exceed the 110-percent limit.

(6) The provisions relating to determination of an allowable reserve for any calendar year were changed so that such determination (for purposes other than the initial designation) is to be made only as of the close of such year; the amount of the reserve for any year is thus made independent of the amount determined with respect to any earlier year.

The House recedes.

Amendment No. 52: This amendment added to section 4914 a new subsection (g), exempting from tax the acquisition by a U.S. person of a debt obligation of a foreign obligor arising out of the sale or liquidation of a wholly owned foreign subsidiary. This exemption would apply to acquisitions made in connection with the sale by such person (or by one or more affiliated companies) of all of the outstanding stock (except for qualifying shares) of a foreign corporation, or in connection with the liquidation by such person (or by one or more affiliated companies) of a foreign corporation all of whose outstanding stock (except qualifying shares) is owned by such person (or affiliated companies); but in the latter case the exemption would be available only if the debt obligation involved had been received by the foreign corporation as part or all of the purchase price in a sale of substantially all of its assets. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 53: This amendment added to section 4914 a new subsection (h), exempting from tax the acquisition by a U.S. person of a debt obligation secured by real property located in the United States, but only to the extent that such debt obligation is part of the purchase price of such property (and related personal property) or arises out of a loan (made by the U.S. person to the foreign obligor) the proceeds of which are concurrently used as part of such purchase price. The owner of the property would have to be a U.S. person, and at least 25 percent of the purchase price would have to be paid in U.S. currency by the foreign obligor to the seller from funds which have not been obtained from U.S. persons for the purpose of purchasing such property. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 54: This amendment added to section 4914 a new subsection (i), exempting from tax the acquisition by a U.S. person who is a bona fide resident of a foreign country, or who is regularly performing personal services on a full-time basis in a foreign country, of stock of a foreign issuer

investing exclusively in U.S. securities; but this exemption would be available only with respect to the first \$5,000 of the stock of such foreign issuers acquired by the U.S. person in any calendar year, and it would not apply if the foreign issuer is 25 percent or more owned by U.S. persons. A U.S. person who obtains this exemption with respect to any stock will not be considered to be a U.S. person with respect to such stock, however, if he sells or otherwise disposes of it after July 30, 1964. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 58: In the House bill, section 4914(g) provided that a person may lose his entitlement to certain of the exemptions under section 4914 if he subsequently transfers the stock or debt obligations involved under specified circumstances. The Senate amendment added to this section (which was redesignated 4914(j) by amendment No. 55) new language permitting a U.S. person acquiring a foreign debt obligation in connection with certain export transactions to transfer it to any other U.S. person without incurring tax liability, if the original extension of credit and the acquisition of the debt obligation were reasonably necessary to accomplish the sale of the property or services involved and the terms of the debt obligation were not unreasonable in the light of the credit practices in the business in which such person was engaged. The House recedes.

SECTION 4915. EXCLUSION FOR DIRECT INVESTMENTS

Amendment No. 62: In the House bill, section 4915(a)(1) provided that an acquisition by a U.S. person of stock or debt obligations is not subject to tax if immediately after the acquisition such person (or one or more affiliated companies) owns (directly or indirectly) 10 percent or more of the total combined voting power of all classes of stock of the foreign corporation, or if such person owns (directly or indirectly) 10 percent or more of the profits interest of the foreign partnership. The Senate amendment extended this direct investment exclusion to the acquisition by a U.S. person of a debt obligation from such a foreign corporation if the corporation acquired such obligation in the ordinary course of its trade or business as a result of the sale or rental of products manufactured or assembled by it or the performance of services by it. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 64 and 65: In the House bill, section 4915(a) provided that the tax paid on the acquisition of stock of a foreign corporation or foreign partnership by a U.S. person will constitute an overpayment if such person continuously holds such stock from the time of its acquisition to the last day of the calendar year in which the acquisition was made and as of such last day owns 10 percent or more of the total combined voting power of all classes of stock of the corporation or 10 percent or more of the profits interest of the partnership.

The Senate amendments changed the holding period requirement to provide that a U.S. person may qualify for credit or refund with respect to an acquisition of stock or a debt obligation of a foreign corporation or foreign partnership (or a debt obligation referred to in the amended par. (1) of sec. 4915(a)) if such person meets the 10 percent or more ownership requirement of paragraph (1) with respect to such foreign corporation or foreign partnership at any time within 12 months from the date of acquisition of such stock or debt obligation and holds the stock or debt obligation continuously from the date of such acquisition to the last day of the calendar year in which such ownership requirement is first met.

The House recedes.

Amendment No. 66: In the House bill, section 4915(c)(1) provided that the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) of section 4915

are inapplicable where the foreign corporation or foreign partnership is formed or availed of by the U.S. person for the principal purpose of acquiring, through such corporation or partnership, an interest in stock or debt obligations (of one or more other foreign issuers or obligors) the direct acquisition of which by the U.S. person would be subject to the tax imposed by section 4911. Paragraph (2) of section 4915(c) provided that, for purposes of section 4915(c), the acquisition by a U.S. person of stock or debt obligations of a foreign corporation or foreign partnership which acquires stock or debt obligations of foreign issuers or obligors in making loans in the ordinary course of its business as a commercial bank shall not, by reason of such acquisitions, be considered an acquisition by the U.S. person of an interest in stock or debt obligations of foreign issuers or obligors.

This amendment added to paragraph (2) of section 4915(c) a provision that any foreign corporation or foreign partnership which is regularly engaged in the business of accepting deposits from customers and receiving other borrowed funds in foreign currencies and making loans in such currencies shall be treated as a commercial bank for purposes of paragraph (2) (A).

The House recedes.

SECTION 4916. EXCLUSION FOR INVESTMENTS IN LESS DEVELOPED COUNTRIES

Amendment No. 68: In the House bill, paragraph (3) of section 4916(a) provided an exclusion from tax with respect to the acquisition by a U.S. person of a debt obligation issued by an individual or partnership resident in a less developed country in return for property which is used, consumed, or disposed of wholly within one or more less developed countries. Under paragraph (2) of section 4916(d), this exclusion terminates and liability for tax is incurred by the acquiring U.S. person as of the time the property exchanged for the foreign debt obligation is first used, consumed, or disposed of other than within one or more less developed countries. The Senate amendment added language to the foregoing paragraphs to make clear that the exclusion is available where money (as well as other property) is exchanged for the foreign debt obligation. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 70: This amendment added a new paragraph (4) to section 4916(a). Paragraph (4) grants an exclusion to a U.S. person acquiring the stock or debt obligations of a foreign issuer or obligor where such acquisition is required as a reinvestment within a less developed country by the terms of a contract with such country, or a political subdivision, agency, or instrumentality thereof (including any corporation or other business entity which is controlled by such government or a subdivision or agency thereof through ownership of more than 50 percent of its voting stock, or, in the case of a nonstock entity, through the authority to elect or appoint a majority of its directors or equivalent body). The contract must provide for the sale of (or indemnification for) property previously held within such country by the U.S. person or its controlled foreign corporation (as defined in sec. 957) more than 50 percent of the total combined voting power of all classes of stock entitled to vote of which is owned (within the meaning of sec. 958) by the U.S. person. This provision will apply only if the contract was entered into because the government of the less developed country or political subdivision, or the agency or instrumentality, (1) has nationalized or has expropriated or seized, or has threatened to nationalize or to expropriate or seize, a substantial portion of the property owned within such less developed country or such political subdivision by the U.S. person or the controlled foreign cor-

poration, or (2) has taken action which has the effect of nationalizing or of expropriating or seizing, or of threatening to nationalize or to expropriate or seize, a substantial portion of the property so owned. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 71: This amendment modified section 4916(b), which defines the term "less developed country" for purposes of the exemption from tax under section 4916, to authorize the President to designate, by Executive order, a possession of the United States as a less developed country. It would thus permit a corporation organized outside the United States to include assets located in a possession of the United States, such as Puerto Rico, and income derived therefrom, as less developed country assets and income for purposes of section 4916(c). The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 74 and 76: These amendments to section 4916(c) revised and extended the asset and income criteria for determining whether a foreign corporation qualifies as a less developed country corporation (the acquisition of whose stock or debt obligations is excluded from tax). Substantive changes were as follows:

1. Tangible property located in the United States, stock of domestic corporations, obligations of a U.S. person (other than deposits in the United States with persons carrying on the banking business), and any right to the use in the United States of a patent or copyright, an invention, model, or design (whether or not patented), a secret formula or process, and any other similar property right, regardless of when acquired, and income derived therefrom, are to be excluded completely in making the 80-percent gross income and assets tests of both operating and holding companies.

2. Debt obligations of less developed country corporations are to be treated as qualifying assets for both operating and holding companies even though, at the time of their acquisition, they have a period remaining to maturity of less than 1 year.

3. In the case of holding companies—

- (a) money, obligations of the United States, and deposits in the United States with persons carrying on the banking business are treated as assets which may qualify the corporation as a less developed country corporation;

- (b) income from deposits in the United States with persons carrying on the banking business constitute qualifying income;

- (c) deposits outside the United States (other than deposits in a less developed country) with persons carrying on the banking business and income from such deposits are excluded from the gross income and asset computations;

- (d) debt obligations of partnerships and individuals resident in less developed countries constitute qualifying assets; and

- (e) if such a corporation does not receive any gross income during an annual accounting period, the 80-percent income test is inapplicable.

The House recedes.

SECTION 4917. EXCLUSION FOR ORIGINAL OR NEW ISSUES WHERE REQUIRED FOR INTERNATIONAL MONETARY STABILITY

Amendment No. 90: In the House bill, section 4917(b) provided that an Executive order described in section 4917(a) may be applicable to all original or new issues, or only to an aggregate amount or classification thereof, as stated in the order. If the order is applicable to a limited aggregate amount of such issues, it will apply to those acquisitions as to which notice of acquisition is first filed, but any such acquisition must be made within 90 days after filing of such notice. The Senate amendment provided that a period of time longer than 90 days may be specified in the order. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 91: In the House bill, section 4917(c) provided that a debt obligation is treated as part of an original or new issue (for purposes of sec. 4917) only if acquired not later than 60 days after the date on which interest begins to accrue on such obligation. The Senate amendment substituted a 90-day period for the 60-day period. It also amended section 4917(c) to provide that a debt obligation secured by a lien on improvements on real property under construction or to be constructed at the time the obligation is issued (or if a series of obligations is involved, when the first is issued) will be treated as part of an original or new issue if two conditions are satisfied. First, the obligation must be acquired within 90 days of the date on which interest begins to accrue on the total amount of the obligation (or if a series of obligations is involved, on the last issued) and, second, the acquiring person must become committed to such acquisition not later than 90 days after the date interest first begins to accrue on any part of the obligation (or if a series of obligations is involved, on the first issued).

The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

SECTION 4918. EXEMPTION FOR PRIOR AMERICAN OWNERSHIP

Amendments Nos. 92 and 93: In the House bill, section 4918(a) provided an exemption from the tax imposed by section 4911 with respect to foreign stock or debt obligations acquired from a U.S. person if such person was a U.S. person throughout the period of his ownership or continuously since July 18, 1963. The acquiring person is permitted to establish such prior American ownership by any clear and convincing evidence. The Senate amendments changed section 4918 (a) by deleting the reference to clear and convincing evidence and by prescribing a more specific procedure (set forth in new subsec. (f) of sec. 4918; see discussion below of amendment No. 95) for establishing prior American ownership. Section 4918(a), as amended, also provided that an exemption based on prior American ownership only applies if the U.S. person from whom a foreign stock or debt obligation is acquired was eligible to execute a certificate of American ownership. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 94: In the House bill, section 4918(c) provided that a written confirmation received from a member or member organization of a national securities exchange registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission (and having the requisite rules) stating that the acquisition was made in the regular market on such exchange serves as conclusive proof of prior American ownership for purposes of section 4918(a).

Under the Senate amendment, a written confirmation will serve as conclusive proof of prior American ownership if the confirmation does not contain a statement that such acquisition was made subject to a special contract. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 95: This amendment added to section 4918 a new subsection (f), providing that for purposes of section 4918 (a) (general rule for exemption for prior American ownership) if a person establishes with respect to an acquisition that there is reasonable cause for his inability to establish prior American ownership under subsection (b), (c), or (d) of section 4918, he may establish prior American ownership by other evidence that the person from whom the acquisition was made was a U.S. person eligible to execute a certificate of American ownership with respect to the acquisition. The House recedes.

SECTION 4919. SALES BY UNDERWRITERS AND DEALERS TO FOREIGN PERSONS

Amendment No. 96: This amendment modified section 4919(a) to permit an underwriter to obtain a refund of tax with respect to stock or debt obligations sold to foreigners

in connection with a private placement or a public offering. Under the amendment, the provisions which in the House bill applied only to public offerings would also apply to private placements. The amended section 4919(a) permits a dealer to obtain a refund of tax not only if he sells a debt obligation to a foreigner within 90 days of purchase but also if he sells it within 90 days of the purchase to another dealer who resells it to a foreigner on the day of purchase by the second dealer or on the following business day. Finally, this amendment permits a dealer to in effect purchase stock from a foreigner tax-free if he sells it to a foreigner on the day of purchase or on either of the two succeeding business days. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 97: This amendment modified section 4919(b) (which would still contain the same proof of sale to foreigner requirements which were contained in the House bill with respect to refunds of tax in cases involving sales in connection with an underwriting of foreign securities) to provide rules by which dealers may prove sales of stock or debt obligations to foreign persons in the special market of a registered national securities exchange and may prove sales of debt obligations to foreign persons in over-the-counter transactions. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 98: Under the House bill, a person had to be a member of the National Association of Securities Dealers to come within the definition of the term "dealer" contained in section 4919(c)(2). This amendment changed the definition so that the person may be a member of any national securities association registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission. The House recedes.

SECTION 4920. DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES

Amendments Nos. 103 and 104: These amendments changed the definition of domestic corporation and domestic partnership contained in section 4920(a)(5) to permit a domestic corporation or partnership which is a dealer in securities to elect, under certain circumstances, to treat a foreign branch office as a foreign corporation or partnership for purposes of the tax. The House recedes on amendment No. 103, and recedes with a clerical amendment on amendment No. 104.

Amendment No. 105: This amendment inserted the phrase "(including any bank deposit)" in section 4920(a)(7)(B)(iv) to make it clear that a demand bank deposit is to be treated as having a maturity of less than 3 years. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 106 and 102: The last sentence of section 4920(a)(3) in the House bill provided that a class of stock of a foreign corporation will be treated as not being the stock of a foreign corporation for purposes of the tax if more than 50 percent of such class of stock was held by Americans on the last record date before July 19, 1963, and if U.S. registered securities exchanges constituted the principal market for the stock in 1962. Amendment No. 102 struck out this last sentence, but amendment No. 106 inserted its substance as a new paragraph (8)(B) of section 4920(a). In addition, amendment No. 106 inserted a new paragraph (8)(A) which provides that a class of stock of a foreign corporation will be treated as not being the stock of a foreign corporation for purposes of the tax if Americans held more than 65 percent of such stock on the last record date before July 19, 1963, without regard to the principal market test. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 107: This amendment added to section 4920 a new subsection (b), under which a foreign underwriter may elect to be treated as a U.S. person with respect to his participation in a public offering by an underwriting group which includes one or more U.S. persons. The House recedes.

SECTION 4931. COMMERCIAL BANK LOANS

Amendment No. 110: This amendment added to chapter 41 of the code (as added by the House bill) a new subchapter B, consisting of section 4931 and providing under specified circumstances for the imposition of tax on acquisitions by commercial banks of debt obligations of foreign obligors having a maturity of 1 year or more; otherwise, such acquisitions either would not be subject to tax at all (where they involve debt obligations having maturities of less than 3 years) or would be exempted from tax under section 4914(b)(2)(A) (in other cases). Under the new section 4931, tax would be imposed upon these acquisitions if the President (1) determines that the acquisition of such obligations by commercial banks in the ordinary course of their banking business has materially impaired the effectiveness of the tax imposed by section 4911 because such acquisitions have (directly or indirectly) replaced acquisitions by U.S. persons, other than commercial banks, of debt obligations of foreign obligors which are subject to such tax and (2) accordingly issues an Executive order making the new section applicable to such acquisitions (during the period and to the extent specified in the order). The tax rates on debt obligations having a period remaining to maturity of from 1 to 3 years would range from 1.05 percent for a debt obligation with a period of between 1 and 1½ years to 2.75 percent for an obligation with a period of between 2½ and 3 years. The tax imposed under section 4931(c) is treated as imposed under section 4911. The exclusions and exemptions otherwise provided under the new chapter 41 would apply, except that the exclusion for prior American ownership under section 4918 would not apply in the case of debt obligations having a maturity of from 1 to 3 years. In addition, certain export-related loans and certain foreign currency loans by foreign branches would be excluded.

The House recedes with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. Under the conference substitute (1) the tax thus provided for could not be imposed retroactively with respect to acquisitions made before such an Executive order is issued and could not be imposed with respect to acquisitions (when made) pursuant to preexisting commitments which were unconditional or substantially formalized no later than August 4, 1964, and (2) the Executive order (if issued) will be effective from the day following the date of its issuance to the date on which the interest equalization tax is to terminate. The Executive order may be modified after it is issued, but not in such a way as to exempt from tax any significant class of acquisitions which had been subject to tax under the order as originally issued or as in effect under any previous modification; and in no case could any such modification apply so as to subject to tax any acquisition made on or before the date of issuance of that particular modification (or any acquisition, whenever made, which was covered on August 4, 1964, by a preexisting commitment as described above).

At the time the Committee on Ways and Means reported H.R. 8000 to the House, concern was expressed as to whether the exclusion from tax provided for loans made by commercial banks might lead to such loans being substituted for loans subject to the interest equalization tax. The report of the Committee on Ways and Means indicated an awareness that an exclusion of this type could be so abused. For that reason, the House version of the bill provided specific authority for the collection of information on the nature and trends in bank lending to foreign persons. It was indicated that this information would be used in determining whether the commercial bank exclusion should be continued. The views of the mi-

nority expressed still greater concern with this exclusion.

Since the third quarter of 1963 (the latest data available on bank credits to foreigners when the House considered this bill), both long- and short-term bank loans have increased. While much of the expansion in bank credits may well be attributable to necessary financing of exports, and be beneficial to the balance of payments, rather than a substitute for taxable obligations, nevertheless, the increase in bank credit since the third quarter of 1963 has convinced the conferees on the part of the House of the desirability of accepting, with the modifications indicated above, the Senate amendment giving the President standby authority to impose the tax with respect to commercial bank loans. The conferees understand that the President will follow closely the volume of commercial bank loans and should he become convinced that they are being used to an appreciable extent as a substitute (directly or indirectly) for obligations taxed by the bill, he will exercise the authority granted to him under this provision.

SECTION 2 (C) OF THE BILL—EFFECTIVE DATE

Amendments Nos. 111 and 112: These amendments extended the exclusion (contained in sec. 2(c)(2)(B) of the House bill) for acquisitions pursuant to commitments which existed on July 18, 1963, to cases where approval of the acquisition had been sent to the person from whom the acquisition was made (rather than to the issuer or obligor as required by the House bill), and to cases where the commitment was evidenced by a draft purchase contract or other unsigned document. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 114: This amendment added a new subparagraph (C) to section 2(c)(2) of the bill, relating to preexisting commitments. Under the new subparagraph, the tax is not to apply to certain acquisitions of foreign securities pursuant to a contract entered into before July 19, 1963, with the government of a less developed country in connection with the nationalization of property owned within that country by the acquiring U.S. person (or a foreign corporation controlled by him). The House recedes.

Amendment No. 117: This amendment added a new subparagraph (E) to section 2(c)(2) of the bill. Under the new subparagraph, the tax is not to apply to an acquisition of stock in the initial capitalization of a foreign corporation which would be excluded from tax under section 4915 of the code (relating to direct investments) but for the provisions of subsection (c) thereof, if at least 75 percent in interest of the U.S. persons who acquired stock in such initial capitalization had signed on or before July 18, 1963, to the person coordinating the organization the intention to invest a specified amount of money through the purchase of such stock, which amount was equal to or greater than the amount ultimately so invested. The House recedes.

SECTION 3 OF THE BILL—RETURNS

Amendment No. 120: This amendment provided that a U.S. person claiming an exemption on the basis of acquisition from a prior American owner (instead of submitting "clear and convincing evidence" of the exemption, as required under the House bill) must attach a statement to his quarterly interest equalization tax return setting forth a summary of the evidence establishing prior American ownership and the reasons for his inability to produce an exempting certificate or confirmation if he does not have a certificate of American ownership or a confirmation from a dealer for a transaction on a registered securities exchange or in an over-the-counter transaction. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 121: Under the House bill, paragraph (3) of the new section 6011(d) provided that members or member organizations of registered national securities ex-

changes or association shall keep such records and file such information as is required by regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate in connection with their sales as brokers and in connection with their acquisitions for their own account of stock or debt obligations as to which a certificate of American ownership, or blanket certificate of American ownership, is executed and filed under section 4918(e). Under the Senate amendment, paragraph (3) of section 6011(d) applies to acquisitions, as well as sales, effected by such member or member organizations as a broker and to acquisitions made for the accounts of such member or member organization, but only to those acquisitions or sales, as the case may be, as to which—

(1) a certificate of American ownership or a blanket certificate of American ownership is executed and filed with such member or member organization under section 4918(e), or

(2) a written confirmation is furnished to a U.S. person stating that the acquisition—

(i) in the case of a transaction on a national securities exchange, was made subject to a special contract, or

(ii) in the case of a transaction not on a national securities exchange, was from a person who had not filed a certificate of American ownership with respect to such stock or debt obligation or a blanket certificate of American ownership with respect to the account from which such stock or debt obligation was sold.

The House recedes.

SECTION 5 OF THE BILL—ORIGINAL ISSUE DISCOUNT

Amendment No. 122: This amendment added to the bill a new section 5 amending section 1232(b)(2) of the code, relating to the definition of the term "issue price" for purposes of determining original issue discount. The new section 5 provides that (in the case of privately placed issues) the price paid by the first buyer of bonds or other evidences of indebtedness will be increased by the amount of interest equalization tax (if any) paid under section 4911. The provision is inapplicable, however, to the extent that a credit, refund, or reimbursement of the tax is obtained, directly or indirectly. The House recedes.

SECTION 6 OF THE BILL—PENALTIES

Amendment No. 127: This amendment added to the new section 6681 of the code, relating to false equalization tax certificates, a new subsection (d). Under this new subsection, civil penalties are provided in cases where members of a registered securities exchange or of a national securities association willfully furnish false confirmations. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 129: This amendment changed the new section 7241 of the code to make it clear that the criminal penalties provided by that section are to apply only to violations occurring on or after the date of the enactment of this bill. The House recedes.

W. D. MILLS,
CECIL R. KING,
HALE BOGGS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that the purpose of the Interest Equalization Tax Act is to bring the cost of capital raised in the U.S. market by foreign persons more nearly into alignment with the cost prevailing in markets in other industrial countries.

The conference agreement in basic substance is the same as the House

passed bill with one exception which I will describe later.

This tax is designed to aid our balance-of-payments position by limiting somewhat the demand on our capital market from other industrialized countries. The interest equalization tax is a temporary excise tax effective for the period July 19, 1963, through December 31, 1965. The bill imposes a tax on the purchase by U.S. citizens, residents, domestic corporations, and other U.S. persons of debt obligations or stock of foreign persons but only where the obligation or stock was purchased from a foreigner. The tax on the transfer of stock is 15 percent of the value of the stock and the tax on debt obligations varies from 15 percent on those with a maturity of 28½ years or more down to 2.75 percent for those with a maturity of 3 to 3½ years. No tax is imposed for obligations with a maturity of 3 years or less.

The House will recall that the purpose of this tax is to reduce the rate of return on foreign securities by about 1 percent per year. Since the burden of this tax is likely to be shifted to the foreign seller, this means that in most cases he will have to pay a tax which has the same effect as a 1-percent higher interest rate for the use of money that he obtains from the American market. The Treasury Department has estimated that this will have the effect of improving the U.S. balance of payments by from \$1¼ to \$1½ billion a year. The need for such an improvement is, of course, the reason why it has been necessary for us to pass this bill which none of us otherwise would be anxious to enact.

The balance-of-payments deficit on regular transactions was running at the annual rate of \$5.3 billion in the second quarter of 1963 when the President announced his recommendation that this interest equalization tax be enacted. Since that time, there has been a very decided improvement in the balance of payments. In the third and fourth quarters, the deficit on regular transactions was \$1.6 billion on an annual rate basis. In the first quarter of 1964, the result is still more favorable with the deficit in balance of payments having shrunk to slightly less than \$900 million on an annual rate basis. Some have suggested that this improvement in the balance of payments since the first half of 1963 and particularly the small deficit in the first quarter of 1964 make the interest equalization tax no longer necessary. However, this ignores the fact that the bulk of the gains in the balance-of-payments position have been due to the fact that this tax was likely to be imposed effective from July 1963 on. Certainly other factors such as price stability here at home and an improving balance of trade have contributed toward the improvement in the balance of payments but the major factor has been the realization by most prospective purchasers of stock or debt obligations that Congress was likely to enact this tax effective as of July 19, 1963. Moreover, the preliminary data for the second quarter of 1964 again show a larger balance-of-payments deficit. On an annual rate basis, the deficit in the

second quarter according to the preliminary statistics is \$3 billion. Even when this is averaged with the more favorable balance in the first quarter of 1964, we can hardly take comfort from a deficit of this magnitude nor consider anything other than the prompt enactment of this bill to restrict capital movements out of this country.

The amendments made by the Senate to the House passed version of H.R. 8000 with one exception were of a relatively technical nature designed to perfect the intent of the provisions as passed by the House. Just as the House Committee on Ways and Means found it necessary to make a series of amendments to the original Treasury proposal, so the further study devoted to the bill by the other body made it necessary to supplement the changes made in the original proposal by the House.

As a result, with the exception of one amendment added on the floor of the other body, the conferees on the part of the House found no problem with the amendments added by the other body. Therefore, with this one exception, your conferees accepted the amendments of the other body with minor clerical modifications. I ask unanimous consent that there be added at the end of my statement a summary of the more significant of these modifications made by the other body in the House passed bill.

The one exception where the other body would make a significant change related to what has been called the Gore amendment. The House version of H.R. 8000 provides an exclusion from tax for debt obligations by a commercial bank in making loans in the ordinary course of its commercial banking business. At the time the House provided this exclusion from tax for commercial bank loans, it was recognized that an exclusion of this type could be abused. For this reason, the report of the Committee on Ways and Means provided specific authority for the collection of information on the nature and trends in bank lending to foreign persons. It was indicated that this information would be used in determining whether the commercial bank exclusion should be continued. The minority report expressed still greater concern with this exclusion. In this regard, the statement of the minority was as follows:

It is understood that approximately one-half of the long-term foreign loans by institutions, amounting to \$248 million for the year 1962, will fall within this exemption. In addition, a substantial amount of the loans, which might otherwise be represented by foreign bonds, may be placed with the banks free of tax. In fact, since the announcements of the proposed tax on July 18, 1963, it is reported that the city of Vienna changed its plan for financing in the United States, from a proposed bond issue to a direct loan from banks.

Since the House acted on H.R. 8000 last fall, the data available do indicate a substantial increase in bank credits to foreigners. In the third quarter of 1963, the total bank credits going to foreigners was at an annual rate of \$612 million. This can be contrasted to annual rates of \$2.8 billion in the fourth quarter of

1963 and the first quarter of 1964. Preliminary data for the second quarter of 1964 show a slight drop to an annual level of \$2.6 billion for bank credits to foreigners.

While the overall increase in bank credits to foreigners represents an unfavorable shift in our balance of payments, since the third quarter of 1963 an analysis of more detailed information suggests that the situation in this regard is not as bad as it might at first hand appear. While short-term loans to foreigners have increased substantially since the third quarter of 1963 the trend in long-term bank credit to foreigners is somewhat more erratic. Short-term credit, that is credit of 1 year or less, increased on a net basis from an annual rate of \$76 million in the third quarter of 1963 to \$1.1 billion in the fourth quarter, to \$1.7 billion in the first quarter of 1964 and to \$2.5 billion according to the preliminary statistics for the second quarter of 1964. This increase would be unaffected by the Senate amendment since the Senate would provide standby authority only with respect to debt obligations of banks of more than 1 year.

Long-term bank credits to foreigners increased from about \$½ billion in the third quarter of 1963, to \$1.7 billion in the fourth quarter and \$1.1 billion in the first quarter of 1964. In the second quarter of 1964, however, long-term bank credits on an annual rate basis are reported to amount to only about \$150 million. However, it is understood that commitments made suggest that this will increase appreciably in July.

It is, of course, difficult, if not impossible, to be sure of exactly what underlies these short-term shifts in statistical data. Thus, the increase in bank credit to foreigners may represent increases in export related loans or perhaps just temporary seasonal factors.

In any event, however, the other body thought that this increase in bank loans was of sufficient importance to justify giving the administration standby authority to impose the tax with respect to commercial bank loans of more than 1 year. It is understood that the President will follow closely the volume of commercial loans but will not exercise this authority granted him to extend the application of the tax to commercial bank loans unless he becomes convinced that these loans are being issued to an appreciable extent either directly or indirectly as a substitute for debt obligations taxed under the bill. Presumably he would not exercise the authority therefore unless long-term bank credits again show an appreciable increase and there is evidence that these loans are replacing for acquisitions which otherwise would be taxed by the bill.

The need for standby authority does not stem from any already demonstrated abuse of the exclusion for bank loans as a result of substitution for bond financing. The rapid increase in long-term bank lending abroad may well be simply another reflection of the heavy foreign demands for all kinds of capital and credit—demands that might, by and large, have developed whether or not this

tax was proposed. But whatever the cause, these loans have resulted in a large outflow of dollars and slowed our progress toward eliminating our deficit.

Although the House conferees accepted the basic standby authority provided by the Senate amendment with respect to commercial bank loans, certain modifications were made in the Senate amendment.

First of all, questions have been raised as to whether it would not be possible under the Senate version of this amendment for the tax to be applied retroactively to commercial bank loans. To meet this problem, the House conferees obtained a modification in the Senate amendment to provide that the tax would in no event be imposed with respect to bank loans made before the date the President issues an Executive order—if he does—imposing the tax with respect to commercial bank loans.

Secondly, the House conferees have obtained a modification in the Senate amendment to provide that a tax—if one is to be imposed—on commercial bank loans will in no event apply to commitments to make loans which were unconditional or substantially formalized not later than August 4, 1964, the date the Senate adopted this basic amendment.

Under the modification agreed to by the House conferees an Executive order, if issued, may be modified after the original issuance. However, if any significant class of bank loans has been subjected to tax under an Executive order previously issued or modified then the tax may not be removed with respect to such a class of bank loans during the limited period of time, this tax remains in effect. Provision is also made to be sure that in any of these cases where an Executive order has been issued and then modified that the modification will not retroactively impose a tax with respect to bank loans made on or before the date of issuance of the modifications.

In granting the authority provided by this bill to the President to impose a tax with respect to commercial bank loans it should be clearly understood that your conferees are not directing that any action be taken in this regard. Instead, it is contemplated that a tax will be made applicable only in the event there is a finding that commercial bank loans are being issued to an appreciable degree as a substitute for otherwise taxable obligations and the extent to which this is true indicates a volume with which we must be concerned from the standpoint of our balance of payments.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I will include a summary of the principal Senate amendments agreed to by the House:

SUMMARY OF PRINCIPAL SENATE AMENDMENTS AGREED TO BY HOUSE CONFEREES WITHOUT SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE

1. The House bill provided that contributions to a foreign pension or profit-sharing trust made by an employee who performs services, for the business involved, on a full-time basis in a foreign country (and who is not an owner-employee) are not to be subject to tax with respect to these contributions. The Senate amended the bill to extend this exemption to contri-

butions made by an employer to a foreign pension or profit-sharing trust established for the exclusive benefit of employees (who are not owner-employees) who perform personal services for the business on a full-time basis in a foreign country. Normal business transactions generally provide for the contributions in such cases to be made in foreign currencies since the benefits are payable to the retired employees in foreign currencies.

2. The House bill provided that tax is not to apply to acquisitions of foreign stocks or debt obligations in a tax-free reorganization (in the case of exchanges to which sec. 354, 355, 356 apply, or would apply but for sec. 367). The Senate amendments provide that the tax also is not to apply in those cases which would be tax-free except for the fact that money (or other property) in addition to stock of the foreign person is received by the U.S. person. Since the receipt of money (or other property) in such a case will benefit the U.S. balance of payments, your committee saw no reason why this should result in the imposition of tax (sec. 4912(b)(4)).

3. The House bill provided an exclusion from tax for the acquisition of debt obligations by a commercial bank in making loans in the ordinary course of its commercial banking business. In this regard, the Senate report made it clear that the interest equalization tax was not to apply to loans or investments in foreign currencies made by foreign branches of U.S. banks to the extent of foreign currency deposits acquired in the ordinary course of their business. Loans or investments will be considered as made in the ordinary course of a branch's commercial banking business if the loans or investments would be considered to be in the ordinary course of commercial banking business either in the United States or in the foreign countries in which the U.S. bank has foreign branches (sec. 4914(b)(2)).

4. Under the House bill, tax does not apply to any distribution by a corporation of its own stock or debt obligations. The Senate amended this to also exclude from tax a distribution in complete or partial liquidation of corporation of stock or debt obligations owned by the corporation on July 18, 1963 (the general effective date of the bill). However, such a distribution is to be free of tax only to the extent the shareholder involved owned his stock on July 18, 1963, or acquired his stock in a transaction other than one excluded from tax under sections 4914(b), 4915, 4916, or 4917. Provision for distribution of securities held on July 18, 1963, free of this tax seemed appropriate to your committee since the tax does not apply to acquisitions before this date (sec. 4914(a)(5)).

5. The Senate added an amendment excluding from tax stock or debt obligations acquired by U.S. persons doing business in a foreign country to the extent the acquisition was a substitute for the payment of tax to the foreign country. This exemption was provided because it was obvious that the acquisition of the stock or debt in such cases was not attributable to variations in rates of return in the United States and foreign countries (sec. 4914(b)(4)).

6. The Senate added an amendment excluding from tax stock of a foreign corporation entitling the holder to occupy for dwelling purposes a house or apartment owned or leased by the corporation. Since purchases of dwellings to be occupied by the purchaser are not generally subject to the interest equalization tax, no reason was seen for subjecting to tax what is the equivalent type of ownership in the case of cooperative housing (sec. 4914(b)(5)).

7. The House bill in the case of exporters contains a rule providing that the tax is not to apply to foreign stock or debt arising out of the sale of tangible personal prop-

erty or services if 30 percent of the purchase price of the property or services is attributable to property produced in the United States by the exporter and at least 50 percent of this property (or services) is produced in the United States by U.S. persons. The Senate provided alternate rules in this case which relate these requirements to the stock or debt to be acquired rather than to the purchase price of the property of services. Thus, the Senate amendment provides an exemption for the stock or debt if 60 percent of the value of the stock or debt acquired is attributable to production in the United States (or services) by the exporter and if 100 percent of the stock or debt acquired is attributable to property produced in the United States (or services rendered by U.S. persons). This alternate rule is intended primarily as a way of liberalizing the House rule in the case of construction projects outside the United States (sec. 4914(c)(2)).

8. The Senate added an exemption for stock or debt acquired as a result of the sale or licensing to a foreign person of patents, inventions, or similar property, if 85 percent of the purchase price, or license fee, is attributable to the sale or license of patents, inventions, etc., produced or developed in the United States by the U.S. person who receives the stock or debt obligation. This exemption was provided on the grounds that such sales or licensing have substantially the same effect on the balance of payments as export sales for which a similar exemption is available under the House bill (sec. 4914(c)(3)).

9. The House bill provides an exemption for debt obligations acquired by a U.S. person as a result of the sale by him of ores or minerals extracted outside the United States if the foreign purchaser agrees to purchase these ores or minerals for a period of 3 years or more. Under the House bill, the ores or minerals could have been extracted (1) by the U.S. person himself; (2) by a corporation included in the same affiliated group (50-percent ownership test applied); (3) by a corporation 10 percent of which is owned by the U.S. person in question and at least 50 percent of which is owned by U.S. persons having 10 percent or greater interests. The Senate amendments liberalize this House provision by making this exclusion from tax available where the mineral is extracted by a corporation in which the U.S. person (or its 50-percent shareholder or subsidiary) has a 10-percent interest, whether or not there are five U.S. persons having 10-percent interests (a modification of rule (3) above). In addition, the Senate amendments make this exclusion available where the ores or minerals are obtained under a contract which was entered into on or before July 18, 1963, or where the ore or mineral extracted outside of the United States was exchanged for similar ores or minerals with respect to which the stock or debt was obtained (sec. 4914(c)(5)).

10. The Senate made a series of minor amendments in the exclusion provided by the House bill which allows insurance companies to elect to acquire stock or debt obligations of foreign persons tax free in an amount equal to 110 percent of their reserves against foreign risks. Under the modifications, insurance companies will estimate the size of their reserves without waiting until the end of the calendar years (sec. 4914(e)).

11. The Senate added an exclusion to provide that a U.S. shareholder may acquire foreign debt obligations tax free in connection with the sale of the stock of a wholly owned foreign subsidiary or as a result of a liquidation of a wholly owned foreign subsidiary following the sale of its assets for a foreign debt obligation. It was considered appropriate to provide exclusions in such cases because acquisitions of this character are not made in response to interest rate differentials (sec. 4914(g)).

12. The Senate added an exemption for acquisitions by a U.S. person of a debt obligation of a foreign person in connection with the purchase from a U.S. owner of real property located in the United States, where 25 percent of the purchase price is paid in dollars to the U.S. seller. Such transactions are beneficial to our balance of payments (sec. 4914(h)).

13. The Senate made an exclusion available in certain cases where the assets of a foreign issuer are invested almost exclusively in U.S. securities. In this case, the Senate had in mind primarily cases where foreign investment companies invest almost exclusively in U.S. securities and sell most of the stock of the company to other than U.S. persons. In such cases, it was thought that the stock sales were beneficial to the U.S. balance of payments and, therefore, should not be discouraged by imposing a tax upon minor sales to U.S. persons who are abroad. The tax-free sales to U.S. persons in such cases, however, will only be available to those who are bona fide residents of foreign countries or perform personal services on a full-time basis in a foreign country.

In addition the sales will be tax free only to the extent of acquisitions in any year not in excess of \$5,000. To qualify for this treatment, less than 25 percent of the stock of the foreign fund must be held by U.S. persons; money and deposits of the foreign fund, other than deposits with U.S. banks, must represent less than 5 percent of the fund's assets; and all other assets of the fund from June 30, 1963, on (or any period thereafter in which the fund is in existence) must be in stocks and debt obligations of U.S. corporations, in U.S. governmental bonds, or in debt obligations of U.S. persons (sec. 4914(i)).

14. Under the House bill, debt obligations exempted from tax under the export provision generally became taxable if the debt was subsequently transferred by the exporter to other than an agency of the United States or a commercial bank. The Senate amended this provision to permit the transfer of the debt obligation in such cases by the exporter, without tax, where the exporter shows that the extension of credit was reasonably necessary to obtain the sale of property or services and that the terms of the debt obligation were not unreasonable in light of credit practices prevailing in the exporter's business. The standard to be applied under this provision is intended to be flexible, so as to permit U.S. exporters to meet the competitive conditions existing in their respective industries by extending the credit necessary to sell their products and services to foreign customers (sec. 4914(j)(1)(A)(iii)).

15. The House bill contains a general exclusion for direct (as distinct from portfolio) investments by U.S. persons in foreign corporations. Generally, direct investments are considered to be those where the U.S. person owns 10 percent or more of the voting stock of the foreign corporation. The Senate amended this exclusion to extend it to debt obligations of other foreign persons obtained by the American person from the 10-percent-owned foreign corporation where it, in turn, obtained the debt obligation in the ordinary course of its business, as a result of the sale or rental of products produced by it or for the performance of services by it. Since much the same result could be achieved by direct loans to the 10-percent-owned foreign corporation, it was thought there was no reason why the foreign companies should not obtain the funds directly by transferring debt obligations to the U.S. person which it acquired in its business with foreigners (sec. 4915(a)(1)).

16. Under the House bill, the 10-percent ownership test required in the case of a series of acquisitions that the direct invest-

ment standard had to be met on the last day of the calendar year in which the stock purchase was made. The Senate provided that this ownership requirement can be satisfied by obtaining the 10-percent ownership at any time within 12 months after the acquisition, and has also provided that debt obligations can qualify under this provision. It was thought there was no reason for requiring the satisfaction of the 10-percent requirement at the end of a calendar year rather than at the end of a 12-month period (sec. 4915(a)(2)).

17. In the case of the exclusion for direct investments, the House bill imposes a limitation to the effect that this exclusion is not to be available where the 10-percent-owned foreign corporation is formed or availed of by the U.S. person for the purpose of acquiring stock or debt which, if it were acquired directly, would be subject to the interest equalization tax. In this connection, it is made clear in the House bill that the acquisition by a U.S. person of stock in a foreign corporation which acquires stock or debt of foreign persons in making loans in the ordinary course of its business as a commercial bank is not to be considered as resulting in the denial of the exclusion to the U.S. person under the direct investment provision. The Senate amended this provision to provide that for this purpose, the term "commercial bank" is to include any foreign corporation or partnership which is primarily engaged in the business of accepting deposits from customers and receiving other borrowed funds in foreign currencies and making loans in these currencies. Even though the institutions are not technically commercial banks, no reason was seen in such cases why the same tests should not be applied as those applicable to these banks (sec. 4915(c)(2)).

18. The House-passed bill provides an exemption from tax for acquisitions by U.S. persons of (1) debt obligations of governments of less developed countries; (2) stock or debt obligations of "less developed country corporations"; or (3) debt obligations issued by individual residents in less developed countries. To qualify as a less developed country corporation, in general, 80 percent of the corporation's income and 80 percent of its assets must, with certain exceptions, originate in, or be located in, less developed countries. The Senate modified this rule to provide for cases where the property of corporations located in less developed countries is being nationalized (or taken in action which has the effect of nationalization) and the property is being paid for by the less developed country involved with the requirement that the funds so obtained be invested in that country. In such cases, the corporations involved have had difficulties in obtaining sufficient information with respect to their reinvestments to provide assurance that the corporations in which they invested constitute less developed country corporations (by meeting the two 80-percent tests). In such cases, there appears to be little doubt that the less developed country corporation test could be met if the necessary information could be obtained. Moreover, because of the fact that the reinvestments within the country are required by the country itself, it appears to your committee that no further tests need be imposed by the United States in such cases (sec. 4916(a)(4)).

19. The definition of a less developed country for purposes of the exclusion for less developed country corporations and investments is to be designated by the President except that certain countries listed in the bill are considered as not being less developed countries. The fact, however, that only "foreign countries" can be so designated makes it impossible for a possession of the United States to qualify for this purpose

as a less developed country. To prevent discrimination in this regard against investments in such U.S. possessions as Puerto Rico, the Senate amended the definition of less developed countries to include not only foreign countries but also possessions of the United States. In the past, in designating less developed countries, the President by Executive order has made it clear that trusted areas are considered as separate foreign countries and, therefore, may qualify as less developed countries even though the country to whom they are trusted under United Nations agreement may not so qualify. It is agreed that there should be included in the same category as trusted countries those which were mandated by the League of Nations whether or not subsequently trusted by the United Nations (sec. 4916(b)).

20. In determining whether or not 80 percent of a corporation's income is derived from a less developed country and 80 percent or more of its assets comes from such countries, the Senate amended the House bill to provide that income or assets located in the United States are not generally to be taken into account. Thus, while such income or assets will not aid a corporation in meeting the 80-percent tests, nevertheless, the presence of income or assets in the United States will not prevent a corporation from otherwise qualifying (sec. 4916(c)(2)).

21. Under the House bill, the interest equalization tax does not apply if a U.S. purchaser establishes by clear and convincing evidence that he purchased a foreign security from another American. The Senate modified this to provide that he must prove that he purchased the foreign security from an American either by (1) a certificate of American ownership from an American eligible to execute such a certificate, or (2) a confirmation that the purchase was made on the regular market of a registered stock exchange or from a member of a national securities association with respect to an exempt over-the-counter transaction. This prevents an individual from obtaining an exemption from tax where he purchases a foreign security from another American who under the bill is in effect treated in the same manner as a foreigner (e.g., an insurance company with respect to its exempt fund of assets) (sec. 4918 (a) and (f)).

22. Under the House bill, where an underwriter obtains foreign securities from a foreigner and then resells these securities to foreigners, a credit or refund on the tax initially paid may be claimed. In addition, an exemption is allowed under the House bill for debt obligations acquired by a dealer and within 90 days sold by him to foreigners. In the case of stock, under the House provision, no exclusion was available to a dealer for resales to foreigners. The Senate provided an exclusion in such cases where the dealer resells the stock to foreigners either on the day of purchase or on either of the 2 succeeding business days. This is designed primarily as a means of exempting dealers whose principal business is engaging in arbitrage in different markets with respect to foreign securities (sec. 4919(a)(3)).

23. The Senate amended the definition of "domestic corporation" and "domestic partnership" to permit a foreign branch of a dealer in securities to be treated as a foreign corporation or partnership if (1) the branch was located outside the United States on July 18, 1963, and was regularly engaged as a merchant in securities for at least 12 months prior to that date, (2) all purchases by the branch of stock and debt obligations are in the ordinary course of its business, and (3) the branch maintains separate books and records properly reflecting its assets and liabilities. If an election of this type is made, any transfers by the domestic corporation or partnership to the foreign branch, or borrowings by the branch from U.S. banks, are subject to the tax. This is desirable be-

cause it places foreign branches of U.S. securities firms, which were in operation for a substantial period of time prior to the announcement of the tax, in a comparable position with foreign subsidiaries of other U.S. securities firms (sec. 4920(a)(5)).

24. Under the House bill, a class of stock of a foreign corporation is treated as the stock of a domestic corporation if registered national securities exchanges constituted the principal market for the stock during the calendar year 1962 and as of the latest record date before July 19, 1963, more than 50 percent of that class of stock was owned by U.S. persons. The Senate amendments also treat a class of stock of a foreign corporation as domestic for purposes of the interest equalization tax if more than 65 percent of the stock was held by Americans on the last record date before July 19, 1963. Treatment of foreign corporations which are substantially owned by Americans as domestic corporations, without regard to the market in which their stock is traded, removes the distinction that existed under the House bill between listed stocks and those traded over the counter (sec. 4920(a)(8)).

25. The Senate provided an exclusion in certain cases from tax for the acquisition of stock in the initial capitalization of a foreign corporation which would be excluded under the direct investment provision but for the requirement that the 10-percent foreign-owned corporation may not invest in assets which would be taxable to the U.S. person if acquired directly. The exclusion is available if at least 75 percent in interest of the U.S. persons in the initial capitalization had appropriately signified before July 18, 1963, their intention to invest in such a corporation (bill, sec. 2(c)(2)(E)).

26. The Senate added new broker reporting requirements to the bill. Under the House bill, only the broker for the seller of the stock or debt was required to maintain records to show that the seller had supplied him with a certificate of American ownership or that he had a blanket certificate on file with respect to the seller. The Senate amended the bill also to require the broker for the purchaser to maintain records where the purchaser is potentially liable for tax; that is, in all cases other than where the purchase was made in the regular market on an exchange or in an over-the-counter transaction where the seller's broker represented to the purchaser's broker that the seller had filed with him a certificate of American ownership (bill, sec. 3(a)(3)).

27. The Senate provided that the criminal provision in the bill which penalizes the willful execution of false certificates is to be made applicable only to false certificates executed on or after the date of enactment of the bill. This is in conformity with the constitutional prohibition against criminal penalties applying to acts occurring before the date of enactment of the legislation involved. However, this change does not affect the applicability of the provisions in present law (sec. 1001 of title 18, United States Code) which provide criminal penalties for false representations made to a department or agency of the United States on a matter within its jurisdiction (bill, sec. 6(b)).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. Could the gentleman state what is the current deficit in the balance of payments?

Mr. MILLS. I do not have that figure in my mind. I shall be glad to yield to someone who has that figure in mind.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. My understanding is that it is running at an annual rate of \$3 billion.

Mr. MILLS. As against an annual rate of \$5.3 billion in the second quarter of 1963, at the time this program was proposed and it commenced.

Mr. CURTIS. That is taking the second quarter rate, by carrying it across that way, but if you take the first and second quarters together, it is not that bad.

Mr. MILLS. But all of us admit there has been some improvement. However, as much improvement as has been made, we want other improvements made. Certainly, if we move backward with respect to this program, we can expect that \$3 billion annual rate to rise in the next 12 months. Undoubtedly it will. I think it would go above the amount of savings here, because there has been a drying up of the availability of American money that would immediately, if we defeat this, be made available to satisfy not only those needs in the future, in the next 12 months, but accumulated needs of the last 12 to 15 months.

I would think it would be a very serious change and enlargement of the balance-of-payments deficit if we do not carry on.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. I am informed the current deficit on the balance of payments is running at a rate just under \$3 billion a year, based on the second quarter of 1964.

Mr. MILLS. Thank you.

Mr. KEOGH. If the gentleman will yield further to me, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. MILLS. I will be glad to.

Mr. KEOGH. Is it not a fact that this pending bill was somewhat unique in that its effective date virtually made it effective on the day of introduction?

Mr. MILLS. That is right.

Mr. KEOGH. And the financial communities of the country have already adjusted themselves to it and are operating on the basis that it is law.

Mr. MILLS. That is right.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute. One thing we did, which I am sure everyone would agree we should have done, with respect to this standby authority is to provide that if it is to be used by the President it has to be prospective, that is, it has to be used prospectively. There will be no retroactive tax in the event he should find it necessary to use it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, this legislation, when it was before the House, was bad legislation at that time. I opposed it at that time. I will not repeat the arguments that were then made, but let us recognize this: that for the first time you are going to impose restrictions and regulations on American investment abroad. That is what this bill does. It says, "Americans, stay home." Yet one of the greatest sources of income that improves our balance of payments are

the earnings of the funds invested abroad. It is one of our great sources of strength. Yet here we try to solve a temporary problem by putting in jeopardy one of the greatest tools we have throughout the world as far as the American flag is concerned and American interests are concerned. I say that because here we take action to restrict, to shut off, and to regulate that investment. As I say, the bill was bad at that time and I opposed it. In my judgment, the bill as it comes from conference is worse instead of improved. And why? Because here we now start the real precedent of giving to the President the authority to, as he sees fit, impose a tax or not impose a tax on certain transactions, namely, bank loans to foreign borrowers. If the committee had gone ahead and said, "We are going to bring these within the purview of the act and impose the tax," at least they would not be starting this bad precedent of giving to the President unprecedented authority—we have jealously reserved and kept this authority as a prerogative not just of the Congress, but of the House of Representatives. Under the Constitution only the House can originate legislation in the field of taxation and impose taxes or repeal taxes.

But here for once under the Senate amendment and as agreed to in the conference, we are going to give authority to the President to tax bank loans. We say: "Use your own discretion, you can impose the tax when and if you want." I think that is bad. Much as I opposed the bill, much as I think it is bad governmental policy on the part of the United States to put this restriction on investment loans abroad by the private sector, if you are going to do it, you probably should include bank loans. But, do it yourself, have Congress do it, do not give that authority to the President. On that basis, Mr. Speaker, I not only opposed the original bill, but I must now oppose the conference report because it is worse now than it was when it originally went from this body to the other body. And it was bad enough then.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished and able gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to concur in the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] and point out that these were the reasons that I, too, did not sign this conference report. Actually, the very loophole that we in our minority views called attention to when this bill was before us has been utilized—our statement occurs on page 78 of the report of the Committee on Ways and Means accompanying H.R. 8000. I read it:

H.R. 8000 exempts all bank loans irrespective of term. It is understood that approximately one-half of the long-term foreign loans by institutions, amounting to \$248 million for the year 1962, will fall within this exemption. In addition, a substantial amount of the loans, which might otherwise be represented by foreign bonds, may be placed with the banks free of tax. In fact, since the announcements of the proposed tax of July 18, 1963, it is reported that the city of Vienna changed its plan for financing

in the United States, from a proposed bond issue to a direct loan from the banks.

I noted it was a very strange thing when we were considering this bill that every lending institution and financial institution in the country had something to say about it except the banks. And when you talked to them they said that they knew it was bad legislation, and when we said, "Why do you not appear and say so?" they did not appear. Now that the amendment was put in the Senate, to restrict to some degree these bank loans which immediately went up to high figures, I have been receiving communications from bankers wanting this particular amendment out of the bill.

The basic point, though, is this, that the bill is over 100 pages long. Any time you try to step into this field of finance to distinguish between bonds and stocks and bank loans, and so forth, you are just asking for trouble. You cannot really separate the various forms of securities.

Mr. Speaker, what we have done in this bill is impose a tariff, and it is a tariff, on the sale of foreign securities in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, one of the basic reasons that this country grew great in my judgment was that we always had a free market for investment capital. However, here we have reached the point, because of our balance-of-payments problem and our gold flow, where we are urged to reverse our basic policy in regard to free markets and impose, in effect a Berlin Wall in order to prevent our money from going to freer climates of investment. But, just as the Berlin Wall has been ineffective in keeping people from East Germany fleeing into the areas of greater freedom, so this kind of wall has been equally ineffective. This is now being brought home to our people.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the balance-of-payments problem is serious, and it is going to continue to get more serious. This is true because we are not hitting at the basic causes. These proposals of the administration like the bill before us are improvisations. Actually, in the long run—and the Secretary of the Treasury has said this in his testimony—it will aggravate the balance-of-payments problem.

Mr. Speaker, one of our greatest assets today in the balance-of-payments picture are the returns that we are receiving from our foreign investment portfolio. However, here we move in and cut down on this kind of investment which we have been making which has been giving us such good returns.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, hidden in these balance-of-payments figures for the second quarter—and I have made some remarks today that are in the RECORD on the whole subject—is the fact that our balance of merchandise trade again, while still substantially in favor of the United States, worsened by \$270 million as imports rose more nearly in line with prevailing levels of domestic business activities and incomes and merchandise exports declined from the first-quarter levels.

Mr. Speaker, these items represent strength in the area of our balance-of-

payments situation, our private investment portfolio, and our private balance of trade.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. These are our assets. Against this are our costs for military expenditures abroad and foreign aid, plus one other thing: I am convinced that underlying this whole situation is our failure to balance our own Federal budget, our foolhardy pursuit of this deficit financing theory. This is the reason we are not creating a healthier investment climate in our own society.

Members of the House have heard me on this subject so many times that I feel like a broken record when I repeat it.

Mr. Speaker, this is the reason we have to get our expenditures at the Federal level within our revenues. This is the way in which we can really move forward in meeting the balance-of-payments problem.

Mr. Speaker, this bill now pending before us under the conference report is a bad bill. It is taking America backward. In the long run it is going to hurt us.

Mr. Speaker, I advocate that we vote down the conference report.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the gentleman from Missouri on his statement and compliment the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin Mr. BYRNES on his statement.

This bill has been bad from its inception. It indicates a lack of understanding on the part of its proponents on the subject of international finance. It is in the long run a self-defeating bill. It is damaging to New York; it is damaging to the country, and it ought to be defeated.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself just 1 minute in order to address my remarks to the remarks made by my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY].

Mr. Speaker, I agree with everything that is said about it being bad. Any bill that places any restrictions upon anyone, direct or indirect, I believe is to be viewed by most of us as being bad. But we are making a choice and I would call the gentleman's attention to a choice between either this or something other than this that I tried to describe earlier as being even worse than the slight restraint that we are placing here. But, bear in mind that what is involved in this legislation is whether or not we will permit those people of the world who want to build factories or anything else in their country to come to the United States and get our money at a less rate of interest than they may be able to get it anywhere else. What we are saying under this proposal is, "Come here, get what money you want, but in the process we are going to require you to pay a tax which equates the difference between

our interest rate and the interest rate in your own country."

We have heard quite a bit about international affairs, but I would doubt that we ought to open this door again—unlock the vaults—and say to them: "Come on over here, get any amount of money you want, regardless of what the effect of that action may be on our balance of payments."

If we do not have and should not face the responsibility of protecting our people against the drain on our gold, I do not know what responsibility we have. It is clear that is what is involved in this. That to me is far more important than any slight inconvenience or equalizing treatment we might place upon a foreigner who is seeking capital to invest in his country.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. The gentleman spoke about a choice. There was a choice. The gentleman and his committee could have established a capital issues committee on that.

Mr. MILLS. We talked about that, we went over it, and there was no one at the time, except a very few people outside, who were favorable to it. I did not think it would be effective then and I do not think it would be effective now. In any event that would be a complete departure from our traditional position of not interfering in the free play of the money market. We have never used direct controls such as that.

Mr. LINDSAY. We happen to disagree with the gentleman on that.

Mr. MILLS. All I am asking the gentleman is, because I know he is a very astute person, to give consideration to the other side of this matter, not just to the one side of somebody being inconvenienced. The people who are being inconvenienced are those foreign borrowers who will find in the process of getting money in the United States they will end up paying as much interest as they would pay at home.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] is agreeing with us that something should be done. His disagreement is only with the method. Our committee decided after discussing the suggestion that the setting up of a capital issues committee would be impracticable and would be more of a burden than anything else.

Mr. MILLS. I appreciate the gentleman going into the merits of it. I did not mention his point.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 221, nays 147, not voting 62, as follows:

[Roll No. 238]

YEAS—221

Abbutt	Green, Pa.	Perkins
Abernethy	Griffiths	Philbin
Addabbo	Hagan, Ga.	Pickle
Albert	Hagen, Calif.	Pike
Andrews, Ala.	Haley	Poage
Ashley	Hanna	Pool
Ashmore	Hansen	Price
Aspinall	Harding	Pucinski
Barrett	Hardy	Purcell
Bass	Harris	Randall
Beckworth	Hawkins	Reuss
Bennett, Fla.	Hays	Rhodes, Pa.
Blatnik	Healey	Rivers, Alaska
Boggs	Hechler	Rivers, S.C.
Bolling	Henderson	Roberts, Ala.
Brademas	Herlong	Roberts, Tex.
Bray	Hollifield	Rogers, Colo.
Brooks	Holland	Rogers, Fla.
Brown, Calif.	Huddleston	Rogers, Tex.
Burke	Hull	Rooney, N.Y.
Burkhalter	Ichord	Rooney, Pa.
Burleson	Jarman	Rosenthal
Burton, Calif.	Jennings	Rostenkowski
Burton, Utah	Joelson	Roush
Byrne, Pa.	Johnson, Calif.	Roybal
Cameron	Johnson, Wis.	Ryan, N.Y.
Carey	Karsten	St Germain
Casey	Karth	St. Onge
Chelf	Kastenmeter	Schweiker
Clark	Kelly	Scott
Cohelan	Keogh	Secrest
Colmer	Kilgore	Selden
Cooley	King, Calif.	Senner
Corbett	Kirwan	Sickles
Corman	Kluczynski	Sikes
Daniels	Kornegay	Sisk
Davis, Ga.	Leggett	Slack
Delaney	Lennon	Smith, Iowa
Dent	Libonati	Smith, Va.
Denton	Long, La.	Snyder
Donohue	Long, Md.	Staebler
Dorn	McDowell	Staggers
Dowdy	McFall	Steed
Downing	McMillan	Stephens
Duncan	Macdonald	Stratton
Edmondson	Mahon	Stubblefield
Edwards	Marsh	Sullivan
Elliott	Matthews	Taylor
Everett	Miller, Calif.	Teague, Tex.
Fallon	Mills	Thomas
Fascell	Minish	Thompson, N.J.
Feighan	Monagan	Thompson, Tex.
Finnegan	Montoya	Trimble
Fisher	Moorhead	Tuck
Flood	Morgan	Tuten
Flynt	Morris	Udall
Fogarty	Moss	Ullman
Fountain	Multer	Van Deerlin
Fraser	Murphy, Ill.	Vanik
Friedel	Murphy, N.Y.	Waggonner
Fuqua	Murray	Watson
Gallagher	Natcher	Watts
Garmatz	Nedzi	Weitner
Gary	Nix	White
Gathings	O'Brien, N.Y.	Whitener
Giaimo	O'Hara, Ill.	Whitten
Gibbons	O'Hara, Mich.	Williams
Gilbert	O'Konski	Willis
Gill	Olsen, Mont.	Wilson,
Gonzalez	Olson, Minn.	Charles H.
Grabowski	Passman	Winstead
Grant	Patman	Wright
Green, Ore.	Patten	Young
	Pepper	Zablocki

NAYS—147

Abele	Belcher	Bruce
Anderson	Bell	Byrnes, Wis.
Andrews,	Berry	Cahill
N. Dak.	Betts	Cederberg
Arends	Bolton,	Chamberlain
Ashbrook	Oliver P.	Chenoweth
Auchincloss	Bow	Clancy
Ayres	Brock	Clausen,
Baker	Bromwell	Don H.
Baldwin	Broomfield	Clawson, Del
Barry	Brozman	Cleveland
Battin	Brown, Ohio	Collier
Becker	Broyhill, N.C.	Conte
Beermann	Broyhill, Va.	Cramer

Cunningham	Keith	Reid, N.Y.
Curtin	Kilburn	Reifel
Curtis	King, N.Y.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Dague	Knox	Rich
Derouanian	Kunkel	Riehlman
Derwinski	Laird	Robison
Devine	Langen	Roudebush
Dole	Latta	Rumsfeld
Dwyer	Lindsay	Saylor
Findley	Lipscomb	Schadeberg
Ford	McCulloch	Schenck
Foreman	McDade	Schneebell
Frelinghuysen	McIntire	Schwengel
Fulton, Pa.	McLoskey	Short
Glenn	MacGregor	Shriver
Goodell	Maillard	Sibal
Goodling	Martin, Nebr.	Siler
Griffin	Mathias	Skubitz
Gross	Matsunaga	Springer
Grover	May	Stafford
Gubser	Meador	Stinson
Gurney	Michel	Taft
Hall	Milliken	Talcott
Halleck	Moore	Teague, Calif.
Halpern	Morton	Thomson, Wis.
Harrison	Mosher	Tupper
Harsha	Nelsen	Utt
Harvey, Ind.	Norblad	Van Pelt
Horan	Osmers	Wallhauser
Horton	Ostertag	Weaver
Hosmer	Pelly	Westland
Hutchinson	Pillion	Wharton
Jensen	Poff	Wildnall
Johansen	Quile	Wilson, Bob
Johnson, Pa.	Quillen	Wilson, Ind.
Jonas	Reid, Ill.	Wydyer

NOT VOTING—62

Adair	Fulton, Tenn.	Morse
Alger	Gray	O'Neill
Avery	Harvey, Mich.	Pilcher
Baring	Hébert	Pirnie
Bates	Hoeven	Powell
Boland	Hoffman	Rains
Bolton,	Jones, Ala.	Rodino
Frances P.	Jones, Mo.	Roosevelt
Bonner	Kee	Ryan, Mich.
Buckley	Kyl	St. George
Celler	Landrum	Sheppard
Daddario	Lankford	Shipley
Davis, Tenn.	Lesinski	Smith, Calif.
Dawson	Lloyd	Thompson, La.
Diggs	McClory	Toll
Dingell	Madden	Tollefson
Dulski	Martin, Calif.	Vinson
Ellsworth	Martin, Mass.	Whalley
Evins	Miller, N.Y.	Wickersham
Fino	Minshall	Wyman
Forrester	Morrison	Younger

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Ellsworth against.
Mr. Rodino for, with Mr. Hoeven against.
Mr. Madden for, with Mrs. St. George against.

Mr. Roosevelt for, with Mr. Smith of California against.

Mr. Toll for, with Mrs. Frances P. Bolton against.

Mr. Gray for, with Mr. Bates against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Adair against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Pirnie against.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana for, with Mr. Younger against.

Mr. Shipley for, with Mr. Wyman against.

Mr. Ryan of Michigan for, with Mr. Morse of Massachusetts against.

Mr. Dulski for, with Mr. Minshall against.

Mr. Daddario for, with Mr. McClory against.

Mr. Evins for, with Mr. Alger against.

Mr. O'Neill for, with Mr. Fino against.

Mr. Lesinski for, with Mr. Tollefson against.

Mr. Jones of Alabama for, with Mr. Martin of California against.

Mr. Dingell for, with Mr. Kyl against.

Mr. Forrester for, with Mr. Whalley against.

Mr. Landrum for, with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts against.

Mr. Bonner for, with Mr. Hoffman against.

Mr. Pilcher for, with Mr. Miller of New York against.

Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Avery against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.
Mr. Boland with Mr. Lankford.
Mr. Rains with Mrs. Kee.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARTICLES IMPORTED FOR USE OF CERTAIN UNIVERSITIES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 4364) to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of Oregon State University and one mass spectrometer for the use of Wayne State University, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1802)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4364) to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of Oregon State University and one mass spectrometer for the use of Wayne State University, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment to the title of the bill; and agree to the same.

W. D. MILLS,
CECIL R. KING,
HALE BOGGS,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
THOS. B. CURTIS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

HARRY F. BYRD,
RUSSELL B. LONG,
GEO. A. SMATHERS,
JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
CARL T. CURTIS,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4364) to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of Oregon State University and one mass spectrometer for the use of Wayne State University, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The bill as passed by the House would permit duty-free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of Oregon State University and one mass spectrometer for the use of Wayne State University. The Senate amend-

ment added new provisions to the bill as passed by the House which would permit duty-free entry for the following additional articles:

One rheogoniometer imported for the use of the University of Tennessee.

One rheogoniometer imported for the use of Ohio State University.

One microcalorimeter imported for the use of the University of Colorado.

All stone imported before the enactment of the bill for use in construction of the Sheldon Memorial Art Gallery, located at the University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska.

Under both the bill as passed by the House and under the Senate amendment, if an article was entered before the date of the enactment of the bill the entry shall be liquidated or reliquidated and appropriate refund of duty shall be made.

The House recedes.

The Senate amendment to the title of the bill conformed the title to the amendment made to the text of the bill. The House recedes.

W. D. MILLS,
CECIL R. KING,
HALE BOGGS,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
THOS. B. CURTIS,

Managers on the Part of the House

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that we can dispose of this matter very briefly.

Mr. Speaker, this is a unanimous conference report.

Mr. Speaker, as Members of the House will recall, on April 30, 1964, the House passed unanimously H.R. 4364 to provide for the free importation of one mass spectrometer for the use of Oregon State University and one mass spectrometer for the use of Wayne State University.

The bill was passed by the other body with amendments not affecting the provisions of the House bill but providing for the duty-free importation of two rheogoniometers, one for the use of the University of Tennessee and one for the use of Ohio State University, and one microcalorimeter for the use of the University of Colorado. The other body also added an amendment providing for the free importation of certain stone imported for the use in the construction of the Sheldon Memorial Art Gallery located at the University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebr.

With respect to the amendments by the other body relating to the scientific instruments for the use of the universities referred to, it should be stated that, as was true of the spectrometers included in the bill passed by the House, such instruments at the time they were ordered were not available from sources within the United States. In other words, there were no domestic manufacturers producing an instrument that combined all the characteristics and specifications required in these instances. The amendments of the other body are consistent with prior congressional enactments, and the managers on the part of the House recommend that the House recede with respect to them.

The other body also added an amendment providing for the free entry of certain travertine marble for use in the construction of the Sheldon Memorial Art Gallery at the University of

Nebraska. On June 29 last when the House requested a conference on this bill, several Members of the House, including the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM], the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. STAFFORD], and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY], expressed concern that if the House should recede with respect to this amendment, it would perhaps establish a precedent for future entries of stone. To these gentlemen and to others who expressed interest in this matter, I can say that, pursuant to the assurances given on the floor of the House, the managers on the part of the House were especially diligent in requiring the conferees from the other body to submit detailed justification for this amendment. As a result we are convinced that this is an exceptional case involving unique facts and should in no wise constitute a precedent for any future legislation.

In the first place, we are advised that the architect for the art gallery had specifically designated Roman travertine marble for its construction and that this particular stone is available only in Italy.

Moreover, in this case the customs appraiser at Omaha had erroneously advised that the stone would be classified for tariff purposes under paragraph 232(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 at a duty rate of only 27½ cents per cubic foot and not more than 50 cents per cubic foot. The construction of the gallery was thus undertaken and proceeded on this advice. Almost 3 years later and after the stone had been imported, the Chicago office of the Bureau of Customs reversed the Omaha office and assessed duty under section 234 of the Tariff Act at a rate of 21 percent ad valorem. This represented an increase in duty of over 500 percent and total duties in the amount of approximately \$45,007.65.

Finally, as has been previously stated, the Sheldon Memorial Art Gallery is on the campus of the University of Nebraska, and we are advised that it houses one of the finest collections of contemporary art that is available in any American community. It is open to the public and is a cultural and educational center for the entire State of Nebraska.

Let me again say that in recommending that the House recede on this amendment, the managers on the part of the House reiterate that this action would not in any way influence the consideration of any future legislation with respect to imports of stone. This is a unique situation which rests on the peculiar circumstances to which I have alluded. It will in no way constitute a precedent, and any other legislation relating to this subject that may come before the Committee on Ways and Means or the House will be considered on its own merits and certainly without reference to this measure.

Unless there is someone else who wants to speak on this, I shall move the previous question.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. I want to confirm what the chairman of the Committee on Ways

and Means has said. There were some individual Members who were concerned about certain aspects of marble in their districts. In fact, I was one myself. I think everyone was satisfied that we worked this out very well.

Mr. MILLS. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman from Missouri because we want the RECORD to be very clear that this action on the part of the conferees is not to be taken as a precedent.

Mr. CURTIS. That is right. It is the circumstances of the case, which involve a very fine educational institution. The circumstances which led up to it were clearly a matter of misunderstanding. I think we did a pretty good job.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SECOND INAUGURAL OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 88-427, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee to Commemorate the 100th Anniversary of the Second Inaugural of Abraham Lincoln the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. PRICE, Mr. DENTON, Mr. BRAY and Mr. SCHWENGEL.

AMENDING THE ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3075) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection 2 b. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is deleted.

Sec. 2. Subsection 2 h. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is deleted.

Sec. 3. Subsection 3 c. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"c. a program for Government control of the possession, use, and production of atomic energy and special nuclear material, whether owned by the Government or others, so directed as to make the maximum contribution to the common defense and security and the national welfare, and to provide continued assurance of the Government's ability to enter into and enforce agreements with nations or groups of nations for the control of special nuclear materials and atomic weapons."

Sec. 4. Section 52 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is repealed. All rights, title, and interest in and to any special nuclear material vested in the United States solely by virtue of the provisions of the first sentence of such section 52, and not by any other transaction authorized by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, or other applicable law, are hereby extinguished.

Sec. 5. Subsection 53 a. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, between the

words "The Commission" and "such material" is amended to read as follows:

"a. The Commission is authorized (1) to issue licenses to transfer or receive in interstate commerce, transfer, deliver, acquire, possess, own, receive possession of or title to, import, or export under the terms of an agreement for cooperation arranged pursuant to section 123, special nuclear material, (ii) to make special nuclear material available for the period of the license, and, (iii) to distribute special nuclear material within the United States to qualified applicants requesting such material—"

Sec. 6. Subsection 53 c. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"c. (1) The Commission may distribute special nuclear material licensed under this section by sale, lease, with option to buy, or grant: *Provided, however,* That unless otherwise authorized by law, the Commission shall not after December 31, 1970, distribute special nuclear material except by sale to any person who possesses or operates a utilization facility under a license issued pursuant to section 103 or 104 b. for use in the course of activities under which license; nor shall the Commission permit any such person after June 30, 1973, to continue leasing for use in the course of such activities special nuclear material previously leased to such person by the Commission.

"(2) The Commission shall establish reasonable sales prices for the special nuclear material licensed and distributed by sale under this section. Such sales prices shall be established on a nondiscriminatory basis which, in the opinion of the Commission, will provide reasonable compensation to the Government for such special nuclear material.

"(3) The Commission is authorized to enter into agreements with licensees for such period of time as the Commission may deem necessary or desirable to distribute to such licensees such quantities of special nuclear material as may be necessary for the conduct of the licensed activity. In such agreements, the Commission may agree to repurchase any special nuclear material licensed and distributed by sale which is not consumed in the course of the licensed activity, or any uranium remaining after irradiation of such special nuclear material, at a repurchase price not to exceed the Commission's sale price for comparable special nuclear material or uranium in effect at the time of delivery of such material to the Commission.

"(4) The Commission may make a reasonable charge, determined pursuant to this section, for the use of special nuclear material licensed and distributed by lease under subsection 53 a. (1), (2) or (4) and shall make a reasonable charge determined pursuant to this section for the use of special nuclear material licensed and distributed by lease under subsection 53 a. (3). The Commission shall establish criteria in writing for the determination of whether special nuclear material will be distributed by grant and for the determination of whether a charge will be made for the use of special nuclear material licensed and distributed by lease under subsection 53 a. (1), (2) or (4), considering, among other things, whether the licensee is a nonprofit or eleemosynary institution and the purposes for which the special nuclear material will be used."

Sec. 7. Subsection 53 d. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by adding the words "by lease" after the word "distributed", and by amending subsection d. (5) to read as follows:

"(5) with respect to special nuclear material consumed in a facility licensed pursuant to section 103, the Commission shall make a further charge equivalent to the sale price for similar special nuclear material established by the Commission in accordance with subsection 53 c. (2), and the Commis-

sion may make such a charge with respect to such material consumer in a facility licensed pursuant to section 104."

Sec. 8. Subsection 53 e. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by deleting subsection 53 e. (1).

Sec. 9. Section 54 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by adding the following at the end thereof:

"The Commission may agree to repurchase any special nuclear material distributed under a sale arrangement pursuant to this section which is not consumed in the course of the activities conducted in accordance with the agreement for cooperation, or any uranium remaining after irradiation of such special nuclear material, at a repurchase price not to exceed the Commission's sale price for comparable special nuclear material or uranium in effect at the time of delivery of such material to the Commission. The Commission may also agree to purchase, consistent with and within the period of the agreement for cooperation, special nuclear material produced in a nuclear reactor located outside the United States through the use of special nuclear material which was leased or sold pursuant to this section. Under any such agreement, the Commission shall purchase only such material as is delivered to the Commission during any period when there is in effect a guaranteed purchase price for the same material produced in a nuclear reactor by a person licensed under section 104, established by the Commission pursuant to section 56, and the price to be paid shall be the price so established by the Commission and in effect for the same material delivered to the Commission."

Sec. 10. Section 55 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 55 ACQUISITION.—The Commission is authorized, to the extent it deems necessary to effectuate the provisions of this Act, to purchase without regard to the limitations in section 54 or any guaranteed purchase prices established pursuant to section 56, and to take, requisition, condemn, or otherwise acquire any special nuclear material or any interest therein. Any contract of purchase made under this section may be made without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, upon certification by the Commission that such action is necessary in the interest of the common defense and security, or upon a showing by the Commission that advertising is not reasonably practicable. Partial and advance payments may be made under contracts for such purposes. Just compensation shall be made for any right, property, or interest in property taken, requisitioned, or condemned under this section."

Sec. 11. Section 56 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 56. GUARANTEED PURCHASE PRICES.—The Commission shall establish guaranteed purchase prices for plutonium produced in a nuclear reactor by a person licensed under section 104 and delivered to the Commission before January 1, 1971. The Commission shall also establish for such periods of time as it may deem necessary but not to exceed ten years as to any such period, guaranteed purchase prices for uranium enriched in the isotope 233 produced in a nuclear reactor by a person licensed under section 104 and delivered to the Commission within the period of the guarantee. Guaranteed purchase prices established under the authority of this section shall not exceed the Commission's determination of the estimated value of plutonium or uranium enriched in the isotope 233 as fuel in nuclear reactors, and such prices shall be established on a nondiscriminatory basis: *Provided,* That the Commission is authorized to establish such guaranteed purchase prices only for such plutonium

or uranium enriched in the isotope 233 as the Commission shall determine is produced through the use of special nuclear material which was leased or sold by the Commission pursuant to section 53."

Sec. 12. Section 57 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 57. PROHIBITION.—

"a. Unless authorized by a general or specific license issued by the Commission, which the Commission is authorized to issue pursuant to section 53, no person may transfer or receive in interstate commerce, transfer, deliver, acquire, own, possess, receive possession of or title to, or import into or export from the United States any special nuclear material.

"b. It shall be unlawful for any person to directly or indirectly engage in the production of any special nuclear material outside of the United States except (1) under an agreement for cooperation made pursuant to section 123, or (2) upon authorization by the Commission after a determination that such activity will not be inimical to the interest of the United States.

"c. The Commission shall not—

"(1) distribute any special nuclear material to any person for a use which is not under the jurisdiction of the United States except pursuant to the provisions of section 54; or

"(2) distribute any special nuclear material or issue a license pursuant to section 53 to any person within the United States if the Commission finds that the distribution of such special nuclear material or the issuance of such license would be inimical to the common defense and security or would constitute an unreasonable risk to the health and safety of the public."

Sec. 13. Section 58 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 58. REVIEW.—Before the Commission establishes any guaranteed purchase price or guaranteed purchase price period in accordance with the provisions of section 56, or establishes any criteria for the waiver of any charge for the use of special nuclear material licensed and distributed under section 53, the proposed guaranteed purchase price, guaranteed purchase price period, or criteria for the waiver of such charge shall be submitted to the Joint Committee and a period of forty-five days shall elapse while Congress is in session (in computing such forty-five days there shall be excluded the days in which either House is not in session because of adjournment for more than three days): *Provided, however,* That the Joint Committee, after having received the proposed guaranteed purchase price, guaranteed purchase price period, or criteria for the waiver of such charge, may by resolution in writing waive the conditions of, or all or any portion of, such forty-five-day period."

Sec. 14. Section 105 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by deleting the phrase "including the provisions which vest title to all special nuclear material in the United States," from the first sentence of subsection 105 a.

Sec. 15. Section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by adding "53," after the word "sections" in the first sentence.

Sec. 16. Section 161 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by adding thereto the following new subsection:

"v. (A) enter into contracts with persons licensed under sections 53, 63, 103 or 104 for such periods of time as the Commission may deem necessary or desirable to provide, after December 31, 1968, for the producing or enriching of special nuclear material in facilities owned by the Commission; and

"(B) enter into contracts to provide, after December 31, 1968, for the producing or enriching of special nuclear material in fa-

cilities owned by the Commission in accordance with and within the period of an agreement for cooperation arranged pursuant to section 123 while comparable services are made available pursuant to paragraph (A) of this subsection:

Provided, That (i) prices for services under paragraph (A) of this subsection shall be established on a nondiscriminatory basis; (ii) prices for services under paragraph (B) of this subsection shall be no less than prices under paragraph (A) of this subsection; and (iii) any prices established under this subsection shall be on a basis which will provide reasonable compensation to the Government: *And provided further,* That the Commission, to the extent necessary to assure the maintenance of a viable domestic uranium industry, shall not offer such services for source or special nuclear materials of foreign origin intended for use in a utilization facility within or under the jurisdiction of the United States. The Commission shall establish criteria in writing setting forth the terms and conditions under which services provided under this subsection shall be made available including the extent to which such services will be made available for source or special nuclear material of foreign origin intended for use in a utilization facility within or under the jurisdiction of the United States: *Provided,* That before the Commission establishes such criteria, the proposed criteria shall be submitted to the Joint Committee, and a period of forty-five days shall elapse while Congress is in session (in computing the forty-five days there shall be excluded the days in which either House is not in session because of adjournment for more than three days) unless the Joint Committee by resolution in writing waives the conditions of, or all any portion of, such forty-five-day period."

Sec. 17. Section 171 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by deleting the phrase "52 (with respect to the material for which the United States is required to pay just compensation)," from the first sentence; and by adding "55" after "43," in the first sentence.

Sec. 18. Subsection 182 a. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is deleted.

Sec. 19. Section 184 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by adding the words "or special nuclear material," after "other lien upon any facility" in the second sentence; and by deleting the word "property" in the second sentence and substituting the word "facility" in lieu thereof.

Sec. 20. Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to diminish existing authority of the United States, or of the Atomic Energy Commission under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to regulate source, byproduct, and special nuclear material and production and utilization facilities, or to control such materials and facilities exported from the United States by imposition of governmental guarantees and security safeguards with respect thereto, in order to assure the common defense and security and to protect the health and safety of the public, or to reduce the responsibility of the Atomic Energy Commission to achieve such objectives.

Sec. 21. This Act may be cited as the "Private Ownership of Special Nuclear Materials Act."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the bill now before the House, S. 3075, would amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to provide for the private ownership of special nuclear materials. It is the most far-reaching change in the Atomic Energy Act since the last basic revision of the law in 1954.

BACKGROUND

The Atomic Energy Act, as presently written, requires that title to all special nuclear material—by this we mean fissionable material or nuclear fuels—must be in the U.S. Government. The reasons for this unique requirement may be found in the legislative history of the 1946 and 1954 Atomic Energy Acts.

In 1946, very little was known about the atom. The United States had a complete monopoly over atomic weapons and a virtual monopoly in fissionable materials. The preservation of this monopoly was a cardinal principle of U.S. atomic policy. In order to provide an added measure of control over these materials the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 specified that title to all special nuclear materials in the United States would rest with the U.S. Government.

By 1954, important changes had occurred. First, there was a widespread demand for private participation in the peaceful uses of atomic energy—particularly in the development of civilian nuclear power. In addition, we had acquired enough experience in the handling of nuclear materials to understand that they could be effectively controlled through the implementation of strict regulatory requirements.

The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 therefore permitted private persons to possess and use special nuclear materials under license from the AEC. Private persons could also own and operate nuclear reactors.

However, the requirement for mandatory Government ownership of special nuclear material was retained in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. The Congress wished to make sure that there would be an adequate means of providing the United States with special nuclear material for weapons and other urgent national requirements, and Government ownership was one of the devices utilized. It is clear, however, that the requirement for Government ownership was retained by the Congress out of an abundance of caution rather than legal necessity.

Even in the absence of Government ownership, the Congress can clearly act to control the security and safety of special nuclear materials. The "war powers" as well as the powers of Congress in the area of interstate and foreign commerce provide an ample basis for such action. There is general agreement among lawyers who have looked at this matter that mandatory Government ownership is not, and never was essential to the effective legal control of special nuclear materials.

WHY PRIVATE OWNERSHIP NOW?

Important strides have been made in the last 10 years in the development of

civilian nuclear power. Although no nuclear plant is yet producing competitive electricity, it is clear that nuclear power will be a significant factor in the Nation's power economy in the decades ahead. This means that special nuclear material—the fuel of this new technology—will become an increasingly important article of commerce.

We have therefore reached a point in the development of civilian nuclear power where the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act concerning the ownership of special nuclear materials must be revised. Unless this is done at the present time, the U.S. Government will become increasingly involved in financing the fuel for an expanding commercial industry.

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE PRIVATE OWNERSHIP BILL

Now what does this bill do?

First, it repeals the requirement for mandatory Government ownership of special nuclear materials. Provision for the continued effective regulation and control of such materials is assured in other sections of the Atomic Energy Act, as amended by this bill. The bill does not, in any way, diminish the authority or responsibility of the Atomic Energy Commission to control fissionable materials for the protection of the common defense and security or the public health and safety.

Second, the bill authorizes the Atomic Energy Commission to sell or lease special nuclear material. However, after December 31, 1970, the Commission will not be able to distribute special nuclear material, except by sale, to a person owning or operating a nuclear power reactor if the material is intended for use in a power reactor. As of June 30, 1973, unless otherwise authorized by law, all special nuclear material previously leased to a person owning or operating a nuclear power reactor will have to be converted to private ownership.

Third, the Atomic Energy Commission is directed to establish guaranteed purchase prices for plutonium production in a licensed reactor and delivered to the Commission only until January 1, 1971. A specific cutoff date is thus imposed on the period for guaranteed purchase prices for plutonium. With respect to uranium 233, the commission could establish guaranteed purchase prices for periods of up to 10 years.

Fourth, the bill would authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to enter into contracts for the furnishing of uranium enrichment services. Under this system of "toll enrichment" the Commission could, for instance, agree to accept delivery of normal uranium and deliver to the purchaser an appropriate quantity of enriched uranium. The purchaser would pay the Commission's charges for enriching services—a charge based generally on the cost of doing necessary processing or "separative" work in the Government's diffusion plants. This service, however, could not commence until January 1, 1969.

In general, the bill authorizes the Atomic Energy Commission to enter into similar arrangements with respect to the distribution and purchase of special nu-

clear material and the furnishing of enrichment services on an international basis.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has been drafted with careful regard for the public interest and the needs of our atomic energy industry. Its enactment will eliminate the necessity for a major build-up in the public investment in nuclear fuel inventories. Its careful transition periods will prevent immediate or serious dislocations in the atomic energy industry.

Mr. Speaker, this bill was reported without dissent by the Joint Committee and passed the Senate by voice vote on August 6. It is deserving of wide and general support.

Mr. Speaker, a note of praise should be injected here for the continuing work and constructive cooperation of my distinguished colleague, the ranking House Minority Member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Mr. HOSMER. He and his colleagues have been of great assistance in the consideration of this difficult legislation. Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill and I urge its prompt enactment.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I take this time largely to answer any questions that any Member may have respecting the bill.

Prefatory, I should like to say that there is no bill in the 12 years I have been in Congress that I have supported with greater enthusiasm than this one. It denationalizes fissionable material. It permits us to get on a private basis in the development of a nuclear industry in this country. It avoids the expense of the ownership by the taxpayers of the United States of all of the fissionable material that will have to go into the private reactors that the burgeoning atomic industry will be building in America.

If we fail to pass this bill there will be \$3 or \$4 billion of the taxpayers' money tied up in an enriched uranium inventory in this country alone by 1980.

Not one iota of security protection in regard to nuclear materials is lost as a result of this bill. In all respects it is the kind of legislation that history will regard as a fine act by this Congress and by all of us who are involved in it.

As the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], the vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, has mentioned, the members of the committee worked over 2 years on this legislation.

Our difficult work has been guided, with excellence, by my able colleague, the vice chairman of the Joint Committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD]. The task before our committee was not easy. This legislation is complicated from both a legal and economic standpoint. Yet, after more than 2 years of hard work, we have arrived at a general consensus which is reflected in the careful drafting of this bill and our committee report.

It is now imperative that this bill be enacted promptly.

I say this for four main reasons.

First, as nuclear power assumes greater importance in the power

economy of the United States, utility companies and atomic energy industry must be able to plan on a long-term basis under normal economic rules. This is particularly true with respect to commitments for fuel.

The enactment of this legislation will allow the utility companies to execute long-term contracts for fuel and thus to project, with a reasonable degree of certainty, the fuel costs over the life of a nuclear plant. This long-term planning for nuclear power could be done under the same free enterprise conditions which exist in the case of alternate sources of energy.

Second, private ownership legislation will eliminate the necessity for a major buildup in Government inventories of nuclear fuel for commercial power reactors.

As I stated earlier, it has been estimated that by 1980, the expected growth of nuclear power will require an investment in nuclear fuel inventories of approximately \$3 to \$4 billion.

If Government ownership were to continue, this enormous inventory would be financed by the taxpayers. Moreover, as the Government's involvement became greater, it would become increasingly difficult to get Uncle Sam out of the commercial atomic power business without serious economic dislocations. It is wise therefore to permit an orderly termination of mandatory Government ownership before a large-scale expansion occurs in the atomic energy industry.

Third, the private ownership legislation will permit the domestic uranium mining and milling industry to develop normally without further reliance on the U.S. Government.

The uranium enrichment services made possible by this bill will enable uranium producers to deal directly and make long-term contracts with utility customers and others. The bill may herald the opening of a new commercial market for natural uranium.

Fourth, this legislation could have a very beneficial effect on America's world trade position in the atomic energy field.

The availability of toll enrichment under this bill will provide a firm assurance of a long-term supply of enriched uranium to other nations. This will enhance the competitive position of the reactors and reactor components manufactured by American suppliers. The sale of American nuclear equipment, materials, and services abroad could be a significant factor in improving our balance of trade. The enlarged volume of business may also help to reduce the worldwide cost of nuclear power.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the timing of this bill is perfect. The bill itself is in complete harmony with the principles of the free private enterprise system and I urge its prompt enactment.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I certainly want to congratulate the gentleman from California both on this side and the other side of the aisle for the extremely fine job they have done on this legislation.

As the gentleman knows, there has been some discussion about the possibility that private ownership conceivably during the initial period would be a hardship on some smaller companies engaged in the nuclear fuel processing business in connection with the interest rates to finance the ownership of these materials. I wish the gentleman would comment so the legislative history here today will clarify the concern which I know the gentleman and the committee had in the consideration of this problem.

Mr. HOSMER. The gentleman is referring, I presume, to the problem of the small fuel fabricator.

Our committee report dealt specifically with this problem. Let me refer you to what we said in the report at page 14:

Thus, under the committee bill, the AEC could continue to lease special nuclear material to persons engaged in the conversion or fabrication of special nuclear material. This provision is included in the bill in order to meet a problem extensively discussed during the course of the hearings, involving the competitive position of certain fuel fabricators and converters.

Leasing of special nuclear material should be of assistance to fuel fabricators and converters who might otherwise be placed at a competitive disadvantage as a result of having to purchase a special nuclear material inventory. Should the Commission elect, however, to require such persons to purchase special nuclear material, the Commission would be expected to utilize a deferred payment plan as set forth in the "section-by-section analysis" of this report.

The committee is aware that even if special nuclear material is leased or sold under a deferred payment plan, certain fuel processors and fabricators may be at a competitive disadvantage insofar as the financing of nuclear fuel inventories is concerned. It is expected that the Atomic Energy Commission will closely follow developments in this field with a view toward taking such steps as may be necessary or desirable to promote competition, including the recommending of legislation, should legislation be needed.

Also, we further stated at page 23, as follows:

It is also expected that if the Commission elects to require licensees engaged in conversion and/or fabrication of special nuclear material to purchase such material after December 31, 1970, the Commission would make available a deferred payment plan. The deferred payment arrangements could assist in the maintenance of a fair competitive situation among fuel fabricators insofar as the financing of special nuclear material inventories is concerned. These arrangements would require the purchaser to pay in full for the material purchased upon transfer of the material to the ultimate user or within some specified period of time, such as 1 year, from the date of the sale by the Commission. In general, it is contemplated that the Commission would permit the deferral of payments on principal for the entire period of fabrication. Interest on the deferred liability would be paid by the purchaser at a rate not in excess of the rate of the charge established by the Commission pursuant to subsection 53c.(4), in effect at the time of the sale, for special nuclear material distributed by lease. Finally, it is contemplated that, in connection with any such plan, the Commission would accept, for appropriate credit against the deferred liability, any unused material returned to the Commission by the converter or fabricator.

Mr. RUMSFELD. May I make one comment further. Then the assurance

we do have from the committee is that the committee will continue to give attention to any problems that might develop in this field?

Mr. HOSMER. You have our absolute assurance on it.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND].

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 3075. This is truly enlightened legislation. In an era where the trend is toward increasing the Government's role in business, here we have a striking example of a step in the other direction. This legislation provides for an orderly withdrawal by the Federal Government from its involvement in commercial atomic power.

As a Representative from a State which is in the forefront of nuclear developments, I have seen the great strides made in the last 10 years in the development of civilian nuclear power. It seems clear that in the next decade or two we will witness a dramatic expansion in this industry. The timing of this legislation is therefore perfect. It comes just before this expected expansion and will thereby avoid the necessity for a multibillion dollar investment in nuclear fuel inventories by the American taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, S. 3075 is a triumph of good sense and vision. It will assure that nuclear power will take its rightful place in our free enterprise economy. I am proud of our hardworking Joint Committee and its distinguished leadership for this outstanding legislative accomplishment.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 3075, the private ownership legislation reported by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. Speaker, I have been a member of the Joint Committee for almost 2 years now and during this period I have participated in the exhaustive committee deliberations that led to this bill. The physical evidence of our effort may be seen in the hundreds of pages of hearings on this legislation and the unusually detailed and carefully prepared committee report.

I have been a witness to the hard, persevering effort of our distinguished vice chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD]. I have also seen our capable and diligent ranking House minority member, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER], probe and resolve the complexities of this difficult legislation. As a result of my experience, I can tell you that the Joint Committee approached its difficult task with a rare degree of intellectual honesty and with a sole purpose in mind—the protection and furtherance of the public interest.

Mr. Speaker, S. 3075 is a rare bill in this day and age of expanding Federal power and authority. It represents a careful and deliberate decision to grad-

ually remove the Government from its involvement in the economics of commercial nuclear power. As such, this bill demonstrates an unusual degree of foresight and statesmanship. It sets an example which could be well followed in other fields.

This bill heralds a new era in civilian nuclear power—an era in which the atom will be able to compete with other forms of energy under free enterprise conditions, unrestricted by artificial conditions established by legislation. I am confident that nuclear power—as have other major American industries—will thrive in the healthy, open climate of the free enterprise system.

For the taxpayer, S. 3075 means freedom from the heavy responsibility of financing a multibillion dollar nuclear fuel inventory.

For the utility company, it means a new ability to make long-term commitments for nuclear fuel under economic conditions comparable to alternate sources of energy.

For the uranium industry, we will open a new range of commercial dealings in uranium and eliminate the complete dependence of this industry on U.S. Government contracts.

In the international area, this bill creates new opportunities to improve our balance of trade by encouraging the sale abroad of American nuclear reactors, materials and services.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have played a role in this legislation. It will be remembered as a bright and vital turning point in the successful development of civilian nuclear power. I urge the prompt enactment of S. 3075.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] for such time as he may require.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 3075. It does not go as far as I think it should go, but it is definitely a vigorous step in the right direction.

Subsidies have a way of becoming entrenched; the older they get the more difficult they are to get rid of. The members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy have reported to us legislation which will eventually get rid of several of the subsidies involved in this program, after a transition period of several years. I want to compliment the Joint Committee on this action. It shows a determination to preserve fair competition, which is the cornerstone of the free enterprise system that has made America so strong. My congratulations, gentlemen.

In approving this legislation, we should not assume we are doing the entire job that is necessary. There is much more to be done if we are to encourage free competition between fossil fuels and nuclear fuels.

Mr. Speaker, one of the principal subsidies remaining in the atomic energy program, after enactment of the legislation now before us, involves the low price charged by AEC for enriching natural uranium. Current prices recover only the Government's cost, without any charge to cover cost of Government. On plants which cost nearly a billion dollars each, the Government's cost is substantially lower than private enterprise would

have to charge. On top of that, it has already been announced by AEC that the Government will not pass on to utilities the increased cost of enriching which will result from the weapons material cut-backs.

I am pleased to note, on page 18 of the Joint Committee's report on this bill, that the Joint Committee intends to follow this matter very closely in the years ahead. I believe that action should be taken in the near future to establish a realistic price which would be equivalent to that which would be charged if these plants were owned and operated by private enterprise. There is precedent for such procedure—precedent established by the AEC itself in establishing prices for fuel reprocessing on the basis of a "conceptual plant."

Mr. Speaker, there is still another important interference with free competition in the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act. I am speaking of the "no recourse" provisions of the Price-Anderson Act. Under that act, the atomic plant operators are given complete freedom from financial responsibility for any accident that might occur. The operators buy the first \$60 million insurance from commercial companies; the Government furnishes the next \$500 million for a nominal fee; and the law says that the public's recovery for damages shall be limited to this \$560 million fund regardless of how high the damage is. This provision is supposedly justified by the authority of Congress to act in bankruptcy matters, but I point out to you now that we are furnishing bankruptcy protection without touching the assets of the so-called bankrupt.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we are, in effect, forcing members of the public into the insurance business for atomic powerplants, and we do not even give them the authority to charge a fee. Furthermore, we say to them that they shall have no right to prevent construction of an atomic plant in their midst. These provisions are scheduled to expire with respect to permits granted after August 1, 1967, although the plants which get a permit before that time will enjoy this benefit as long as they last. I predict to you that next year or the year after Congress will be asked to extend this 1967 cutoff date for another 10 years. I say to you that we should refuse to extend this date. Financial responsibility for negligence is a powerful deterrent to corner cutting when safety costs money. I believe the public is entitled to this additional safety factor, in order that atomic power will grow at a natural rate with the benefit of experience acquired in an orderly manner.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to vote for S. 3075 as an important beginning to the restoration of fair competition for the energy markets.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for bringing this bill, which establishes the procedure for a transition to private ownership of nuclear fuel, to the floor of the House for action at this session.

I regard this bill as a significant first step in placing civilian nuclear power in the mainstream of our competitive free enterprise system. As the Joint Committee stated in its report, this bill represents the most sweeping amendment to the Atomic Energy Act since 1954.

It is important that private ownership of nuclear fuel for the generation of electric power be made a fundamental part of our national policy governing future developing of civilian nuclear power. The tremendous strides which have been made since 1954 in advancing nuclear technology and achieving a competitive equality with other fuels for generating electricity fully justifies the proposal to remove the subsidy to private utilities represented by Government ownership of all nuclear fuels, and their leasing to private utilities at a fraction of the cost if the fuel were to be purchased through private financing.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, of course, does not go far enough in advancing the nuclear power industry toward the day when it must stand on its own feet, free of all Government support and assistance in the building and operation of proven reactor concepts. However, because the bill does constitute a significant first step toward this goal, I am going to support it.

I would like to see the Joint Committee go one step further and propose legislation which would confine future research and development work on the part of the Government to the breeder reactors and atomic fusion. I have introduced legislation along this line and I hope that early in the next session the Joint Committee can hold hearings at which the desirability of a policy declaration of this kind can be fully explored.

In reading the Joint Committee's excellent report on the legislation before us, I concluded that there is not much, if any difference, between the approach to future nuclear programs I have recommended and that of the Joint Committee.

For example, in discussing the future role of the Government in the nuclear power program, the report states, and I quote:

The task ahead—and it will require continued Government assistance, direction, and encouragement—involves the development of reactors which show the promise of significantly enlarging the Nation's energy resources—indeed, of providing the Nation with a virtually inexhaustible source of energy. This is the job that lies ahead and the atom's promise for generations yet to come.

I have no quarrel with this statement of the Government's future role. As a matter of fact, this same philosophy motivated my introducing H.R. 10687 to establish this as Government policy.

There is no question but that the development of a breeder reactor is the key to our realization of the full potential of the atom. A breeder reactor would manufacture more nuclear fuel than it consumes, thus enlarging by an untold amount the energy represented in our uranium.

To this end the Government should direct its research and development ac-

tivities. No one can take issue with this approach.

My difference with the Atomic Energy Commission is that the Commission wants to continue heavy Government expenditures on reactor concepts of an already proven nature, or on those which do not clearly show the promise of significantly enlarging the Nation's energy resources.

The four large advanced converter reactors which AEC has proposed to be built are nothing more than a refinement of present concepts. No doubt these advanced reactors could be made more efficient than those existing now. But the question is, should the Government take the lead in this improvement and refinement, at a substantial cost to all the taxpayers, or should this be done by the manufacturers of reactors for sale?

I believe that this phase of the nuclear power program is the sole responsibility of the reactor manufacturers, and perhaps the electric utilities which will benefit from the increased efficiency of the improved reactors.

The Government's role should be confined to the breeder reactors and other new concepts which promise to carry out the objectives as expressed in the committee's report.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of this bill. It is a good first step toward the complete withdrawal of the Government from that part of the program which has now been proven to be of commercial value.

I urge that the committee, as a second step, agree to take up early next year legislation to define more precisely the role of the Government and private industry, with particular reference to limiting the Government's role to truly experimental work on breeders and other advanced concepts.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support S. 3075, the private ownership legislation reported by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

As the committee report accompanying this legislation notes:

This legislation is the most sweeping amendment to the Atomic Energy Act since 1954.

Yet, the timing of this legislation is singularly appropriate. It will gradually remove the Government from an otherwise deepening involvement in the economics of an expanding nuclear power industry. This legislation has been carefully drawn so as to minimize any possible economic dislocations.

In particular, this bill will have an important effect on the domestic uranium industry.

Today, after 10 years of intensive exploration, the United States has been converted from a have-not Nation in terms of developed uranium reserves to the point where we have some of the largest uranium reserves in the world. We have, in the process, created a substantial uranium mining and milling industry.

The uranium mining and milling industry has been, and remains, completely dependent upon the Government for two

reasons: First, the Government has been the only large-scale consumer of uranium, primarily for its weapons program; second, the uranium industry, even if a large commercial atomic power market had existed for its product, would not have been able to deal directly with its ultimate customer—the utility industry—since neither party had access to facilities for the vital enrichment process.

Current contracts between the Government and the uranium producers expire not later than December 31, 1970. Prices paid by the Government under these contracts are generally \$8 per pound through 1968. However, these prices drop to a maximum of \$6.70 a pound during 1969–70 and, under a flexible formula dependent upon the producer's cost, will average about \$6 per pound during this period.

Recently announced cutbacks in the production of special nuclear materials for weapons purposes and apparent future trends in this direction indicate that the Government's need for uranium for military purposes will not be sufficiently large to support a viable domestic uranium industry beyond 1970. Indeed, it appears that when the uranium procurement contracts expire in 1970, the Atomic Energy Commission will have uranium inventories substantially in excess of requirements for some years.

Thus, in the 1970's and beyond, the uranium-producing industry must depend not upon the Government, but rather upon the civilian power program for its primary market. Yet, under present law there is no basis for the Government to extend uranium enrichment services on a long-term basis for privately owned uranium and therefore no possibility of creating a more normal commercial market for natural uranium.

This bill by providing a statutory basis for toll enrichment of privately owned uranium will allow this market to develop on a commercial basis. It will make possible a variety of normal commercial transactions in uranium and it may also help to create new incentives for further exploration. Moreover, this legislation, by providing a flexible restriction on the enrichment of foreign uranium, will protect our industry from possibly ruinous competition.

The maintenance of a viable domestic uranium mining and milling industry is an essential part of a sound nuclear industry and is also vital to the long-range defense and security interests of the United States. This bill by providing for uranium enrichment services, is a desirable step in this direction.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Joint Committee from its inception, this is an especially proud moment for me. This bill is in the great tradition of the Joint Committee—a tradition of forward-looking, progressive legislation.

When this legislation was introduced 2 years ago, it was immediately apparent that private ownership would be a complicated and difficult matter. But the Joint Committee went to work—and worked hard for 2 years. It probed every problem and every alternative solution

and came up with a bill which is carefully drawn with a keen awareness of the public's interest in the development of civilian nuclear power.

In particular, this bill is a tribute to the devotion and hard work of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD]. He has given careful study to the private ownership legislation and largely through his leadership, we have developed an excellent piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this bill and urge its prompt enactment.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my support for the enactment of S. 3075.

As my colleagues have noted, this bill is the product of extensive hearings, discussions and committee deliberations. The product is a good, tightly drawn bill which assures the future development of civilian nuclear power along normal commercial lines. It is a tribute to the vision and hard work of the distinguished vice chairman of the Joint Committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. Speaker, as a Representative of one of the major uranium producing States, I am particularly pleased with the careful attention which has been given to the problems of the domestic uranium industry by this committee. Although our uranium industry has a guaranteed market from the Government through 1970, the prospects after 1970 depend, almost entirely, on the civilian nuclear power market.

This bill, by providing for "toll enrichment," opens the possibility of developing a normal commercial market for uranium. It frees the Nation's uranium producers from their complete dependence on the Government and I am confident that it will open new opportunities for this important industry.

I am particularly pleased that the committee has taken special care to provide protection to our domestic uranium producers against the competition of cheap foreign uranium. The flexible restriction on the enrichment of foreign uranium contained in this bill will protect our industry against ruinous competition from cheap foreign uranium. Our uranium industry is a vital link in the national defense and security. It has been built and nurtured by vast Government expenditures. The Joint Committee had the foresight to protect our investment in this industry during a possible period of limited demand for uranium.

Mr. Speaker, this is an outstanding legislative job by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, of which all in the Congress may be proud. It is in the best tradition of furthering the free enterprise system and I urge its prompt enactment.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H.R. 12228, was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ELECTRICITY IN PACIFIC NORTHWEST

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1007) to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1822)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1007) to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7, and agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language inserted by the House amendment, insert the following:

"SEC. 8. No electric transmission lines or related facilities shall be constructed by any Federal agency outside the Pacific Northwest for the purpose of transmitting electric energy between the Pacific Northwest and Pacific Southwest, nor shall any arrangement for transmission capacity be executed by any Federal agency for the purpose of financing such lines and related facilities to be constructed by non-Federal entities, except those lines and facilities recommended for Federal construction in the Report of the Secretary of the Interior submitted to Congress on June 24, 1964, as supplemented on July 27, 1964, or as hereafter specifically authorized by Congress: *Provided*, That, except with respect to electric transmission lines and related facilities for the purpose of transmitting electric energy between the two regions above mentioned, nothing herein shall be construed as expanding or diminishing in any way the present authority of the Secretary of

the Interior to construct transmission lines to market power and energy."

And the House agree to the same.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
WALTER ROGERS,
JACK WESTLAND,

Managers on the Part of the House.

HENRY M. JACKSON,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
ALAN BIBLE,
THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
GORDON ALLOTT,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1007) to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the language agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The language agreed upon is the language of the House bill except the language in section 8 thereof. Section 8 of the House bill prohibited construction of electric transmission lines outside the Pacific Northwest by any Federal agency for marketing Northwest power and energy until they have been specifically authorized by the Congress. There was no similar provision in the Senate bill. This provision was placed in the bill by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House over a year ago when it approved S. 1007. In explanation of the provision the House committee report on S. 1007, dated July 25, 1963, contains the following:

"This action by the committee is not intended to question the feasibility or desirability of an interconnection between the electric systems of the Pacific Northwest and the Pacific Southwest. All the testimony presented to the committee indicated that there should be such an interconnection. This action by the committee indicates a desire on the part of the committee that the Department's final plans for interconnecting the two regions be examined by the Congress. It stems from the extensive costs involved, alternative plans that have been proposed, the present uncertainty with respect to Federal construction, and technical questions that have been raised with respect to direct current transmission.

"The task force report to the Secretary of the Interior, dated December 15, 1961, makes it clear that the economic benefits to be derived from a Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest interconnection are so great that the question is not one of whether such an interconnection should be built but rather one of 'when' and 'by whom' and 'under what operating criteria' should it be built."

S. 1007 was debated in the House on August 27, 1963 and the discussion of this matter during that debate left no doubt that the House supported the committee's position.

Since the action by the House almost a year ago, the Secretary of the Interior has submitted to the Congress his recommendations for interconnecting the Pacific Northwest and Pacific Southwest with electric transmission lines. These recommendations are set out in his letters of June 24, 1964, and July 27, 1964, to the chairman of the Senate and House Appropriations Committees. The Secretary's plan, involving not only construction by the Federal Government but construction by both consumer-owned and investor-owned utilities, was developed after extended negotiations in connection with all the non-Federal proposals received for electrically interconnecting these two

regions. The plan has the approval of all parties—private, municipal, State, and Federal. Thus, the questions raised in the language quoted from the House report on S. 1007 have been answered. The Department has recommended a final plan to the Congress and the plan has been examined by the committees of the Congress. We now know who will be constructing the lines and the cost to the Federal Government. We have detailed information relating to the operation of the interconnected systems and the benefits which will flow from the interconnections.

During the extended period of controversy on this matter, one of the major questions has been whether the Secretary of the Interior presently has authority to construct the proposed transmission lines. The language adopted by the conference committee in lieu of the House language in section 8 makes it unnecessary to answer this question. The language adopted provides congressional authority for the electrical interconnection of the Pacific Northwest and the Pacific Southwest and for construction of the lines that are included in the recommended plan and, in addition, the language makes it clear that there is no intention either to expand or diminish in any way the present authority of the Secretary of the Interior to construct transmission lines to market power and energy. In other words, except with respect to these two regions, whatever authority the Secretary had prior to the adoption of this language he still has. This language does no violence to the position of those who believed that the Secretary had no authority to construct transmission lines interconnecting the Pacific Northwest and the Pacific Southwest and who believe that the Secretary still has no authority to construct transmission lines interconnecting the Pacific Northwest with other regions. Likewise, this language does no violence to the position of those who believe that the Secretary presently has authority for such interconnections.

The Secretary's recommended plan proposes construction by a combination of Federal, public, and private entities of the following electric transmission lines:

(1) A 750-kilovolt direct current line from the Dalles Dam, Oreg., via Nevada to Sylmar substation, Los Angeles, plus a 345-kilovolt alternating current line from Hoover Dam to Phoenix, Ariz.

(2) A 500-kilovolt alternating current line from John Day Dam, Oreg., via the Central Valley of California to Vincent substation, Los Angeles.

(3) A 750-kilovolt direct current line from the Dalles Dam, Oreg., to Hoover Dam, connected to Los Angeles by a 750-kilovolt direct current line, and to Phoenix, Ariz., by a second 345-kilovolt alternating current line.

(4) A 500-kilovolt alternating current line from John Day Dam to Table Mountain in the Central Valley of California, and thence to Vincent substation, Los Angeles.

(5) A 500-kilovolt line from the California-Oregon boundary into Round Mountain station about 100 miles south of the State boundary; and from Round Mountain a 230-kilovolt line to Cottonwood or Keswick.

The letter of the Secretary of the Interior, dated June 24, 1964, transmitting the Secretary's report on the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest Intertie and the letter of July 27, 1964, modifying the plan in certain respects, are attached as a part of this statement. It is the position of your conferees that any substantial change or deviation in the plan recommended to the Congress by these two letters must be reported back to the Congress for authorization.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
WALTER ROGERS,
JACK WESTLAND,

Managers on the Part of the House.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF

THE INTERIOR,

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,

Washington, D.C., June 24, 1964.

HON. CARL HAYDEN AND GEORGE MAHON,
Chairmen, Appropriations Committees,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN AND MR. MAHON: Transmitted herewith, as requested by your committees, is the Department of the Interior's report of negotiations with non-Federal entities for construction of extrahigh voltage intertie lines linking the Pacific Northwest and the Pacific Southwest.

The report proposes that four such lines be constructed by a combination of Federal, public, and private entities:

(1) A 750-kilovolt direct current line from the Dalles Dam, Oreg., via Nevada to Sylmar substation, Los Angeles, plus a 345-kilovolt alternating current line from Hoover Dam to Phoenix, Ariz.

(2) A 500-kilovolt alternating current line from John Day Dam, Oreg., via the Central Valley of California to Vincent substation, Los Angeles.

(3) A 750-kilovolt direct current line from the Dalles Dam, Oreg., to Hoover Dam, connected to Los Angeles by a 750-kilovolt direct current line, and to Phoenix, Ariz., by a second 345-kilovolt alternating current line.

(4) A 500-kilovolt alternating current line from John Day Dam to Table Mountain in the Central Valley of California, and thence to Vincent substation, Los Angeles.

The essential facts concerning the regional interties between the Pacific Northwest and the Pacific Southwest, as proposed by the Department of the Interior, are these:

The four heavy transmission lines constructed would link all major electric systems—public, private, and Federal—in both regions;

Of about \$375 million investment in the first two lines, one-third would be Federal and two-thirds non-Federal;

These lines would interconnect the largest Federal hydrosystem in the country (Bonneville Power Administration), the largest municipally owned electric system (Los Angeles), one of the largest privately owned utility groups (the California Power Pool, comprised of Pacific Gas & Electric Co., Southern California Edison Co., and San Diego Gas & Electric Co.), and two major Bureau of Reclamation systems (the Colorado River project and the Central Valley project).

In addition the lines would provide greater benefits to the smaller public agencies and cooperatives in the Central Valley of California and the Colorado basin that cannot build their own generating plants economically in this era when the most efficient steam generating plants have capacities of 500,000 to 1 million kilowatts.

When fully implemented, the intertie plan would constitute the finest example of interconnected electric systems in the world—and put the United States in a position of world leadership in electric transmission technology. The proposed 750-kilovolt direct current lines from the Columbia River to Los Angeles and to Hoover Dam would be the longest direct current lines in the world;

As a vital side benefit, these lines would open California markets for Canadian entitlement power, and enable us to implement the United States-Canada Treaty for the joint development of the Columbia River.

The multimillion annual benefits of the interconnection would be shared by both public and private utilities—and the Pacific Northwest would benefit from the sale of nearly \$20 million "secondary" hydroelectricity which is being wasted each year in the Northwest.

I find that this plan will result in benefits to the national interest comparable to those to be derived from all-Federal construction.

I make this finding and recommendation in compliance with the directive from Congress contained in the conference committee report (H. Rept. No. 1027, Dec. 11, 1963) on H.R. 9140, 88th Congress, 1st session. H.R. 9140 appropriated funds to start Federal construction of the intertie facilities. The accompanying report required good faith negotiations with non-Federal entities which might desire to build the facilities and a report from me to Congress before Federal construction could commence. It also required that S. 1007, a bill to give electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on Federal hydroelectric power produced in the region, or similar legislation, be passed first.

To implement this congressional directive, the Honorable Kenneth Holum, Assistant Secretary for Water and Power, developed a "Federal yardstick" proposal and made available to all non-Federal entities that had indicated an interest in submitting proposals the criteria that would be used in evaluating their proposals.

On April 17, 1964, we received 10 proposals to build all or portions of the Federal yardstick plan (3 of the 12 entities joined together as the California Power Pool to make a single offer). These proposals, with amendments thereto as negotiated, were evaluated by a three-member departmental team composed of Charles F. Luce, Bonneville Power Administrator, as Chairman; Emil V. Lindseth, Associate Chief Engineer, Bureau of Reclamation; and Morgan D. Dubrow, Assistant and Chief Engineering Research Adviser to Assistant Secretary Holum. Mr. Holum recommended approval of the result of their negotiations and their evaluations.

The plan we are recommending to the Congress involves acceptance of proposals of the city of Los Angeles, California Power Pool Companies, Pacific Power and Light Co., Portland General Electric Company, and Arizona Public Service Company. Lines and segments of lines would also be constructed by the Bonneville Power Administration and the Bureau of Reclamation.

The recommended plan will produce benefits estimated to be \$2.6 billion over a 50-year payout period. Approximately two-thirds of the benefits would accrue to preference customers. About \$1 billion in benefits would flow to the Pacific Northwest, \$869 million to California, and \$724 million to Arizona, Nevada, and other Colorado basin states.

With regard to the proposed 750-kilovolt direct current line from the Dalles Dam to Hoover Dam, it is our intention that wheeling agreements with non-Federal utilities be negotiated during the present calendar year to assure the financial feasibility of this line.

Our recommendations as to the construction of the first two lines across Oregon also deserve special comment. These lines would be constructed by the Bonneville Power Administration, which would require 75 percent or more of their capacity. Construction by BPA would be much less costly than under any other firm non-Federal proposals we received. For example, under present standards, BPA's own costs on the Oregon portion of a 750-kilovolt direct current line, having capacity of 1,350,000 kilowatts, would be approximately \$2 per kilowatt per year. A Northwest Intertie, Inc. proposal would cost about \$2.72 per kilowatt per year, and if International Utilities Company built this line, it would cost BPA about \$2.91 per kilowatt per year. Thus over a 50-year payout period, these two proposals would cost the Bonneville Power Administration and other users of the lines from \$48 to \$60 million more than if BPA constructed these lines as part of its main grid. All, or a large percentage, of this additional cost would come from Federal funds, since the non-Federal proposals are conditioned upon long-term leases from BPA

sufficient to pay the full cost of the line plus, in the case of International Utilities Company, a profit of its equity investment. A comparison of Federal and non-Federal transmission charges on the first 500-kilovolt alternating current line across Oregon similarly favors BPA construction by a wide margin.

By contrast, the proposals of the city of Los Angeles and the California Power Pool companies, and the other non-Federal proposals we have recommended be accepted, result in transmission charges as low or lower than would result with Federal construction.

One other condition remains to be met before construction of the Federal portion of the recommended intertie plan can begin. That is for the House and Senate to resolve their differences over the Westland amendment to S. 1007. We strongly believe that the intertie plan herein recommended provides a basis for resolving these differences by a substitute amendment. We look forward to early start of construction on a joint Federal-public-private intertie program that is engineeringly sound, economically advantageous, and compatible with the pattern of diverse ownerships of electrical facilities in this Nation.

Under separate cover we have sent, or are sending, you the full text of the criteria and of each proposal.

Sincerely yours,

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., July 27, 1964.

HON. CARL HAYDEN and GEORGE MAHON,
*Chairmen, Appropriations Committees,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN and MR. MAHON: As a result of conferences between Senators and Congressmen from Western States interested in the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest intertie, we have been asked two questions:

1. Could our report of June 24, 1964, to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, as amended July 21, 1964, be further amended to include an all-Federal tie between the Federal Columbia River power system and the Federal Central Valley project power system?

2. If so, what plan of service would accomplish this objective most economically?"

The answer to the first question is "Yes, and this letter may be regarded as such a further amendment. Our report to the Appropriations Committees dated June 24, 1964, is based upon our understanding of the criteria that Congress asked us to apply in negotiations with non-Federal entities for construction of the intertie lines, see conference committee report accompanying H.R. 9140, House Report No. 1027, December 11, 1963. If it is now determined, as a matter of policy, that the intertie program include an all-Federal tie between the Columbia and the Central Valley, our report can be amended accordingly.

The answer to the second question is that an all-Federal tie between the Columbia and Central Valley systems can be accomplished most economically if the Bureau of Reclamation constructs a 500-kilovolt line from the California-Oregon boundary into Round Mountain station about 100 miles south of the State boundary; and from Round Mountain a 230-kilovolt line to Cottonwood station, where it would connect, directly and indirectly, with five existing Federal 230-kilovolt lines now carrying Shasta and Trinity power southward to Tracy. Such a line would be an extension into northern California of the Bonneville 500-kilovolt line proposed for construction from John Day Dam to the California-Oregon boundary. The approximate cost to the Bureau of Reclamation of such lines, including substation

additions, is \$20,300,000. To start construction of such lines in fiscal year 1965, the Bureau would require an additional appropriation of \$500,000.

The modification of our intertie report to include construction of a Federal 500-kilovolt line from the California-Oregon line to Round Mountain, and a 230-kilovolt extension into Cottonwood, requires negotiation of certain additional agreements with other utilities whose facilities would be affected, for example:

1. P.G. & E.'s agreement would be needed to interconnect the Bureau's 500-kilovolt and 230-kilovolt lines at P.G. & E.'s Round Mountain station, and the Bureau's 230-kilovolt line at its Cottonwood station.

2. A long-term agreement with P.G. & E. whereby the Bureau's 500- and 230-kilovolt lines would be operated in parallel with the company's 500-kilovolt lines and system and capacities on the Bureau and company lines between the Oregon boundary and Tracy would be pooled. The capacity of the 500-kilovolt transmission line to be constructed by the Bureau from the Oregon border to Round Mountain shall be made available, first, for the Bureau's own uses up to 400 megawatts and the balance of the capacity in said line shall be made available to carry out the proposal of the companies including the fulfillment of obligations of the companies thereunder.

3. Agreement between the Bureau and the California companies for equitably sharing the wheeling revenues payable by the State and SMUD, and for reducing the companies' wheeling charges to the Bureau for service to Tracy. It may be necessary to adjust the charge to the State and SMUD, depending upon the result of further negotiations.

4. Agreement by the Pacific Power & Light Co. and the Portland General Electric Co. regarding their participation in the intertie plan.

5. Agreement by the California companies not to withdraw the other features of their proposal, including support for The Dalles-Los Angeles 750-kilovolt direct current line, and service to SMUD and the State of California.

In connection with our recommendation to Congress that either the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power or the Southern California Edison Co. construct the direct current tie between the Hoover and Sylmar direct current terminals, further negotiations will also be necessary.

We cannot say at this time whether all of these agreements could be obtained on satisfactory terms if the intertie plan were thus amended. If funds are appropriated for such a line, we will use our best efforts to obtain the agreements.

Sincerely yours,

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report which the committee of conference brings to the House at this time brings the same bill that the House passed on the matter of electricity in the Pacific Northwest, commonly known as the Northwest preference bill, with the exception of one amendment. The one amendment, of course, has to do with the important amendment which was discussed on the floor of the House and upon which the House voted. That amendment was known, and is still known, as the Westland amendment. It is an amendment which has for its purpose bringing to the Congress requests for the authorization of any transmission lines

to be built outside of the Pacific Northwest for the purposes authorized in the legislation.

The report has been signed by the majority members with the exception of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY]. It was signed by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND] of the minority, and sponsor of the Westland amendment. It has not been signed by the ranking minority member of the House committee who served as a member of the conference committee.

The difference comes about with respect to the understanding which the gentleman from Pennsylvania had concerning the Westland amendment, as opposed to the understanding which others of us working on the bill as it passed the House had on the same amendment. Most of us were of the opinion that the Westland amendment, with its mandatory provision for the Secretary to come to the House for any authorization to build lines outside of the Northwest area, had to do with lines to be built from the Northwest area, or more specifically, the Bonneville area. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, as I understand his position, understood that this language was to be considered nationwide in its scope.

With that in mind as the difference which divides us, may I say that since we last met on this bill the Secretary has arrived at agreements with the power handlers of the Southwest United States—in Nevada, California, and Arizona—whereby there is an agreement as to what the Federal Government is to build and also as to those lines which private interests and municipalities are to build.

Most of us feel that the agreement arrived at by the Secretary, although not entirely agreeable to everybody, nevertheless was as good an agreement as he could have obtained from these various interests. We are willing to go along with him on that agreement.

The agreement is set forth in letters printed in the House report, together with maps, so there is no possibility of anybody mistaking the intention of the Secretary, or of those contracting with the Department of the Interior, as well as those of us who have worked on this legislation.

In order to see to it that there was no implication whatsoever that the Secretary would have any other authority than that given to him in this agreement, there was placed in the conference report this proviso:

Provided, That, except with respect to electric transmission lines and related facilities for the purpose of transmitting electric energy between the two regions above mentioned, nothing herein shall be construed as expanding or diminishing in any way the present authority of the Secretary of the Interior to construct transmission lines to market power and energy.

In other words, this leaves the matter, except for the agreement provisions, just as it was before this was brought to our attention. I think this is as much as we can ask of the Department of the Interior regardless of who happens to be Secretary. I think it is fair.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, almost exactly 1 year ago this body considered the so-called Pacific Northwest regional preference bill (S. 1007); and, after extended debate, it was approved. Much of the colloquy at that time centered around an integral and vital provision of the legislation known as the Westland amendment which was designed to give Congress the final determination on an important matter of national policy concerning Federal construction of extra-high voltage transmission lines.

Now we are back here again today to consider a conference report on that bill and a complete capitulation on the Westland amendment.

The original Westland amendment was not so complicated or difficult to understand. It merely said:

No electric transmission lines or facilities shall be constructed outside the Pacific Northwest by any Federal agency for the purpose of transmitting electric energy for sale or exchange pursuant to this Act except those lines and facilities hereafter specifically authorized by the Congress.

This amendment was added to S. 1007 by an overwhelming majority of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. I think a vote of 23 to 9 can be said to be an overwhelming majority. The amendment was also affirmed by the Committee of the Whole House. To many of us on the Interior Committee, the Westland amendment was the only redeeming feature of an otherwise highly undesirable and dangerous piece of legislation. Without the protection it would give to all other areas—not just California—the Pacific Northwest regional preference bill is again undesirable, dangerous and, therefore, unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, in order to refresh our memories I would like to reiterate some of the basic reasons I cited during the debate last August as to why S. 1007 is dangerous legislation. The documentation on these points may be found in House report 590 of this Congress as a part of the separate views signed by seven members of the Interior Committee, including myself.

The bill would abrogate existing preference laws, first enacted in 1906, governing the sale of Federal electric power at least insofar as they would apply to such power produced in the Pacific Northwest and sold outside of that area.

The bill does not follow the principle of other legislation prescribing boundaries for Federal power marketing agencies, such as TVA.

The bill would lure industries from other areas to the economic detriment of these other areas.

The tax dollars used to pay for Federal Northwest projects containing power came from all Americans.

Regional preference would impede the free flow of power from areas where it can be produced most economically to those areas where it might be needed most.

Customers outside the Pacific Northwest would have to incur the financial burden of building high-cost steam power-

plants to meet their increasing needs for power.

This legislation would be a precedent for extending regional preference to other areas.

This legislation is not the effective way to protect the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. Speaker, the one redeeming feature of this bill, however, was the original Westland amendment, which I repeat was adopted by 23 to 9 vote in the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. The inclusion of that amendment was required to permit Congress to face the issue directly and on its merits as to whether a Federal interconnection should be built between the Northwest and all other regions. It does not prevent any construction within the Northwest area. This amendment permitted the questions of how the power should be marketed and whether Federal funds should be expended to be considered separately. Without this protection the bill would be completely unacceptable.

The original Westland amendment was consistent with other recent actions taken by this body in a number of instances to protect congressional prerogatives. The Atomic Energy authorization bill as passed last year provides in section 107 that:

No appropriation shall be made to the Commission nor shall the Commission waive charges for the use of materials under the cooperative power reactor demonstration program, unless previously authorized by legislation enacted by the Congress.

The distinguished vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy staunchly defended this provision July 8, 1963, on the floor of the House by saying:

We have therefore provided, in section 197 of the bill, that prior congressional authorization will be required for all appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission.

The ultimate effect of this legislation will be to strengthen political and fiscal responsibility in this important scientific program. The result should be beneficial to the Congress, the taxpayers, and the Nation.

His reasoning is equally applicable to the Westland amendment.

In Public Law 88-45, enacted on June 21, 1963, Congress provided that after fiscal year 1964, funds may not be appropriated to or for the use of the Coast Guard for the construction of shore or offshore establishments or for the procurement of vessels or aircraft, unless the appropriation of such funds has been authorized by legislation enacted after December 31, 1963. This certainly constitutes another clear precedent for the original Westland amendment. The amendment offered by the distinguished chairman of the Interior Committee to the Missouri River Basin authorization bill provided that none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this section shall be available to initiate construction of any unit of the Missouri River Basin project, whether included in the comprehensive plan or not, which is not hereafter authorized by act of Congress.

The Interior Committee report states that:

The committee believes that this procedure is necessary to provide the Congress with

proper surveillance and control over further development by the Department of the Interior in the Missouri River Basin (88th Cong., H. Rept. 304, p. 2).

The Missouri River Basin bill was enacted in the past few days and is waiting Presidential approval.

By the same token, the original Westland amendment is just as necessary to provide Congress with proper surveillance and control over this important question of national policy. Perhaps those who criticize the original Westland amendment realize that the presently incomplete plans of the Federal agencies could not stand up under the light of thorough congressional appraisal. If such is not the case, it is difficult to understand why they seek to avoid congressional review.

The appropriation for starting the intertie from the Pacific Northwest to the Pacific Southwest would—as admitted by the Secretary of the Interior—be of no consequence without enactment of the Northwest preference bill (S. 1007) nor could construction of the lines be undertaken if the Westland amendment to S. 1007 were to be retained in its original form.

You cannot have one without the other.

Through the manipulations of a strange group of bedfellows, however, it appears that the skids have been greased and all the legislation necessary to open the way for a hybrid transmission system is in the offing. To attempt to stop this steamroller seems futile. Nonetheless, I should like to make my position clear, though I may end up being the only Member of the House on record in opposition to the so-called revised Westland amendment, which is nothing more than a complete capitulation on the House position that the lines cannot be built from Bonneville without congressional authorization.

Yet I feel that I may not be standing alone after I have reminded my colleagues of the manner in which the intertie was arranged. You are all aware, I trust, that when the public works appropriation bill left the House, there was no mention whatsoever of funds for the grand design to bring power from the Pacific Northwest into California, Arizona, and the several other States selected by the Secretary of the Interior as market areas.

Let us look at the chronology of H.R. 11579, the public works appropriation bill. The Appropriations Committee reported the measure on June 11, 1964, and it passed the House without amendment and without funds for the intertie on June 16. Eight days later the Secretary of the Interior transmitted to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees a report of negotiations with non-Federal entities for construction of the extra-high-voltage intertie lines. The next day, on June 25, the Secretary of the Interior wrote a letter to selected members of the California delegation in answer to questions they had raised in a letter written June 16, thus indicating that certain Members of Congress received preferential treatment on release of information about this project; and I might add

that this information had not been made available to the ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, where such projects historically get their start or their stop.

But things move fast in closing days of a Congress when it is only the taxpayers' money at stake. On the afternoon of Thursday, June 25, the Secretary of the Interior, accompanied by the Assistant Secretary, the BPA Administrator, and the Commissioner of Reclamation, held a press conference to explain the intertie and the many benefits that it would bring to selected areas at the expense of taxpayers everywhere. Secretary Udall, with his usual ebullience and enthusiasm, explained the proposed four-line system:

I think this is the first time in the whole history of the West, you had river basin projects, you had reclamation projects, and power projects in one State. This is the first time that you have a project of this magnitude, nearly three-quarters of a billion dollars, that affects all 11 of the Old West Western States.

The Secretary neglected to mention, in his buoyant poise, that his extravagance would be a tremendous burden on the taxpayers of the older East Eastern States.

The package was all tied up and ready to be delivered, the Secretary assured the press. In answer to a question about the Northwest power preference bill and the Westland amendment, he assured reporters that everything was being taken care of and that a solution had been reached so that conferees on S. 1007 would agree to the passage of the preferential legislation with what one reporter described as a "backoff from the Westland amendment." The conference was dismissed after the Secretary answered this question: "Are there any bugs in this thing?"

"If there are," the Secretary stated, "I am sure they will be brought out. We have our critics."

Maybe it is time to bring out those bugs, including the ones that interfere with normal, traditional, and accepted legislative procedure. How does legislation of this kind, which the Secretary admits is the "first time you have a project of this magnitude," get as far as it is in a responsible Congress without referral to the proper committees?

Mr. Speaker, the Senate appropriation hearing is replete with evidence in testimony of the need for having this whole project closely scrutinized by an Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of at least one House before one penny of Federal funds is made available for construction. In the first place, there is the matter of so-called good faith negotiations which Congress directed the Secretary of the Interior to conduct with private utilities before proceeding with any phase of the proposed lines' construction. What actually happened is that the utilities were told—with a shotgun at their heads—to get in on this deal or else. If they would not go along, the result would be an all-Federal transmission system. Period.

Those are the good faith negotiations that brought around this strange coterie of witnesses that testified in favor of the

intertie. Yet with experts from private companies and with an entire cheering section from the Department of the Interior, a great many of the questions posed by members of the committee went unanswered. The matter of the heavy flow of water that determines seasonal power capacity was never carefully examined during the hearings. The cost factor was never fully explained, and indeed by the Interior Department's own figures it was learned that electricity delivered by the intertie in the Phoenix area would actually cost more than if it were generated by steamplants. The senior Senator from California, who throughout the hearings showed a very zealous interest in the intertie, questioned whether the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee should not properly look into the proposal. He contended that the staff of that committee is better qualified to deal with such matters because the Appropriations Committee staff is not equipped for such functions.

The senior Senator from Colorado deplored the lack of information on costs, and he also pointed out that there has been no experience in the operation of a 750-kilovolt direct-current line. No, Mr. Speaker, so far as we know there is no line of this capacity in operation anywhere in the world. In other words, the proponents of these lines are not at all certain as to the rate of line loss, the extent of rights-of-way that will be needed, or other technical questions that are sure to arise. In this connection, I should like to read the following paragraph from *Electrical World* of March 23, 1964:

Bonneville's \$2 million d.c. research program is in a class of its own. During acceptance tests of the E.h.v. d.c. test center near The Dalles, Oreg. (E.Q., Nov. 4, 1963), a large insulating tube supporting one rectifier transformer failed, and a 2-year test is about to begin on its replacement. The results are expected to yield valuable information for design of d.c. transmission lines. In BPA's fiscal year 1965 budget request to Congress is \$3 million for R. & D. which includes \$2 million for permanently housing the d.c. equipment on the Bonneville system.

Mind you, Mr. Speaker, this Congress is being asked to permit construction, at what will eventually be a bill of at least \$242 million for the American taxpayer, of high-voltage transmission that has failed its first test and still needs—according to BPA—2 more years of laboratory work on this one phase of it alone.

You are acquainted with the more recent episodes of the intertie story. The Senate Appropriations Committee approved \$45.5 million to start construction. The Senate passed the bill and it went to conference. Now, not long ago, a very influential member of the House Appropriations Committee made it very clear that he was not at all pleased with what was becoming common custom in the Senate—that is, usurping the House prerogative of originating appropriations. I do not know what his position was when the amended appropriation bill came back to this side of the Capitol with that \$45.5 million attachment to it, but for some reason the conferees

agreed to the addition without complaint.

As predicted by the Secretary to the press 3 weeks ago, the Westland amendment to the Northwest power preference bill sure enough was amended to authorize specifically this circumvention of proper congressional procedure in the case of the intertie, and now the House is asked to permit the Secretary of the Interior to proceed without any authorization whatsoever on a project that is going to cost the U.S. Treasury a minimum of one-quarter of a billion dollars.

In tracing the timetable of the Interior program, I might also point to the Secretary's press release of last Thursday which announced the signing of an agreement covering the sale of Canada's share of downstream power to be generated at Columbia River dams to the United States under the proposed Colorado River treaty. This step in the intertie plan, which also should have been studied by the Interior Committee along with all other facets of the case, was announced on the day the conferees agreed to the intertie appropriation.

For my colleagues outside the old and the new Bonneville marketing areas, let me look for a moment at what your approval of such projects as these is doing to residents of your own districts. The BPA, which is incurring an annual loss in the vicinity of \$18 million due to unnaturally low rates, is making power available to consumers at only 2.4 mills per kilowatt-hour. In contrast, the average TVA cost is 4.11 mills. For those of us who look to private enterprise to supply us with electricity, our cost is at least 6 mills. Why, will someone tell me, should the taxpayers of New England, of Pennsylvania, and of the many other sectors underwrite the loss incurred by BPA so that it can use these rates to attract the industry that would otherwise be ours?

If you do not like the setup, then I suggest that you join me in rejecting this whole Northwest preference bill unless and until it is amended to include the original Westland specification that refuses the Department of the Interior from building tielines outside its own area without the authorization of Congress. It is our last opportunity to protect the integrity of Congress in dealings of this nature.

Mr. Speaker, let me again remind our colleagues that when the bill was debated on this floor last year, several Members took strong exception to the bill without the original Westland amendment. Furthermore assurances were given to the Rules Committee and the whole House that the position in insisting upon the Westland amendment would be upheld. Despite these facts, this conference report now before us represents a total and complete capitulation and is not worth the paper it is written on as far as protecting congressional prerogatives on this vital question.

The House can and must reject this report and instruct its conferees to go back and insist on the original Westland amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I have no crystal ball, but I predict that just as sure as the

House of Representatives is meeting in Washington today, the 18th day of August 1964, within less than 10 years from today, if you pass this conference report, there will be from the west coast to the east coast, from the Canadian border to the Gulf of Mexico, a Federal power grid. Now, mark my words and remember the dates. This is the first big step that they have been able to take in the Bureau of Reclamation for the past 20 years. Believe it or not, though, today they take the big bite. Today they make the move that takes power out of Oregon and Washington and moves it down to southern California and into the Hoover Dam. The next step, my colleagues, will be to move it right out of the Pacific Northwest down into the Missouri Basin; tie the Missouri Basin in with the TVA; the TVA with Passamaquoddy, and you have the Federal power grid.

Now, if you want a Federal power grid, then vote for this conference report. If you do not want it, then vote against it.

Let me tell you what happened. We reported out a bill to build a Chinese wall around the Pacific Northwest. For you folks who say you are in favor of Federal power and the Federal Government being in the power business, the bill says that the preference clause does not apply in the Pacific Northwest hereafter. No; we are going to take care of Alcoa and take care of all the big companies that are down in your area now, and we are going to bring them up there and take care of them with low-cost power. You say I am dreaming? Oh, no, I am not. Just while this bill was pending the Bonneville Power Administration entered into a contract with Monsanto Chemical Co. to give them a power rate that they have never given to anybody else in the Pacific Northwest. This is the lowest rate that has ever been given, and if this bill passes, you will put your stamp of approval on that type of legislation. If you want the preference customers in your community to have the benefit of low-cost power, then you vote against this bill. Some of the people from California say they are satisfied with this bill. They should be satisfied with this bill. The four companies—the four private utility companies in California—went to deal with the Secretary of the Interior, and they got the best deal they could possibly get out of the Secretary of the Interior. It is not a good deal for either side. There are some things in it. However, the price you had to pay to get that deal—and I would like you folks from California to pay attention to this—the price you had to pay was not whether or not you should transport that power out of the Pacific Northwest to give it to you down in California to use. No. The price was that this bill, that has absolutely no connection with it, has to be passed before the Secretary of the Interior will authorize the Bonneville Power Administrator to enter into a contract with the power companies. If this is not an agency of the Federal Government holding a gun to the head of Congress and saying, "If you want those people in southern California to have that power, you have to

pass the bill," then I do not know. This is the issue that Congress must face today.

This is why I did not sign the conference report. I can say to the Members of the House that the Northwest preference bill would never have passed, it would never have come out of the Interior Committee if the Westland amendment had not been attached to it. What was the vote? Twenty-three to nine in favor of the Westland amendment, in the Interior Committee.

We went to conference last fall. The Senate would not move; the House would not move. The House stood by the Westland amendment. We felt that the Westland amendment should be included.

What you are doing in this bill is giving the Secretary of the Interior a blank check. He can go anywhere he wants to in the United States, build any powerlines he wants. Do you want to give him that authority? Or do you in Congress, who have charge of the purse strings, who are charged by the people in your district with representing them, want to have something to say about whether the Secretary of the Interior spends the money or not? I think we should. And the best thing that can happen today is for the House of Representatives to turn down this conference report. If you do then I am sure that those who believe in the preference clause will see to it that it will apply to the people in their district. If you approve this conference report, just as sure as you are sitting here today, you will see a national power grid.

And I might say to the power companies who have entered into their agreements that if this bill passes, they had better get their accounts ready, and be able to put a price tag on what they have got involved, because they will be out of business in 10 years.

This I do not like to predict, but this I sincerely believe. I sincerely hope that the House turns down this conference report.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY] and I refused to sign the conference report.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH].

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, on June 15 last I was concerned by the ticker stories on the series of decisions handed down by the Supreme Court of the United States in the reapportionment cases, which series of cases included the Ohio case. Those cases, unless something is done about it by the Congress or by the people of America, will end 173 years of the glorious history of this country.

Within 7 days after those decisions were handed down as many as 50 Members of the House and almost as many Members of the Senate had introduced joint resolutions proposing to amend the Constitution of the United States or to amend the law of the land to give breather time to offer such amendments.

I was therefore pleased indeed to see in the Washington Post this morning the column by Walter Lippmann entitled

"The Dirksen Breather," which is a counterpart, as I have indicated, of some 30 or 40 bills in the House. I quote this column by the distinguished columnist Walter Lippmann:

TODAY AND TOMORROW
(By Walter Lippmann)
THE DIRKSEN BREATHER

Although it is a bit awkward and rather inconvenient to make Congress deal with apportionment at the tail end of the session, the importance of the subject is overriding. The real issue, as I see it, is whether reapportionment of the State legislatures, which is necessary but also a far-reaching change of habit and custom, should be propelled by something more than the Federal courts alone—whether, that is to say, this great change in the political balance of power should have also the approval of Congress and be subjected to the test of a constitutional amendment. Taking this to be the purpose of the Dirksen proposal, it seems to me sound and in the end desirable.

The heart of the matter is that since about 1890 the United States, which was then composed two-thirds of people from farms and villages, has been transformed. Two-thirds of the Americans now live in cities or in the suburbs. But the apportionment of at least 44 of the State legislatures does not represent this change. In these 44 States, less than 40 percent of the people elect a controlling majority of the legislature. In 13 of these States, one-third or less of the people can elect a controlling majority of the legislature.

While the statistics of this misrepresentation cry out for reform, it is nevertheless true that the problem here, unlike that of the civil rights bill a few months ago, is not such a present danger that delay is intolerable. It is essential that the city and suburban people be properly represented in their State legislatures in order that they may be better able to deal with their pressing needs. But, there is no critical emergency which makes the delay proposed by Senator DIRKSEN intolerable.

There are also positive advantages in the Dirksen Breather. It involves Congress, not only the Supreme Court, in the problem of apportionment, and the pause provided by the Dirksen rider may help to make the coming reapportionment seem less terrifying to those who will lose by it.

For many of us this will help to assuage a troubled conscience about the dilemma posed by the Supreme Court's decision in the Alabama case and Mr. Justice Harlan's dissenting opinion. The dissenting opinion argued powerfully against bringing the affairs of the State legislatures into the Federal courts. The opinion was, in my view, unanswerable but for one enormous fact. That is that the unrepresentative State legislatures are unwilling to reform themselves. The under-represented voters in the cities and suburbs have little or no power to compel reform. In this situation, when there is indubitable evil for which there is no known legal remedy, the intervention of the Supreme Court was the only way of breaking the deadlock.

But such a choice of the lesser of two evils is not attractive, and as one of those troubled by it, I welcome Senator DIRKSEN's action in taking the question to Congress and to the amending process.

The public discussion, which will ensue, will be clarified if we distinguish the two principal arguments which have been used to justify the overrepresentation of the rural voters. One reason, which is as old as the Nation, is that the excitable working people in the cities are not to be trusted as against the stable and virtuous farmers, and that the representative system should be constructed so as to prevent the urban

masses from ruling the State. This is the principle of the New York State constitution which was framed before the turn of the century.

This reason could prevail when the city people were still a minority. It cannot prevail much longer now that they have become a preponderant majority.

But there is another reason, closely related in practice but separate in theory. It is, as Madison put it, that it is necessary to "refine the will of the people," and that one of the best ways of doing this is to have a legislature with two houses in which the upper house is more stable and more conservative.

The real question which will confront the States is how to construct senates in which, though all voters are equal, the senators will check and balance the lower house.

It is not an insoluble problem. The States will have to deal with the problem by making the senatorial districts larger and the number of senators smaller. Each senator will therefore represent a much more varied constituency than a member of the lower house. The States can give the senators a longer term and higher pay. This will tend to give the senators a broader view, a less hurried view, more honor, a greater independence and sense of responsibility.

These are ways to refine the will of the people without obstructing it.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to take the further time of the House at this late hour in the day and I shall, therefore, not continue except to say that I commend the editorial which I have just read into the RECORD to the reading of the Members of the House in its entirety. Because on tomorrow will begin the debate on proposals which may well be the turning point in the history of America.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I repeat differently what I have said at the very beginning, we will, unless the Congress or unless the people of this country do something about those series of decisions, be at the end of an era in America.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOLLING). The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, may I have 1 minute in which to answer my colleague from Ohio [Mr. HAYS], who is one of the examples of our great system in Ohio?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. I appreciate the remarks of my distinguished colleague and esteemed friend from Ohio. I do not know exactly what he is going to answer because I had not said anything, and I hope what I say will not require an answer.

I am pleased at the gentleman's recommendation of the eminent columnist Walter Lippmann on the subject of reapportionment and I hope the gentleman pays the same kind of careful attention to his numerous columns on Senator GOLDWATER.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Well, Mr. Speaker, there is the power of discernment on the part of some of my colleagues from Ohio, including your humble servant, the gentleman from the Fourth Congressional District.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington [Mrs. HANSEN].

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my commendation and appreciation for the diligent work done on this Senate bill, which is similar to the House bill introduced.

I think the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has done a magnificent job, and I would personally like to express the appreciation of the people of my region for the splendid work he has done.

I would also like to express the appreciation of these people to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS] for the work he has done on behalf of this entire problem.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND].

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WESTLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to know that at long last, the regional preference legislation, S. 1007, is before us on the House floor.

Now that agreement by all major parties on the Interior Department's recommendations with respect to the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest intertie plan is a matter of record, we can proceed with this desirable and necessary legislation so that the first phase of construction of the tielines can proceed.

As the committee is aware, the Senate-House conferees have recommended an appropriation of \$42,200,000 with which to initiate construction of three of the four transmission lines between the power system of the Bonneville Power Administration and the Pacific Southwest. The conferees, rightly, agreed that none of these funds shall be expended until enactment of S. 1007, or similar legislation guaranteeing electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region, and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority.

I would be remiss, Mr. Speaker, were I not to give recognition to my able colleague, the gentleman from the State of Washington [Mr. WESTLAND]. My colleague, I feel, was largely responsible for setting forth the conditions under which a realistic and satisfactory intertie plan would be developed. It was his amendment to S. 1007, which was approved by this body, that made this intertie plan possible. My colleague's amendment has thus served its purpose and this is why he and our other colleagues

could now agree to compromise language with the other body.

I urge, Mr. Speaker, that S. 1007, as reported by the conference committee, be accepted by the House. It will mean we can get on with the job of constructing the intertie to the benefit of all.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I support this conference report. Eight out of ten members of the conferees have signed this conference report, which I believe is beneficial to the people of the country. Some 20-odd million people will benefit to the extent of \$2.5 billion over the term of this intertie. I believe this conference report should be approved by the House, as I am sure it will be, and by the Senate.

This particular piece of legislation has had great consideration by the Interior Department. Anyone who talks about a threat of Federal intertie throughout the Nation really is not talking about this legislation because there is nothing here that says there will be any national intertie proposition. This is designed for a specific area and for the benefit of the people of that area. As I say, it will benefit them to the tune of better than \$2 billion.

The Secretary of the Interior has gone out and negotiated with non-Federal entities, with the private power companies, with the municipal water districts, such as the Los Angeles district, and by his own words the Secretary of the Interior has said that through those negotiations he comes here with a better package that will provide a greater benefit and at less cost than by the building of a Federal intertie. This is the kind of thing we wanted to have done. This is the way I believe the processes of the Congress should go.

The Secretary came before the Congress and told the Congress what he had in mind. The Congress has approved it.

Mr. Speaker, this will be one of the most beneficial pieces of legislation I have seen this year, and I hope it will be overwhelmingly approved by the House.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, the passage of this bill this afternoon will mark the culmination of many months of work on the part of many, many people. There have been disagreements and disputes—and there still are. But a remarkable consensus is embodied in this conference report. It is one that can be supported by advocates of public and private power alike and will provide benefits to both as well as to the various geographical areas involved. It is proof again that, with all the disadvantages, the democratic system can work and does work.

This is not a Federal grid, though it is a regional grid. Someday there may be a national grid. I doubt that it will be a Federal grid however but rather one that follows the pattern of the one soon to span the country along the west coast. Maximum utilization of our resources and the elimination of waste demands the answers we are helping to provide today.

The gentleman from Colorado who chairs the Interior Committee has

patiently and skillfully acted as the midwife along with his counterpart in the Senate. The Secretary of Interior and Mr. Charles Luce, the able Administrator of Bonneville were anxious parents along with many of my colleagues from California, Washington, Arizona, and Oregon. All can share the credit for the very imaginative and far-reaching high-voltage intertie that will result.

May I express the thanks of the people of Oregon to all of them and to all of the Members from around the country who support this legislation today.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the House today, I hope, will take the final legislative action on a measure that has been a long time in the legislative mill. I hope the House will accept this report of the conferees. The conferees deserve commendation for the persistent manner in which they have negotiated and renegotiated among themselves in an effort to reach agreement. We have before us an imaginative proposal to create a vast hydroelectric power net reaching from the Columbia River basin, that vital artery of the Pacific Northwest, into the lower reaches of California and eventually into the Southwest. There will be private, municipal, State and Federal participation in what will be the biggest single electric transmission program ever conceived in the United States. The President in late July sent to the Congress a request for \$49.5 million to start construction of the Federal portion of three of the planned four lines. The lines would carry more than 4 million kilowatts of power, equivalent to the daily power needs of five Washington, D.C.'s, or to the output of two Grand Coulee dams.

The conference report accompanying S. 1007 would establish needed ground rules for operating the west coast interties, that involve the exchange and sale of hydro energy and power capacity which is surplus to the needs of the respective Federal power marketing areas and agencies. Regional preference legislation is needed to protect electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest by giving them first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region.

It has been a long, hard road, Mr. Speaker, for those of us who see the advantages of the intertie but appreciated the keen need to properly protect our resources development in the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOLLING). The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 230, nays 134, not voting 66, as follows:

[Roll No. 239]

YEAS—230

Addabbo	Hagen, Calif.	Perkins
Albert	Halleck	Philbin
Andrews,	Halpern	Pickle
N. Dak.	Hanna	Pike
Arends	Hansen	Poage
Ashley	Harding	Powell
Aspinall	Harris	Price
Ayres	Harrison	Pucinski
Baker	Hawkins	Purcell
Baldwin	Hays	Randall
Barry	Hechler	Reid, Ill.
Beckworth	Henderson	Reifel
Beermann	Holifield	Reuss
Bell	Horan	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bennett, Fla.	Horton	Rhodes, Pa.
Berry	Hosmer	Rivers, Alaska
Betts	Hull	Roberts, Tex.
Boggs	Ichord	Rogers, Colo.
Bolling	Jennings	Rogers, Tex.
Bolton,	Jensen	Rooney, N.Y.
Oliver P.	Joelson	Rooney, Pa.
Bow	Johnson, Calif.	Roosevelt
Brademas	Karsten	Rosenthal
Brook	Karsh	Rostenkowski
Brooks	Kastenmeier	Roudebush
Brotzman	Kelly	Roush
Brown, Calif.	Keogh	Roybal
Brown, Ohio	Kilgore	Ryan, N.Y.
Burke	King, Calif.	St. Germain
Burkhalter	Kirwan	St. Onge
Burton, Calif.	Kluczyński	Secrest
Byrne, Pa.	Laird	Senner
Byrnes, Wis.	Langen	Short
Cameron	Leggett	Shriver
Carey	Libonati	Sickles
Chenoweth	Lipscomb	Sikes
Clark	Long, La.	Sisk
Clausen,	Long, Md.	Slack
Don H.	McDowell	Smith, Iowa
Clawson, Del	McFall	Staebler
Cohelan	Macdonald	Stafford
Cooley	Madden	Staggers
Corman	Mahon	Steed
Cunningham	Malillard	Stephens
Daniels	Martin, Calif.	Stinson
Davis, Ga.	Martin, Nebr.	Stratton
Dawson	Matsunaga	Stubblefield
Delaney	May	Sullivan
Dent	Miller, Calif.	Taft
Denton	Mills	Talcott
Dole	Minish	Taylor
Donohue	Monagan	Teague, Calif.
Duncan	Montoya	Thomas
Edmondson	Moorhead	Thompson, N.J.
Edwards	Morgan	Thompson, Wis.
Elliott	Morris	Trimble
Everett	Morrison	Tupper
Farbstein	Mosher	Tuten
Fascell	Moss	Udall
Feighan	Multer	Utt
Finnegan	Murphy, Ill.	Van Deerlin
Fino	Murphy, N.Y.	Vanik
Flood	Murray	Van Pelt
Flynt	Natcher	Wallhauser
Fraser	Nelsen	Watts
Friedel	Nix	Weltner
Gallagher	Norblad	Westland
Gialmo	O'Brien, N.Y.	White
Gilbert	O'Hara, Ill.	Whitten
Gill	O'Hara, Mich.	Wickersham
Gonzalez	O'Konski	Widnall
Grabowski	Olsen, Mont.	Willis
Gray	Olson, Minn.	Wilson, Bob
Green, Oreg.	O'Neill	Wilson,
Green, Pa.	Patman	Charles H.
Griffiths	Patten	Wright
Gubser	Pelly	Young
Hagan, Ga.	Pepper	Zablocki

NAYS—134

Abbutt	Burleson	Derwinski
Abele	Burton, Utah	Devine
Abernethy	Cahill	Dorn
Anderson	Casey	Dowdy
Andrews, Ala.	Cederberg	Downing
Aashbrook	Chamberlain	Dwyer
Ashmore	Clancy	Findley
Bates	Cleveland	Fisher
Battin	Collier	Ford
Becker	Colmer	Foreman
Belcher	Conte	Fountain
Bray	Corbett	Frelinghuysen
Bromwell	Cramer	Fulton, Pa.
Broomfield	Curtin	Fuqua
Broyhill, N.C.	Curtis	Gary
Broyhill, Va.	Dague	Gathings
Bruce	Derounian	Gibbons

Glenn
Goodell
Goodling
Grant
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Hardy
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Herlong
Huddleston
Hutchinson
Jarman
Johansen
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Keith
Kilburn
King, N.Y.
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Latta
Lennon

Lindsay
McCulloch
McDade
McIntire
McLoskey
McMillan
MacGregor
Marsh
Mathias
Matthews
Milliken
Minshall
Moore
Morton
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Pillion
Poff
Pool
Quile
Quillen
Reid, N.Y.
Rich
Riehlman
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.

Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Rumsfeld
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebell
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Sibal
Siler
Skubitz
Snyder
Springer
Teague, Tex.
Tuck
Waggonner
Watson
Weaver
Wharton
Whitener
Williams
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wydler

NOT VOTING—66

Adair
Alger
Auchincloss
Avery
Baring
Barrett
Bass
Blatnik
Boland
Bolton
Frances P.
Bonner
Buckley
Celler
Chelf
Daddario
Davis, Tenn.
Diggs
Dingell
Dulski
Ellsworth
Evins
Fallon

Fogarty
Forrester
Fulton, Tenn.
Garmatz
Harvey, Mich.
Healey
Hébert
Hoeven
Hoffman
Holland
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Kee
Kyl
Landrum
Lankford
Lesinski
Lloyd
McClory
Martin, Mass.
Michel
Miller, N.Y.

Morse
Nedzi
Pilcher
Pirnie
Rains
Rodino
Ryan, Mich.
St. George
Sheppard
Shipley
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Tollefson
Ullman
Vinson
Whalley
Wyman
Younger

So the conference report was agreed to.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Smith of California for, with Mr. Morse against.
Mr. Toll for, with Mr. Auchincloss against.
Mr. Daddario for, with Mr. McClory against.
Mr. Adair for, with Mr. Wyman against.
Mr. Ellsworth for, with Mr. Fogarty against.
Mr. Tollefson for, with Mr. Pirnie against.
Mr. Younger for, with Mr. Alger against.
Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Hoeven against.
Mrs. St. George for, with Mr. Hoffman against.

Mr. Barrett for, with Mr. Michel against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Avery.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Harvey of Michigan.
Mr. Shipley with Mrs. Frances P. Bolton.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Kyl.
Mr. Chelf with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Bolland.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Lankford.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mrs. Kee.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Pilcher.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Sheppard.
Mr. Holland with Mr. Healey.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Thompson.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Lesinski.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Rains.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Vinson.
Mr. Ryan of Michigan with Mr. Evins.
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.
Mr. Forrester with Mr. Johnson of Wisconsin.

Messrs. McMILLAN, McDADE, and FORD changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

SENECA INDIAN NATION

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 1794) to authorize the acquisition of and the payment for a flowage easement and rights-of-way over lands within the Allegany Indian Reservation in New York, required by the United States for the Allegheny River—Kinza Dam—project to provide for the relocation, rehabilitation, social and economic development of the members of the Seneca Nation, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1821)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1794) to authorize the acquisition of and the payment for a flowage easement and rights-of-way over lands within the Allegany Indian Reservation in New York, required by the United States for the Allegheny River (Kinza Dam) project, to provide for the relocation, rehabilitation, social and economic development of the members of the Seneca Nation, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, and 9.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Page 3, lines 19 and 20, strike out "\$1,033,275", and insert "\$945,573"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following:

"(f) The sums payable under (a) and (c) of this section shall be subject to deduction in accordance with stipulations entered into, or to be entered into, between the United States, the Seneca Nation, and individual Seneca Indians if it is judicially determined that title to any lands or improvements to which such compensation relates was not

vested at the time of the taking, in whole or in part, in the Seneca Nation or individual Seneca Indians."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following:

"Sec. 4. There is authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of \$12,128,917, which shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Seneca Nation and which shall draw interest on the principal at the rate of 4 per centum per annum until expended for assistance designed to improve the economic, social, and educational conditions of enrolled members of the Seneca Nation, including but not limited to the following purposes:

"(a) developing and carrying out individual and family plans, including relocation and resettlement and the construction of roads, utilities, sanitation facilities, houses, and related structures;

"(b) the construction and maintenance of community buildings and other community facilities; and

"(c) industrial and recreational development on the Allegheny, Cattaraugus, and Oil Springs Reservations.

The funds authorized by this section shall be expended in accordance with plans and programs approved by the Seneca Nation and the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That no part of such funds shall be used for per capita payments."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

"Sec. 18. Except as specifically required to carry out the provisions of this Act, the Department of the Interior shall not enlarge the services which it is now in fact rendering to, or the supervision which it is now in fact exercising over the property and affairs of, the Seneca Nation and its members pursuant to the laws of the United States relating to Indians and Indian tribes. The Secretary of the Interior shall, after consultation with the Seneca Nation, submit to the Congress a plan for complete withdrawal of Federal supervision over the property and affairs of the Nation and its members. Said plan shall be submitted within three years from the effective date of this Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill, and agree to the same.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
JAMES A. HALEY,
ED EDMONDSON,
CHARLOTTE T. REID,

Managers on the Part of the House.

FRANK CHURCH,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
GEORGE MCGOVERN,
MILWARD L. SIMPSON,
PETER H. DOMINICK,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses to the bill (H.R. 1794) to authorize payment for certain interests in lands within the Allegany Indian Reservation in New York, required by the United States for the Allegheny River (Kinza Dam) project, to provide for the relocation, rehabilitation, social, and economic development of the members of the Seneca Nation, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the language agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The Senate amended H.R. 1794, as it passed the House, in 10 respects. Five of these amendments—those numbered (1), (2), (3), (7), and (9)—were clarifying or perfecting in nature and the House conferees recommend that the House recede from its disagreement thereto. Another, amendment number (5), added language to the effect that the sums payable to the Senecas under section 2, subsections (a) and (c), of the bill should be subject to deduction for any property the title to which is found not to have been vested in the Senecas. The House conferees recommend acceptance of this amendment with a further perfecting amendment.

Senate amendment No. (4) reduced the amount payable to the Senecas for so-called indirect damages from \$1,033,275 to \$824,273. The conference committee recommends that the latter figure be raised to \$945,573. This amount was arrived at by deducting from the House figure the sum of \$94 per acre for 933 acres of submerged lands in the Allegheny River. The remaining amount thus includes all other items for which the House had allowed compensation in this subsection plus \$6 per acre for the submerged lands. The \$6 allowed is in accord with legislative decisions heretofore made in other Indian land-taking cases.

Senate amendment No. (6) reduced the amount authorized to be appropriated for rehabilitation and improvement of the Senecas' economic, social and educational conditions from the \$16,931,000 in the House bill to \$6,116,550, and otherwise modified the language of section 4 in which this amount appeared. The conference committee recommends acceptance of the text of the Senate amendment with a clarifying amendment and the substitution of \$12,128,917 for the lower Senate figure.

Senate amendment No. (8) struck from the House-passed bill a provision for the acquisition of property outside the Allegany Reservation for recreational or commercial development and for such acquired property to become part of the Reservation. The House conferees recommend that the House recede from its disagreement to this amendment.

Senate amendment No. (10) would have directed the tribal council of the Seneca Nation to submit a plan for termination of Federal supervision over its property and affairs within two years from the date H.R. 1794 becomes law. It also would have directed the Secretary of the Interior to submit proposed legislation to carry out this purpose within 90 days of the date on which the tribal council submitted its plan. In lieu of this amendment, and in order to encourage the Seneca Nation to continue managing its affairs as it has done since 1949 when the State of New York assumed responsibility for its Indian citizens and to insure that the Secretary of the Interior will not assume responsibilities other than those advisory in nature, the conferees recommend a substitute which will, in effect, forbid the Department of the Interior to enlarge upon the services which it is now rendering to the Senecas and the supervision which it is now exercising over their property and affairs, except as such enlargement is specifically required to carry out H.R. 1794. It also directs the Secretary of the Interior, after consultation with the nation, to submit to the Congress a plan for complete withdrawal of Federal supervision within 3 years from the date of the act.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
JAMES A. HALEY,
ED EDMONSON,
CHARLOTTE T. REID,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, in this particular conference report the differences between

the House and Senate conferees were pretty well ironed out without much controversy with the exception of one matter having to do with the ultimate figure to be authorized for the rehabilitation and improvement of the Seneca's economic, social, and educational conditions. The House provided \$16,931,000 and the Senate provided \$6,116,550. We finally came to agreement on the amount of \$12,128,917. This amount with the other benefits that are provided comes to \$15 million to take care of the expenses, the distress, and the rehabilitation of this tribe that was so rudely moved away from its home.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to commend our colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY]. Mr. HALEY took up the problems of the Seneca Indians as a personal crusade, realizing that their treaty had been broken and that it was incumbent upon the people of the United States to do something to take care of this great tribe.

As a result of his efforts, and his efforts alone, we are here today with a conference report which gives the Seneca Indians the necessary money which will enable them to rehabilitate themselves. This is a tremendous credit to the gentleman from Florida; it is a tribute to him.

The only item that was really deleted was an item that involved a section of their reservation which is not affected by the reservoir, and for this reason the gentleman from Florida was willing to concede that this be taken out.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, may I at this time express my commendation not only to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY], who has worked hard on this matter, but also the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who has done his best to take care of the Indians involved in this legislation.

Mr. SAYLOR. I thank the gentleman. I certainly hope the conference report will be adopted and that the money will be provided so these Indians can be rehabilitated before the reservation is closed.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, this conference report takes care of the Seneca Indians in my district. We have had a good many fights about the building of the Kinzua Dam in the area of the Allegheny River bordering New York and Pennsylvania.

I want to commend the House conferees and the House committee, as well as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], for their all-out efforts on behalf of the Indians. They took the trouble to go up there and confer with the Indians and look the situation over. They understood the problems created by this dam going in there and flooding out the Seneca Nation. I

commend them, therefore, for this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, at long last the Congress has taken final action to provide reimbursement to the Seneca Nation of Indians for the taking of their lands. In earlier actions the United States broke its treaty with the Senecas and proceeded to plan and construct the Kinzua Dam on the Allegheny River.

That dam and the reservoir that will result will cause the Federal Government to take more than 10,000 acres from the Seneca Reservation. The conference report we approve here tonight provides payment to the Senecas for that taking.

This is the culmination of more than 35 years of threats to the very existence of the Seneca Nation. By endorsing this conference report we provide for the continued existence of that ancient nation in our midst. The great heritage of these people can be preserved, studied, and displayed to many, many of our modern society.

The Seneca Nation has indeed suffered.

By tonight's action we alleviate, to some degree, that suffering. I, for one, wish that we could do more. This is, however, a beginning in the drive to rebuild the nation of the Senecas and to provide for its young people the means to develop their own future based upon their traditional past.

I support the conference report and commend those who made it possible.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION].

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my approval of this conference report.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the conference report just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

CONSERVATION OF WILDLIFE RESOURCES

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 793) to promote the conservation of the Nation's wildlife resources on the Pacific flyway in the Tule Lake, Lower Klamath, Upper Klamath, and Clear Lake National Wildlife Refuges in Oregon and California and to aid in the administration of the Klamath reclamation project, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the

part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1820)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the Bill (S. 793) entitled An act to promote the conservation of the Nation's wildlife resources on the Pacific flyway in the Tule Lake, Lower Klamath, Upper Klamath, and Clear Lake National Wildlife Refuges in Oregon and California and to aid in the administration of the Klamath reclamation project, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 1 and 2.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language inserted by the House amendment, insert the following:

"SEC. 6. In carrying out the obligations of the United States under any migratory bird treaty, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (40 Stat. 755), as amended, or the Migratory Bird Conservation Act (45 Stat. 1222), as amended, waters under the control of the Secretary of the Interior shall be regulated, subject to valid existing rights, to maintain sump levels in the Tule Lake National Wildlife Refuge at levels established by regulations issued by the Secretary pursuant to the contract between the United States and the Tulelake Irrigation District, dated September 10, 1956, or any amendment thereof. Such regulations shall accommodate to the maximum extent practicable waterfowl management needs."

And the House agree to the same.

WALTER ROGERS,
ROBERT B. DUNCAN,
HAROLD T. JOHNSON,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
JOE SKUBITZ,

Managers on the Part of the House.

HENRY M. JACKSON,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
FRANK E. MOSS,
THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
GORDON ALLOTT,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 793) to promote the conservation of the Nation's wildlife resources on the Pacific flyway in the Tule Lake, Lower Klamath, Upper Klamath, and Clear Lake National Wildlife Refuges in Oregon and California and to aid in the administration of the Klamath reclamation project, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the language agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report. The language agreed upon is the language of the House except the language in section 6. The language agreed upon in section 6 is new language which is different from either the language of the House or the language of the Senate.

Section 6 relates to the maintenance of water levels in the sumps in the Tule Lake

National Wildlife Refuge. Presently, these water levels are established by Secretarial regulations which are issued pursuant to section 7 of the contract between the United States and the Tulelake Irrigation District entered into in 1956. Since 1959, these regulations have satisfactorily provided for proper waterfowl management and optimum agricultural use without interfering with either purpose. The new language adopted by the committee of conference as a substitute for the House and Senate versions of section 6, is designed to continue this satisfactory arrangement.

The language agreed upon directs the Secretary of the Interior, in carrying out various treaty and statutory obligations, to regulate the water under his control, subject to valid existing contractual rights, through regulations issued pursuant to the contract entered into in 1956 between the Government and the Tulelake Irrigation District. These regulations establish sump levels in the Tule Lake Refuge. The language agreed upon also directs that the regulations shall, to the maximum extent practicable, accommodate waterfowl management needs.

Your conferees believe that this new language does not impair the rights of the district under its contract, and therefore accomplishes what was intended to be accomplished by the House language. The validity of the contract is recognized and, at the same time, the Secretary retains authority to serve the broadest possible public interest in adjusting the two primary purposes to which the sumps are devoted, waterfowl management and flood control.

In summary, in our view, the language agreed upon fully accomplishes what was intended to be accomplished by the House language in section 6, and it should be adopted.

WALTER ROGERS,
ROBERT B. DUNCAN,
HAROLD T. JOHNSON,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
JOE SKUBITZ,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, in presenting this conference report I wish to commend the members of the committee of conference, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS], the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON], the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DUNCAN], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SKUBITZ] for the wonderful job they have done. This perhaps is one of the most intricate and controversial responsibilities that we have had to take care of. The conferees have done a magnificent job, and I recommend their report to the House.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS] and the members of the committee of conference on bringing in this fine conference report. By the adoption of this conference report we will have solved a problem that has been before the Congress for 20 years. I urge the adoption of this conference report.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to

the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on bringing in a conference report we can all support. This has been a problem in our State for approximately 20 years, and for the 6 years that I have been here in the Congress. I certainly hope the House will today adopt the conference report, because it does do justice to everyone concerned.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN].

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] for his tireless work in bringing this important legislation through the conference committee and to the House for final consideration.

The Tule Lake-Klamath Waterfowl Refuge is one of the largest waterfowl concentrations in the United States. It is situated at a critical point, or "bottleneck," on the Pacific flyway and is an essential resting and feeding area for in excess of 7 million birds each year winging southward from their Alaskan and Canadian breeding grounds.

Despite its importance, however, Mr. Speaker, controversy has raged for many years between those who would divert refuge lands and waters to private uses and those who would safeguard this invaluable wildlife habitat. And this despite the fact that the present refuge is but a small part of the once extensive wetlands of the Klamath basin.

This bill, I am pleased to say, is in the public interest. For not only does it preserve an irreplaceable national and international waterfowl refuge, but its maintenance as an assured habitat of migratory fowl also benefits the great majority of affected agriculturists.

Mr. Speaker, this is a sound, constructive bill. It protects a critical national interest, and I urge its approval without further delay.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be allowed to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the conference report just adopted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

JULIAN A. ERSKINE

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 5941) for the relief of Julian A. Erskine, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That the estate of the late Julian A. Erskine, master sergeant, United States Army, retired, of Staples, Minnesota, is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the amount of \$601.07 representing overpayments of active duty pay as a member of the United States Army for the period from July 20, 1944, through August 9, 1959, which he received as a result of a typographical error made in the date of his original enlistment in the National Guard and the granting of subsequent longevity increases prior to entitlement.

"Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Julian A. Erskine of Staples, Minnesota, the aggregate of amounts received or withheld from the late Master Sergeant Julian A. Erskine on account of the payments referred to in the first section of this Act. No part of the amount appropriated in this section shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of the preceding sentence shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF E. A. ROLFE, JR.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2215) for the relief of E. A. Rolfe, Jr., and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOLAND). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1804)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2215) for the relief of E. A. Rolfe, Jr., having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses, as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment and agree to the same.

ROBERT T. ASHMORE,
JOHN DOWDY,
ROLAND V. LIBONATI,
GARNER E. SHRIVER,
CARLETON J. KING,

Managers on the Part of the House.

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
ROMAN L. HEUSKA,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2215) entitled "An act for the relief of E. A. Rolfe, Jr.," submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

When this proposed measure passed the Senate it was amended by the addition of the words "and assessment of deficiency by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue for any of said years against the said E. A. Rolfe, Jr.," on page 1, in line 6 after the word "Arkansas". This would have extended a waiver of the statute of limitations to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue for the assessment of any deficiencies for the years 1948, 1949, 1951, and 1954 for which the House passed form of the measure would have permitted the filing of a claim for credit or refund of overpayment of income taxes by the taxpayer.

The Senate receded from its amendment.

ROBERT T. ASHMORE,
JOHN DOWDY,
ROLAND V. LIBONATI,
GARNER E. SHRIVER,
CARLETON J. KING,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEFENSE SECRETARY McNAMARA'S TESTIMONY BEFORE DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM COMMITTEE

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the remarks of Secretary of Defense McNamara before the Democratic platform committee cannot be left unanswered. In reading over his remarks, I found it difficult to determine from one paragraph to the next whether he was attacking General Eisenhower or Senator Goldwater. I found it virtually impossible to unearth one direct answer to the charges that have been leveled against his administration of the Department of Defense.

It is not, I think, because he misunderstands the charges that have been leveled. Many of us have repeated them on several occasions over the past several months. We can only conclude that his failure to address himself more directly to the charges leveled is an admission that there is no meaningful answer to those charges.

Tomorrow, I will address myself in some detail to the remarks of the Secretary before the platform committee.

For the moment, I would like to address myself to one of the more flag-

grant assertions contained in the Secretary's statement. In the opening paragraph, he makes reference to the Eisenhower administration and states:

The Defense Establishment we found in 1961 was based on a strategy of massive nuclear retaliation as the answer to all military and political aggression. We, however, were convinced that our enemies would never find credible a strategy which even the American people did not believe.

This assertion, Mr. Speaker, to any who lived through the Eisenhower years, or to any who have read about the Eisenhower years, and most particularly, to those who understand the Eisenhower years, is a patently indefensible and irresponsible statement. Our response in Lebanon, to Quemoy-Matsu and many other military or political incidents would bear this out.

Mr. Speaker, by way of anticipating what I will lay before this House tomorrow, let me say that I find it shocking that the Secretary of Defense would present a document so obviously political rather than an objective assessment of our defense posture.

CANADA'S DUTY REMISSION PROGRAM

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, Canada's duty remission program, adopted by our neighbor last fall for the avowed purpose of increasing her exports of automotive parts of this country, has been capably discussed on this floor by several of our colleagues who are genuinely and rightfully concerned over potentially adverse effects upon U.S. jobs and workers.

I share their concern and join them in censuring a unilateral trade action that raises such grave questions of Government subsidy and unfair competition.

I am, however, sorely troubled by the remedy that has been proposed in the form of a demand for the imposition of countervailing duties by the Treasury Department.

Such action is, I submit, neither the only nor the best answer. It is a solution that would be only too likely to create greater problems than it attempts to solve. It is a course that offers much too little lasting relief for the affected U.S. producers and much too much danger to the entire framework of trade relations between Canada and the United States.

Indeed, as far as the U.S. auto parts industry as a whole is concerned, the imposition of countervailing duties might well be worse than taking no action at all. I do not propose such a passive attitude, but in considering our alternatives we must keep in mind that the duty remission program does not operate exclusively on a one-way street. For many U.S. producers of automotive supplies, this program could well mean more ex-

ports to Canada and more jobs in the United States.

Remember how the Canadian program works: essentially, it provides for the remission of automotive import duties to manufacturers who successfully increase their exports of similar goods.

The effect and intent of Canada's import duties—like import duties anywhere on anything—is to permit Canadian parts manufacturers to compete on more even terms with their U.S. counterparts whose efficiency and volume permit cheaper production. Any remission of these duties must logically, therefore, increase the competitiveness of the U.S. producer on the Canadian market. Thus, while Canada would be making inroads on the U.S. auto parts market, at least some U.S. producers would also be building up their Canadian sales.

How the interchange would balance out, I cannot predict—nor can anyone else. It is entirely conceivable that the net result would be far less detrimental to the United States than we might initially suppose.

Some U.S. companies, of course, are bound to be hurt if the Canadian program succeeds, and it is for their protection that the demand for countervailing duties has come about. Let us take a hard look at what this course of action might accomplish or fail to accomplish.

The imposition of countervailing duties, of course, would result from a determination that Canada's duty remissions are equivalent to a "bounty or grant" from the Canadian Government to Canadian manufacturers on their exports to this country. In that case, the Treasury Department would assess additional U.S. import duties sufficient to offset the amount of the "bounty or grant." In theory and for the moment, the Canadian program would be neutralized and the situation would be very much as though she had never adopted the program in the first place.

Whether duty remissions as Canada is employing them do or do not actually constitute a subsidy is an involved and complex question that I am content to leave to the Treasury Department and, likely, the courts for interpretation.

In the event countervailing duties were to be imposed, however, I find it hard to believe that the matter would end there. In Canada, the current accounts deficit with the United States, to which automotive parts are a major contributor, is very much a burning issue. The possibility that Canada would meet reprisal with further reprisal is only too real.

Various means are at her disposal. She could, for example, increase tariff levels on imported parts, or increase the local content requirement—now 60 percent on passenger cars—for motor vehicles sold in Canada. Such measures could effectively seal off a large part of the Canadian market in which U.S. automotive producers now enjoy an annual business of more than half a billion dollars. Different U.S. workers and different U.S. companies might be affected, but the total impact would dwarf the worst we can reasonably anticipate from the duty remission program.

Since neither inaction nor retaliatory action holds assurance, or even promise, of solving the problem Canada has posed to U.S. auto parts producers, the alternative that recommends itself is negotiation with Canada. This is by no means the first time that we and our best customer have clashed over trade matters but we have always managed to work things out. We could not otherwise have become the world's largest trading partners whose intercommerce last year totaled nearly \$8 billion. Both countries have too much at stake to now start playing beggar-your-neighbor.

Mr. Speaker, it is especially unfortunate that the dispute threatens to come to a head at a time when all our trading partners are on the alert for straws in the wind because of the upcoming Kennedy round of tariff negotiations in Geneva.

We are told by the New York Times of August 10, for example, that Canadian authorities are already expressing apprehension. Under unanimous consent, I insert the Times news account.

The temptation is great, of course, to retort that Canada shouldered the chip with her duty remission program on auto parts, but nothing can be more futile and less helpful at this stage than recriminations. However it came about, a serious situation has arisen in the mutually beneficial trade relationship between our two countries. Our task now is to find a just and equitable solution acceptable to both.

Mr. Speaker, such a solution is not to be found in reprisals, retributions and retaliations. Certainly the route of negotiation and freer trade holds more promise for growth and industry on both sides of the border. Let us not block that path with action taken in haste and regretted at leisure.

CANADA-UNITED STATES RIFT ON TRADE LOOMS: OTTAWA AUTHORITIES FEAR NEW TARIFF BARRIERS

OTTAWA, August 10.—New protectionist trends on both sides of the international border are making Canadian authorities apprehensive of the atmosphere that will prevail at the Kennedy round of tariff bargaining in Geneva.

In recent weeks and months, one of those periodic deteriorations in Ottawa-Washington trade relations has occurred that threatens to substitute mutual reprisals for the usual tranquil trading pattern between the two countries.

The U.S. automobile parts industry is annoyed by new Canadian legislation on shipments. The industry charges the law is a subsidy on the shipment of Canadian automobile parts to the U.S. market, and therefore a threat to the jobs of thousands of American automotive workers.

"BUY AMERICAN" PROTEST

Canadian authorities for their part, have instructed the Canadian Embassy in Washington to protest both the "buy American" clause inserted at the last minute into the rapid transit bill passed by Congress and the meat imports quota bill, which was passed recently by the Senate.

Of the two pieces of legislation, the rapid transit bill is viewed as the more vital in its potential damage to Canadian interests.

It stipulates that U.S. Federal aid to urban rapid transport shall be conditional upon the purchase of materials in the United States.

POLICY REVERSAL SEEN

This is a reversal of the exemption that Canada previously has enjoyed from similar "buy American" clauses in U.S. defense legislation.

As such, it is viewed by Canadian authorities as a vital departure in principle, which if extended, could result in widespread discrimination against Canada in United States purchasing policy.

That prospect is one which, in the view of Canadian trade authorities, could only have one ultimate result: a trade war between the two countries.

A senior official of the Department of Trade and Commerce recently stated:

"In Canada we do not discriminate against U.S. sources of supply. But if Washington should do so we would have to become similarly selective in self-defense."

By comparison, the meat imports quota bill now going before Congress after being passed by the Senate is a measure of far narrower application.

Its effect will be to cut Canadian meat exports to the United States by 30 percent from the present annual volume of \$6.25 million.

The bill would not affect Canadian live cattle exports now numbering 250,000 head a year and valued at nearly \$20 million.

Nevertheless, it is regarded by Canadian authorities as the kind of protectionist measure that is out of harmony with the Kennedy round of negotiations scheduled to open in mid-November in Geneva.

BEEF IMPORTS

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, it appears that the Washington Post is unusually jittery about legislation passed in the Senate and being considered by the House now to establish reasonable limitations on beef imports at a time when domestic prices are depressed because of a domestic oversupply.

For several days now the Washington Post has had editorials on this subject, inferring that the livestock industry is attempting to impose rigid quotas on imported meat. Yesterday, the Post outdid itself in its editorial entitled "Import Jitters," in which they went so far as to insult the livestock industry by using this phraseology:

The organized cattlemen, a group endowed with more dollars than brains, has found a scapegoat for declining beef prices in the trickle of meat imports, and their demands for rigid import quotas has spread a paralysis of fear among otherwise intelligent lawmakers.

It, of course, does no good apparently to suggest that whoever writes the lead editorials in the Washington Post should exercise their own brainpower a little more carefully and find out what a bill provides before they continue to state, time after time, that the livestock industry is demanding "rigid import quotas." I suppose we, who have introduced such legislation and who support it for good reasons, can take comfort in the fact that this is bipartisan legislation—and its aim is to protect the welfare of not only the livestock industry,

but also the American consumers, and the American workingmen.

Let me reiterate what I have been stating now for several days: The livestock industry proposal has been to establish a quota based on the average of the last 5 years' imports—which have been the highest in our Nation's history. In addition a growth factor has been added. The fact that this, in effect, guarantees by law a high level of imports regardless of our domestic price situation—seems to have escaped the "brainy" editorialist of the Washington Post.

The livestock industry has been accused of trying to impose higher prices on lower income beef consumers, who supposedly purchase most of the imported beef. Let me point out that low-income groups are not the only consumers of imported beef, because this product is largely used for making hamburger. Hamburger sandwiches are popular items with all our children, as any parent of teenagers can testify. Hamburger is used for innumerable purposes in cooking, such as Italian spaghetti, meatballs, and various and sundry other items. It also is a popular item for the outdoor grill cookouts so much in vogue in this country.

Further—11 percent of our total beef supply—the amount of imports in 1963—involves a lot of primary processing. This primary processing directly involves a considerable number of jobs in our packing industries in this country. Packinghouses in Australia and other foreign countries pay a great deal lower wage level than we do in the United States. Meat imported into the United States is boned and frozen—and this, too, involves a minimal amount of labor in this country. We have no objection to competing with our good neighbors when their cost of production is in line with our costs in the United States. However, we recognize economic facts of life—which the Washington Post may or may not consider important in utilizing "brainpower." We cannot compete with foreign competition from countries where costs of production is a fraction of what ours are in this country. One of the most attractive things to those importing beef today is the fact that our foreign competitors utilize much less expensive labor in boning the production—which means that a lot of packinghouse workers are taken out of employment.

The emphasis this administration is placing on "poverty" in this country—and their efforts to solve our unemployment problem—simply does not make sense, if at the same time they insist that the workers of the United States are to be forced to compete with much cheaper labor from other countries by means of the importation of goods which are priced lower—and therefore more attractive to the American consumer.

The livestock industry is trying to establish what their share of the American market is to be. We have not, in the proposed legislation, cut off the foreign trade because we are interested in providing a reasonable amount of market for the importers.

We are concerned about the consumer because of a situation now existing in

England where housewives are completely dependent upon imports, and are faced with an extreme shortage of beef. In our efforts to keep this industry healthy for the consumer, we are trying to keep this country from being faced with a situation similar to England's.

The livestock industry has a proud record. It has never sought, nor does it intend to seek, any direct subsidy payments from the Federal Government—which means the American taxpayer. Instead, the livestock industry asks for a fair opportunity to place their own production in line with the market they are entitled to.

The Washington Post—in repeatedly inferring by means of their editorials—and even the women's page—that the livestock industry is trying to shut out imports and thereby invite retaliatory actions from injured foreign countries—is doing a disservice to the American citizens. They are, furthermore, doing a disservice to the many honest and intelligent journalists who try to ascertain facts before they write articles.

U.S. BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS DEFICIT WORSENER IN SECOND QUARTER

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Commerce has recently announced preliminary second quarter figures on the U.S. balance of payments. These figures show that the payments deficit on so-called "regular types" of transactions for the first half of calendar 1964 was running at an annual rate of about \$2 billion. In the second quarter—which was, by far, the worst quarter out of the past four—the deficit was \$742 million on a seasonally adjusted basis, or at an annual rate of nearly \$3 billion. This rate compares with \$3.1, \$3.6, and \$3.3 billion on the same basis for the preceding 3 years, 1961, 1962, and 1963, respectively. Admittedly, the first quarter deficit this year was exceptionally low, but even if we view the first half as a whole the annual rate of loss would be \$2 to \$2.5 billion.

One of the most disturbing things about the figures just released is that the balance on merchandise trade account, while still substantially in favor of the United States, worsened by \$270 million as imports rose more nearly in line with prevailing levels of domestic business activities and incomes and merchandise exports declined from the first quarter levels.

Of course, undue importance should not be given to quarterly figures, even when converted into annual rates. Quarterly figures can swing widely, as they clearly did between the first and second quarter of this year. While the balance-of-payments figures are compiled by some of the most capable statisticians in

the Government service, their task is made particularly formidable by several things. The reporting and sources upon which they must rely are illusive and do not always match up, so that later and more complete data may result in sizable adjustments to the preliminary figures. Single large transactions may swing the total in unexpected and unseasonal directions. Many items which do not go through regular channels may escape reporting entirely.

Having thus warned of the risk of concluding too much from the quarterly figures, it is certainly a safe understatement to say that the figures just released for the second quarter make it profoundly clear that the balance-of-payments problem is far from solved. The big payments inflow of last March, which did so much to improve appearances during the first quarter, have been wiped out by a reversal in April.

The statisticians can adjust seasonally for known items such as tourist travel which is known to be low in the winter months, but they can do little more than point out some of the temporary one-shot developments such as those which made the results for the first quarter so deceptively encouraging. Among the temporary developments which had this favorable effect on the first quarter appearance were several in particular that could be specifically identified.

Special Government transactions during the first quarter included foreign debt repayments to the United States in advance of scheduled returns of about \$50 million, of which \$42 million were collected from Mexico. Agricultural exports during the first quarter were increased by sales to the Soviet bloc amounting to about \$80 million. Receipts from military transactions during the first quarter were boosted by collections of about \$50 million on foreign obligations arising from logistic supports given by the United States to allied troops in earlier years. After seasonal adjustment, income on direct investments increased during the first quarter of this year by \$230 million over the fourth quarter, with at least \$75 million representing dividend payments to the U.S. parent companies from accumulated earnings, the payment of which had apparently been postponed to take advantage of the lower tax rates applicable to corporate incomes this year. Including only the special agriculture sale to the Soviet bloc, these developments improved the balance in the first quarter by close to \$400 million. Some of these items were single transaction operations which did not repeat themselves and, in several of the cases, as in the special Government transactions, the aggregate, which in the first quarter was favorable to the balance of payments, changed to being unfavorable in the second quarter by about \$50 million as cash receipts on military orders fell short of deliveries.

It is, of course, now disturbing to us all to have these second quarter figures destroy the optimism which seems to be implicit in the data released for the previous period.

The second quarter figures should re-emphasize, however, the futility of

sweeping the balance-of-payments problem under the rug on the basis of a fortuitous package of favorable, but temporary, short run developments or the invention of new expedients. The balance-of-payments problem is not going to be cured by swap arrangements, sales of U.S. Government securities to foreign central banks, interferences with the private flow of capital, tourist restrictions, and other ad hoc transactions to which the administration has been resorting, one after another, in an effort to cure the figures, if not the problem.

The interest equalization tax with which we in Congress have been dealing recently, is a specific example of another of these devices. It is perhaps too soon to judge whether the effects of the interest equalization tax on capital outflows may prove more or less restrictive than was expected since it was first proposed. The second quarter data on capital transactions indicate a rise of \$130 million from the previous quarter in purchases of newly issued foreign securities. Admittedly, a large portion of these were parts of larger issues arranged early in 1963, before the equalization tax was proposed, or exempt issues of the Inter-American Development Bank.

It is significant, however, that net capital outflows reported by banks, on long term and short term, which had risen to about \$700 million in the first quarter, continued close to that rate in the second quarter after adjustment for seasonal variations. It is especially significant to note for the future of capital outflows that there was a shift from long-term to short-term outflows.

The persistent and basic causes of our balance-of-payments problems which need consideration include a domestic monetary policy and an interest rate structure which is relatively low compared to the other industrial countries. The effect of this can only be to siphon off funds from this country, one way or another, no matter how difficult it may be to trace or measure the magnitude of the capital movements prompted by interest rate differentials. Another difficulty is that we have been depending entirely too much upon the prospect of rising costs in Western Europe to correct the relative cost situation. This reliance on cost inflation in Europe to help us out has lead us to ignore or neglect our own responsibilities for improving and maintaining our own competitive position. Another basic problem that makes the balance-of-payments issue so persistent is that we in the United States are undertaking through our aid and grant programs to buy longrun security and peace for the world through financial processes which in the end create more and more short-term financial liabilities to foreigners.

The discipline of the balance of payments is periodically sharpened for us when foreigners and their central banks, for reasons of their own, convert these open accounts due from the United States into gold or international monetary reserves. The recurrent gold outflows should dramatize anew for us our own responsibility for making the do-

mestic adjustments necessary to bring payments more nearly into balance instead of trusting an occasionally improved statistical improvement in the apparent balance, or a series of new and ingenious devices.

Under unanimous consent I place in the Record at this point the news release of the Office of Business Economics of the U.S. Department of Commerce, dated August 13, 1964, entitled "Preliminary Release on the Balance of Payments During the Second Quarter."

BUSINESS NEWS REPORTS—PRELIMINARY RELEASE ON THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS DURING THE SECOND QUARTER

During the second quarter of this year, international reserves of the monetary authorities of the United States declined by \$303 million, the U.S. Department of Commerce reported today.

While the official gold stock increased by \$73 million, holdings of convertible foreign currencies declined by \$258 million, and the gold tranche positions of the United States in the International Monetary Fund—which represents nearly automatic drawing rights on foreign currency holdings of that institution—declined by \$118 million, according to preliminary calculations by the Department's Office of Business Economics.

Liquid liabilities, consisting of foreign deposits in U.S. banks and foreign holdings of marketable U.S. Government securities, increased by about \$245 million. Foreign holdings of nonmarketable medium-term securities, convertible into cash at short notice, were \$122 million higher than in the previous quarter.

The balance on international transactions during the second quarter, measured by the changes in U.S. official monetary reserves, and in liquid liabilities to foreigners, was adverse by \$670 million, if the foreign holdings of nonmarketable medium-term convertible securities are included among the latter—and by \$548 million if they are excluded and considered long-term foreign investments in the United States.

The major part of the adverse balance of \$670 million, \$470 million, occurred early in the quarter, in April. The adverse balance during May and June together was only \$200 million. (If the special Government securities are not included with liquid liabilities, the April figure is \$418 million and that for May and June \$130 million.) The large adverse balance in April followed a favorable balance of about \$360 million in March. Both the March and April figures were quite exceptional, and the \$830 million shift of the balance between these 2 months accounted for a large part of the change in the balance from the first to the second quarter, OBE noted.

Seasonal factors are generally favorable to the U.S. balance of payments during the first half of the year, but more so in the first than in the second quarter. Preliminary adjustments for seasonal variations would raise the second quarter balance to about \$790 million, which compares with a revised figure of about \$75 million for the first quarter of the year. Counting the foreign purchases of the \$122 million of convertible special Government securities in the second quarter as long-term investments in the United States, the balances for the two quarters would be about \$670 million and \$75 million, respectively.

Although the change in the balance from the first to the second quarter appears to have been large, it was not unexpected, as the international transactions during the first quarter included many which were temporarily favorable to the U.S. balance of payments.

Incomplete data now available to OBE indicate that the following changes accounted for the major part of the shift in the balance from the first to the second quarter.

1. Special Government transactions (mainly advances on military purchases by foreign countries) which in the first quarter were favorable to the balance of payments by about \$140 million, changed to being unfavorable by about \$50 million as cash receipts on military orders fell short of deliveries. Omitting these special transactions, the adverse balance on other (regular) transactions, after adjustment for seasonal factors, rose from slightly over \$200 million in the first quarter to about \$740 million in the second. This compares with last year's nearly \$3.3 billion, or a quarterly average of \$820 million in 1963, and the quarterly average of \$900 million in 1962.

2. Merchandise imports, which in the first quarter were lower than usual at the prevailing level of domestic business activity and incomes, rose by about \$200 million. Merchandise exports, which in the first quarter were expanded by extraordinary grain sales to the Soviet bloc, declined by about \$70 million. The trade balance declined, therefore, by about \$270 million, but was still \$200 million higher than in last year's second quarter.

3. Preliminary data on capital transactions indicate a rise of about \$130 million from the previous quarter in purchases of newly issued foreign securities. In both the first and the second quarters the new issues included \$50 million of securities which were part of a larger issue arranged for early in 1963 before the Interest Equalization Tax was proposed. The second quarter issues also included \$50 million of bonds of the Inter-American Development Bank.

4. Transactions in other foreign securities, which had resulted in net sales of close to \$100 million in the first quarter, changed to net sales of only about \$34 million in the second quarter. The adverse effect of this change was largely offset, however, by a shift from net sales to net purchases of U.S. securities by foreigners.

5. Net capital outflows reported by banks, both on long and short terms, which had risen to about \$700 million in the first quarter of this year continued close to that rate after adjustment for seasonal variations. There was, however, a shift from long- to short-term outflows.

6. The balance on other transactions—for which data are not yet available but can be derived as a residual—changed from net debits of \$1,250 million in the first quarter to net debits of \$1,420 million in the second. It includes all private services transactions, Government transactions and capital transactions reported by U.S. and foreign corporations other than banks and security dealers.

This balance appears to have been exceptionally low in the first quarter, and the change returned the balance approximately to the same level as it was in the last two quarters of 1963. It continued to be more favorable, however, than in the first two quarters of 1963 or the average quarterly balance during 1962.

A summary of data now available is provided in the following table.

Details on the second quarter balance of payments will be published in the September issue of the Survey of Current Business, official monthly journal of the Office of Business Economics, U.S. Department of Commerce.

The Survey of Current Business is available from field offices of the Department of Commerce, or from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., at an annual subscription price of \$4, including weekly supplements; single copy 30 cents.

Selected data on foreign transactions and the balance of payments in the 2d quarter of 1964 available as of the middle of August

[Millions of dollars]

Credits (+), debits (-)		1962	1963					1964		Adjusted for seasonal variations					
										1963				1964	
			Year	I	II	III	IV	I	II ¹	I	II	III	IV	I	II ¹
A. Regular types of transactions:															
Merchandise, excluding military:															
Exports.....		20,576	21,938	4,953	5,691	5,192	6,102	6,090	6,275	4,984	5,459	5,597	5,898	6,087	6,020
Imports.....		-16,134	-16,931	-3,999	-4,212	-4,239	-4,511	-4,333	-4,570	-4,017	-4,197	-4,353	-4,364	-4,347	-4,550
Balance.....		4,442	5,007	1,044	1,479	893	1,591	1,757	1,705	967	1,262	1,244	1,534	1,740	1,470
New issues of foreign securities.....		-1,076	-1,269	-481	-518	-183	-87	-132	-265	-446	-483	-253	-87	-97	-230
Redemptions.....		203	195	43	50	52	50	44	55	43	50	52	50	44	55
U.S. purchases (-) or sales (+) of other foreign securities.....		-96	-6	-59	-68	32	89	99	34	-59	-68	32	89	99	34
Capital outflows reported by U.S. banks:															
Long-term.....		-127	-722	27	-177	-114	-458	-231	-67	-13	-147	-134	-428	-271	-37
Short-term.....		-324	-721	77	-402	96	-492	-421	-534	62	-492	-19	-272	-436	-624
Foreign purchases (+) or sales (-) of U.S. securities.....		134	252	14	114	51	73	-42	9	14	114	51	73	-42	9
Other transactions (derived as residual).....		-6,761	-6,022	-1,478	-1,690	-1,672	-1,182	-1,006	-1,560	-1,738	-1,550	-1,377	-1,357	-1,251	-1,419
Balance on regular types of transactions.....		-3,605	-3,286	-813	-1,212	-845	-416	68	-623	-1,170	-1,314	-404	-398	-214	-742
B. Special Government transactions:															
Nonscheduled receipts on Government loans.....		681	326	25	34	241	26	54	30	25	34	241	26	54	30
Advances on military exports.....		470	359	20	-5	105	239	140	-70	20	-5	105	239	140	-70
Sales of nonmarketable, medium-term, nonconvertible securities.....		251	-43	63	-10	-95	-1	-55	-7	63	-10	-95	-1	-55	-7
Sales of nonmarketable, medium-term, convertible securities.....			702	350	152	175	25		122	350	142	175	25		122
C. 1. Balance A+B excluding net receipts from sales of nonmarketable, medium-term, convertible securities.....		-2,203	-2,644	-705	-1,193	-594	-152	207	-670	-1,062	-1,295	-153	-134	-75	-789
2. Balance A+B including net receipts from sales of nonmarketable, medium-term, convertible securities.....		-2,203	-1,942	-355	-1,041	-419	-127	207	-548	-712	-1,143	22	-109	-75	-667
D. Increase (+) or decrease (-) in short-term official and banking liabilities and in foreign holdings of other liquid assets in the United States.....		670	1,564	323	917	192	132	-156	245						
E. Decrease (+) or increase (-) in monetary reserve assets.....		1,533	378	32	124	227	-5	-51	303						
1. IMF gold tranche position.....		626	30	-46	2	59	15	131	118						
2. Convertible currencies.....		17	-113	-33	6	-28	-58	-228	258						
3. Gold.....		890	461	111	116	196	38	46	-73						

¹ Preliminary.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Office of Business Economics.

APPALACHIA—FACTFINDING TOUR TESTIMONY

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, throughout the hearings on the Appalachian regional development bill, I repeatedly requested that the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Appalachian Regional Development of the Committee on Public Works, a subcommittee of which I am a member, make an onsite inspection of the region. As I have stated several times before on the floor of this House, my requests for such a tour were denied.

Because of my interest to obtain firsthand knowledge from the people on legislation, and because I was not convinced that Appalachia was as bad as many people made it out to be, I went to Martinsburg, W. Va., on August 4. I took with me Allen Schimmel, my legislative assistant, and Randal Teague, minority clerk, Watersheds Development Subcommittee, House Committee on Public Works. They also asked questions of the witnesses who appeared to add their remarks to the testimony on Appalachia.

I held a 1-day, informal, and unofficial session in Martinsburg, and I invited,

through the press, anyone to come and give testimony on the legislation. There were approximately 20 people at the hearing, and most of them testified.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make the transcript from that session a part of the RECORD. While the testimony is rather lengthy, it is highly important, and I would like to have it included in the body of the RECORD in one part rather than in different insertions.

The people whose names appear in this testimony are as follows with their addresses:

Nevin A. Schall, Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce, 222 North Third Street, Harrisburg, Pa.

Mr. George R. Heldrich, member, West Virginia State Soil Conservation Committee, Charles Town, W. Va.

Mr. Charles S. Toam, executive secretary, Frederick County Fruit Growers, Post Office Box 567, Winchester, Va.

Mr. Ralph E. Fisher, publisher, Moorefield Examiner, Post Office Box X, Moorefield, W. Va.

Mr. W. C. Harper, Harpers Motel, Moorefield, W. Va.

Mr. C. A. Hehle, Tri-County Labor Camp, Martinsburg, W. Va.

Mr. H. J. Slonaker, National Fruit Producers Co., Inc., Inwood, W. Va.

Mr. C. R. McQuilkin, Rock Spring Farms, Shepherdstown, W. Va.

Mr. Franklin McQuilkin, Rock Spring Farms, Shepherdstown, W. Va.

Mr. Lyle C. Tabb, Kenneysville, W. Va.

Mr. J. E. Saville, Charles Town, W. Va.
Mr. W. B. Campbell, Route 1, Martinsburg, W. Va.

The testimony referred to follows:

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Good morning. First let me introduce myself. I am Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL, from the First District of Iowa. As a member of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Appalachian Regional Development of the House Public Works Committee, I am intimately acquainted with the Appalachian regional development bill, H.R. 11946, which has been reported out of the Public Works Committee and is now awaiting Rules Committee action.

When the ad hoc subcommittee began holding hearings on Appalachia I requested that the subcommittee take a trip to the area to get a firsthand look at the problems. I renewed this request several times during the hearings. Each time I was assured this request was being considered, but it turned out to be nothing but a stall and the committee never did make such a trip.

I felt that if President Johnson, his wife, and Cabinet and other administration officials felt it was important to take the time to go to Appalachia, the committee should also take the time to come.

So I decided that even at this late date a purpose could still be served by coming to Appalachia to try to get a look at the problems firsthand and talking to the people here to find out how they feel about the Appalachian legislation.

Let me make it clear at the outset that I am not against programs that will adequately deal with poverty in Appalachia or in any other part of the country. I am convinced that we are acting now without having all the facts, information, and material that we should have in order to deal constructively with the legislation we have before us.

There is a right and a wrong way to do the right thing. I am not quarreling about what should be done, but what is the best and the right way to do it.

The probing and searching that is done here today will be inadequate, but it will at least be a start of what should have been done by the ad hoc committee. Our purpose is to hear from the people who know this area best and try to learn from them about the problem and get some idea from the grassroots on how to resolve the problems of this area.

With me today are Randal Teague, minority counsel to the Watershed Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee, who sat through all the hearings on Appalachia and has done a great deal of work on the legislation; Allen Schimmel, my legislative assistant who has also spent many long hours working on the Appalachia bill; and Stuart Huseby, also a member of my staff who will be recording the happenings here today.

I will chair the meeting and will yield to my young assistants for any questions they may want to pose to our witnesses.

Since this hearing was called on rather short notice we do not expect written statements from those wishing to talk to us.

If there are those who would like to submit statements, but do not have them ready today, I invite you to send them to me.

I might add that we have already had contact with some people of the area and some will not be able to be here but will be sending statements to Washington, and I understand we are to get testimony from people in Pennsylvania as well. I had hoped that we could do this sort of thing in different parts of Appalachia; but the bill goes before the Rules Committee and is scheduled to come out soon, and we may not have time to get around to any other parts of the area.

Now, there were some people who contacted us originally and we decided that we should hear from them first and then from those with whom we had not had contact who wished to testify.

Mr. HEIDRICH. I don't think Mr. Hocken-smith will be able to be here. However, he has sent a representative.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. We will be hearing testimony today, and I hope today we can get out in the field. If there aren't Soil Conservation Service people here before us we will go to see them in their offices and, if time permits, I may want to see some of the farm area whose owners might be interested in taking advantage of the farm section, section 203 of the bill, if it is passed. Are there any questions before we proceed? Now we would like to hear from somebody right in the area who is prepared to talk to us.

Mr. TOAM. I might as well kick this off. I am representing the Frederick County Fruit Growers, Winchester, Va.; Frederick and Clark Counties of Virginia and Jefferson and Berkeley in West Virginia. Our main concern is one of providing farm labor for the area for harvest of the peaches and apples in this area. We come in contact with this bill only indirectly.

We have endeavored for a number of years to obtain labor out of both West Virginia and southern parts of Virginia for our harvest. We are large users of Bahamian and Jamaican labor because we have been unable to supply our needs for labor in this area from our local supply in spite of the statements that there are many unemployed, and I do not doubt the truth of these statements. We have not been able to induce these people to leave home and to come into this area and pick our fruit crops. We feel that along with this there are several different items that bear greater consideration in the bill—one of them being a modification of our welfare programs, one that would induce people and encourage people to work rather than to discourage them from

working because of their inability to get back on a program or to pick up after work ceases to be available, particularly of a seasonal nature. We find all too frequently that they just do not want to take a chance on taking a job. We have even had occasions where public officials have discouraged them from working because they would deplete their rolls and thereupon more or less put them out of a job.

We feel that there is a need, a very definite need, for a welfare program that must be continued; but we feel that somehow these people should be encouraged to work and to take jobs as they may be available. We think that considerable thought and money should be put into a program of a very serious and deeply probing nature on what would motivate these people to work. All too often we have gotten them on the job. They will work only 3 or maybe 4 days. Working right beside them are other men earning excellent wages yet these people will establish a minimum goal for themselves, and when this goal is reached they cease to work. I am not trying to speak against good wages or good working conditions. These are important.

I am saying somewhere, somehow we need to develop the incentive, the initiative, the desire, or to find something to entice these people to get down and go to work. We have found that we have raised wages, yet we have gotten less work out of the people. They simply reach their own goal at an earlier stage and instead of working 4 days they work 3 days. This sounds terrible, and we don't like it. As wages go up, our working force to get the same job done has had to increase. We question whether or not a great deal more emphasis shouldn't be placed on education, starting at an early date of say 3 years old. You might have to go so far as a boarding school where they would come in for a week. It's almost impossible to inspire a child to learn when neither parent can read or write or barely do so. When the parents are sitting around and very little work is being done, the home conditions are not desirable. You don't get the inspiration to the child to learn any more than his parents did.

This is a drastic step to go that low; but it is one that I think needs a great deal of study with the idea of instilling in these children this need to learn the desirability of working and the merits of a free enterprise system. As they see it, this is strictly a welfare state. This is not a healthy situation to keep promoting generation after generation; and if we are every going to break this pattern we are going to have to start with the little ones and instill in them the incentive to work, the principles of democracy, and the merits of a free enterprise system. Along with this, I would suggest—and I know this is controversial—a matter of birth control. This is, as I see it, certainly fair to all these little kids and their families not being given the best that could be provided simply because the family knows no better.

You get back again to the item I mentioned earlier of motivation. How do you instill in these people a desire to better themselves? No matter how many millions of dollars and the best intentions we have of helping them, unless we find the underlying item of motivation that will help them pick themselves up with our assistance, we are just wasting money. I think that Mr. Hehle here can give you a few more concrete examples of it in our efforts to bring labor out of the depressed areas and the success or lack of success he has had. He has direct contact with them; I have not. That's all I have.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. That's a very good and interesting observation. This idea of motivation and education is something that interests me very much. I am quite interested

in your suggestion that we change the laws, rules, and regulations to make it more difficult to get back on relief. Do you really believe this would make it easier to get the necessary help? I would like to ask Mr. Hehle to give us his comments.

Mr. HEHLE. I represent the Tri-County Labor Camp, Martinsburg, W. Va. Two years ago, we were told that we could get 300 able-bodied, capable applepickers for the eastern panhandle of West Virginia. Three of us went to southern West Virginia. We visited the three cities of Bluefield, Welch, and Beckley. But on Sunday when we arrived in Bluefield we found an advertisement in the newspaper that said that there would be applemen there to interview men for apple picking in the eastern panhandle. That was a surprise to us because we had thought that they were already to have been screened for us. When we arrived at the office in Bluefield on Monday morning, we found that there were 3 out of the 300 that reported to us to be interviewed. The others had been taken off the list and put on some other program of relief. We visited the three cities. We interviewed approximately 100 out of the 3 cities; and out of the 100 we selected a group of names, came back to Martinsburg, and went over the list again. We finally came up with about 30 that we would accept as applepickers. We sent that list back and when the men arrived at Martinsburg we received 22, I believe. Three of those were people that we had never seen before who arrived at the bus just as it was leaving and they put them on. Out of that group there were seven of them that stayed out the entire season. So you see that our efforts down there were not too good.

Now, in Louisiana where we also went to recruit men we received one busload of 35 one Sunday. Half of those men were given to National Fruit Growers and the other half to Tri-County. On the following Sunday we received another busload of 37 from Louisiana. It is a very good camp, and you can see that it is a very good camp. I don't know for what reason they got out, walked down the road and we didn't receive an hour's work from any of them and at a cost of \$700 to our camp. I don't know how far it can go. I was in the CCC back in 1933. That program to me was very good. I understand that such a program, if it were established, could not work on individual or privately owned enterprises. When I was in the CCC we cut rights-of-way for telephone and electric poles, railroad rights-of-way, State roads, county roads, and private roads. That was our task. So I was talking when we were in Winchester on last Tuesday about establishing a camp. A youth camp in this particular area where we could have 200 or 300 young men would be helpful. Why couldn't they work at one of our State parks, such as Cacapon State Park, at Sheppard College? Some of them could be used there. Why couldn't they be funneled out on other projects? During the cherry and peach season, why couldn't those men be utilized on those projects? The Federal Government seems each year to be forcing our hand and saying that we are not going to get offshore labor. Domestic and migrant labor is becoming shorter every year.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. The critical problem here is apple picking, and I am from Iowa but we pick corn down there but we have machines to do this. Is there a possibility of the existence of some sort of an apple-picking machine?

Mr. HARPER. We are spending thousands of dollars every year trying to develop a machine, but so far there is nothing.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. What is the reason that people don't want to pick apples?

Mr. HEHLE. The people on the local scene, as Mr. Toam stated, are on relief rolls and getting money. Otherwise they don't want

to work. It's being handed to them on a silver platter. If they get off the relief rolls for a while it takes a couple of weeks to get back on and consequently they don't work.

Mr. SCHIMMEL. In other words, if they just take a job for 3 or 4 days and then quit, they can get back on the rolls?

Mr. HEHLE. It takes them a little time to get back on.

Mr. SCHIMMEL. Can they stay on the rolls even though they are not availing themselves of the jobs?

Mr. HEHLE. That is the peculiar part of that. I don't know. Supposing a man, a plumber, or an electrician or some other tradesman that is what he signs up for. In the spring, if a job picking apples comes along he says he is not a laborer, that he has a trade—a plumber or an electrician—and he does not avail himself for that particular job. Then he could turn down the apple picking job. That is my understanding.

Mr. SCHIMMEL. In other words, these people do not define themselves as apple pickers? Mr. Hehle, about what percent of your apple pickers through this season are brought into Appalachia from sections other than the Appalachian region?

Mr. HEHLE. Here in the three counties, I believe the figure is around—in the past 4 years an average of 700 that are picking apples—we have to bring in that amount.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Where do you bring them from?

Mr. HEHLE. We have been getting them from the Bahamas and from the South. Tri-county has been using mostly Bahamians, but the other growers are securing some other laborers. They have had them for years and years.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. You pay their traveling expenses?

Mr. HEHLE. They pay their traveling expenses up and we pay it back to Florida.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. What do you state is their total salary? Very little of their money is spent in this State?

Mr. HEHLE. The biggest percentage is spent in this community. However, 25 percent is sent back to the Bahaman Government, and that is the savings for their families. The balance is given to them in check or cash and those boys will buy everything on the face of the earth and the biggest percent of their earnings are spent here with the exception of the 25 percent.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. They will buy things here and take them back with them?

Mr. HEHLE. Right.

Mr. SCHIMMEL. As far as the labor supply that is concerned here, you feel that there is adequate labor supply here for the needs that you would have and that you are unable to fill that need because of relief rolls?

Mr. HEHLE. Our supply is not adequate here. However, there are applepickers in the county that are experienced but they would have to be inspired to work.

Mr. SLONAKER. My name is H. J. Slonaker. I am manager for the National Fruit Products Co., Inc., of Winchester. We have been conducting individual recruitment down South. In other words, at the expense of my company, they sent me down South to conduct individual recruitment. Last year I spent 10 days in the State of Louisiana with the employment people, and before I made the trip I had been informed by the employment people of that State that there was adequate and plentiful laborers down there for picking apples. I interviewed approximately 300 Negroes in that area in about eight towns. This was prearranged by the employment office.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. What employment office—Federal?

Mr. SLONAKER. No, the State employment office. The State made clearance, and then I worked with them when I arrived there,

and I had definite forms to be filled out in case the men were interested in working. I spent some time in that area and signed up 350 workers that expressed an interest in picking apples and signed the form stating that expressed an interest in picking apples and signed the form stating that we were willing to come up, and they knew all the situation of the job, what the food bill would be, what the camp facilities were, what the job was specifically, and what they would possibly make if they would apply themselves.

Just before leaving that State, I lined up a bus service at Baton Rouge to bring these people to Inwood to the National Fruit Growers camp. However, they weren't to be loaded until 10 days after I left. I had to be here Friday, but I wanted to be close to the time, and then not leave too much time before we loaded them on the buses to bring them to the job. We had to have a little time and this was 1 week and it was under the supervision of the employment people to go around to the different little towns—Church Point and Franklin. There were about eight towns in the south central portion that these men were to report to. The bus had driven approximately 200 miles and had gone through 4 towns when I received a call from the employment officer saying, "What do I do? Out of the people that you were supposed to be getting on the bus I now have two workers on the bus." This bus company wanted to know who was going to pay. The employment man in that State checked with other officers in charge of the arrangements. Out of the 350 I was going to have 2. You can't run a bus from southern Louisiana up to Inwood with two workers. But the company had to pay \$150 to that bus company. After spending 10 days down there, and the help was to be available, and the help was there, I never have gotten a reason why the people didn't get on. I ended up with no help from that State for the individual recruitment last year.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. How long is your apple picking season? How long have they got a job?

Mr. SLONAKER. We tell them from 8 to 10 weeks. From the first of September we will go until about the 10th of November, so that is a period of about 10 weeks you can expect to work.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. How much can a workman make during that period?

Mr. SLONAKER. I was telling those people down there, "You people with no experience, healthy, fit, and able, and big enough to carry a 10-foot ladder and pick the fruit like we instruct them—in other words, there are very little instruction that they would have to follow, and I have to tell them they should be earning at least \$60 per week for 5 days a week."

Mr. SCHWENGEL. What does it cost them to live?

Mr. SLONAKER. I had a catering service in from down in the State of Florida that fed them three square meals per day for \$1.75 a day, and these are well-balanced meals. That was the only expense they had, and it's good eating. On Thursdays they would be served fried chicken and two vegetables and coffee.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I don't know if he is from Tri-County Camp, but I would like to say something about Tri-County Camp. I am just a laborer myself, but I have a great interest in meeting strange people, so I personally went down to Tri-County to meet these Bahamians and in fact I hauled several of them to town in my pickup truck, and I was talking to about three of them and the boys told me that they averaged \$20 a day, if they were willing to work.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. If they are good and willing to work?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, willing to work just as he stated. They all told me they give them

three good meals a day. They all seemed well satisfied with what they were getting paid. They all seemed satisfied with camp, but just as one, I think Mr. Hehle said my personal experience, and I think they indicated to him. I have three boys, and I have done my best to encourage them to work, and they are working small jobs. They are under 20 years of age. When Mr. Furror, who is in the cherrypicking business, came along, the boys all ran out there to pick cherries. Two years ago, I believe it was, his peach season came, and the boys wanted to pick peaches. They went out and asked Mr. Furror. I want to try to teach them to do something on their own, and so they asked Mr. Furror about picking peaches. He said to them, "I'm sorry, I am not able to hire you. I would like to hire, but I am not able because I am forced to sign a contract with the Bahamas." In other words, not to hire anyone else. Now, I have three boys that cannot get a job, cannot pick up a little money due to these contracts. Now, I don't know who is to blame for this. I think a person who is willing to go to work should be able to.

Mr. HEHLE. If he reported there, there is a standing order at this employment office. I have always had a standing order in there at harvesttime any able-bodied person that wants to work, and says he can or is willing to try to pick fruit, to send him to National Fruit, he has a job. Whether he stays depends on him, but I have put up a standing order there and in Jefferson County that is there at all times.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Could they have made such a contract with an individual grower?

Mr. HEHLE. No, sir. They must deal through us.

Mr. SCHIMMEL. The gentleman who was doing the hiring in that particular instance was deliberately misleading the boys?

Mr. HEHLE. Definitely.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. How old were these boys?

Mr. CAMPBELL. He was 17½, and he was bigger than you are (indicating Mr. Toam).

Mr. SCHIMMEL. Is there an age requirement for these jobs?

Mr. HEHLE. In the State of West Virginia all your workers must be covered with workman's compensation, and you cannot cover them under age 18.

Mr. SCHIMMEL. During the Appalachian hearings we heard a great deal of talk about unemployment directly due to the coal mines having closed, and of course, this entire State is a depressed area. What about the labor market here? Is it because the people are still under the unions, and the unions don't want to let go, and the labor cannot be moved from one area to another?

Mr. HEHLE. That is the question I brought out awhile ago. They will not move. You cannot get a coal miner to do anything but mine coal.

Mr. TABB. I am a dairy farmer, and I tried to bring some of those fellows in to help me on the farm. I brought about 10 that had been in the coal mines, and out of the 10 I had 1 man that stayed, and he is an excellent farmer and made an excellent hand. But very few of them will stay because their families are not there. If your wife wants to go back there, you just cannot keep traveling on the road. They are dissatisfied, and what we did was to give my fellow a couple of weeks off to take his wife back, so she could see her people and be satisfied. They would be all right.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Let me ask a question here, because I have been involved in the District of Columbia taking me into the public school and into contact with the faculty members. I sit down with the faculty members, and the majority of these are Negroes, and we talked about this relief proposition in the District of Columbia. I was surprised to have these Negro educators tell me that the laws have to be changed so that

every able-bodied person, if able to work, would be forced to work for his relief check. This came from Negro leaders. I throw this out, because it was a suggestion from them, and this would force these people to gain self-respect. I just throw this out for consideration. I wonder if you have any observations, and if this could relieve your situation—if the Government changed its policy on this.

Mr. HEHLE. This goes back to what I mentioned awhile ago. When we made the trip to Bluefield, Welch, and Beckley, it was into the biggest coal mining area. I might add that while we were there, we passed a Montgomery Wards store and chatted with one of the salesmen, and they had three or four boats in the back of the store which ran about \$2,000 each. Then between Welch and Beckley we passed a small coal mining area with a lot of shacks, but in front of one there was a similar boat and three brand new automobiles. That is the way the people live, and I have done a lot of work in the southern part of West Virginia. When they are at their best in earnings, they would not go out and buy maybe one pair of shoes, they have to have three or four pair of the finest shoes you can buy.

Mr. SCHIMMEL. In other words, you feel that these people should do some sort of work. That they have to do something whether it be for the city cleaning streets or anything like this, which would certainly be in order for them to get their relief checks, that they should make them do at least something, if they are able bodied anyway?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. If we liberalize the laws so that these people could come off and could go on the relief roles more easily, would that solve your employment problem?

Mr. SLONAKER. There are people in this county alone at the present time on this relief program. They are paid \$1 an hour, if they work. If they cannot, they still get it. If they are sick, or if they have other things to do, they are not docked for it. They are working for the State roads in this county. They get free medical and dental work for themselves and all their dependents, and they get eight cents a mile to travel from their house to the field office.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Is this Federal Government money?

Mr. SLONAKER. Federal Government money and the State.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. There are 175 able-bodied men on such a program?

Mr. SLONAKER. I talked to the superintendent, and he tells me able-bodied men on this program in this one county—Beckley County. Now, that would not provide enough labor to pick all the apples, but it would sure help. Last winter I was in the employment office, and I told them at the time that I needed men to prune apple trees, and I asked him if he had some men. He said, "No, however, if you will agree to pay \$1 an hour I can send some of the men who are on this program. I can insist that they apply for this job." I said we do not pay but 90 cents an hour. This is the going rate for fruit growers, so we will be going against other fruit growers, if we agree to the \$1 per hour. But after talking it over with the company, we decided that since we do not furnish them housing, we could pay \$1 per hour. So we offered \$1 per hour, and told the men to come out. There was a job available. There were 10 men available, and we hired all 10 of them. Out of the 10, only 2 came to work. Those two worked for about 5 days. I personally knew these two boys. They were qualified orchard workers.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Have you been able to explain why they feel they are better off not working?

Mr. SLONAKER. I can explain why. Just because the \$1 an hour is clear money. When they work in the orchard, a man can

make about \$60 a week, when he is going to make \$40 by not working. Now we provide better housing than he has, but he is not interested in that.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. And he has free medical and dental care which he would have to pay for, if he worked for you?

Mr. SLONAKER. Right. We try benefits and look after some of their problems with the families. We have group insurance. But this is not giving completely free medical and dental care.

Mr. TEAGUE. Getting back to the Appalachian bill, the administration sent over a number of people to testify in favor of the bill before the Public Works Committee. One of the administrative decisions, it was brought out in testimony, which might be made upon passage of this bill is that no industries or corporations will be allowed to move into Appalachia to take direct advantage of the Federal grants-in-aid. The next step might be an administrative decision which would prevent new individuals being brought into the area for the use of industries there receiving any Federal assistance. If the fruitgrowers are receiving any type of assistance, this would probably put the growers in a very bad situation, would it not?

Mr. TOAM. We are going to have to get even more help from some other source, because the harvest in these areas is going to increase by 1970, and the problem is going to get more intense.

Mr. SCHIMMEL. Before we leave this, what, as far as the provisions of the bill, are the provisions that you feel would be beneficial to you?

Mr. TOAM. I am not that acquainted with the bill.

Mr. SCHIMMEL. What about the pasture improvement section?

Mr. TOAM. My people are strictly fruit-growers.

Mr. SCHIMMEL. You are aware that the bill envisions bringing 9½ million acres into production as pasture land. You have more beef production than you can handle. If that is true, I wonder how adaptable this area is.

Mr. TOAM. There is considerable beef production in this area. Now you have got to have the market.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Hehle, during the so-called war on poverty hearings before the House in a different committee from ours, Sargent Shriver testified that one of the main functions of the Job Corps would be to take school dropouts into the program. He emphasized taking some troublesome youths, perhaps juvenile delinquents, off of the streets and putting them into the work camps. I am wondering, if you had these young men, whether or not you could trust them with your materials, if these jobs were allowed to be extended to private enterprise?

Mr. HEHLE. Well, that is a chance that would have to be taken, but that is one of the best parts of the bill that I can see. When I was in the CCC, of course, we had some "bad apples" in the group, but we did a good work, and it was a good experience for myself and everyone.

Mr. HEIDRICH. I am not here on this particular subject, but I would like to comment on it, because I am chairman of our local selective service draft board. I want to say that I disagree with Mr. Hehle. He will send 25 boys to Baltimore for examination, a pre-induction examination. Probably three will pass.

Others do not pass, because of their mentality, lack of education. It's a horrible situation. Getting the boys to rehabilitate themselves is probably as good an answer as any, but I don't know. It's a waste of our people. They are not of use to themselves or to the community.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Is this due primarily to the lack of incentive, lack of desire to get an

education? Do most of these people have an elementary education?

Mr. HEIDRICH. All of these boys have an elementary education of sorts. I think it is a matter for the family. They come from families who pay no attention to such. They don't think it's important. They have lost their incentive. The Government pays them \$20 a month or more to the girls for every kid they have, married or unmarried. It's just a horrible situation. These boys will never be anything useful.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Would you say one of the greatest needs is to enspire, motivate, and lift the sights of these people? Do you have any idea? Do you have any indication what could be done?

Mr. HEIDRICH. Well, I don't know. I don't know the role of the church in this. I have no idea, but I do know, I think I know, that the family has deteriorated in its method of thinking and its emphasis on work. They are handed too much without any effort on their part. There is no incentive to have their boy, I'll say, be able to earn himself a good living.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Would a program by the Government training these people who are on relief motivate these people? I get the idea from these people that I associate with, that probably that would help. I have had the top Negro teachers say that one section of the District of Columbia needs a night school to teach them how to be parents. Would this be a legitimate objective of the schools? I think myself—I came from a family which was of German background. My eighth-grade education was enough, and if I got any more I had to get this myself. I remember very well two teachers who sat down with me periodically and said, "Look, have you thought about this? Are you going to college?"

Mr. HEIDRICH. Although education has some bearing on it, I think this is mostly a family thing.

Mr. TABB. This has gone on through generation after generation. They can get money without work. They apparently have done it, and think it is honorable. They don't think it a disgrace to be on relief.

Mr. HEHLE. Following through on this point, not too long ago, a couple or 3 months ago, a schoolteacher told me this. In his classroom two boys he could not get to do anything—they would not follow instructions, would not study or anything. The teacher said to them, "Don't you want to be able when you grow up and start earning a living to be able to figure out how much you are going to have taken out in income tax and how much the employer is?" He said the boys answered, "I don't intend to work. I am going to be on the State, the way Father is." This is a problem that started some time ago.

Mr. HEIDRICH. This is not an odd situation. Find a remedy for a situation, and the remedy creates another problem.

Mr. TEAGUE. Is anyone here from Virginia? Last year they supposedly had a \$57 million surplus of State funds. Could there be a way to use these State funds before resorting to Federal funds?

Mr. TOAM. First, there is not a \$57 million surplus. It's closer to \$11 million, because a good portion of that is on a contingency basis which immediately affects other appropriations. This is a political year. We work on a biannual basis. I think the closer you keep it to home the better administration you have and the more you get for your money.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. We have a gentleman from Pennsylvania here. What has been your experience?

Mr. SCHALL. On this particular subject, I think our Governor stated before your committee, and we can concur in what he said to you. But we have some objections to the

Appalachia plan in addition. I do have a short statement here. Would it be appropriate here? I think the best thing to do is to briefly run through this statement:

**"POLICY STATEMENT CONCERNING APPALACHIA
BY PENNSYLVANIA STATE CHAMBER OF COM-
MERCE"**

"The State chamber supports the parts of the President's Appalachian Regional Commission (PARC) program which assist private, local, and State efforts toward regional development. However, it opposes the parts of the program which increase Federal ownership or control of resources or tend to discourage private, local, or State effort through Federal domination.

"The chamber believes that the useful portions of the Appalachian program can be fully implemented by existing Federal agencies. Creation of a new Federal commission, of a new Federal financing corporation, or any additional level of Federal bureaucracy is unnecessary and harmful. Additional governmental structures would not improve existing or proposed programs and would certainly cause Federal domination in essentially State and local affairs. Proper coordination of programs for the Appalachian region could be obtained simply and effectively by a Presidential assistant working with existing agencies.

"The chamber gives qualified approval to the proposals for construction of a highway system for better access to the Appalachian region as suggested in the PARC report. Although such a program is in keeping with traditional functions of government, care must be exercised that proper standards are established. Design criteria for each State should be adequate to insure that the new roads withstand heavy loads of industrial and commercial products. The design criteria should be no less than the standards in effect in each State at the time the roads are constructed. In addition, location criteria should be reevaluated in the light of local needs. Legislation providing for the Appalachia program should set forth (1) the number of miles of development and local access roads to be constructed in each State; (2) the Federal-State matching ratio to be in effect for each State; and (3) a specific but equitable formula that will distribute the annual Appalachian highway appropriation among the participating States. Also, the legislation providing for the Appalachia program should be flexible in assignment of mileage and funds between development roads and local access roads. However, the State chamber opposes the use of general revenues of the U.S. Treasury to construct highways. The Appalachia highway program should be financed by highway funds. With these qualifications the highway program should aid Pennsylvania's economy by increasing the mobility of its citizens, facilitating commerce and stimulating tourism.

"The State chamber approves much of the water resources program recommended in the PARC report. The suggested programs aimed at flood control, reclamation and navigation are a proper responsibility of the Federal Government. However, sewage treatment and prevention of stream pollution are primarily matters for State and local action, and Federal assistance should be given only at the request of State authorities. Moreover, water resources projects should not include uneconomic production of hydroelectric power. Where power can be generated economically at such projects as a byproduct, the power development should be financed by private investor capital and should be owned and operated by private enterprise upon payment of proper costs and license fees to the Government.

"The natural resources proposals in the PARC report are given qualified approval by the chamber. Many of the recommendations concerning agriculture, timber and minerals,

including coal, provide for valuable research and technical assistance. More intensive management of existing public forest land for multiple use, as proposed in the PARC report, would have direct beneficial impact on the Appalachian forest products industry and communities dependent on that industry.

"Other parts of the natural resources proposals are objectionable. The proposed agriculture program unwisely provides a substantial possibility of Federal subsidization of uneconomic land use and of perpetuation of the conditions intended to be remedied. The proposed timber development organizations are objectionable because they are unnecessary and would create federally subsidized competition with existing private organizations. The State chamber is opposed to acquisition of additional lands for the national forest system. Public land ownership of forest land in Pennsylvania already exceeds 20 percent. With reference to the minerals portion of the report, the chamber believes that technological advances creating a potential increase in the economic use of coal, by means of large-scale mine-mouth electric generating plants and extra high-voltage long-distance transmission lines, are already being fully utilized by the investor-owned electric companies. Hence, it believes that Government owned or financed power facilities are neither necessary nor desirable.

"The chamber opposes the PARC recommendation that studies be made of mine-mouth powerplants and related hydroelectric projects because such studies would unnecessarily duplicate the national power survey now being conducted by the Federal Power Commission. The chamber expresses concern in light of recent statements by President Johnson, Secretary of the Interior Udall, and other program sponsors that the PARC proposals concerning water resources, minerals, and power might lead to the establishment throughout Appalachia of a Federal electric power empire similar to the Tennessee Valley Authority. The chamber points out that Government subsidized electric power is not an important factor in attracting new industry or stimulating the economy of a region. After 30 years' operation and an investment of \$2.3 billion in the power facilities of TVA, most of the counties served by the TVA are listed as distressed areas where Federal assistance is urgently needed.

"The chamber gives qualified approval to the human resources recommendations of the report. While proposals for training, vocational rehabilitation, and health and welfare services are within the proper sphere of governmental activity, the chamber believes that control of these activities should be placed at State and local levels of government. It does not believe that existing Federal programs such as the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and the Manpower Development and Training Act should be expanded as proposed until those programs have been properly implemented and actual experience under the programs have been evaluated.

"The chamber recommends that basic responsibility and leadership for industrial, commercial, and community development activities remain at the local level. In keeping with this, the State chamber has encouraged such activity as its community development contest and other programs. The chamber recognizes that some State aid is necessary for these activities and that Federal research and technical assistance are beneficial. PARC recommendations fulfilling these functions are endorsed.

"Expansion of Federal programs like the Area Redevelopment Administration are centralizing control of community development at the Federal level of government. Achievements of these programs have not justified the Federal expenditures involved. More-

over, these programs are causing local government to become increasingly dependent on Washington and are discouraging local initiative.

"The chamber believes that a number of the PARC recommendations offer hope for alleviating some of the economic problems existing in portions of Pennsylvania. It urges that the PARC programs be confined to operate within the traditional framework of the American political and economic system. If this is done, they should serve a useful purpose."

(Statement attached at end of testimony.)

Mr. TEAGUE. During the public hearings before our committee on this bill, we did not have one person come before us in opposition to the bill. After we closed hearings, we began receiving from the National Association of Manufacturers, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and so forth, a great number of statements to be placed into the record in opposition or with reservations to the bill. Do you have any idea why people did not appear in opposition?

Mr. SCHALL. I think it was a matter of time. We had a lot of work up there, and before we knew it, your hearings were finished. This is the first chance we have had.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. We are very glad to have this statement.

Mr. SCHIMMEL. I was thinking, as far as I noticed, you mentioned the employment section. As far as the Pennsylvania Chamber of Commerce is concerned with regard to Pennsylvania and the sections of the State in Appalachia—do you not believe the pasture improvement section in this bill would be beneficial or would be of any great help to alleviate the conditions in the farms that exist in your State?

Mr. SCHALL. I believe the people in the farming community will submit data which will support your position.

Mr. MCQUILKEN. I am a beef cattleman in this area, and I would like to object to this portion of the bill myself. The reason I object to it is our market is depressed right at the present, and if you, as stated in this document—if you further list nonprofit land as you have done in the past, as has been done in some other conservation programs, and more cattle are produced, our market will slip further.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. As a beef producer, how large an operation do you have to have to make it profitable?

Mr. MCQUILKEN. I don't know. You have to carry 200 or 300 head. You have a cow-calf operation, but it's not where do you get your feed. I produce most of my own feed.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Unless you have an operation where you have at least 200 cows?

Mr. MCQUILKEN. You have to have at least this to make an ordinary living or exist.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Now if this bill is passed in its present form, and Section 203 is left in it, what would be the average size of the farm?

Mr. MCQUILKEN. It would have to go up. I could not say. I would just be guessing.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. (To Mr. Heidrich) Now I would like to ask you a question on another part of this bill. The Soil Conservation Service proposes to complete all the watershed projects in this whole Appalachian region in 10 years. Now I like the idea of completing watersheds, as soon as we can, but is it feasible and practical to do these? Could you complete the watersheds in 10 years, if we passed this bill?

Mr. HEIDRICH. In the first place, let's start back with the Potomac watershed development program that the Army Engineers studied for so long and made the recommendations with which I disagree. There is part of the upper watershed that I have been interested in and concerned with and worked with for almost 20 years. I am on the State committee that has to approve all of these

projects or disapprove them. They are worth while. They are done and paid for by local money and government money, Federal money and local money, the people and Federal money. Controls of the entire project are in the hands of local people. That is what I like. There is one thing about it I don't like.

Because of the cost-benefit ratio some of these structures, just to cite an instance, a 2,000-acre-foot reservoir will be put in that should have or is naturally equipped for a 20,000-foot reservoir. We are wasting good reservoir sites with small structures. The reason is the cost-benefit ratio. Now in our State we have almost innumerable sites where we can and could benefit from the public recreation water supply. So far these sites are being wasted. Allow us to put in these large reservoirs. So my recommendation would be that some means be found. If you are going to put in small reservoirs make them large enough, so they can be increased in size later when it is warranted that a bigger body of water should exist. These reservoirs are put in primarily for flood control, and for that reason they have flood retention pools, so that when you have a heavy rain downstream they will retain the water. My recommendation is to make maximum use of this situation.

To answer your question of 10 years, yes, I think we can complete this program in 10 years, if the funds are found for the engineering. The funds should be assigned to the Soil Conservation Service for their upper watershed program. Another thing I want to advocate, and these are not all my personal opinions, these opinions I am reflecting are from the State committee. A primary goal of course is to have no structure be built unless the above land is first protected. Now that is one of Representative BEN JENSEN's primary ideas. The reservoir sites are available, and they are not too numerous.

A big objection of mine to these Army Engineers structures on the Potomac River plan is that their life expectancy is too short. It should not be completed on the main stream, until the upper stream is taken care of first. No Army engineering structure should be planned, until the upper watershed is completely protected. For two reasons: one, the site will spill over and be gone forever. Two, the Engineers' data necessary to complete these dams change as the upper watershed is completed. If they take care of smaller dams, these can be made later. Now I will not say that these structures are not necessary. They are. It's foolish to say they are not. They should be in context with the entire watershed above them.

Mr. SCHIMMEL. As far as Soil Conservation Service in West Virginia is concerned, as you are familiar with it, under existing authorities and under existing provisions of law, if the funds were made available, you could go ahead and get the job done without such circumstances such as pasture improvement sections, although it still puts pastureland into production for soil conservation purposes—supposedly. Would this be an integral part of any such program or would it merely have to be altered by ACP, or SCS would have little to say about it in such a manner that would not necessarily coincide with ACP's plans?

Mr. HEIDRICH. Are you talking about agricultural conservation program officials?

Mr. SCHIMMEL. Soil Conservation Service and ACP both.

Mr. HEIDRICH. To begin with you are confusing ACP and Soil Conservation. That is no longer true. We work together. Rarely is there any conflict anymore. It is an integrated program, and both are respected by the other.

Mr. SCHIMMEL. Again, with the failure in Iowa for the ACP and the SCS to work hand in hand, if that situation exists here,

Mr. HEIDRICH. It could occur. The ACP and the PMA, although the PMA was first organized, and then when it was declared unconstitutional, they swung over to conservation. This philosophy is a little bit different and you cannot carry water on both shoulders.

Mr. SCHIMMEL. One of the biggest problems we seemingly encounter in Iowa too often is ACP money supposedly for soil conservation which the SCS administrators not being utilized specifically for that purpose.

Mr. SCHWENDEL. Let me go back a little to this cost-benefit ratio. I know this is an important factor, and I suggest, this is part of the problem. Do you agree with some of us that maybe we ought to review all these costs-benefit factors to see whether or not we are taking into consideration all the benefits from it?

Mr. HEIDRICH. I most certainly do agree.

Mr. SCHWENDEL. I say that because we do not consider the hazards of the silt in the river. The silt when it comes down the river becomes a hazard, and it makes it more difficult to clear up the streams. It is a costly thing.

Mr. HEIDRICH. I will agree with you on that. I will agree that cost-benefit theory should be reviewed. If we put an upper watershed, right here we have seven up there, we are not allowed to take into account the benefits outside of that stream's benefits. Even if it goes all the way down to Washington.

Mr. TEAGUE. In the majority report on the Appalachian bill, the majority stated that one reason why the Appalachian States were lagging behind the rest of the Nation in watershed development under Public Law 566 was that those States do not appropriate sufficient funds for matching the costs. The Appalachian region has received only 7 percent of the total nationwide Public Law 566 Federal funds, even considering the fact that Appalachia is the place where many floods on the Ohio and Tennessee Rivers begin. If the amount or percent of matching funds was revised to, say 80 percent, would this benefit West Virginia to any great extent? Could you build more structures then?

Mr. HEIDRICH. Yes, plenty of them.

Mr. TEAGUE. A change in the law would be beneficial then?

Mr. HEIDRICH. Yes. It would let us take advantage of the proper cost-benefit ratio. You really wouldn't need any more Federal funds.

Mr. SCHIMMEL. I would like to ask Mr. McQuilken a question. Under the pasture improvement section of the bill, they are going to give pasture improvement for 25 acres. What effect would this 25 acres have to a farmer of the average cow-calf manner in Appalachia?

Mr. McQUILKEN. Well, that's kind of difficult to answer. I mean it would benefit for a short period. But that stimulation would be over, if you are going to depress in the end. Why build it up to depress it?

Mr. SCHIMMEL. It would be a short term thing. It would build them up and then leave them right back where they started?

Mr. LOVE. My name is Love, and I live in Jefferson County. I raise approximately 75 beef cows, and it looks like to me as though it just is a useless program. There are acres and acres in Jefferson County that are already cleared and is not suitable for our modern type of machine which in addition could be converted from cow-calf operations and would remain permanent. The soil is of the type, if you give it some benefit from fertilizer and liming and so on, it would remain there. They are talking about rehabilitating, and the land cannot possibly remain profitable for a man to make any living off of, because it will be of such that it will cost an enormous amount. To make it profitable it would have to have from 300 to

350 acres to carry on a good cow-calf operation and operate it efficiently.

Mr. SCHIMMEL. What would be the average size farm to take advantage of that?

Mr. LOVE. Well, because I am not familiar with that area, but I would say if you got a hundred acres you would be about tops. Then you would have a very uneconomical operation. You don't have an area like that to operate a cow-calf operation and make anything out of it on a hundred acres.

Mr. SCHIMMEL. And you said that you have thousands of acres in this area that could be easily produced or converted into pastureland.

Mr. LOVE. Well, I don't know for sure, but I suppose possibly there is a thousand acres without any trouble in Jefferson County that could be converted to it.

Mr. SCHIMMEL. What would be the cost to the Government?

Mr. LOVE. I think if the market would be brought up to where it's a profitable operation, because certainly it's a much easier way of making a living off of that ground than it would be to try to farm it in grain crops because your cost of machinery and maintenance and all that sort of thing goes terribly expensive today, even if you are able to do a lot of it yourself, or even if you have to take it to somebody to repair it. It gets expensive when you total it up.

Mr. SCHIMMEL. Mr. Fisher, I would like to talk to you because I understand you have to leave at noon.

Mr. FISHER. I am Ralph Fisher. I publish a weekly newspaper in Hardy County. We have one-seventh of the agricultural land in production in the State of West Virginia. Primarily we are cattle and poultry, but our poultry raising is going downward due to the fact that our poultry industry was developed back in the late thirties and forties and consisted of farmers who constructed broiler houses and produced from 15,000 to 35,000 broilers, and it was a wonderful thing for the area. Of course, at that time chickens were selling for about 50 cents per pound, but the most lasting, permanent benefit we got out of it was chicken manure. However, at one time we had 6 million broilers, and De Gaulle clamped down on the duty on the broilers on the Common Market. It hurt us a great deal. We don't buy French products anymore. As I see it, the best thing we can get out of this Appalachian development would be some method of financing our small farmers to build an efficient operation, where they could raise somewhere in the neighborhood of 10,000.

Mr. SCHWENDEL. Have you investigated whether or not you could go to the Small Business Administration or to Farmers Home Administration for money to do this very thing?

Mr. FISHER. Well, it's a matter of time. We are on the dry side of the Appalachians. Last year we had a very bad drought, and I think only 8 inches of rain. Financing under ARA or the RAD are so cumbersome, our people simply get discouraged. We have three industries now trying to get money, and supposedly we are a depressed area. We haven't got any place.

We are not in the proposed highway program, although we have one of the most scenic sections of the entire State, and I don't know what or why they just seem to bypass us. We also have one of the best flood programs in the Nation with a series of 23 proposed dams and 11 of them are finished. We think they are wonderful for the simple reason of our protection from floods is very evident with just the use of half of these dams. They are all small watersheds. I think the entire project is only \$5 million and the two counties put up \$60,000, and the State contributed through moving operations on the dams and so forth.

We have three projects we would like to help on. One is a manufacturing operation,

a processing of poultry, and the other is recreational. (The third apparently was not mentioned by Mr. Fisher.)

It's been in the mill for almost a year, and nothing has happened. Well, we get tentatively approved, then nothing else happens. We are sort of bewildered there. There is one thing I would like to question you, we have a gas dome in our area. We have two of the largest wells in the State, both of which happened to be drilled by the United Fuel & Industry. It's a subsidiary of another firm. Now we cannot sell this gas to their own company.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. How much closer are your wells to the ultimate consumer?

Mr. FISHER. Well, they are now pumping it all the way from Texas, 1,100 or 1,200 miles. There is a 9-mile pipeline that has to be built to the pumping station from the field. They have got all the rights-of-way. Everything except the IOC permission. They won't permit them to put that line down, because that comes from them—the gas that comes from them is owned by the parent company which has this Big Inch line.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. It would be quite a shot in the arm for this area.

Mr. SCHIMMEL. You said your county was quite an agricultural center. You mentioned poultry and beef cattle. Are these mainly cow-calf operations?

Mr. FISHER. Feeder calves. Of course, the pastures have burned up which contributed to the depressed market.

Mr. SCHIMMEL. What approximately would be the average size farm in Hardy County?

Mr. FISHER. It would be meaningless, if I told you, because you have valley farms which seldom run over a hundred acres. Then you have your hill farms which may run five.

Mr. SCHIMMEL. You said you have got quite a big watershed program in the county, right now?

Mr. FISHER. It's been going on for 3 years.

Mr. HEIDRICH. I would like to comment on that. You mention two projects: One roads and one recreation—vacationers' money. These are dams that they put in for ultimate watershed projects. Very little more expenditures to make them into real ponds for recreational purposes would have done more good for our community than anything I can think of. In the places where they put in the bigger dams down South, the vacationers are flooding there and spending their money. The same thing could have been done here.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I would like to get back to the question of engineering. You would get the engineering done to complete the watershed in 10 years. We just do not have enough engineers, and I think also that there is some feeling in the Department of Agriculture that we do not have our sights high enough. Some people in the Department agree with you that these small dams cannot be bigger and better dams unless we build a bigger program.

Mr. HEIDRICH. In the first place, you have an acre-foot limitation. The acre-foot first should be raised.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. To what height would you raise the acre-foot limitation?

Mr. HEIDRICH. 20,000 acre-feet would cover almost all the sites that I am familiar with.

Mr. TEAGUE. There is a bill, H.R. 9938, before the Senate, already passed by the House, which would raise it to 12,500 acre-feet.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. That would give you a very fine working arrangement and increase the efficiency in places where you can install these dams.

Mr. HEIDRICH. I would not put so much emphasis on completing these quickly as much as I would on completing them properly. What's the sense in putting in the small dams just to say you have done it in 10 years, when they are inadequate? If you want to set your sights make it a combina-

tion program. Put in within 10 or 15 years, whatever it is.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Do you think it would be advisable to set up a special high level study group to look into this? I am talking now about soil conservation.

Mr. HEIDRICH. Sir, I believe all of the surveys have already been made. All the data are in. All you have to do is just look at it. The Department of Agriculture could study this. As far as the scarcity of engineers, there is a scarcity of engineers and the Department should try to induce more young men to take up this career. The colleges are putting them out, but because of the competition of the industries, they do not go into this work.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Now I would like to ask you about another problem. We have found in Iowa that there is a problem of educating the people who own the land on the importance of conservation, preserving the soil. Do you have this problem?

Mr. HEIDRICH. Yes; it is a universal problem in this country.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Well, how do you get the landowner to the point where he will listen to you?

Mr. HEIDRICH. Well, it is improving, but his land is only one of his problems.

Mr. SCHIMMEL. Mr. Fisher, do you have anything more to say since you indicated you will not be here after lunch?

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Harper does. He is a farmer in the area.

Mr. HARPER. I am W. C. Harper from Moorefield, W. Va. Speaking about educating the people and educating the parent, I think we should educate the people in charge of the relief and unemployment programs. I think they are the ones who need a lot of educating, the unemployment especially. We have had so much trouble with that. A fellow can work a period of time then quit with no trouble at all and go draw unemployment. The manufacturer will encourage it, and tell them how they can get by and draw unemployment without working.

Recently, we had a girl quit the store, in fact we have had two quit, just because they don't like to work. But they can draw unemployment. They can be penalized 4 to 6 weeks, but then they can get back, and I have to protest and go before the board each time, and it takes me about a day to do this, and most employers won't take that time to go.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. You have to testify? Can't you merely write a letter confirming the position? Shouldn't that satisfy them?

Mr. HARPER. It should, but it will only last for 3 or 4 weeks.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Instead of personally testifying, could you send a letter?

Mr. HARPER. You cannot even send a lawyer. You either appear, or your protest is overlooked. This draws money from the unemployment fund that you help build up along with the work.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. If the laws were changed, if the unemployment laws were changed so that the check would show that something is put in the unemployment compensation fund, do you think that would change his attitude toward that?

Mr. HARPER. Yes, I do. Maybe then he would realize, you don't get things for nothing.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. If the employee could be made to feel that when he takes money from that fund unjustly and his colleagues could realize he is doing it because he is doing more—he is taking it from the fund.

Mr. SCHIMMEL (to Mr. McQuilken). Would 25 acres pasture assistance be of any help to cow-calf assistance?

Mr. MCQUILKEN. Well, I don't know. I wonder why the average taxpayer should help me.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Getting back to this conservation. This is a very special interest of

mine. I have a group in my staff who help me with legislative matters, and in recent years have been working on soil conservation, and we have gone into all counties in my district in Iowa to study the problem. They are sincerely trying to find a way to solve the problem. They have come up with an idea of giving a bonus for a person who completes his watershed. Would such an idea help?

Mr. HEIDRICH. You mean giving a bonus for the completion of a watershed?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. This would be done through rearranging the schedule of payment.

Mr. HEIDRICH. It would draw a bigger participation. That is a problem. I am not sure. I would like to study that a little more.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I would like to have you give this some thought, if you would. If you agree with me, you might suggest such a schedule.

Mr. CHARLES. My name is Charles, I am from Martinsburg. I am a fruitgrower, small by comparison, but I listened with interest, and I would like to add that most of the farmers' biggest problems today in this area is that we don't have enough people to get in this area. If our State could have some better way of moving these people. Every time we go down to get apple pickers, we talk about, "Don't you want to come up and live?" In most cases I know very few who have really taken us up. If we could have a positive program. This retraining program, in my opinion, is a boondoggle, a way of getting money to people who apparently need money.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Your idea to get people to move is a very excellent one, and my committee did not do what they should have done from the very beginning. That is to come to people like you to hear your testimony to learn about the problem at this level and to get your views. I do this at home in every county and spent a full day or two or three to hear the peoples' views and problems.

(The session adjourned for lunch at 12:25 p.m. to reconvene at 1:30 p.m.)

Mr. SCHWENGEL. The meeting will now come to order. I yield to Mr. Heidrich.

Mr. HEIDRICH. Let me start off by saying that I in no way object to the Appalachia regional program as such. I think it's justified, because if you have one section of the country it's going to affect the entire country. It is a matter of public concern to do something for this region. The only thing I would question are the methods and the care taken to assure that the ultimate results are what you aim for. I reflect the views of the State soil conservation committee. I reflect the views of the State Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. John T. Johnson, who is ill and cannot testify. If he had not been ill, he would have been here or sent a statement. A little on the SCS proposition. We are not, and I am speaking for the committee and for myself, we are not in favor of any such extension of authority. I don't care whether it is a river valley authority or the SCS or TVA, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Schall) pointed out as now listed as a depressed area despite the billions of dollars. I do want to emphasize that there are two things that would help us. One is an extension of the upper watershed program to the point where these could be used for recreational purposes. Second, that we should have roads coming into this State from the metropolitan areas. The mountains are holding the people back now. Limited access roads and good access roads within the State, I think would be of great benefit to the whole Appalachian region, especially when they are near the centers of population, such as Washington and Baltimore. I think that would help.

Mr. SCHIMMEL. We were talking about something coming back from lunch that I would like to discuss further with you. We were talking about the mining operations constructing steam generating plants at the mouths of the mines. This bill, as it is originally drawn, left some doubt or some leeway in which one could construe that the Federal Government was going to come in and construct some steamplant or something and under some of it and we considered wide-sweeping authority. This bill constructs some powerlines, and we finally got an amendment into the bill that prohibits the Government from building any steamplants in the area, so I think we have stopped any development toward the TVA. At least what we can see in this bill right now.

Mr. HEIDRICH. In that respect, I don't think the people of West Virginia, in my opinion and I will say an overall opinion of the people of this State, by any means plenty of people in the State who like to see governmental money come in for steamplants and power transmission purposes, figuring it as an opening wedge. They are the people that would favor the TVA type of affair. The majority would not. The people I am associated with would not want that. Plenty of private money for it through private enterprises. I don't think that any Federal money is necessary for any such approach in the Appalachia region.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. One reason you take that position I think is the basic philosophy you have with this TVA authority. They come in and take over the soil conservation.

Mr. HEIDRICH. I would consider that one of my selfish interests. Whenever you have government money under a program of that type, people lose their say over local conditions.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. That is a very good solid point. This has a lot more importance than people realize. You turn the power interests over to a quasi-government interest and not even quasi-interest sometimes.

Mr. HEIDRICH. You have the expenses with the railroad, you have it with the TVA now. It's not making money.

Mr. SCHIMMEL. One thing I was going to ask. We have had at different times great many comments about the Great Plains conservation program. It is a closely coordinated program. Do you have any comments about that?

Mr. HEIDRICH. It's closely coordinated in this respect. It applies to the problem. You have a region with a special problem and everyone got together to solve it. They are working together. The Great Plains conservation program is one of the finest.

Mr. SCHIMMEL. Could such a program be adopted for Appalachia?

Mr. HEIDRICH. Probably with proper preparation, yes. There is a need for it. If it is dumped cold into the lap of the people, however, I think it would be a horrible failure. I think with proper preparation and understanding by the people in the area, I think such a program would be of benefit, but not parallel other programs. They can all be coordinated and do the job. Yes, I think so. May I also mention this, that I mentioned before about this center for the development of small fruits and berries. The Beltsville station has recommended to the Congress that small fruits and berries experimental farms should be established in Appalachia. I believe they favor some region right around here, somewhere where it is mountainous. This area around here is typical and still near Washington. They want a plot of ground and enough money to develop species of small fruits that are applicable to this region. We mentioned the trouble with the apple harvest. They want to develop a type of apple tree that lends itself to the mechanized picking of the fruit which would in large measure solve part of our labor problem. It is a long-range program. It is too big for private money. I would advocate

such an experimental farm for the small fruits and berries.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Are there any plans on paper for this?

Mr. HEIDRICH. Yes, the plans are fully developed. I think Senator ROBERT BYRD even suggested an appropriation for this and did receive an appropriation for a study. I believe the plans are fully formed. This area here is near Beltsville. It could be controlled and handled by Beltsville, and it is not too far for the scientists that take care of these things. We have ample water here, and that is one thing they will need. Most of these things have to be developed with irrigation.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. You have a community that would attract people. It would be a nice place to live.

Mr. HEIDRICH. I think this is one of the finest areas in the East.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. How about your school system?

Mr. HEIDRICH. Wonderful school system, good local government.

Mr. SCHIMMEL. One thing I would like to get on the record. When was the first time you saw the report they made for Appalachia?

Mr. HEIDRICH. When did I see this Appalachia program first?

Mr. SCHIMMEL. Right.

Mr. HEIDRICH. Probably late spring, when it was in its entirety.

Mr. SCHIMMEL. In other words, you were not consulted at all?

Mr. HEIDRICH. Not a person in this State, I don't think, other than the Governor's representative in Washington, Mr. Crabtree.

Mr. SCHIMMEL. Most of the local people in West Virginia had very little to say or any influence or meaningful suggestion that in any way were included in the report?

Mr. HEIDRICH. I would say with the exception of our Representatives in Congress. They probably tried to reflect the feelings of the people.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Heidrich, you are known to be a great authority in the field of soil conservation and highly respected in this field, and it is inconceivable to me that somebody at the Government level, and you are known and respected as Congressman BEN JENSEN so well knows to be a great conservationist. It is inconceivable that they didn't counsel with you on the watershed programs and soil conservation programs.

Mr. HEIDRICH. Well, sir, there are thousands like me over the country, and when a program like this and it is a hasty thing, they consider it sort of an emergency and probably put it together expecting it to be amended to be acceptable to people in the field.

Mr. SCHIMMEL. All I can say is that speaking as one who has been in Washington almost a year, not being too familiar with everything that went on and coming out here today has been a real revelation. Perhaps a real eye opener.

Mr. HEIDRICH. Well, these opinions of mine, they are local opinions. Not only that, I represented the National Association of Soil Conservationists in Washington for a good many years. I had a lot to do with the passage, the formulation and passage of some of our watershed and conservation measures. I think my views reflect by and large the views of the majority of soil conservation supervisors. I want to say that in the Appalachia program, you have not paid enough attention to your soil conservation districts.

Mr. TABB. I am a victim of pesticides. On March 23, they came in and checked my milk from the dairy herd I raise, and it was 0.66. I feel that instead of doing a lot of new things, maybe we need to straighten out some of the old things we have had. Because of this pesticide I was using, I am not allowed to sell my milk, but I still have to pay my high expenses. I feel that this

should not be happening to American farmers. But it is happening. It's happening in Maryland, Pennsylvania and some of the other States. So I would like to see if something couldn't be done to help farmers in the situation we are in now where we can't use our feed because of the fact they are contaminated by the pesticides. What are we going to do?

Mr. SCHIMMEL. We have gotten some mail on this particular problem. This is the pesticide problem, of course. With the pesticides that you use, they were approved by the Department of Agriculture and used according to the standards that the Department of Agriculture set out for their use?

Mr. TABB. Used according to their recommendations. But now we have used this pesticide and it's in our soil and we don't know how long it will take to clear up. We have it in our streams. In fact, every stream in the Northern Hemisphere shows it in it.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Would the completion of watersheds be a major solution of that problem?

Mr. TABB. Probably it would help a lot. I have asked for a test to be made on my farm, but I haven't got too far.

Mr. SCHIMMEL. Has the Department of Agriculture taken any action or otherwise acknowledged their mistake and tried, through indemnities, to rectify this?

Mr. TABB. Yes. There is a bill before the House now. I understand it is going to be up before very long. In fact, there have been several bills introduced. I went to Washington right after this happened, and offered my farm for research both to the Department of Agriculture and to the Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Food and Drug Administration, and I was denied. A fellow from Beltsville came out but he didn't do anything.

Mr. SCHWENGEL (to Mr. Heidrich). Mr. Heidrich, in your opinion, would the completion of the watershed by and large resolve that problem by refining the water before it got to the stream?

Mr. HEIDRICH. I don't think so, Congressman. This problem of insecticides must be resolved. We don't know how they get into the streams and it is such small quantities that seem to do the damage. I am no authority on that, but I doubt that it would clear that problem up.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Do you think the chemicals dissolve very soon in the water, and certainly they are refined out if they go through the ground?

Mr. HEIDRICH. Ground waters are comparatively free of these chemicals but when water runs off the field into a stream, of course the chemicals go with it.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. This Appalachia bill will be before the Rules Committee very shortly, and I shall appear before the committee on this bill in opposition to it. Not because I don't want to obtain the objectives, but because I don't think it is a sound approach. I think our appearance here has confirmed my position.

Mr. HEIDRICH. Do you have any alternative plans in the process?

Mr. TEAGUE. The alternative to this is already in existence. Everything to be done by this bill can be done under existing authorities.

Mr. SCHIMMEL. I think one more point should be brought out. Throughout the hearings on the bill, time after time, it was pointed out by many of the comments that it appeared from the Commission report on the bill that it was poorly drawn up, poorly drafted, that the proper research and proper study, getting the kind of background that was needed was deficient, and I think we have accomplished one thing today. We have proven our point in that regard. If more attention had been given in the preliminary study, preliminary drafting of the legislation,

and if they had come out and talked to the people at the grassroots level, perhaps a better bill would have been drawn up, and would have drawn more support, and would have been a bill that had better answers and would, therefore, have a better chance of passage.

Mr. SCHWENGLER. Well, I want to thank you all for being here today and giving us your views. This type of approach is certainly very beneficial, and this is what my committee should have done. They should have come out to talk to the people who are actually affected by this bill. Thank you again for coming.

THE NAVY WAS READY—AS ALWAYS

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following editorial of the Chicago Daily News, August 7, 1964, which pays deserving honor and tribute to the U.S. Navy, an arm of our defense that is ever ready and capable of undertaking any task it may be called upon to perform:

THE NAVY WAS READY—AS ALWAYS

The Navy is accustomed to crises. Even as the *Maddox's* skipper, Capt. Jerome Herrick, understood exactly what was expected of him when the North Vietnam torpedo boats made their first run, so the rest of the fleet was ready to respond as required. A score of ships moved quietly out of their Japanese base. The mighty base at Pearl Harbor came alive. The carrier *Ranger*, in San Francisco, headed out through the Golden Gate. The strength to sink a torpedo boat or, if grim necessity should dictate, to lay waste the industrial might of a whole nation, was being drawn into position to perform whatever mission might be asked.

This year, as all years, the Navy has had to fight for its life—not against fleets abroad, but against its persistent critics in this country, some in Congress and many within the Defense Department, who think the entire fleet, possibly excepting its submarines, is a vast anachronism.

The present crisis should provide an object lesson even for the most skeptical of critics. Utterly self-possessed, dependent upon no hospitable land bases within the area, the 7th Fleet proved ready to answer instantly the abrupt challenge by hostile forces. To do this required no by-your-leave from any government, involved no one's forces but our own. And yet nothing could have served our purpose better—or in fact, so well.

YOUTH TEMPERANCE EDUCATION WEEK

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a joint resolution to provide for the designation of the fourth week in April of each year as "Youth Temperance Education Week," and wish to call attention to the outstanding service being performed by the Youth Temperance Council—whose headquarters are located in the 13th Congressional District of Illinois which I am honored to represent—in educating our youth to the dangers of alcoholism.

Today, our young people are in great need of direction and guidance in order that they may successfully meet the challenges which confront them in this age of pressures and conflicts. All the resources of home, church, school, and government must be mobilized to help our children develop the best in spiritual and moral character and intellectual and physical strength.

I urge the adoption of this resolution by the House.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 8864, TO IMPLEMENT THE INTERNATIONAL COFFEE AGREEMENT OF 1962

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the International Coffee Agreement was signed for the specific purpose, among others, of preventing coffee prices received by exporting nations from dropping below the general level prevailing in 1962.

By itself, this objective is a worthy one, especially since the United States, which imports nearly 55 percent of the world's coffee, has a grave responsibility to use this enormous economic power in such a way that countries which depend on their exports of coffee for a major share of their foreign exchange earnings can achieve reasonable price stability.

By the same token, stabilization of prices received by exporters should mean—everything else being equal and supplies capable of meeting demand—that prices paid by consumers in importing countries should also be relatively stable. Unfortunately, as we all know so well, this has not been the case during the brief life of the agreement. From a 1962 level of 69 cents a pound, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] has pointed out, the retail price of a particular brand of coffee in a Washington supermarket has risen to 91 cents a pound—a 22-cent-a-pound increase, and a rate of increase which would cost American consumers about \$660 million a year more than the already high level at which the agreement was supposed to stabilize the price of coffee.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, something is wrong, and before the Congress provides authority to the President to implement the controls involved in the International

Coffee Agreement, we should find out where the trouble is. Certainly, the 10-month experience we have witnessed since this bill was approved last October has more than justified the fears which led so many of us to vote against this bill the first time around. Even though the legislation has not been enacted, it is important to remember that the agreement has been in effect for more than a year, that we have been operating under the quotas set by the agreement, and that 20 cents of the 22-cent increase has taken place since quotas began to operate.

We should benefit from this experience, and use the U.S. authority under the agreement to make any necessary changes—before we ratify, in effect, a system which has already proved itself incapable of protecting the legitimate interests of American consumers. To do otherwise, in the face of such convincing evidence, would be the height of folly. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will reject the conference report.

HOW OUR STATE LEGISLATURES SHALL BE CONSTITUTED

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, the extraordinary, somewhat chaotic situation created by the Supreme Court decrees as to how our State legislatures shall be constituted, makes it imperative that the Congress take extraordinary action to protect the people of our sovereign States in their fundamental rights.

We of Illinois take pride in the initiative our Senator DIRKSEN has taken toward securing remedial action by the Congress.

My views, and I believe the views of the vast majority of the people of Illinois, are expressed in an editorial that appeared in the Chicago American of August 5 and a "letter to the editor" that appeared in the Washington (D.C.) Post of August 16.

I am inserting them in the RECORD as part of my remarks. They follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 18, 1964]

THE DIRKSEN BILL

Your editorial, "Dubious Cargo," of August 8, accuses Senator DIRKSEN and his colleagues of "encroaching upon the judicial role" in pushing a legislative stay of execution on the Supreme Court's reapportionment decisions. The objective of the Dirksen bill is to give Congress and the States time to consider a constitutional amendment to remedy what many consider to be a mischievous extension of the Court's power.

Your editorial is based on an inadequate conception of our constitutional system. It talks about "the basic principle of the division of powers into legislative, executive, and judicial categories" as if that principle were an end in itself. It is not, of course. The division of powers was created as a

means of checks and balances to the end of preventing concentrations and usurpations of power. It was precisely to create a limit upon the Supreme Court that the Constitution's authors gave Congress power to curtail its appellate jurisdiction. They reasoned, no doubt, that if the Court became too assertive or grasping in its jurisdictional claims, the Congress would step in and blow the whistle. This is exactly what we are now seeing happen. Far from abusing the Constitution, as you imply, the Dirksen proposal seeks to execute its intention.

Granted that the one prior application of this congressional power to protect the Reconstruction Acts was disgraceful, it certainly is no reason to fall to use that power for the purpose for which it was written into the Constitution. Far from being an "encroachment upon judicial authority" as you allege, the Dirksen bill is a check upon it—and by merely holding up reapportionment cases for a reasonable period of time instead of removing them from Supreme Court jurisdiction entirely, the bill seems to be quite a moderate one.

EUGENE H. METHVIN.

ALEXANDRIA.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) American, Aug. 5, 1964]

DIRKSEN'S REMAP PLAN

Senator DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, has proposed legislation to keep States from having to reapportion their legislatures under the Supreme Court's recent ruling that all such reapportionments must be made according to population. He will offer the proposal as an amendment to a bill he knows President Johnson will not veto—the foreign aid bill, for instance.

The amendment would stop any action by the courts on reapportionment until the end of the second regular session of the legislature of the State concerned, upon a request for the delay by the State government by the State's citizens.

In Illinois, where the legislature meets in regular session every 2 years, and will meet next January 1, that would mean that no court could force the State to reapportion under the Supreme Court's ruling until July 1967.

DIRKSEN said that Congress' original plan to block the Supreme Court ruling—by passing an amendment to the Constitution—would take too long unless the amendment he has proposed is passed.

The amendment to the Constitution should still be passed to prevent the Supreme Court's ruling from going into effect at all. In Illinois the house has been remapped on a basis of population but the senate had been remapped partly on a basis of territory. This resulted in one party controlling the senate and the other the house—which was the way the legislature, elected by the people of Illinois, wanted it. We think this is a matter which the people of Illinois should settle for themselves. We do not think it is any of the Supreme Court's business.

CONTROLLING LABOR COST IN THE DEFENSE PROGRAM, AUGUST 18, 1964

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina Mr. [HENDERSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I indicated to the Members of the House that the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee was to begin a series of public hearings relating to the total cost of manpower to the Federal Government. The subcommittee has heard from top management officials, representing manpower, procurement and fiscal operations in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the three military departments, employee groups, and private contractor associations. Our hearings have produced sufficient information to warrant this preliminary report.

NEGATIVE EFFECTS ARISING FROM RESTRICTIVE GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT

The establishment and administration of ceilings on direct-hire Government employees has tended to increase the numbers of both active-duty military and contractor employees in support-type work in the Defense Establishment. The chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Texas, Hon. GEORGE MAHON, along with other members of that committee, during public hearings earlier this year with representatives of the military departments questioned the net savings resulting from cutbacks in Government civilian employment. On this point, my colleagues in the Appropriations Committee were certainly correct.

Both the Air Force's Special Assistant for Manpower, Mr. Ben Fridge, and the Under Secretary of the Army, Hon. Paul Ignatius, testified that restricted civilian personnel ceilings were overcome by increased use of military personnel and/or private contractors. In fact, a U.S. Continental Army Command order of December 23, 1963, suggested to the various U.S. Armies, "Replace contractual and direct-hire personnel with military personnel, to the extent that combat readiness is not significantly impaired."

USE OF ABLE-BODIED MILITARY IN CIVILIAN-TYPE JOBS

Two years ago the military services, in a self-made survey, found over 15,000 military personnel in civilian-type jobs for which military management wanted to switch to Government civilian employees. This proposed switch would have resulted in an annual savings in excess of \$18 million. Due to the Cuban crisis the switch was not completed. Since then no other studies have been made; however, the trend is upward in the number of able-bodied military performing work outside of their military specialty training.

Apparently, Pentagon officials are beginning to realize that this civilian or support-type work; that is, carpentering, painting, operating office equipment, auditing, et cetera, outside the scope and training of men for combat can and is having a morale effect on reenlistments. Also it might well boomerang when the current selective service legislation again comes before Congress for consideration.

CONTRACTOR EMPLOYEES PERFORM CIVIL SERVICE WORK

The use of contractor employees by the military services to perform work normally accomplished by career civil service employees is alarming. Our

studies and the recent public hearings have also emphasized the necessity for top management in the Federal Government not only to take a hard look at existing procurement policies and practices but also to monitor more sharply and realistically contractual operations, including the supplements and change orders.

I say this as a friend to private industry. There is a role for private industry to play in daily Government operations. I do not want to see an agency of the Federal Government go into shoe manufacturing or the oil refining business. Likewise, I feel there is a continuing need for the Government's own people. Certainly we cannot condone an agency's attempt to contract out its responsibilities.

Our subcommittee has reviewed many contracts whereby the military services, under the justification of limited civilian ceilings, bought labor from private industry. These contracts reflect the spectrum of support operations—from custodial work to telemetering in missile range operations.

The Federal Government today is using contractor employees to man some of its defense warning systems. If this be appropriate, is it then not plausible to replace American sailors with foreign nationals on our picket ships?

The Federal Government is currently using contractor employees at premium salaries, possibly double that paid Government civilian employees, to maintain combat equipment in such areas as Korea and Vietnam.

The Department of the Army recently opened a new supply center in the Midwest and then proceeded to let a contract to a private firm to furnish local people to work in the Government building in performance of supply functions historically accomplished in every agency and department in the Government by career civil service employees.

The Air Force at one of its largest installations has crews of civilian and military personnel working in parallel production lines in the same hangars with contractor employees, all on the F-105 airplanes. The contractor is merely furnishing personnel.

The Navy for more than 8 years has contracted with a corporation to furnish engineers and technicians. This year these contractor employees are costing the Government an average of \$20,000 each. Many of these employees have for years worked alongside regular Navy civilian technicians.

Our subcommittee on several occasions has been told by executive branch officials that they must resort to the use of contractors due to Government salary limitations. In view of the adoption of the policy of salary comparability in 1962 and of its implementation in 1963 and 1964, it would appear that recruiting problems for the Government are less likely now than has been the case for several years.

NOW IS TIME TO EVALUATE LABOR COSTS

As I said earlier, there is a place in Government for the contractor, the same for the military man in a support role

and for the Government civilian employee. The members of the subcommittee join me in congratulating this tri-party team for its success to date. However, we do not consider it wise to exercise rigid ceiling control over only one of the three facets of labor; namely, the direct-hire civilian personnel. Ironically we have more specific cost data on the Government civilian employee than on the military man or the contractor personnel. Army officials indicated that the contractor employee cost 30 percent more than Federal personnel.

Mr. Speaker, it appears unwise for the Department of Defense, at this time, to push ahead with full speed to close installations, to reduce career Government civilian employment and at the same time to contract for the furnishing of personnel services until Defense management has a more complete and detailed picture of the total labor costs in the Department, especially the cost of contract labor.

Time and again during the course of our hearings witnesses referred to the Government's current policy on contracting, namely Bureau of Budget Bulletin 60-2. This procurement policy has not been revised since 1959 and is in need of revision. The subcommittee members are looking to the Bureau of the Budget for action in this area.

LACK OF FACTUAL CONTRACTOR DATA IN THE PENTAGON

Another major finding by our subcommittee was the lack of factual data in either the services or in the Office of the Secretary of Defense regarding contractor operations. The Air Force has made an attempt to determine contractor labor costs, with an estimate that about 21 percent of that Department's labor force is supplied by private contractors. However, both Norman Paul and Tom Morris, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Assistant Secretary of Defense for Installations and Logistics, respectively, admitted that they lacked this information. They announced, however, that as a result of the subcommittee's interest, procedures were being formulated to supply the data to top management in the Department.

During the 4 weeks of public hearings it became increasingly apparent that Defense management lacks definitive and comprehensive data on operating problems in the field activities of the Department. This lack of information was reflected in such cases as the following:

It took the U.S. Comptroller General to point out to Defense management that Army has been using a commercial contractor for 7 years to perform aircraft maintenance at Fort Campbell, Ky., notwithstanding the fact that it was the primary military mission of the military personnel to do this work. Fort Campbell's own military aircraft mechanics were engaged in kitchen police and post beautification work.

At an Air Force installation cost data were developed justifying the use of a contractor. The data were so unrealistic that the justification appeared ridiculous. The situation reflected a defective procedure as well as a lack of

knowledge in Washington of operating conditions in the field.

Navy's top management learned from the subcommittee of contracts for technicians, that have been going on for years, reflecting personnel costs that could have been reduced through direct-hire.

WAGE BOARD PAY PROCEDURES NEED REVISING

Apparently for the first time, several of the Defense Department's administrative officials learned of the impact of wage board pay procedures on in-house Government operating costs. Testimony has developed the fact that in many labor market areas Government wage board pay rates are not comparable with private industry—they lead private industry. Likewise, the wide differences in wage board pay between Government agencies in the same cities were revealed to the Defense managers. Here are some data our subcommittee staff developed for the hearings:

For custodial workers in Washington, D.C., the General Services Administration pays \$1.54 an hour; the Veterans' Administration pays \$1.67 an hour; the Army and Air Force pay \$2.10 an hour; but, the Navy pays \$2.23 an hour for the same work. Here is a difference of 69 cents an hour for custodial workers, all on the Federal payroll, all working in the Nation's Capital.

We revealed other differences, just as significant, in New York, Norfolk, and San Francisco.

Mr. Speaker, I bring these points to the Members' attention because there are today over 400,000 Federal employees who are being compensated on an hourly basis under wage board pay procedures. These pay procedures are in need of revision. For example, not only is there a wide variation in the hourly pay scale for Federal Government carpenters in the same city but even within the Department of Defense. The Navy Department has a wage board pay procedure that is different in many respects from that of the consolidated Army-Air Force plan.

Our subcommittee has, on numerous occasions, questioned the realism of some area wage rates. We have examples of the military services changing a Government function, base maintenance, for example, from civil service to private contractor operation. The contractor hired local people, most of whom were the former Government employees, at less than the wage board scales previously paid by the Government. The reductions in pay suffered by those who were reemployed were substantial.

The private shipyards have indicated to our subcommittee that one of the reasons they can do work cheaper than Government yards is that the naval shipyards have higher rates of pay and fringe benefits.

The high Government wage rates are easing the way for department heads to contract out work historically and successfully performed by the Government. Many of the contractors are paying extremely low wages. A case in point, the Navy recently contracted out custodial work at the Naval Supply Cen-

ter, Oakland, Calif., at a reported rate of \$1.25 an hour. Navy's custodial employees at this Center have been drawing \$2.35 an hour.

Mr. Speaker, this, in effect, means the Federal Government is sponsoring substandard living wages.

Since our hearings began the Department of Defense has instituted a review of the wage board pay procedures in relationship to the total labor costs of the Department. The subcommittee members hope that improvements will be forthcoming in the Department of Defense and that the Bureau of the Budget also will move ahead in this functional area, possibly to bring about a single Government-wide wage board procedure.

CONTINUING SUBCOMMITTEE INTEREST

Our subcommittee is going to continue to examine these manpower areas. Current plans call for the subcommittee to prepare within the next few months at least three reports relating to the control of labor costs in the Department of Defense.

These various manpower problems, especially the use of contractor employees in work historically and successfully performed by civil service personnel and wage board pay procedures, are not confined solely to the Department of Defense. Therefore, the subcommittee early in the next Congress plans to look at manpower management in several other departments and agencies.

We are most willing to work closely with any congressional committee that has a need for our material. Two or three committees have already indicated an interest. I appreciate their interest and the cooperation of all my colleagues in this attempt to control, and wherever possible to reduce, the total labor cost of the Federal Government.

LOUISIANA AND ITS FUTURE

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. THOMPSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the recent speech delivered by former Governor of the State of Louisiana, Sam H. Jones, needs no preamble if read objectively. I commend this address to the membership of this body as being a striking example of the type of representation which has made America the great and strong Nation she is today. While a lawyer by profession, Governor Jones has devoted much of his time toward development of our areas in Louisiana, and has truly left his fine mark upon our fair State.

LOUISIANA AND ITS FUTURE

(Address by the Honorable Sam H. Jones, former Governor of Louisiana, over KPLC-TV, Lake Charles, La., July 26, 1964)

There is a tendency in Louisiana to downgrade the State. This tendency has existed for many years. It exists in nearly every walk of life. It is not confined to the con-

genital calamity howlers and confirmed pessimists. It extends even to the most constructive and best educated leaders of our State. There seems to be an uncontrollable urge to criticize, and to point out weaknesses and defects and shortcomings.

This tendency, I fear, is developing into something approaching a disease. Unless restrained, it could become malignant and destructive. There seems to be an idea that, in order to progress, we should point out only our shortcomings, and never our progress and potentials.

I belong to the legal profession. As lawyers our profession must be ready to meet both sides of all questions—the good and the bad. Our training equips us to do this. So it is natural for the lawyer to sift the good from the bad part of his case, and then present the good. It's appalling to me, as a lawyer, to see most Louisianians do the opposite and present only the bad. I think it's a habit. But it's a bad habit, and one that's hurting us terribly, and should be stopped.

I'll give you five examples of the bad side most Louisianians are telling. They say (1) we are the most illiterate people in the Nation and our schools are the worst; (2) they say we are falling behind in per capita income and our neighbors are surpassing us; (3) they say our State tax burden is the heaviest, or about the heaviest, of any State in the Union, and is the most unstable; (4) they say we are failing to keep pace with our sister States, in the building of industry, and our economy is thereby suffering; (5) they say we are losing population because of a steady stream of outmigration, and this is due to our failure to provide job opportunities.

Now these are just a few examples of half-truths. But we have heard them so much that we have convinced ourselves that they are the whole truth. And so this constant repetition is largely destroying the morale, the enthusiasm, the esprit de corps, and the optimism of our people. And it has, to a great extent, weakened the effect of our combined constructive efforts to build a greater State.

This repetition has, in fact, built a psychological barrier against our rightful progress in political, economic, sociological, and cultural welfare. While this barrier is psychological, and the facts upon which it is based are largely untrue, it is extremely potent and deadly. For we not only convince ourselves, we also convince outsiders. Of course, when the patient convinces himself of the improbability of his recovery, it is impossible for him to convince the outsiders we need in the development of our economy.

Now, let us analyze these five typical charges and criticisms that constantly permeate the atmosphere all about us.

1. In the first place are we, in fact, the most illiterate people? The Government used to follow Webster and define an illiterate as one who could not read and write. In those days there were a number of States that ranked below us. Now the Government says one is illiterate who does not have 5 years of education. That caused us to drop because we had 32 percent of our population in Negroes. And our French people had to learn English before they could learn in an English language school.

But whatever illiteracy we have, we are removing faster than any other State of the Union. In median years of school completed from 1940 to 1960 only 17 States improved faster than Louisiana. In percentage of adults having 4 years of high school, only 3 States moved faster from 1950 to 1960. And in percentage of those having 4 or more years of college, we ranked 10th in progress in the entire Nation.

Finally, amazingly, and almost incredibly, 29 States have a smaller percentage of college graduates in their total population than

Louisiana does. This is in spite of the fact that our aid to colleges has increased only half as fast in the past 20 years as our aid to public schools. Notwithstanding this, we have added eight complete new college campuses to the six which existed in 1932.

May I pause here to say that our total appropriations to education have increased from \$26 million in 1940 to \$284 million in 1962—more than 10 times as much.

2. Let's move to per capita income. We are said to be falling behind here. It's true that we remained relatively static from 1950 to 1960. But it's also true that we jumped from 61 percent of the national average in 1940 to 72 percent in 1960, a gain of about 18 percent, which is mighty good progress. Also remember that our per capita income was only \$363 in 1940, while it is \$1,605 at the present. Then let me remind you that our bank capital accounts increased 150 percent since 1950, while savings and loan accounts skyrocketed from less than \$100 million in 1940 to nearly a billion dollars at the present time.

3. We do a lot of talking about our tax handicaps. And we have them. But remember that 40 percent of our total revenues come from oil-lease bonuses, rentals, and royalties, none of which are taxes, and from severance taxes, most of which are paid indirectly by people outside Louisiana. It is, unfortunately, true that business pays 63 percent of our total taxes, against only 50 percent for the average State, which is bad; but remember that our tax rate actually dropped from 1948 to date, the only State to do so, and our taxes per person dropped from 24th in 1953 to 33d at the present—a record any State could be proud of.

4. Let's move into the fourth category—we're losing industry. We lost 2,200 jobs since 1950, one highly respectable group tells us. The same group waits 3 months and then concludes we've gained 4,000 jobs since 1950. But about this time the investor-owned utility companies tell us we've gained 89,000 jobs since 1946, which sounds more like it.

Of course it's true that if we don't build new plants—or additions to the old ones—we'll lose manufacturing jobs. Why? Because of better machinery, and more efficient labor, and automation. But I know one huge plant in this State that lost 2,200 jobs in 10 years, but it's putting 40 percent more money into the community. Why? Because it works more skilled labor, and far less unskilled.

Well, you can't convince me we're losing industry. I live in a community where one concern pays more taxes than all of Lake Charles. But let's sum it up in the words of Dean William D. Ross who, early last year, said, "Louisiana still ranks with Texas and Florida as one of the three wealthiest and most economically developed States in the South and Southwest."

5. Now let us take on the fifth and final story of gloom. It says we had a serious outmigration from our productive population group. That's true. Since 1940 we've reduced our tenant farmers from 80,000 down to 18,000. We've reduced our farm operators from 150,000 to 75,000. But the 75,000 farmers farm more land than the 150,000 used to, and they produce more than twice as much food and fiber. What's wrong with that?

I suspect there are some among our uprooted farmers who have left the State for productive jobs. I don't know how you feel about it, but I'd rather see them do that than go on welfare. Of course I'd rather see them remain in the State, and get good industrial, or distributive or service jobs. And that should be our aim.

But we are not losing population. The Nation gained 18.5 percent from 1950 to 1960, while Louisiana gained 21.4 percent. Only two states in the South—Florida and Texas—exceeded our percentage gain. And our gain

was greater than the South Atlantic, the Southern and the Southwestern States—as regions.

There really is no reason, and there has never been a reason, why Louisiana should not be at the very top of the States, economically speaking. Let me give you a few of the recorded statements of some of the great men of the past, on the subject of Louisiana.

As far back as 1721, Father Charlevoix, both a pioneer and a man of God, said, "Rome and Paris had no beginnings so considerable, nor were they under auspices so happy, nor did their founders meet upon the Seine and upon the Tiber the advantages we find upon the Mississippi."

Napoleon looked upon lower Louisiana, with its undeveloped hinterland, as the economic and political force which would enable America to surpass in power the British Empire. Thomas Jefferson, speaking of New Orleans, said that it would "forever be, as it is now, the mighty mart of merchandise brought from more than a thousand rivers" and would "in the not distant time leave the emporia of the eastern world far behind," unless prevented by some accident of human affairs—which came from 1861 to 1865.

Robert R. Livingston said, on the occasion of the Louisiana Purchase, "The treaty which we have just signed will change vast solitudes into a flourishing country. Today the United States take their place among the powers of first rank"—further predicting that, the purchase "will prepare centuries of happiness for innumerable generations of the human race."

There was to come a time when these predictions of these great men of the past would come true. It is recorded that in the year 1850 New Orleans was the third city of the United States. For a period of 7 years its banking resources exceeded those of the city of New York by a substantial margin. It had 20 percent more exports than New York City and with the aid of Charleston, S.C., it controlled, not only the commerce of the United States, but that of Great Britain as well.

In the year 1850 we were the richest State in the Union, both in per capita income and per capita wealth. Our income was 74 percent above the national average. Seven-eighths of the Nation's millionaires lived in Natchez, Miss.; but they made their millions across the river on the delta lands of Louisiana. Our agriculture was a matter of amazement throughout the world. Even to this day, farmlands that were swallowed up by hardwood forests, in the wake of the carpet-baggers, have not yet been placed back in cultivation.

Other generations have come and gone. New forests, so old that they are called virgin and primeval, once again cover the land. Deep down in the bowels of the earth, wealth and resources and minerals our forebears never dreamed of have admitted their presence to the tools of the geophysicist. A cornucopia far beyond the dreams of John Law and Antoine Crozat has been discovered.

So it can be said without exaggeration, that with one-half the resources and advantages we now possess, our forebears gave to the world, here in Louisiana, the richest economy ever known in their day. Now with twice the resources and advantages they possessed, what have we done?

There is not the slightest doubt that those of our generation have let the greatness of Louisiana slip. We have failed to properly develop the storehouse of wealth, resources, and natural advantages that nature has provided. We are the greatest undeveloped agricultural frontier in all of North America. We have been in the past, and we will be again, the leader in forestry, for here we can grow a tree in 40 percent of the time required by the climates of the North and of Canada

and of Scandinavia. And we have 16 million acres of land upon which to do this job. Now, in our own time, we are already producing timber twice as fast as we are consuming it.

We have seen our mineral wealth grow to staggering proportions; salt deposits sufficient to outlive the span of the Roman empire; sulfur supplies that furnish 40 percent of the Nation's production; shell reefs, which take the place of limestone, deposited over thousands of years; oil and gas that already place us in second rank among the States, with additional reservoirs in the Gulf of Mexico which competent geologists say will outproduce the fabulous supplies of the Middle East; 9,000 miles of waterways, that nature gave us, which cannot be equaled anywhere else in the world; and supplies of fresh water that daily flow through our State in quantities greater than is consumed the same day by the Nation, by all its people, for all purposes—domestic, agricultural, and industrial.

Then, too, contemplate our fish and wildlife, the quantity and versatility of which is without equal; a fur-bearing industry that surpasses all the other connected 47 States put together, and a seafoods supply of fabulous extent from the Gulf of Mexico and our lakes, bays, and inlets, which has never yet been explored, much less utilized. Thus one day ours will be the leading commercial fisheries State of the Union.

We are thus blessed with products and supplies from the forest, and the farm, and the mine and the sea that causes us to be the No. 1 example of economic self-sufficiency, still largely waiting for its development by the brains and tools of man.

When we repeat the inventory of the wealth which is ours and hear one of the Nation's greatest present-day real estate developers say, "The lower Mississippi Valley has the potential to become the Ruhr Valley of America," we can only conclude that John Law and Antoine Crozat, with their "Mississippi bubble," were merely some two centuries ahead of their time.

I hope by now I have convinced you that we do, indeed, have a place in the American Union that sets us aside from our sister States, and gives us special distinction. I hope I have done something to convince you of the glory of our heritage, the wealth of our resources, and the almost unlimited opportunities that shine brightly upon the horizon of the future.

We do have an inspiring history and a great heritage. We have traditions worthy of the great civilizations. The genius of our people has been drawn from the far corners of the earth. No State in the Union can approach the versatility, the universality, and the breadth of vision which characterized our founders and forebears. I wish I had the time to tell this story, but time forbids.

We live in the present, not in the past. And we are moving once again, up the forward road of progress. In 1950 we crossed the "economic Rubicon" and became for the first time a predominantly urban State. We are moving ahead in general industrial development. We are second in petroleum reserves and production, and that industry today has become the most important factor in the foundation of our economy.

We are becoming, day by day, more important in the field of chemical manufacturing. And, according to the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas, we now possess three of the seven great petrochemical complexes on the gulf coast. We are modernizing our ports and waterways, and thus we are, once again, making Louisiana a daily word in the household of the world's great commercial marts.

We have the potential capacity, from our growing forests, to increase our papermills from 8 at present to a total of 32 or more by 1975 from pine forests alone, not counting hardwood, of which we have an equal quan-

tity, and thus we can bring prosperity to those portions of our State that need it most.

We are one of the few places in America where oil and gas reserves are increasing in substantial quantities. In the last 10 years half of the new U.S. reserves were discovered in Louisiana. Out in the tidelands are proven reserves already equal to one-third of all those on the mainland of the United States. I do not have to tell an audience like this what this means to the industrial and economic growth of our State and region.

We have barely scratched the surface so far as production of consumer goods is concerned, and that, of course, presupposes a market. Some say that in that field we are lacking. But may I remind you that in the South alone we have 50 million customers. Then lift your vision for a moment to the rapidly developing markets of the Caribbean countries, where 60 million people live. Add these two groups together and you have 110 million people, or 60 percent as much as the total population of the United States. And remember there are 200 million people in all Latin America, all of which could be our market, if we will it.

So we'll whip the problem of markets just as we have whipped the problems of finance, and technical know-how, and skilled workmen, and men of experience. The fact is we'll have to run fast to be ready for the new markets that are developing not only in our own region, but in the lands to the South.

We have a tremendous potential in the tourist business, when you consider that 90 million Americans are spending each year close to \$20 billion on recreation and travel. In Louisiana we are spending only \$200,000, most of it by New Orleans, to promote tourism, yet we are already receiving each year more than a half-billion dollars in return. Already it is our fourth biggest industry. It can be our first. In addition to official agencies, the new tourist association has recently been organized; and it is beginning the first serious effort to develop the tourist business in our time.

There are few, if any, States in the Union that have the variety and versatility and attractiveness, in this area of activity, as does Louisiana. If we but encourage the leadership which is seeking to promote our tourist attractions, we can easily double, and possibly quadruple, the number of tourist dollars. This presupposes the development of the unmatched advantages and resources that God and nature, in the fullness of time, have given us.

We have not, of course, solved all our problems. The story of Louisiana must be told, not only to the outside world, but to our own people. We have heard, as I said at the outset, too much of our own failures, and shortcomings, and mistakes. We have heard far too little of the glory and grandeur of our past, of our glorious history, our magnificent heritage, our diversified culture, the genius of our people, our fabulous resources, our incomparable location, and our truly brilliant future. This is the untold story of Louisiana. We are now ready to make our dreams come true. We are ready to move into the position of economic axis of the Western Hemisphere.

All this will require constructive leadership. And that is the reason I am talking to groups like yours, as time gives me the opportunity to travel about the State. Louisiana's "golden age" of more than a hundred years ago was not projected into existence by second- and third-rate politicians. It was done by the best brains and the best tools we possessed. It was done by the first team.

Our people, I think, are on the right track again. We are thinking and acting constructively. Despite our periodic lapses into demagoguery and corruption, I could cite you many examples of accomplishments even

in the political arena in the last 20 years that have been truly astounding. I could show you periodic bursts of statesmanship in the fields of agriculture, drainage, the development of our oil and mineral resources, the development of waterways and the re-vamping of our port facilities, and magnificent assistance given to forestry and reforestation—the huge new push for industrial development, as well as for the general economic development of our State.

But we need, not only in Louisiana, but in all America, the type who can make the first team of political and economic leadership. And that is where you come in. Back in 1850 we furnished the leadership and that made us the economic miracle of the world. We still have that kind of brains. Henry Voorhies, the head of the biggest industry in Louisiana, was born on Bayou Teche and educated at LSU. Harrell Smith, head of the giant complex of nearly a dozen refining and petrochemical plants in Lake Charles, was born in Ruston and educated at Louisiana Tech. Louisiana and the South are producing leaders, not only for this State and region, but for the Nation. Seven of the eight biggest banks in New York City have chief executive officers who are southerners, one of them being from Bunkie, La.

The next two decades belong to the scientists and the engineers. I've had my quota of experience with engineers—those who can give you the reasons why a job can't be done, as well as those who can figure out how it can be done. I like the latter, the ones who are not the defeatists, the ones who are the optimists, and who have vision.

As I said 19 years ago, in a talk at Monroe, I do not subscribe to "the idea that we are politically innocuous, economically doomed, and intellectually inferior to the rest of the country. I do not agree with the defeatist attitude," nor with the idea that we must spend our time in excessive self-criticism, condemnation, castigation, and vilification.

I am not afraid of the facts, and it is not my purpose to hide or cover them. But I want all the facts, not just a part of them. I'm an officer of PARI which finds the facts—both good and bad—and distributes them, both good and bad. But if you are trying to sell an article, as we are trying to sell Louisiana, your job is to present the good side—not the bad. That's salesmanship.

In addition, we need a more effective correlation between the efforts of Government and those of private interests.

Also, we must remind ourselves that this country was not created by those who were merely schemers, opportunists and self-seekers—but by the participation of the top leaders from every walk of life. By businessmen like Samuel Adams and Benjamin Franklin and Robert Morris, who entered the ranks of politics. By men like Thomas Jefferson and Patrick Henry and Tom Paine, who fired the imaginations of the Colonials and spurred them on to a higher plateau for the common man. Of men like Washington and Madison and John Marshall who built the foundations from the bold dreams of dreamers.

Finally, I think we need more who can subscribe to the major portion of the following creed:

"I do not choose to be a common man. It is my right to be uncommon if I can. I seek opportunity—not security. I do not wish to be a kept citizen, humbled and dulled by having the state look after me.

"I want to take the calculated risk; to dream and to build, to fail and to succeed. I refuse to barter incentive for a dole. I prefer the challenge of life to the guaranteed existence; the thrill of fulfillment to the stale calm of utopia.

"I will not trade freedom for beneficence, nor my dignity for a handout. I will never cower before any master nor bend to any

threat. It's my heritage to stand erect, proud and unafraid; to think and act for myself, enjoy the benefits of my creation and to face the world boldly and say, this I have done. All this is what it means to be an American."

Our basic job in building that kind of America is to assume that portion of the task that lies within the borders of our State. Our forebears did it more than a century ago. They gave us Louisiana's "golden age," and they did it with fewer resources and fewer advantages, by far, than we possess today.

Let me give you two examples of what this community has shown it can do.

1. Back in the early twenties it was obvious to all that Lake Charles was a dying town. The sawmills were cutting out, and timber was then the backbone of our economy.

So the people got together and decided to dig a channel to the gulf. The U.S. engineers said it wasn't economically feasible, but Lake Charles defied the U.S. engineers and dug its own channel at its own expense, and thus became the first port in the United States wholly built with local funds. It still is.

But the point is: Lake Charles pulled itself back from the brink of bankruptcy, and opened up the brightest economic horizon this community has ever gazed upon.

2. Then for the second example: Back in 1941 things weren't too good. World was at war, and the shores of America had to be protected.

The entire area of the gulf coast—for 250 miles into the interior—was proscribed by the powers in Washington. Within the red line that was drawn near the northern boundaries of this State, no defense plant was to be built.

So a man from Lake Charles went to Washington and tackled the great F.D.R. in his own den, saying: "A year ago, Mr. President, you said: 'The defense line of the United States is out in the islands of the Caribbean.' If this was true a year ago, it is true now." So with the help of the Governors of Texas, Mississippi, Alabama, and Florida, the red line was erased.

Came the time for Lake Charles' second great opportunity. The country needed a huge new plant for the production of high-octane gasoline. It was headed for Texas when once again Lake Charles woke up. They said to the U.S. Government and to Cities Service: "We'll work out the tax differential; we'll vote a 10-year tax exemption; and we'll see to it that the State's 1-cent oil refining tax is repealed."

The last thing was like David tackling Goliath, but we tackled it, and once again, we won.

As a result you can count 40 separate industrial plants—or units—owned by a dozen or more concerns, with a replacement value of a billion dollars, and a payroll of some 8,000 workers.

3. Now, I have a feeling that the third great economic upsurge is about to take place:

We have, in effect, just repealed another 1-cent tax. For the legislature has just granted a tax credit to manufacturing concerns which is equivalent to a reduction of 1 cent in the price of natural gas for Louisiana industrial users.

In addition, the current legislature has:

1. Provided for the equalization of industrial assessments which, heretofore, have often been twice as high as the average taxpayer's rate.

2. Provided for the creation of industrial districts by police juries to prevent tax exploitation of industrial properties.

3. A special appropriation for a pilot project, to test the potentials in adult education, has been adopted.

4. Has reorganized the Department of Commerce and Industry, so as to provide pro-

fessional guidance, staggered terms, and non-political administration.

5. There is still hope that we may secure an outstanding research institute, and many, in a special session, correct inequities in our workmen's compensation law and its administration.

In addition, a "new look" will be given the State, in the national estimation, because of the passage of the following good Government measures:

The most comprehensive code of ethics ever adopted in the Nation;

A system of centralized purchasing;
Centralized listing of State employees;
Investment of idle State funds;

Plus the activation of the office of legislative post auditor, sought in this State for 25 years and finally achieved.

Then, too, there is that bright light on the horizon of our future, brought about by the fact that we have mandated the law institute to commence the most momentous task undertaken in our State in more than 40 years. I refer to the fact that, at long last, we are tackling the revision of the most antiquated and outmoded constitution of the 50 States of the Union.

If the Governor signs the bills we have mentioned, and if the voters approve the amendments at the election in November, then we shall be on our way to the brightest economic status this State has experienced since 1850, when Louisiana was the richest State in the Union.

On the local scene just remember that:

1. We have more money in our savings and loan associations than ever before in history.

2. We have more prospects for more industrial development than at any time since World War II.

3. We have a police jury that is working with businessmen to a greater extent than I have ever known.

4. Our local legislators have secured the passage of a bill that will give us a non-political dock board modeled after that of New Orleans, which is the model for the Nation.

All we need is to lift our chins up from the sidewalks and point them to the new program, and to adopt a new philosophy that the glass is not half empty: it's half full.

We have no problems in this community half as difficult as those we solved in the midtwenties, and the early forties; and what we did in the twenties and forties, we can do with more ease and greater proficiency in the sixties.

We can do this because we have the benefit of the plans and specifications left us by the leaders of those prior decades.

So let us strike now: For the iron is hot, and the same glorious opportunity may not soon present itself again.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked in recent months a number of questions concerning the civil rights bill and the attitude of the National Federation of Independent Business concerning it.

The issue in question grew out of my recent experience with this organization, publishers of the Mandate, an opinion ballot which it publishes periodically.

The story of my encounter is contained in a letter which I have sent to the subscribers to the Mandate who reside in my congressional district.

Because it is of general interest to every Member who receives these monthly opinion ballots, I insert herewith my letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRIEND: As a subscriber to the Mandate of the National Federation of Independent Business, San Mateo, Calif., you will be interested, I believe, in my recent correspondence and a meeting with their officials.

For the past year or so, I looked forward to the day when the Mandate would poll the federation's membership for their opinion of the civil rights bill. Since no other single measure in the past decade would have a greater impact on independent businesses, I felt it would be overwhelmingly rejected. I planned to use the results as a further argument against passage of the bill.

As month after month went by and the civil rights bill was never mentioned on the Mandate, I became concerned and asked for a meeting with the Washington representative, Mr. George J. Burger, with the intention of discussing the matter with him. The interview was entirely unsatisfactory. Mr. Burger informed me that he was a third generation New Yorker and had very strong feelings on the subject, though he would not explain what his residence had to do with the matter or what his "strong feelings" were. In response to my direct questions as to why the Mandate had never polled the membership on the subject of the civil rights bill or if any plans existed to do so, his replies were evasive and, finally, belligerent. I made every effort to explain to him that I was not asking for either his personal opinion of the bill or the opinion of any official of the federation, but the opinion of the federation's membership. The only answer I could elicit from him was that the federation had not polled the membership because the bill was emotional and "too controversial."

I attempted to point out that, in my opinion, this was the very purpose of the federation, to obtain opinions on controversial legislation. Mr. Burger apparently did not agree. The interview was completed unsatisfactory and I was advised by Mr. Burger to direct any further inquiry to the president of the federation.

In an exchange of letters with Mr. C. Wilson Harder, the president, I was not able to persuade him to poll the independent businesses of the Nation to find their opinions of this bill in whole or in part. Although Mr. Harder was extremely courteous in his letters, the end result was that he would not agree to poll the entire bill or the separate sections (FEPC and public accommodations particularly) which directly affect businessmen. Although the federation has polled the membership on a number of allied subjects dealing with the rights and prerogatives of small business and dealing with Federal intervention in State matters, none of the questions and no combination of them substitute for a poll on the civil rights bill itself or its several sections.

Needless to say, I was extremely disappointed that the federation would not ask for membership opinion on the civil rights bill.

I must say, with all candor, that I can have little faith in the Mandate in the future now that I know the philosophy of avoiding some "controversial" legislation underlies the activity of the federation.

I have made it a practice to study the Mandate and all similar opinion ballots. At

the same time, I have always been aware that it is relatively simple to phrase the question and the explanation of an issue in such a manner as to prompt only one answer.

It is not my intention to discourage you from renewing your subscription to the *Mandate* because your opinion is welcome at all times on any issue and regardless of the manner in which I receive it. However, in view of my disappointing experience with the National Federation of Independent Business, I felt obligated to advise you of the position it took on this vital subject.

Sincerely yours,

JOE D. WAGGONER, Jr.

TAX CUT

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONER] may extend his remarks at this point in the *RECORD* and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, there have been a number of indications that the recent tax cut has had a positive and welcome effect on our economy, but there is one, I think, that has been outstanding and I would like to bring it to the attention of the Members.

It concerns the Southwestern Electric Power Co. of Shreveport, La.

I believe the example to be a particularly good one because the entire savings realized by Southwestern was passed on to their customers in the form of a rate reduction for electric service.

The tax cut, in this instance is now having a direct, traceable impact on the spendable income of their customers. The action taken by Southwestern in passing along a saving of \$1,415,970 to their customers is in the highest tradition of responsible business and they are to be commended.

The text of the announcement released by Southwestern Electric Power Co. follows:

Approval of a reduction in electric rates has been granted Southwestern Electric Power Co. by the Louisiana Public Service Commission, the Arkansas Public Service Commission, and the cities they serve in Texas. The reduced rates, affecting all types of customers will become effective with all use billed after August 1. The total companywide savings to customers will be \$1,415,970, company officials announced.

Reduction for residential customers will range between 2 and 3 percent, depending on amount of use. The small percentage of customers now paying the \$1 minimum bill will not be affected, it was said. Commercial and industrial customers as well as municipalities will participate in the decrease.

Savings which the company will realize as a result of the reduction in Federal income taxes made by the Congress this year is the primary reason the reduction is possible, according to J. Robert Welsh, Southwestern president. "We are pleased to be able to pass on to our customers all of the savings made possible by the tax cut," he said. "Greater use of electricity has made it possible for us to hold the price line against rising costs."

In addition to the general reduction in rates for all residential and commercial customers, appreciable reductions have been

made in water pumping rates to cities. Also, the minimum rate for summer electric use has been reduced from 2 cents to 1.8 cents for all use over 1,000 kilowatt-hours. In addition the new rates provide that customers may have their electric water heating billed on one regular meter at a rate of 1.1 cents per kilowatt-hour instead of 2 cents. Customers who choose to can still retain the separate meter.

Southwestern made a major rate reduction in 1945 and has been maintaining this schedule of rates up to the present time.

TARIFF CUTTING PROGRAM

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] may extend his remarks at this point in the *RECORD* and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I have from almost the first day of taking my seat in this House battled against the interperate program of tariff cutting that has plagued American industry since the war. I have repeatedly pointed to the ill effects that would be inflicted on the American workingman—not only from the direct impact of imports that take jobs away but from the indirect results that come from new jobs not being opened. The failure of new jobs is more serious even than the actual loss of jobs.

Let me tell you why. When American industries go abroad to open new plants or to buy into foreign manufacturing companies, or when they license foreign firms to use American patents, the new jobs are opened in other countries rather than here in this country. The jobs that are not created here show up in unemployment figures because the newcomers for employment find fewer openings.

By manufacturing abroad we also reduce our export markets. In many cases products manufactured abroad by our expatriated capital are sent into our own market at lower prices than our costs of production permit. These imports shrink our own domestic production.

What hits home is the discouraging prospects facing many of our industries as they contemplate expansion in this country. In all those cases, and there are many of them, in which the industry is confronted with sharp import competition, investment money will go preponderantly into modernization, the purpose being to lower costs by producing more goods with fewer workers. Two-thirds of our new investment in manufacturing enterprise has been going into modernization, which usually means stepping up automation and putting people out of work—all as a means of remaining competitive.

Mr. Speaker, let me say with all the force at my command that we are losing the battle—oh, not the big corporations, the multinational corporations—but American labor, the small- and medium-sized producers, the suppliers of materials and parts to the great assembly plants.

We are losing the battle, I say. Our exports are sustained in great part by subsidies of one kind or another. Yet our share of world exports has been declining.

Mr. Speaker, without prolonging my remarks, I ask leave to insert at this point in the *RECORD* a review of some of the points I have made plus some others that are basic in character. This review and analysis of our economic system appears in a statement made by O. R. Strackbein before the platform committee of the Democratic Party this week.

Mr. Strackbein is chairman of the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy, an organization that has been in the lead in combating the trend that is by way of setting back this country if remedial steps are not soon taken.

The analysis goes to the heart of the question, and I urge all Members to read it, study it, and weigh its message:

STATEMENT OF O. R. STRACKBEIN, CHAIRMAN, THE NATIONWIDE COMMITTEE ON IMPORT-EXPORT POLICY, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS AND PLATFORM OF THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION, WASHINGTON, D.C., AUGUST 17, 1964

A general euphoric atmosphere envelops the American economy today, both in its shortrun and longrun prospects.

This high optimism unfortunately is oblivious of trends and of forces, already in high tide, that will, if not halted, reverse the world industrial leadership enjoyed by the United States in the 20th century.

This is a startling statement and needs support in the form of substantiating historical background if it is to stand.

Perhaps the most protrusive fact, standing high in the landscape, is the uniqueness of our economy until its phenomenal record, particularly in World War II, recommended it to Europe and Japan as well as other countries of the world. They are now in full cry on our heels. This erstwhile uniqueness is of crucial importance if we are to understand and weigh the American economic position in the midst of competitive forces that now beset it on all sides.

A half dozen interlocking factors originating from a continental base of considerable advantages can be traced. These are the threads that were combined to form the unique industrial fabric which this country gave to the world.

The economic base rested on a continent relatively rich in both natural and human resources. The abundant natural resources extended not only to fertile land and a temperate climate but to minerals, forests, and streams. The favorable human resources included a remarkable toil-willingness, readiness to withstand hardships, and above all a love of freedom. Also within the population was that sprinkling of inventive genius without which man would not have learned what to do with fire. Then there was the discipline of obedience to law, faith in education, and the moral suasion of religion.

This combination represented a good augury from the beginning.

What was to be done with these resources and endowments was a blank book yet to be written. We adopted a constitutional blueprint, an organic law, for our society, designed to give free rein to human potentials. This was important. The organic law also provided for a system of checks and balances to insure against the formation of tyrannical governmental power. This, too, was important.

Within the Constitution was a recognition of private enterprise through the granting of a temporary monopoly to authors and inventors. This fact represented a recognition

of special inducement as a generator of extraordinary effort. It meant that originality was to be rewarded by assuring the innovator of the fruits of his efforts.

The importance of this constitutional provision, in the form of incentive, to our technological development can hardly be exaggerated. It was a blood brother of the profit motive. In turn, technological development of course, was the indispensable forerunner of mass production.

The climate most conducive to the development of human potentials in the material field appears to be constituted of freedom, incentive, and competition. Yet, freedom without restraints leads readily to license and abuse. Since the restraint built into our system of government in the forms of checks and balances was not extended to the commercial and industrial world, economic freedom developed a strong penchant for monopoly.

The great ferment that marked our developing economy in the building of railroads and industrial enterprises, intertwined with financial controls, soon erupted in vast aggregations of power that were beyond challenge by new enterprisers entering the field or by small competitors who were marked for obliteration by the growing giants. Recognition of the incompatibility of this trend with our political system led to the enactment of laws against monopoly.

The Sherman antitrust law of 1890, followed a generation later by the Clayton Act, the Federal Trade Commission Act, and still later by the Robinson-Patman Act, marked one of the principal steps that separated our economy from those of the rest of the world. These acts of Congress attested to our firm belief in the value not only of competition but fairness of competition. We had seen that unfair competition could itself be used to destroy competition. Therefore we concentrated on fairness of competition as a means of preserving this vital force.

The choice was a most crucial one, and one that laid the groundwork of our unique system.

Having before us the vast potentials of mass production, based on our inventive endowment, the system could have succumbed to monopoly and so would have died aborning. Our economy would have been patterned on the European variety which was dominated by cartels. We would not then have achieved world industrial leadership as we did.

The possibility of mass production posed a great lure to anyone who could organize it, manage it, and dispose of its products. It was a great lure despite the tormenting and mountainous obstacles in the way precisely because success would possibly be crowned with handsome rewards, thus repaying the burdens of worry, risk, and toil.

Indeed the problem was formidable, no doubt seemingly insuperable early in this century, because we were wholly without example. It was always easy to go broke. Pioneering in this field was as beset with pitfalls as was the opening of the continent.

What indeed could be done to dispose of the mounting volume of goods that the new technology made possible? Who would buy all the crowding succession of goods that could now be manufactured, many of them new and strange? That was a question that faced the ambitious and prospective enterprisers. The inventor could not answer it. He was seldom even a manufacturer. The producer alone could not answer it. He was not a merchandiser. Which was to come first, the chicken or the egg? First, there must be consumer purchasing power, or the growing volume of goods would simply choke the warehouses and bankruptcy would follow. Unquestionably the merchandiser, salesman, and advertiser had an indispensable function to perform.

Perhaps some obscure annals have recorded the great struggle over an answer; but if so they did not find their way into the public consciousness. Only the most dramatic of all the answers was recorded. It was the one provided by Henry Ford when he announced the \$5 a day wage. He had grasped, if only obscurely, the second half of the equation that was needed to complete the vision of mass production. As now seems so obvious, this was mass consumption, based on mass purchasing power. Labor, which represents by far the heaviest part of the consuming public, had to come by the means of purchasing what the system produced; and the possibility of higher worker income was in turn made possible by the higher productivity generated by mechanical and managerial technology. All that was needed was a catalyst, and Henry Ford, as nearly as anyone, was it.

At this point a new function of competition was recognized. Once more the American way took a turn away from the European.

Mass production which was now possible, in turn made possible lower prices; and this became an objective as a means of reaching more consumers. Instead of adopting the course of forcing down wages as a means of achieving lower prices, a course which would have been self-defeating, the function was placed on the shoulders of competition, free and fair competition. However, there had to be a waiting period allowing for experimenting with the market. Fortunately such a period, 17 years of it, was available if the new industry was centered about a patent. Not only did this provide a reasonable period of time but assured a handsome monopolistic reward if the patented device was responsive to human needs.

Time indeed was needed (1) because of the slow pace of converting a mechanical invention into a practical instrument of production, (2) the equal slowness of shaping the product made by use of the new device to the indistinct or latent demand of prospective consumers, (3) the difficulty of gaining adequate financial support for the operation, and (4) then selling the product to a skeptical or indifferent public. The period of the patent provided the time.

With the foregoing factors in gear with each other we moved forward with increasing momentum through the twenties. The profit motive which was and is the luring element that draws economic activity forward, ran ahead without restraint and then crashed. This was followed by the great depression of the thirties. It ushered in the period not only of reform but of widespread hostility to the very system that had produced such industrial wonders.

Denunciation of the system was bitter and ran deep. A product of universal economic frustration, the disenchantment was so great that it teetered on the verge of a disastrous error; namely, substituting the concept of "production for use" for the price-profit system. The venom spewed by frustrated economic aspirations knew no bound but yet was contained in words rather than breaking out in violence.

Having learned the function of purchasing power and having also observed its dependence on employment at good wages, it was now concluded that public works would "prime the pump" by putting people back to work. Reliance on pump-priming indicated that we still looked to our system to pull away once the pump was primed; but the general approach was one that revealed our ignorance of the function of confidence in supplying movement to our system. Therefore we fell into contradictory efforts. The Government scared business while expecting it to respond cheerfully through lively investment in expansive activities. Confidence does not lead far from base in an atmosphere of hostility.

The formula naturally did not work and could not be made to work. Public works, however extensive, cannot be a substitute for wooing of the open market for profit. They provide no lure from the future, drawing forth continuous activity. Public works are piecemeal, and the multiplier on which John Maynard Keynes relied for reemployment stops when a project is completed, be it a highway, school, public building, or what-not.

During this period we extended the concept of fair competition to wages and hours, seeking to prevent the erosion of purchasing power and to match mass consumption with mass production.

We failed, however, to grasp the essential remaining factors on which the health of our system depended.

Mention has been made of business confidence. These are not new words; but the basis of their great significance has not been analyzed and exhibited in its natural form.

Had this been done we should have avoided some errors, the effects of which still bedevil us. For example, we launched a far-reaching tariff reduction program without reckoning with the upset inherent in foreign competition of the kind that we had explicitly outlawed at home, and without assessing the effects on business confidence when many of our industries found the future clouded by rising import competition.

We did not then and we do not even yet fully appreciate the difference between staple goods such as basic food, plain clothing, unadorned households, etc., on the one hand, and fancy clothing, shapely furniture, multiple duplicates of many items, etc., on the other, so far as their economic behavior is concerned.

No vastly and indefinitely expanding industry dedicated to the provision of the staple necessities is possible. Demand for such products is quite inelastic and limited by the population. The vast expansion of the automobile industry and the ramification of suppliers, maintenance, repair, and fuel services, etc., could not have been duplicated in flour milling, meatpacking, or similar industries. Only those industries that cater to the secondary human needs, the semi-luxuries and luxuries, enjoy almost limitless potentials. People need, say, one or two pairs of shoes a year, but may be induced to buy dozens of pairs. On the other hand, the luxuries may be dispensed with completely. This fact makes of confidence a very sensitive flower in this field.

A flour miller or foodpacker, by contrast, may be quite sure of a sustained demand. He needs only to avoid overproduction.

The producer of goods that need not be bought at all is at the mercy of all kinds of lurking upsets. Planning for the future is therefore precarious. In the United States today a great part of production caters to the secondary as compared with the primary demand. Our imports have been moving more heavily into this very area of goods. The meaning of this fact has not hitherto been grasped. Proposed further tariff reductions would aggravate the problem.

Particularly vulnerable are "growth" industries dedicated to nondurable consumer goods; but the retardation goes farther.

In our earlier mass-production activity, we strove to gain the advantage of lower costs, and depended on competition to pass them on to the consumers. If the demand of the product was elastic, i.e., if there was no specific limit to consumption, and if the product had good appeal, consumption would respond to the lower prices. Consumption might double and go on up and up; but it might also be volatile.

This process became a classic of our economy. Much of our growth relied on it. (One of the latest examples was television.) Potential demand awaited a good product;

but technology still came first, followed by actual market outlook. This might be brilliant, fair, or gloomy for several reasons, depending on consumer attitude, selling, etc. Uncertainty became a sure retarder.

If the gloomy factors outweigh the favorable ones, the producer will hesitate. Even if he has a going concern he may reduce his costs by laying off workers; or he may decide on a holding operation, and hire no new workers.

If all looks well on the domestic front, as is seemingly the case today, he may yet be sorely perturbed by import competition. If imports have risen or loom menacingly he will modernize, automate, etc., to hold his own. He will again displace workers; even as the oncoming column of new workers cries for jobs. Unemployment will rise.

Let us say his industry is indeed a new industry (such as electronics) and one that is growing because of wide consumer acceptance of the product.

He will now find that our tariff reductions muddled considerably the springs of confidence that in the past provided courage. While in this country consumer purchasing power is high and supported by high wages, we have exposed ourselves to a foreign competition that can upset the applecart because it is free from our labor legislation extending fairness of competition to wages. The prevailing general prosperity will not lift the fear and uncertainty from such an exposed domestic industry.

The condition is widespread and still growing because other countries now enjoy our technology and may quickly duplicate our patents by similar innovations; or may obtain licenses to manufacture; or, again, our leading firms may establish overseas production. The companies that remain behind may then join the ranks of importers or remain satisfied with a small share of the business. The vision of growth gives way to a struggle to survive. Several elements hold the bag: labor, small companies, suppliers of parts and of materials (farmers, miners, etc.). Thus is blown the fuse of building a huge network of industry with its integrated parts, and providing extensive employment: all in behalf of a hope to increase exports while engaging in a process that assures their shrinkage.

The record shows this to be the trend. Except as we subsidize exports, they have not held their own. Imports are moving into finished goods, aggravating the sliding confidence and the rising unemployment found in our industries that face the competition.

Only by artificial means, such as further subsidization, forced exports, as under foreign aid, etc., can we postpone the inevitable regression of the American economy. The alternative lies in utilizing tariffs and/or import quotas to overcome the unfairness of much of our import competition and to substitute new conditions of confidence. Well-founded hopes of enjoying an expansive domestic market, not robbed of its promise by an instant jump-up of imports, ever ready to share the market under a favorable handicap, will then restore in good part the conditions that accounted for our surge to world economic leadership in the first place.

These are the needs. We hope that they will be recognized in the Democratic platform. Adjustment assistance after injury has been inflicted, is wholly misconceived. To advocate it is to misread the character of our system and to fall completely to understand the motivation and dynamics that alone can generate and maintain a system such as ours.

A PLATFORM PLANK ON TRADE

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House I ask that a presentation on trade made before the Democratic platform committee be printed in the Journal.

I regret that the makeup of the platform committee does not allow much room for the trade views expressed in the presentation.

Sooner or later we will have to admit that the disease of unemployment has its virus in the unequal trade agreements the Nation has entered into.

Every session of the Congress finds more and more legislation aimed at the relief of our beleaguered industries. Every day more and more U.S. corporations move their scene of operations to foreign shores for the purpose of evading our U.S. wage laws, our payroll taxes for the benefit of our peoples and every day more and more subsidies have to be paid to fishing fleet owners, textile mill owners, farmers, and others who find themselves in dire straits because of imports.

None of us want to isolate this Nation from the outside world, but by the same token we have had enough of the isolation of poverty and want caused by unemployment.

I present my case to the House, fully realizing the futility of my endeavor.

Following is my statement before the Democratic platform committee:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appear before you in an effort to reemphasize the U.S. position in world trade as it relates to our domestic economy.

It has been a matter of common knowledge and longstanding that the Democratic Party endorses and supports a relaxation of trade barriers and the promotion of International good will and growth through the expansion of world trade. As a Democrat, a Member of Congress and as an American I have no quarrel with this trade policy or its objectives. I do, however, believe the time has come for certain understandings to be underscored and made part of the national platform of the Democratic Party.

When trade is carried on in a market where the need for goods is the prime move in the trading agreements it is logical and equitable. However, since the advent of the automated production facility, the advancement in transportation and communication, the expanded and far-reaching exchange of ideas, know-how, and the easy access to investment finance, world trade takes on another face. This new face has all too often been hidden behind doubletalk, false figures, propaganda, and a confusion caused by a perversion of the original intent of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

When the price structure of a commodity or product in world trade becomes the determining factor in the movement of said goods, reciprocity flies out the window of reason and fair trade and becomes a menace to the economy of any high-waged, high-cost nation.

We can protect the U.S. standard of living without disturbing our time-honored position of defending free trade in the goods produced in surplus by our Nation and in short supply in another, or the freedom of trade in the minerals, farm products, and

manufacturing machinery and commodities necessary for the survival and growth of the underdeveloped nations or nations in short supply. To do this we must adopt a platform (a) which will embargo all imports produced overseas for the sole purpose of reducing the cost of production by substituting foreign labor in producing U.S. marketed goods bearing trademarks, copyrights, and any and all markings or symbols that traditionally identifies said products as American made or common to the American market; (b) which prohibits the importation of any competitive product at a price below the foreign selling price—the lowest U.S. cost of production; (c) that will impose a charge at customs on all imports equal to the amount lost by the Federal Government in taxes, to the differences in the cost of production including wages paid in the United States, the fixed costs of all services set by Federal or State statute and the costs of raw materials; (d) no imports may be imported in volume greater by percentage of the U.S. market than the like article is exported to the exporting nations domestic market.

These safeguards against the further deterioration of our job potential in the United States are minimum. Our primary economic objectives must be to continue the growth of our national product and the necessary job growth for the welfare of our peoples. Examination will show that every other nation protects, by one device or another, the price level of its competitive goods in its domestic marketplace.

As we become more and more mechanized in the nations of the world, we must protect, not our economy alone, but the economies of all nations. Trade therefore must be beneficial to both the exporting and the importing nation. It must be the rule of trade that no nation shall sell in a competitive country products below the costs of production in that nation, any products produced in sufficient quantity to meet the needs of its peoples. This platform should be a notice to all nations that the U.S. marketplace will no longer be used as a dumping ground for products in world trade that destroy our job opportunities and curtail the growth of our industrial complex.

We should reemphasize our position on the freedom of trade in the goods necessary to each nation's welfare with a protective covenant against the destruction of a domestic market by the dumping of goods produced in surplus at prices below the import nation's domestic costs of production.

Sooner or later the trade in world goods will have to be measured on a cost basis rather than the selling price, or the advanced nations will deteriorate at a faster pace than the underdeveloped nations can advance.

Trade when equitable can build understanding and good will amongst peoples and nations.

Trade based upon profit and dollar commercialism has in the past, and will again, sow the seeds of misunderstanding and bitterness which brings on the harvest of devastation and destruction of suffering and war.

LATIN AMERICA

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, as one who long has been interested in Latin America, and the image of Latin Amer-

ica which prevails in the United States, I have followed closely the type of reporting which our media give us on that vital area of the world.

For too long a time, a consistent Latin American complaint was that the news of Latin America, disseminated by the U.S. press and radio, was negative—that it stressed revolution and disorder.

The Latin Americans, through the forums available to them, pleaded for a more positive approach—for correspondents who would seek the solid rather than the sensational.

I recall particularly that one of the recommendations of Dr. Milton Eisenhower, following his 1953 tour of South America, and one of the recommendations of the Inter-American Committee of Presidential Representatives in 1957, was that our media should improve their treatment of news from Latin America.

The events connected with Vice President Nixon's 1958 trip proved the validity of these recommendations. On hindsight, if they had been followed, if our media had had the in-depth reporting of Latin America that we get from other areas, then those events would not have come as a surprise to us.

Since 1958, of course, the situation has changed.

Instead of the one or two handfuls of wire service and individual newspaper or magazine correspondents in Latin America in 1958, we now have something like 100 newsmen assigned to the major capitals, many of them on roving assignments.

The news now is coming to the United States. But I still think that there is room for improvement, within the newspapers. The copy editors, who rarely have a background in Latin America, sometimes tend to overlook the really significant developments which their correspondents report.

In this situation, apparently, what is needed is a high level determination to utilize the reports which come in from the southern part of our hemisphere.

Here in Washington, we are particularly fortunate. Such decisions have been made.

All three of the Washington papers—the Post, the News, and the Evening Star—now are bringing us news of Latin America which in other years they may have overlooked.

I have been particularly impressed, recently, with the work on Latin America being done by the Evening Star, and the correspondent it has assigned to this task—Mr. Jerry O'Leary, Jr.

To his assignment, which, as I have already indicated, it is a difficult one, Mr. O'Leary has brought a high degree of reportorial skills, a sure knowledge of Washington, and a refreshingly positive approach to the news.

In other words, through this collection of articles which I would like to insert in the RECORD, he is giving us information by which we—and the people of Washington—can judge developments in Latin America, and our response as a nation.

This is a calm voice—not one that cries sensation.

I shall follow—and I hope other Members of the House will follow—the future course of Mr. O'Leary, particularly since I understand that he shortly is to make a lengthy tour through South America.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, May 31, 1964]

OAS VOTE DUE IN 30 DAYS ON CHARGES AGAINST CUBA

(By Jerry O'Leary, Jr.)

A conference of Western Hemisphere foreign ministers is expected to convene within the next 30 days, probably in San Jose, Costa Rica, to act on Venezuela's complaint of aggression against Communist Cuba.

The preliminary maneuvers and strategy discussions are virtually complete. It remains only for the Organization of American States to name the time and place.

Washington observers believe enough votes have been lined up for the necessary two-thirds majority needed to pass a stiff resolution, warning the Cubans that no further aggression will be tolerated in this hemisphere. The estimate is that 14 or 15 nations will support a censure of Cuba's attempts to undermine Venezuelan democracy.

FOUR STILL MAINTAIN TIES

Experts expect the resolution will recommend that the American Republics sever diplomatic ties with Cuba—as all except four have already done—and halt all economic relations with the island.

The United States, Venezuela, and Costa Rica are the hardline neighbors. At the opposite end of the spectrum are Mexico and Chile, which with Bolivia and Uruguay are the only four hemisphere nations still maintaining diplomatic relations with Cuba.

The Council of the Organization of American States, perhaps this week, will decide on some of the procedures to take about Venezuela's complaint.

Cuba has already been read out of the OAS. Now the bolder residents think the time has come to take sterner action.

The questions are: When, where, and how to chastise the unruly Red nation?

Venezuela and democratic little Costa Rica insist that the letter of the Rio Pact requires a meeting of foreign ministers. The biggest, richest, and most powerful neighbor, the United States, has felt that the strongest resolution against Cuba would come from a session of the OAS Council itself, meeting as an organ of consultation. A few nations—Mexico, for example—would rather pretend the problem doesn't exist and ignore it.

One influential diplomat, Gonzalo J. Facio, Costa Rican Ambassador to the United States, said in an interview that he believes the decision will be to convene the foreign ministers either next month or in July to consider the Venezuelan complaint. A likely location, he said, is San Jose.

The major Latin American nations do not want the council of ministers to meet in their capitals, Mr. Facio says. He believes, on the other hand, that a council session in Washington would put the anti-Cuba nations at a propaganda disadvantage.

Mr. Facio discounts the argument that the Latin foreign ministers would balk at taking a public stand in the action against Cuba.

"It is time they did stand up so the rest of the world can see," Mr. Facio declared.

CONDEMNATION OF CUBA SEEN

He predicted that the hardline nations have the necessary majority of 11 votes required to convene the foreign ministers and the 14 needed to secure condemnation of and even economic sanctions against Cuba.

The foreign ministers he predicted, will vote to condemn Cuba for attempting to export revolution to Venezuela, and authorize any member nation, or group of nations,

to take armed action against Cuba if any new aggression occurs.

A second result of the council, Mr. Facio forecast, would be the application of steps to deepen Cuba's isolation from the rest of the hemisphere. Depending on the wording of the resolution, he said, the 20 nations might decide either to recommend or to require severance of all diplomatic and trade relations with the Caribbean island.

Mr. Facio said he believed Bolivia and Uruguay would break with Castro if a strong moral condemnation results from the council, and that Chile will follow suit after the September elections if Eduardo Frei is elected President.

ARMS CACHE DISCOVERED

"If any case demands the application of the Rio Pact, this one does," Mr. Facio said. "Unless the pact is acted upon, we might as well tear it up. We believe this treaty should be invoked in a meeting of the foreign ministers, as the pact requires."

He said Venezuela's case against Cuba is proved beyond any doubt. The complaint is based on the finding of a cache of arms on the Venezuelan coast last November. The arms bore Cuban markings and apparently were intended for the Communist FALN underground. The motor of the boat used to transport the arms had been shipped from Canada to Cuba just 2 weeks before the incident, Mr. Facio asserted.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 29, 1964]

ORLICH TO THANK UNITED STATES FOR 35 "AMBASSADORS"

(By Jerry O'Leary, Jr.)

When Costa Rica's President Francisco J. Orlich arrives in Washington tomorrow, one of his first acts will be to thank President Johnson for the 35 "ambassadors" the United States has sent to the Central American Republic.

The 35 have had no diplomatic training. They are, in fact, Navy Seabees, more at home with bulldozers than at embassy receptions. But they have become virtually national heroes in Costa Rica where they were sent a month ago to help control the damage being wrought by the erupting volcano, Irazu.

Some of them nearly lost their lives earlier this month when an avalanche of mud, water, and volcanic ash, 600 yards across, swept down the mountain and threatened to inundate the city of Cartago.

In less than 5 minutes, the avalanche rose 28 feet above the bed of the Rio Reventado, along which the Seabees were working. Only advance warning from Costa Rican civil guards posted on the mountain above enabled the Americans to escape safely.

JOHNSON SENDS SEABEES

In this avalanche, two Costa Ricans died and 300 were left homeless. Last December, another avalanche from restless Irazu caused the death of 7 others and left 5,000 homeless. Damage was in the millions.

President Johnson applied \$2 million from the contingency funds of the Alliance for Progress to send the Seabees and their heavy equipment to Costa Rica.

Their mission, on which they have been working double-shifts ever since, is to build dikes and flood control works along the Reventado which periodically overflows with accumulated ash from Irazu.

When their work is done in the next 2 months, they will leave their equipment behind for the Costa Ricans to continue the projects.

Since the Americans arrived they have won the respect and admiration of the Costa Ricans. They have been lionized by the press, radio, and TV. Civic organizations compete to do them honor. They have been made honorary citizens of Cartago.

PRAISE FOR U.S. AID

As one Costa Rican editorial writer put it: "The United States sends men who run risks, and sends material and financial assistance. Communism sends agents and propaganda to twist the facts and the truth."

Irazu continues to rain volcanic ash over 100,000 acres of the richest land in Costa Rica. The streets of San Jose, the capital, have to be cleared of ash as snow is removed in Washington. Women never go out without wearing the Costa Rican equivalent of a babushka to protect their hair. The hottest selling item in the country is shampoo.

The visit of President Orlich will be the first of a Latin American chief of state since President Johnson took office. The Orlich party will remain overnight in Williamsburg, Va., tonight and arrive for the 4-day state visit tomorrow.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, July 14, 1964]

UNOFFICIAL U.S. "PARTNERS" HELP LATIN AMERICAN AREAS

(By Jerry O'Leary, Jr.)

A New program is personalizing U.S. aid to Latin America by making various areas of the United States partners with towns, sections and whole nations south of the border.

The program is called Partners of the Alliance by Americans and Companeros de la Alianza by the Latins.

But in the last analysis it is a people-to-people program between private groups in American cities and States and similar areas in Latin America.

For example, a group of Texans is leaving soon for a trip to Peru with whom the people of the Lone Star State have agreed to become partners. It is not a case of Texas adopting Peru or an old clothes charity program; the Texas Partners Committee will begin to work with a similar group in Peru.

The Texans will furnish some money and the Peruvians will furnish the work on a number of projects, small as aid programs go. The money comes from civic clubs, 4-H clubs, business and professional groups, chambers of commerce, high schools and other organizations who want to help others help themselves.

SELF-HELP REQUIRED

"If there's no self-help in it, we won't touch it," says 38-year-old James H. Boren, special assistant to the Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress.

The self-help projects the Texans will undertake in Peru are typical.

A Peruvian teacher has volunteered to establish a poultry program for a tribe of Indians in the Jivaro country and \$607 is needed for baby chicks and rolls of wire. The Texas groups will furnish the money and the purchases will be made in Peru if possible. The Indians will do the work.

Another village needs 1 bull and 30 rolls of barbed wire at a cost of \$600. Another needs a \$168 hand-operated water pump and a fourth needs \$78 for two kerosene lamps and a dozen books so the Indians can be taught to read.

The partnerships have been catching on fast. Utah has joined with Bolivia. Pensacola, Fla., has sent almost \$30,000 to establish a medical center in Chimbote, Peru.

FAIRFAX SCHOOL HELPS

The students of Mount Vernon High School, in nearby Fairfax County, Va., raised \$200 to help students at a vocational school in Haurara, Peru, buy tools and books.

Fifteen public school districts in the area around Eugene, Oreg., have been linked with Costa Rica so that 15 Costa Rican teachers will spend 2½ months in the Oregon school system for in-service training. The Latin teachers will live with Oregon families.

Alabama is planning an alliance with Guatemala, Arizona with El Salvador, Utah with Bolivia, Ohio with the state of Parana, in Brazil and Illinois with the Brazilian state of Rio Grande do Sul.

The civil defense director of Oakland County, Mich., John E. Madole, is going to Cali, Colombia, to start a partnership with the people of the Cauca Valley. A Colombian counterpart will come to Pontiac, Mich., to form the opposite end of the pipeline. Cali wants help in municipal planning and budgetary control, educational and industrial development.

AT LOWEST LEVEL

Operating at the lowest level of government, where nation-to-nation assistance rarely filters down, Mr. Madole is heading for Cali with the support of Oakland County leaders and its Congressman, Representative WILLIAM BROOMFIELD. He will have his work cut out for him in an area that is unbelievably rich but has a desperately poor population.

The aim is to keep the system uncomplicated, according to Mr. Boren, who is the catalyst for the partners program.

He believes the burgeoning program will do much to erase the image of the "Ugly American." He cites the case of Pellileo, a village of 2,300 people in the shadow of Mount Chimborazo, in the Ecuadorian Andes.

Pellileo was leveled by earthquakes in 1949. The survivors moved 2 miles and slowly began to rebuild their village. Over the years, they reestablished a school, a hospital, and their homes but now they need a water system.

SENDING WATER SYSTEM

The Idaho partners, who had already furnished four pedal-operated sewing machines and a typewriter for an orphanage at nearby Concocto, are going to help the people of Pellileo with a portable water system, equipment for a baking cooperative and electric lights for the hospital which now has a gooseneck lamp in the operating room.

The people of Pellileo are so overwhelmed that when Mr. Boren went there on a visit recently he wound up at the head of a parade.

California has signed agreements with Chile in a larger scale operation, activated by the late President Kennedy and Governor Brown for water resource development, agricultural extension services, and manpower planning.

But the partners program is generally smaller and almost entirely unofficial. Most of the projects cost less than \$500.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 14, 1964]

ROSTOW TO PROPOSE PLAN TO BUILD LATIN MARKETS

(By Jerry O'Leary, Jr.)

Walt W. Rostow, Chairman of the State Department's Policy Planning Council, will propose new strategy for creating national markets in Latin America at the first working session of the Inter-American Committee on the Alliance for Progress in Mexico City this week.

The new American delegate to the committee (called CIAP from its Spanish initials) will make an important report outlining a four-point program for narrowing the gulf between developing metropolitan centers and stagnating rural areas in Latin America. The session, underway in the Mexican capital, may last 3 weeks.

FOUR PROPOSALS

Aside from the obvious need for roads, Mr. Rostow will propose:

Building up agricultural production in rural areas through increased technical assistance, expanded credit resources, and incentives to adopt new crops and methods.

Revolutionizing the marketing of agricultural products in cities by encouraging mass marketing with small unit profits.

Shifting of industrial emphasis to the production of simple agricultural equipment such as canvas shoes, flashlights, bicycles, and sewing machines.

Revolutionizing the marketing of industrial products in rural areas.

TRUCKS NEEDED

"What may be required," Mr. Rostow said, "are mobile trucks which go at regular intervals to the villages with stocks of consumer goods and agricultural equipment. It might take 3 or 5 years to become profitable but the availability of such goods at reasonable prices would yield for the developing nation a higher amount of industrial employment for the expenditure of a given amount of income in the villages."

He said most marketing involves too many middlemen with excessive unit profits.

Mr. Rostow replaced Teodoro Moscoso as the American representative on the committee, which is charged with drawing up long-range plans for applying the principles of the Alliance to Latin America.

REAPPORTIONMENT

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD a statement I made today before the Drafting Committee of the Resolutions Committee of the Democratic National Convention.

It seems to me altogether right and proper that the Democratic Party which is the party of the people, should in its national platform take a strong and forthright position in support of the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court upholding the right of the people to be represented on the principle of one man one vote in the legislative bodies of the States and in the Congress. Yet, today we see that reasonable and fair principle—and I do not see now any principle could be fairer than the principle of one man one vote—is under bitter, determined, and sinister assault from those who want to preserve and protect the vested interest of politicians and the holders of political power and privilege because they represent more space than they do people.

This landmark decision of the U.S. Supreme Court today is not only itself the subject of assault but it is the avenue through which the independence and the integrity of the judicial system of this country is under dangerous attack. For what is proposed is nothing less than that the Congress attempt to deny to the Federal courts of this country the protection of rights and privileges which the U.S. Supreme Court, the constitutional integrity of the Constitution, has held, that the citizens of this country are entitled to enjoy.

This is not the only attack upon an independent judiciary through the forum of the Congress but it is an attempt to

induce Congress to usurp power to deny the judicial protection of the constitutional rights of our people, which power the Congress under our Constitution, does not possess.

Under the Constitution, legislative power is vested in the Congress, not judicial or executive. The protection of the constitutional rights of our citizens is vested in the judicial system of our Government.

For example, recently the U.S. Supreme Court held that a defendant charged with a felony in a State court could not be legally convicted unless he had or was tendered by the State qualified counsel. Does any member of this committee believe that if the Congress were to attempt to say that that right could not be enjoyed by a defendant charged with a felony in a State court and the denial of that right could not be properly protected in a proper U.S. court?

Further, the U.S. Supreme Court a bit ago held that children could not be denied access to public schools of this country because of race or color. Could the Congress of the United States set aside that decision of the U.S. Supreme Court and deny to the Federal courts the protection of these constitutional rights?

It may be assumed for the sake of argument that under the judiciary article of the Constitution Congress can abolish the U.S. district courts since it has the power to establish those courts. But so long as the courts exist can the Congress deny to the U.S. district courts the right and power, indeed the duty, when proper application is made to protect the constitutional rights of our citizens?

I am sure that fair interpretation of the judiciary article will not so hold. My State of Florida is particularly interested in this subject and especially so is Dade County, a part of which I have the honor to represent in Congress. Prior to the Baker case, Dade County with one-fifth of the population of the State had 1 senator out of a senate of 38 and 4 representatives out of a house of 95 in the Florida Legislature. After the Baker case was decided and a three-judge Federal court held on our constitutional apportionment under the Constitution, the Legislature of Florida to avoid reapportionment by the Federal courts, finally reapportioned the State after a fashion. As a result of the new apportionment, Dade County with one-fifth of the population of the State got 2 senators out of a senate of 45 and 14 representatives out of a house of 105, in the legislature. The progress toward fair representation which our people have gained has been due to the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court holding that the courts of the country under the Federal Constitution have a right to hear the complaint of any citizen who is not fairly represented in his State legislature. Under the latest decision of the U.S. Supreme Court—Dade County will get a representation of substantially one-fifth of the State senate and one-fifth of the State house of representatives because we have one-fifth of the State population. But that will vastly increase Dade County

representation in the State legislature and give us that equality of one man one vote which is the truly democratic principle upon which such apportionment should rest. Those who oppose these measures therefore attack our judicial system and its integrity and thereby endanger every constitutional right which every citizen of America enjoys today. Those who attack the one-man-one-vote decision of the Supreme Court are seeking to freeze modern-day America with its urban problems into the pattern of a past America of rural pattern. They are trying to freeze political privilege and power into the hands of senators and representatives to represent space and trees and water and to deny such power to senators and representatives to represent people. They want to perpetuate privilege and power to benefit the few and to do so they are willing to deny the equitable rights of the many.

If we are to meet the problems of urban America today those problems must be in the hands of the people elected by our citizens whose lives are a part of the urban America to have the association, the knowledge, the point of view about urban problems which will enable them to understand them with their heads and solve them with their hearts.

Let the Democratic Party speak out in words that shall be heard around the world that we are more perfectly, with every passing day, making America in practice the democracy of which we preach to other people around the world. Let the Democratic Party, the party of the people, rebuke those who wish to deny representation on the basis of equity to the people.

As Thomas Jefferson said in the Declaration of Independence, "Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." Let us not perpetuate a government based upon the denial of the right of the people to give their consent but let us perpetuate a government truly based upon the consent of the people. All America is listening for the Democratic platform to come out strongly and forthrightly for the constitutional system which has made us the greatest Nation in the world and for the protection of the rights of all the people of this country.

PEEPOLE DEVICES IN POST OFFICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEGGETT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker and Members, I am pleased to announce that with the introduction yesterday of H.R. 12402 and H.R. 12403, Representative LEGGETT, of California, and Representative HECHLER, of West Virginia, have jointly declared war on peepholes in post offices throughout the United States.

Apparently a practice cropped up in merry old England several hundred years ago of maintaining surveillance of the administration of the mails through means of hidden devices. When America inherited England's common law system

apparently she also inherited their peepholes. The practice was known during the Revolutionary War and subsequently during the Civil War.

I am informed that in 1875 the postal facility down at Richmond, Va., was constructed with a peephole device to allow for the surveillance of bonded postal employees.

Today in modern America, where the right of privacy in personal affairs has grown up in a law of torts, and where in most public and private employment employees are free from the snooping eye and snooping lie detector management might seek to impose, it seems an anachronism to allow a snooping device, an observation gallery which extends even into the very sacrosanct latrines of the postal facilities. In spite of the fact that each of the postal employees is a civil servant carefully screened and bonded and an inspector in his own right, we have a multimillion-dollar inspection gallery system, a holdover from the middle ages, and we have the snooping eye of inspectors in hidden galleries, with one-way glass, casting suspicion on more than 448,000 career civil service employees, and also on the more than 5,000 post office postmasters, which postmasters, I might point out, have been approved by the Congress of the United States, in the Senate.

How effective are these devices? I am advised that last year the Post Office Department arrested and convicted some 513 postal employees. This was out of a total number of 448,000 employees. One-tenth of 1 percent were arrested. We might estimate that if half of the arrests were in some way accomplished through the special archaic middle-age snooping devices that perhaps one-twentieth of 1 percent is the effectiveness. So why should 448,000 public employees be placed under public scrutiny and observation, even in the men's restrooms where, I am advised, they do not allow the separation of facilities within the restrooms because this might block the snooping eye of the inspector? Why should we allow this merely to assist in the arrest of one-twentieth of 1 percent of the employees?

What about the cost? The Post Office states that the thieves who were apprehended in 1963 resulted in a recovery, from the thefts, of a total of \$259,940. This seems like a lot of money. The figure should be measured against the cost of the peephole facilities.

Under the law the figure is set at 5 percent of the cost of new construction as the amount which the law allows the Government to spend for peephole devices in postal facilities.

I am told that due to the fact that lights must be raised and ceilings must be raised to allow for the inspection peepholes, many of them account for nearly 10 percent of the cost of post office facilities. This, of course, disregards the annual maintenance cost and other effective costs for heat, light, and maintenance. The plant and facilities budget for the post office system for fiscal year 1965 amounts to \$205 million. So that if we take 5 or 10 percent of this item for peephole facilities, you can readily see that the United States spends every year

from \$10 to \$20 million to construct peephole devices to recover perhaps a fraction of \$249,000.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEGGETT. I am pleased to yield to my colleague from California [Mr. COHELAN].

Mr. COHELAN. I would like to take this opportunity to compliment my colleague from California and our colleague from West Virginia who I understand have put in a bill on this subject matter today. I would like to say to the gentleman that unfortunately I have not filed a bill with him, because this matter came to my attention some time ago when, for the first time, I had the opportunity to examine in great detail the physical facilities of the postal operations in and about the bay area. In so doing this was one of the items I discovered that seemed to me to be quite antiquated and which deserved a very, very careful analysis and reevaluation. Consequently, when I returned to Washington from this recent trip to my district, I arranged for a meeting with the Postmaster General, Mr. Gronouski, and with the Deputy Postmaster General, Mr. Tyler Abell, and other important officials in the Post Office Department who were in charge of facilities and other matters of this kind. Out of this discussion I was promised or it was pretty clearly understood, may I say, that they would definitely attend to some of the items that I had called to their attention, including this particular subject. The way the matter was left was that in terms of research and development it was my clear understanding that the authorities in our post office, in the administration of our post offices, would give this subject a very, very careful reexamination.

I want to get that into the RECORD because it is one of the reasons I have not filed a bill with the gentleman, because I feel the authorities did respond to the complaint I made about this. As a matter of fact, I am sure and I feel reasonably certain that when they complete their studies on this subject they will find there are many, many other means to accomplish their objectives both in the form of good industrial management and industrial relations. In addition to that, there are other methods that the Postal Inspection Service might find available in the accumulation of the necessary evidence for people who stray from the path of righteousness from time to time. Still, I could not resist the opportunity to commend the gentleman for what he is bringing to the House today, because the system as it presently exists is really an antiquated and outmoded and uneconomic system. I really think that ultimately they will find that this is so and we will adopt other methods.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LEGGETT. I am pleased to have the remarks of the gentleman from Alameda County, who I know represents a number of postal workers and where these highly antiquated facilities cast

suspicion on a great number of the fine civil servants that I know you have in your district.

Mr. COHELAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LEGGETT. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COHELAN. There are many other points I indicated I took up in the course of my tour, but this one particular thing was so outstanding that I was rather shocked. As the gentleman has called to the attention of the House, this is an uneconomic and unproductive sort of operation, but it is not even consistent, I would remind the gentleman, because these galleries extend in one area, and apparently they only cover the male employees. Is that not correct?

Mr. LEGGETT. That is true.

Mr. COHELAN. So in terms of employee surveillance it is apparently inconsistent. I wonder if the gentleman can tell the House how many female employees there are in our modern post offices.

Mr. LEGGETT. This, of course, is a subject which we will pursue, if we can get this matter to a hearing before the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. I have talked to members of the committee and I am sure they want to hear about it; perhaps not in the 88th Congress, but certainly in the first part of the 89th Congress.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, as I leave this evening, I want to commend the gentleman from California and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] for bringing this to the attention of the House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEGGETT. I would be pleased to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I trust the gentleman has personally carried his criticisms to the Postmaster General, Mr. Gronouski; but, on second thought, I suspect he would have a difficult time locating Postmaster General Gronouski these days because he is too busy out castigating Republicans and particularly what he pleases to call Republican extremists. I imagine the gentleman would have a difficult time finding him in his office. He is too busy campaigning.

As one member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service I would be most happy, if I am returned to Congress next year, to have the gentleman from California before the committee and others before the committee to provide us with their criticisms and maybe by that time the campaign will be over and if the Democrats are in control, Mr. Gronouski can return to the business of operating the Post Office Department instead of traveling through the country castigating Republicans.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I am sure Mr. Gronouski would be doing the thing that he thinks most important. I think, however, the Post Office is in good hands. I am satisfied that they are upholding the law and carrying out the system in the most economical way possible, delivering some 70 billion pieces of

mail. Certainly I do not mean to be critical of the 448,000 post office employees or the Postmaster General himself. However, sometimes we get harnessed with certain procedures the antiquity of which we really cannot recognize.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEGGETT. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the gentleman from California has brought this subject to the attention of the House. About 4 years ago when I first brought up this subject my office was literally flooded with mail from postal workers who were very exercised against the operation of these peepholes. One of the main criticisms is contained in this letter, in which a postal worker from a town in Rhode Island indicated that "this practice is an insult to the dignity of one of Uncle Sam's postal workers." And that I think holds true for all of the some half million postal workers, both clerks and letter carriers.

I do not believe that these peepholes accomplish anything which good supervision could not cure. I believe that it is a very healthy thing to have a full-scale investigation of this by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if I caught correctly the suggestion of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] a minute ago that perhaps Mr. Gronouski would be around with us next year. I thought I caught the suggestion in what the gentleman from Iowa said, that Mr. Gronouski would be around to assist in that investigation in 1965. I appreciate the suggestion and the confidence of the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEGGETT. I would be pleased to yield further to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I made no suggestion such as that of having Mr. Gronouski around next year. I think this situation can be cured only if we have a change in the administration.

Mr. LEGGETT. I might point out that we are not being partisan at all in our current attitude with reference to the post office, this particular part of the post office system, because if you look back in the record I think you will find that our colleague, Mr. HECHLER from West Virginia, carried on this attack under the Eisenhower administration.

And, I believe, whomever the Postmaster General may have been at that time likewise failed to heed the suggestion made by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER].

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LEGGETT. I yield further to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, certain improvements have been made by the Post Office Department. I talked with the Chief Postal Inspector, Mr. Henry

Montague, and it is true now that these lookout galleries are not installed in post offices employing less than 20 employees.

In addition to that, the cost has been reduced somewhat. I commend Mr. Montague for his work.

But, Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman from California and I share the feeling of many other Members that it is the principle of the operation which could stand some improvement.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly commend the gentleman from California [Mr. LEGGETT], and I trust that this investigation may proceed in the new Congress to such an extent that we may be able to install an adequate system of supervision that will insure the dignity of the great number of postal employees.

Mr. LEGGETT. I thank the gentleman from West Virginia for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I just have a few more remarks that I would like to insert into the RECORD.

To begin with, Mr. Speaker, is the system foolproof, the existing system of peepholes? I believe that we know that it is not. Thefts, of course, still go on in the postal system.

Mr. Speaker, if an employee is going to steal, why not do it out on the route, or better, with the old cliché, the hand is quicker than the eye, applies as well in the postal system as it does on the stage.

Admittedly, Mr. Speaker, the peepholes only cover 80 percent of the working room in a post office.

Is there an alternative method to decrease crime in the post office?

Mr. Speaker, I hope no one gets the idea that I am against or for crime in the postal system. Certainly, I believe any crime should be detected in the easiest and best possible way. But obviously over a period of years the best possible method of handling theft is through the baited-letter system, which is a system that uses marked bills, as well as a number of other facilities which clearly and cogently catches the offender but catches him in a fair way. However, this is not done through snooping and other methods such as that.

VIETNAM AND THE CONGO— ANOTHER RED COUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOLLING). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, no official of the present administration seems able to explain why the incident in the Gulf of Tonkin was provoked by the North Vietnamese. To all outward appearances, there was no justification for this unprovoked action. It appears to be even more inexplicable to administration officials because there seems to have been no Communist followup in that area of the world.

For my part, I cannot look at Communist-inspired incidents as isolated, or unrelated to other events, or without purpose.

Let us recall that in 1948, while all eyes were on the Berlin airlift, decisive battles were lost which led to the fall of China.

This is not an unusual Communist tactic.

Today, in 1964, while all eyes were on the Gulf of Tonkin, another decisive action was taken by the Communists, this time in the Congo. Stanleyville, a strategic key to the whole Congo area, is now firmly in Communist hands.

Mr. Speaker, so as to underscore the seriousness of this situation, it has just come to my attention from a usually reliable source that Communists are shipping in Migs and Ilyushin aircraft to Stanleyville.

Mr. Speaker, when will this administration realize that Communist strategy is global strategy, that one incident in one part of the world is almost always related to other incidents in other parts of the world, that President Johnson's proud boast that we have not 1 but 120 foreign policies is a grave deficiency that will prevent this administration from understanding what the Communist strategy is all about?

Mr. Speaker, it is time to develop one meaningful and coordinated American foreign policy.

END OF AN ERA

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, mentioned that tomorrow we may take action which will be necessary if we are to prevent the end of an era. I suggest to you that tomorrow will see the end of an era one way or the other. For one thing, if we take up the matter at all, we will see the end of an era in this House in which we have some respect for our legislative committees. The Committee on the Judiciary was in the middle of hearings on an extremely complex subject, attempting to bring to this House some advice on what we ought to do concerning the proposed bills to block reapportionment of State legislatures. We had heard some 30 Members of Congress over a period of about 3 weeks, and 23 additional Members were waiting their turn to be heard. Also waiting to testify were a great number of public witnesses. At this point, after a hearing which lasted less than 2 hours on one day, the Committee on Rules took the matter from the Committee on the Judiciary and reported it out of that committee.

If we take up the resolution tomorrow and consider the Tuck bill, we will have abandoned our traditional procedures in the House. The legislative committees of the House will be degraded. If the Committee on Rules can report bills directly to the floor in this manner, of what use are the legislative committees?

Mr. Speaker, assuming we take some action tomorrow, whatever it may be, we will see the end of an era.

If we refuse to take up the Tuck bill and show that we support the Supreme Court decision on reapportionment, we will see the end of the era of control of State government by rural minorities and special-interest groups. Now that end is one which appeals to a great number of people in this country and I hope in this Congress.

If on the other hand we act to deny the plaintiffs in the various reapportionment cases the relief which has been granted to them by the Supreme Court, if we deny the Federal courts the power to rule on constitutional rights and thus deny each American citizen protection of his constitutional rights in the Federal courts, then we will see an end of a system which has served this country well for nearly 200 years.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that there is any issue which will come before the Congress in this decade which is of such importance and such far-reaching effect as that action which is proposed on tomorrow.

I sincerely hope all of the Members will be here and participate in the discussion, and after due reflection, decide that each American citizen is entitled to the kind of protection he can presently get in the courts of this land.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GRANT] for today, be transferred to tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MCCLORY (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for today through August 29, 1964, on account of attending Interparliamentary Union Conference as a delegate.

Mr. POOL (at the request of Mr. BECKWORTH), for August 18 and 19, 1964, on account of illness.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for today through August 29, 1964, on account of attending Interparliamentary Union Conference as a delegate.

Mr. FIRNIE (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for today through August 29, 1964, on account of attending Interparliamentary Union Conference as a delegate.

Mr. HOEVEN (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for today through August 29, 1964, on account of attending Interparliamentary Union Conference as a delegate.

Mr. ADAIR (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for today through August 29,

1964, on account of attending Interparliamentary Union Conference as a delegate.

Mr. TOLLEFSON (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for today through August 29, 1964, on account of attending Interparliamentary Union Conference as a delegate.

Mr. SMITH of California (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for today through August 29, 1964, on account of attending Interparliamentary Union Conference as a delegate.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. LAIRD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PELLY (at the request of Mr. SHRIVER), for 30 minutes, on August 19.

Mr. FORD (at the request of Mr. SHRIVER), for 30 minutes, on August 19.

Mr. LAIRD (at the request of Mr. SHRIVER), for 30 minutes, on August 19.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. SHRIVER), for 15 minutes, on August 18.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BONNER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILBIN in two instances.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. SHRIVER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SCHWENGEL.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HECHLER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RYAN of New York.

Mr. TRIMBLE.

Mr. PEPPER.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 437. An act for the relief of Wilhelm Konyen, his wife Susanne Fritsch Konyen, and their children, Susanne Konyen and Willy Konyen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 486. An act to amend certain criminal laws applicable to the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles,

which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 189. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain Federal land under the jurisdiction of the Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, Calif., to the county of Kern, State of California;

H.R. 4223. An act to provide for audit of accounts of private corporations established under Federal law;

H.R. 4361. An act for the relief of the estate of Paul F. Ridge;

H.R. 5154. An act for the relief of Wilfredo Lacar de Leon;

H.R. 5155. An act for the relief of Mrs. Guiseppe D'Aquanno, Maria D'Aquanno, and Benedicto D'Aquanno;

H.R. 5728. An act for the relief of the county of Cuyahoga, Ohio;

H.R. 5964. An act to provide for the inclusion of Hopkins County, Tex., within the Paris Division of the eastern district for the U.S. District Courts in Texas;

H.R. 6034. An act for the relief of Robert L. Johnston;

H.R. 6353. An act to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as amended;

H.R. 7138. An act for the relief of St. Francis Levee District, Ark.;

H.R. 7219. An act to amend sections 3288 and 3289 of title 18, United States Code, relating to indictment after dismissal of a defective indictment;

H.R. 7508. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, to establish jurisdiction and venue for appeals from orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission in judicial reference cases;

H.R. 8201. An act for the relief of Maj. Jack J. Shea, U.S. Air Force;

H.R. 9561. An act for the relief of Moni Parvanoff Floroff;

H.R. 10216. An act for the relief of Dr. Miguel de Socarras;

H.R. 10222. An act to strengthen the agricultural economy; to help to achieve a fuller and more effective use of food abundances; to provide for improved levels of nutrition among economically needy households through a cooperative Federal-State program of food assistance to be operated through normal channels of trade; and for other purposes;

H.R. 10683. An act to amend the act of July 25, 1956, to remove certain residence restrictions upon officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia;

H.R. 11296. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11466. An act to enact subtitle II, "Other Commercial Transactions," of title 28, "Commercial Instruments and Transactions," of the District of Columbia Code, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11520. An act to amend subsection (d) of section 1346 of title 28 of the United States Code relating to the jurisdiction of the U.S. district courts;

H.R. 11579. An act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 1160. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1965, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 51. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to relinquish to the State of Wyoming jurisdiction over those lands within the Medicine Bow National Forest known as the Pole Mountain District;

S. 1046. An act to provide hospital, domiciliary, and medical care for non-service-connected disabilities to recipients of the Medal of Honor;

S. 2419. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to condemn certain property in the city of St. Augustine, Fla., within the boundary of the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 162. Joint resolution extending recognition to the International Exposition for Southern California in the year 1968 and authorizing the President to issue a proclamation calling upon the several States of the Union and foreign countries to take part in the exposition.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 1026. Joint resolution to amend section 316 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to extend the time by which a lease transferring a tobacco acreage allotment may be filed.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill S. 3049.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, August 19, 1964, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2432. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, relative to transmitting three

copies of the Air Force report entitled "Semiannual Research and Development Procurement Action Report," covering the period January 1, 1964; through June 30, 1964, pursuant to section 2357, title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2433. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations) transmitting additional information pertaining to certain additional projects for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves to be undertaken, which relates to letters dated January 21, 1964, and May 4, 1964, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 2233a(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2434. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States relative to an examination which relates to overstated cost estimates for miscellaneous and minor outside production items included in incentive target prices negotiated with the Boeing Co., Seattle, Wash., for KC-135 airplanes, Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2435. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, relative to an examination which relates to overstated material cost estimates included in firm fixed prices negotiated for T-37 airplanes produced by Cessna Aircraft Co., Wichita, Kans., Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2436. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on a review which relates to significantly increased costs without commensurate benefits resulting from an inadequately planned and administered program of installing data processing equipment in hospitals, Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2437. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting a report stating that shipments to Yugoslavia insured by the Foreign Credit Insurance Association and the Export-Import Bank under our short term export credit insurance program for the month of July 1964 totaled \$11 million; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2438. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, relative to a list of cases submitted to Congress on October 1, 1963, involving suspension of deportation, and requesting the withdrawal of the case of George Eric Nurse, XXXXXXXX, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2439. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting certain information relating to a major project which the National Historical Publications Commission has had in mind for many years relating to the publication of a documentary history of the First Federal Congress, pursuant to Public Law 88-383; to the Committee on House Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HARDY: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 12308. A bill to authorize removal of a flight hazard at the U.S. Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Va.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1825). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 2411. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Auburn-Folsom south unit, American River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws; with amendment (Rept. No. 1826). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 12128. A bill to amend the act of March 10, 1964; without amendment (Rept. No. 1827). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee of conference. S. 3049. An act to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1828). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 12416. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide a uniform rate of duty for tape recorders and dictation recording and transcribing machines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 12417. A bill to amend section 2056 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the effect of disclaimers on the allowance of the marital deduction for estate tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 12418. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to expand the exemption from the tax on the transportation of persons which is accorded members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York (by request):

H.R. 12419. A bill to provide for the popular election of the Governor of Guam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 12420. A bill to provide for the popular election of the Governor of the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 12421. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to impose an import quota on iron ore; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 12422. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the treatment of certain sets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.R. 12423. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income dislocation allowances received by members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 12424. A bill to facilitate the obtaining of employment by older workers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.J. Res. 1160. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.J. Res. 1161. Joint resolution to establish a commission to formulate plans for the commemoration of the 200th anniversary of

the founding of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H.J. Res. 1162. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the fourth week in April of each year as "Youth Temperance Education Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H. Con. Res. 356. Concurrent resolution expressing the disapproval of Congress of the agreement entitled "Agreement Between the Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty for Cooperation Regarding Atomic Information," submitted to Congress by the President on June 30, 1964; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. Res. 858. Resolution to create a select committee to study the administration and operation of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H. Res. 859. Resolution to create a select committee to study the administration and operation of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 12425. A bill for the relief of Martin W. Elliott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 12426. A bill for the relief of Moises, Elka, Elena, Flora, Diana, Eva Dragon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 12427. A bill for the relief of Loretta Negrin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 12428. A bill for the relief of Guido Parete, his wife, Giovanti Parete, and their children, Claudia and Mario Parete; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 12429. A bill for the relief of Horacio Pereira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 12430. A bill for the relief of Laudalina D. F. Pereira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 12431. A bill for the relief of Antonina Mandracchia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 12432. A bill for the relief of Janina Janus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIBAL:

H.R. 12433. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Aikler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 12434. A bill for the relief of Charles B. Franklin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

1015. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to requesting the President of the United States, by resolution, to reassure the American people from time to time that no foreign aid whatsoever is going to any nation (from the United States of America) which is suspected of furnishing Red China with any materiel which may possibly be used for nuclear war-head manufacture by said Red China, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.