

Roll No. 124]
YEAS—215

Abbutt
Abernethy
Adair
Addabbo
Alger
Andersen,
Minn.
Anderson, III.
Arends
Ashbrook
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barry
Bass, N.H.
Bates
Battin
Becker
Beckworth
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Brewster
Broomwell
Broomfield
Brown
Broyhill
Bruce
Burluson
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Church
Clancy
Clark
Collier
Colmer
Conte
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis, Mass.
Curtis, Mo.
Dague
Davis, Tenn.
Dent
Deroujian
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Dominick
Dooley
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Durno
Dwyer
Ellsworth
Everett

NAYS—205

Belghan
Renton
Rindley
Rino
Fisher
Fogarty
Ford
Fulton
Garland
Gavin
Goodell
Goodling
Griffin
Gross
Gubser
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Harrison, Va.
Harrison, Wyo.
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Eberert
Herlong
Hestland
Hoeven
Hoffman, III.
Hosmer
Jarman
Jensen
Johansen
Johnson, Md.
Jonas
Judd
Kearns
Keith
Kilburn
Kilgore
King, N.Y.
Knox
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lindsay
Lippscomb
McCulloch
McDonough
McIntire
McVey
MacGregor
Mahon
Mailliard
Martin, Nebr.
Mason
Mathias
May
Meader
Merrow
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Minshall
Montoya
Moore
Moorehead,
Ohio
Morris
Morse

Hull
Ichord, Mo.
Inouye
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kitchin
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kowalski
Landrum
Lane
Lankford
Lennon
Lesinski
Libonati
McDowell
McFall
McMillan
McSween
Macdonald
Mack
Magnuson
Marshall
Matthews
Miller, Clem
Miller,
George P.
Mills

Moeller
Monagan
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Morrison
Moss
Moulder
Multer
Murphy
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen
O'Neill
Patman
Perkins
Peterson
Pfof
Pilcher
Poage
Powell
Price
Pujcinski
Purcell
Rains
Randall
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt

NOT VOTING—17

Addonizio
Alford
Blitch
Flood
Frelinghuysen
Glenn
Hoffman, Mich.
Saund
Siler
Loser
Madden
Martin, Mass.
Riley

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:
Mr. Martin of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Madden against.
Mr. Frelinghuysen for, with Mr. Flood against.
Mr. Horan for, with Mr. Saund against.
Mr. Glenn for, with Mrs. Riley against.
Mr. Siler for, with Mr. Stubblefield against.
Mr. Hoffman of Michigan for, with Mrs. Blitch against.
Mr. Loser for, with Mr. Spence against.
Mr. WRIGHT and Mr. GIAIMO changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."
Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a recapitulation of the vote.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman insist on his request for a recapitulation?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I insist upon it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair feels that the vote is not sufficiently close to order a recapitulation.

Mr. COOLEY. All right, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the bill under consideration today.

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

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963

Mr. NATCHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight Friday night to file a report on the District of Columbia appropriation bill for 1963.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL reserved all points of order on the bill.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight as well as midnight tomorrow night to file certain reports.

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

There was no objection.

ANTITRUST CIVIL PROCESS ACT

Mr. CELLER submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 167) to authorize the Attorney General to compel the production of documentary evidence required in civil investigations for the enforcement of the antitrust laws, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1884)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 167) to authorize the Attorney General to compel the production of documentary evidence required in civil investigations for the enforcement of the antitrust laws, 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, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, and 24.

Amendment numbered 4: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out by said amendment insert "or the Federal Trade Commission"; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out by said amendment insert "any final order of the Federal Trade Commission, or"; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its amendment numbered 14.

Amendment numbered 18: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 18 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken by the amendment insert "or the Federal Trade

June 21
1962

Commission"; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 19 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted insert "court or grand jury, or the Federal Trade Commission".

Amendment numbered 20: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 20 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted insert "court or grand jury, or the Federal Trade Commission".

Amendment numbered 21: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 21 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken by the amendment insert "or the Federal Trade Commission"; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 22 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted insert "court or grand jury, or the Federal Trade Commission".

Amendment numbered 23: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 23 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken by the amendment insert "or the Federal Trade Commission"; and the House agree to the same.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
ESTES KEFAUVER,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

EMANUEL CELLER,
PETER W. RODINO, Jr.,
BYRON G. ROGERS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

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. 167) to authorize the Attorney General to compel the production of documentary evidence required in civil investigations for the enforcement of the antitrust laws, 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:

DEFINITIONS

Amendments Nos. 1 and 3: Provide formal changes made necessary by the deletion provided in amendment No. 2 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 2: Provides for the deletion from the antitrust laws to which the bill applies as proposed by the Senate of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 4: Provides for the insertion of the Federal Trade Commission in lieu of antitrust agency as proposed by the Senate and stricken out as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 5: Deletes as proposed by the House the definition of the term "antitrust agency" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 6, 7, and 8: Correct the subparagraph numbers as proposed by the House; and reinsert the words "any final order of any antitrust agency, or" as proposed by the Senate and stricken out as proposed by the House, except that "the Federal Trade Commission" be inserted in lieu of "any antitrust agency".

Amendments 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13: Correct the subparagraph numbering.

Civil investigative demand

Amendment No. 14: Delete Amendment No. 14 as proposed by the House which inserts "under investigation."

Amendment No. 15: Inserts before "antitrust investigation" as proposed by the Senate "a civil" as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 16: As proposed by the House, the court in any proceeding under section 5(d) may direct the place of production and inspection of the documents demanded.

Amendment No. 17: Eliminates useless phraseology as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 18: Strikes out as proposed by the House "or any antitrust agency" as proposed by the Senate and inserts in lieu thereof "or the Federal Trade Commission".

Amendments Nos. 19, 20 and 22: Strike out as proposed by the House "court, grand jury, or antitrust agency", and insert "court or grand jury", but amend to insert in lieu thereof, "court or grand jury, or the Federal Trade Commission".

Amendments Nos. 21 and 23: Strike out as proposed by the House "or any antitrust agency" as proposed by the Senate and insert in lieu thereof "or the Federal Trade Commission".

Amendment No. 24: As proposed by the Senate any person, not including a natural person by virtue of the definition of person in the bill, could be punished for disobedience of a court order under the bill. The amendment of the House makes a natural person subject to such punishment as agreed to by the managers on the part of the Senate.

In substance, the conference report makes the following changes in the bill: It deletes from the bill the Robinson-Patman Act as proposed by the House. Persons on whom civil investigative demands may be made would include all persons, other than natural persons, who may possess such documentary material as proposed by the Senate and are not limited to only such persons who are under investigation as proposed by the House. As proposed by the Senate the material obtained under a civil investigative demand would be available to any agency charged by law with the administration of any antitrust law prescribed in the bill instead of only the Department of Justice as proposed by the House. The conference report would delete antitrust agency and substitute therefor the Federal Trade Commission, making such material available only to the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission. The report also includes a natural person as punishable for disobedience to a court order issued in the enforcement of the provisions of the bill.

EMANUEL CELLER,
PETER W. RODINO, Jr.,
BYRON G. ROGERS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

NEGATIVISM OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

(Mrs. GREEN of Oregon asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend her remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, frequent references have been made today and yesterday to a letter written by Martin Sorkin, adviser to Ezra T. Benson, Secretary of Agriculture during the Eisenhower administration.

May I again quote a portion of the letter to underline a point about the negativism of the Republican Party—a point which is emphasized by an editorial appearing last Friday in the Republican-

minded newspaper, the Oregonian, in my home city of Portland:

It was agreed—

Wrote Mr. Sorkin—

that it was not the responsibility of the Republicans to propose solutions, but to criticize the Kennedy administration wherever feasible. This included varying the basis for the attack depending upon the area political situation.

The Republican Oregonian wisely points out that negative criticism is not sufficient when the people of this country are earnestly seeking constructive programs.

At a time when the Republicans are seeking to scuttle one bill after another, the Republican Oregonian's editorial, entitled "Negative GOP," is well worth reading:

NEGATIVE GOP

The Republican Party is unlikely to begin winning national elections and the control of Congress again until its spokesmen get together on constructive programs, rather than negative criticism of the New Frontier.

In Seattle, the Republican National Committee adopted resolutions blasting the Kennedy administration for doing nothing to correct discriminations harmful to the lumber industry. This was legitimate criticism. But the committee made itself ridiculous by attributing lumber's decline to the present administration, when the causes go far back beyond Mr. Kennedy's regime, and by charging an administration conspiracy to bring distress to lumber in order to subject the industry "to manipulation and control of the power-hungry planners of the New Frontier."

And in Washington, D.C., while Senator WAYNE MORSE (frequently an assailant of Bureau of Land Management range policies), was carrying an amendment in the Senate to restore \$2 million for range rehabilitation cut out by the Appropriations Committee, Republican Senators, except three, went down the line in voting opposition. This item included \$1 million to start the Vale project in Oregon to restore the animal-carrying capacity of a district larger than the State of Rhode Island, and \$1 million for range rehabilitation work in other areas. Many Democrats voted for the amendment to "bail out" WAYNE. But evidently many Republicans voted against it to give MORSE a black eye—without concern for the continued wasting of a national resource.

These kinds of performances give voters no confidence in constructive possibilities of a Republican President and a Republican Congress. No attention is given by these so-called national Republican leaders to the pleas of Republican Governors, like Gov. Mark Hatfield, who want to improve the cooperative working arrangement—if any—between the people of the States and the national party.

From the Republican voters' standpoint in the Northwest, Republican Members of Congress have signally failed to understand and to support a number of proposals, some by western Republicans, which would benefit our region. These include the Hanford dual-purpose reactor to provide 800,000 kilowatts of firm power from wasted nuclear heat, at a low cost. This bill was defeated in the House three times last session and the Kennedy administration has dropped it, being willing to turn the project over to Washington public utility districts.

The same Republican opposition, backed as in the Hanford case by some southern Democrats, is now being brought to bear against the bill to establish a regional power preference, to be followed by the sale of sur-