

tive on-the-job training program, or such a program is adopted, the Secretary of Labor should work through the State agency which administers such a program.

UTILIZATION OF PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS

The conference report underscores the fact that whenever possible the many excellent private institutions will be utilized in the vocational education programs. As we are all aware, there are many excellent private institutions which perform invaluable service in many of our States. It is anticipated that the services of these private institutions will be used whenever it is possible to do so. In many instances it will be only through the adequate utilization of these institutions that the training called for under this act can be carried forward.

REIMBURSEMENT OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PAYMENTS

The House provision which provides for reimbursement whenever unemployment compensation payments have been paid to a trainee has been included in the conference bill. During the House debate on this bill, it was specifically noted that where such reimbursement has been made, the employer's account which has been charged as a result of the payment of unemployment compensation should be credited. Unfortunately, the Labor Department, I understand, tentatively chose last week to interpret this provision as meaning that although there is reimbursement to a State fund, the particular employer's account which has been charged should not be credited. This interpretation directly contradicts the congressional intent. Members of our committee and the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee are agreed on this point. In order to clarify this point once and for all, the manager's statement provides:

It is the intent of this subsection that if a State is reimbursed for paying unemployment compensation to trainees, that employers should not be charged with such unemployment compensation payments under the experience rating provisions of their laws, and that the trainees should not have their eligibility for unemployment compensation reduced on account of the payments they receive during training.

In view of this statement, there now is absolutely no basis for the Labor Department to misinterpret the intent of Congress. I am confident that they will not do so.

PAYMENT OF TRAINING ALLOWANCES TO YOUTHS

Although the House bill did not contain a provision which would permit the payment of training allowances to youths, the conferees agreed to include such a provision. However, this provision is precisely stated and is very carefully limited in its application. Thus, the conference substitute permits the Secretary to pay training allowances at a rate not to exceed \$20 a week to youths in their 19th, 20th, and 21st years where such allowances are necessary to provide for occupational training, but not more than 5 percent of the estimated total training allowances paid annually to the Secretary can be paid to such youths. By this pro-

vision it is intended that training allowances may be paid to those youths who have either completed their high school education or are too old or completely unsuited for further schooling of this type. In most cases, the youths receiving training allowances will be married and often times the head of a family. In no way is this provision intended to encourage youths to drop out of school when they should be continuing such schooling.

FURTHER CLARIFICATIONS OF SPECIFIC SECTIONS OF THE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, section 203(c) contains three conditions to the payment of training allowances under this bill. First, that the recipient must be unemployed; second, that he must have had not less than a 3-year attachment to the labor market; and third, that he be the head of a family or a household as defined in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. Any persons, irrespective of age, who meet all three of these criteria and who are selected for training will be entitled to training allowances. Unemployed youths between the ages of 19 and 22 who have not had at least 3 years of experience in gainful employment and who are not heads of families may, if they are receiving training, be paid a training allowance at a rate not to exceed \$20 a week.

Unemployed youths less than 19 years of age who do not meet the other two criteria specified in this section and who are selected for training can receive no training allowance in this bill.

Section 202(a) includes provision for a special program for the testing, counseling and selection of youths 16 years or older for occupational training and further schooling. The age limitation intended in this provision is 16 through 21.

Section 203(b) is intended to permit the payment of subsistence expenses and transportation costs not to exceed the rate of 10 cents per mile to any persons who are receiving training, whether or not they are eligible for, or are receiving, training allowances subject to the conditions contained in this section.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have 5 days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report just adopted.

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

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. 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. 33]

Alford	Huddleston	Rhodes, Ariz.
Andrews	Hull	Roberts, Ala.
Avery	Jensen	St. Germain
Blitch	Karth	Sheiley
Chelf	Kitchin	Smith, Miss.
Davis,	McVey	Spence
James C.	Macdonald	Steed
Davis, Tenn.	Morse	Thompson, N.J.
Flynt	Moulder	Tollefson
Gialmo	Norrell	Weaver
Grant	Powell	Whitten
Harrison, Va.	Purcell	Willis
Hoffman, Mich.	Rains	Wilson, Calif.
Hosmer	Randall	Zablocki

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 392 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

ANTITRUST CIVIL PROCESS ACT

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution—House Resolution 558—providing for the consideration of S. 167, a bill 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, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of 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. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH] 30 minutes and now yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 558 provides for the consideration of S. 167, a bill 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. The resolution provides for an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

The purpose of S. 167 is to enable the Department of Justice to obtain documentary evidence during the course of

a civil investigation to enforce the anti-trust laws.

Certainly a determination whether or not to bring a civil antitrust suit, wherever possible, should be made only after an adequate investigation. Fairness to a prospective defendant requires no less. On the other hand, to enforce the antitrust laws adequately on the civil side, the antitrust authorities must be able to make an adequate investigation to ascertain the facts.

Although the Federal Trade Commission, like many other Government agencies, has authority to procure documents for investigative purposes, the Department of Justice, which, through its Antitrust Division, is the primary enforcer of the antitrust laws, lacks such authority. This proposed legislation would merely place the Department of Justice on a parity with other Government agencies in this respect.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 558.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as stated by the gentleman from California, this provides for an open rule of 2 hours for the consideration of S. 167, which if passed will permit the Attorney General, or his assistant in charge of the Civil Division of Antitrust, to request documents from corporations, partnerships, and associations in connection with civil antitrust cases. There are some four different ways by which investigations and papers can now be obtained.

One, of course, is to ask the person being investigated or the corporation to provide them. This has not been too effective over the years. The second is the grand jury method of subpoena. The third has to do with the Federal Trade Commission.

For some 40 years they have had the power to do as is asked for in this bill and, of course, the Department of Justice could go through the Federal Trade Commission, but that is not the best way to do it. The Justice Department is reluctant to proceed in this way. Of course, the fourth is that they could file a case of an antitrust violation.

This might cause cases to be filed which later were proven unjustified. So this bill is an effort to permit the Antitrust Division to get the documents they think are necessary.

In making a change like this we must keep in mind that we do not want to ask the corporations to come in and testify against themselves. These questions were presented to the Judiciary Committee, who state there is adequate protection. Where the associations or corporations do not wish to give up the papers, then a case would have to be filed in the Federal court demanding the papers. If the Federal court held that they had to give them up, then, of course, if they did not give them up they could be held in contempt of court.

The American Bar Association has worked on the bill and, I understand, approves of it.

I request the adoption of the bill.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution, House Resolution 559, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10079) to amend section 104 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 559 provides for the consideration of H.R. 10079, a bill to amend section 104 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes. The resolution provides for an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

The purpose of H.R. 10079 is to abolish the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs of the Department of State as originally established, and to divide its present principal functions into first, a specialized office headed by an officer with the rank of Assistant Secretary of State, and second, an administrative unit charged with security functions such as investigation and supervision of personnel of the Department of State pertaining to suitability and loyalty to the United States, security of the Department of State and its establishments abroad, and physical security.

The specialized office headed by an Assistant Secretary of State would have the responsibility for: First, the administration of passport laws; second, the determination of nationality of a person outside of the United States; third, the administration of the immigration laws relating to issuance of visas; fourth, the participation of the United States in international migration organizations and the effectuation of their purposes; and fifth, such other related matters affecting consular affairs as may be assigned to the office by the Secretary of State.

The bill also would reenact three provisions of the Mutual Security Act authorizing the operation or the participation by the United States in defined programs of assistance to certain migrants and refugees, and would authorize the appropriation of funds for such programs.

In addition, the bill H.R. 10079 would authorize the appropriation of funds to

assist certain refugees from Western Hemisphere countries who fled to the United States in fear of persecution, which assistance has been hitherto rendered by using the President's contingency funds for the benefit of refugees from Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 559.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, as stated by the gentleman from Mississippi, this is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 10079, with 1 hour of general debate.

The contents of title 2 of the bill were passed last year, I believe, on the Consent Calendar. The other body added a number of amendments which were unacceptable to the House, so the matter has never been resolved. This is a further effort to try to pass into legislation several of the things which the Judiciary Committee of this body unanimously agree should be passed.

Title 2 of the bill would provide for the continuance of three programs that were in existence under the Mutual Security Act of 1953 but were not continued under the Assistance Act last year. In addition, it will provide a fourth program, which is a new program so far as Congress is concerned. These four programs I think are of interest to all of us, and I would like to mention them to you.

First, it will continue our participation in the Intergovernmental Committee on European Migration, commonly known as ICEM. The second will provide for the continuance of our participation in the United Nations High Commission for refugees. The third is a small program which the United States has been engaged in which has to do with assistance to a select category of refugees behind the Iron Curtain.

The fourth program is a new one so far as Congress is concerned and will authorize assistance in connection with the Cuban refugee program in the United States. The program has been in existence under Executive order. Funds have been provided by the Executive. This will authorize the program and permit appropriation of funds.

It is mainly for the assistance of the State of Florida that has so many people from Cuba at the present time.

No specific money is set forth in the bill. The estimates will have to be presented by the administration and subsequently considered by the appropriations bill.

Title I of the bill is new. In my opinion, this is a long overdue reorganization of the Bureau of Security and Counselor Affairs of the State Department. It will lump the new security functions and the counselor functions. It will also include a physical checkup of the establishments abroad to determine their suitability. It will provide that the head of the security unit may not be a Foreign Service officer. It is believed undesirable to have one individual investigate