

Gallagher	Lesinski	Reuss
Garmatz	Levering	Rhodes, Ariz.
Gathings	Libonati	Rhodes, Pa.
Gavin	Lindsay	Richman
George	Loser	Riley
Glaimo	McCormack	Rivers, Alaska
Glenn	McCulloch	Roberts
Goodell	McDowell	Rodino
Granahan	McFall	Rogers, Colo.
Grant	McGinley	Rogers, Fla.
Gray	McGovern	Rogers, Mass.
Green, Oreg.	McMillan	Rogers, Tex.
Green, Pa.	Macdonald	Roosevelt
Griffin	Machrowicz	Roush
Griffiths	Mack, Ill.	Rutherford
Gross	Mack, Wash.	Santangelo
Hagen	Madden	Saund
Halpern	Mahon	Schenck
Hardy	Maillard	Schwengel
Hargis	Marshall	Scott
Harmon	Matthews	Selden
Harris	May	Shelley
Healey	Metcalf	Sheppard
Hébert	Meyer	Sikes
Hechler	Miller, Clem	Siler
Hemphill	Miller,	Simpson, Ill.
Henderson	George P.	Sisk
Hoffman, Ill.	Milliken	Slack
Hoffman, Mich.	Mills	Smith, Iowa
Hogan	Mitchell	Smith, Miss.
Hollifield	Moeller	Spence
Holland	Montoya	Springer
Holtzman	Moorhead	Staggers
Huddleston	Morris, N. Mex.	Stratton
Hull	Morris, Okla.	Stubblefield
Ikard	Moss	Sullivan
Irwin	Moulder	Teague, Tex.
Jarman	Multer	Thomas
Jennings	Mumma	Thompson, N.J.
Jensen	Murphy	Thompson, Tex.
Johnson, Calif.	Natcher	Thomson, Wyo.
Johnson, Md.	Nelsen	Thornberry
Johnson, Wis.	Nix	Toll
Jonas	Norblad	Tollefson
Jones, Ala.	Norrell	Trimble
Jones, Mo.	O'Brien, Ill.	Tuck
Judd	O'Hara, Ill.	Ullman
Karsten	O'Hara, Mich.	Vanik
Karth	O'Konski	Van Zandt
Kasem	O'Neill	Vinson
Kastenmeyer	Oliver	Walsh
Kearns	Ostertag	Walter
Kee	Patman	Watts
Kilgore	Perkins	Weaver
King, Calif.	Pfost	Westland
King, Utah	Philbin	Whitener
Kirwan	Poage	Whitten
Kitchin	Poff	Wier
Kluczynski	Porter	Willis
Knox	Price	Withrow
Kowalski	Prokop	Wolf
Landrum	Pucinski	Wright
Lane	Quie	Yates
Langen	Quigley	Young
Lankford	Rabaut	Zablocki
Latta	Rains	Zelenko
Lennon	Randall	

NAYS—53.

Allen	Haley	Pelly
Arends	Harrison	Pirnie
Baring	Herlong	Ray
Bates	Hess	Reece, Tenn.
Bosch	Hiestand	Rees, Kans.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hoeven	Robison
Chiperfield	Holt	St. George
Cramer	Hosmer	Saylor
Cunningham	Johansen	Scherer
Curtis, Mass.	Keith	Short
Curtis, Mo.	Kelly	Smith, Kans.
Derounian	Lafore	Smith, Va.
Dorn, N.Y.	Laird	Utt
Dorn, S.C.	McDonough	Weis
Ford	McIntire	Widnall
Frelinghuysen	Meader	Wilson
Gary	Michel	Younger
Gubser	Murray	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Dingell

NOT VOTING—78.

Abernethy	Cannon	Fino
Alford	Cederberg	Fisher
Alger	Collier	Flynt
Anfuso	Colmer	Fogarty
Ashley	Dague	Hall
Becker	Davis, Tenn.	Halleck
Bolton	Dawson	Hays
Bow	Dollinger	Horan
Bowles	Dooley	Jackson
Boykin	Elliott	Johnson, Colo.
Burke, Ky.	Evins	Keogh
Canfield	Farbstein	Kilburn

Kilday	O'Brien, N.Y.	Steed
Lipscomb	Osmer	Taber
McSweeney	Passman	Taylor
Magnuson	Pilcher	Teague, Calif.
Martin	Pillon	Teller
Mason	Powell	Thompson, La.
Marrow	Preston	Udall
Miller, N.Y.	Rivers, S.C.	Van Pelt
Minshall	Rooney	Wainwright
Monagan	Rostenkowski	Wampler
Moore	Shiple	Wharton
Morgan	Simpson, Pa.	Williams
Morrison	Smith, Calif.	Winstead

So the bill was passed.  
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Wampler for, with Mr. Dingell against.  
Mr. Preston for, with Mr. Lipscomb against.  
Mr. Horan for, with Mr. Taylor against.  
Mr. Cederberg for, with Mr. Osmer against.  
Mr. Collier for, with Mr. Teague of California against.  
Mr. Wainwright for, with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania against.  
Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Taber against.  
Mr. Dollinger for, with Mr. Kilburn against.  
Mr. Anfuso for, with Mr. Van Pelt against.  
Mr. Farbstein for, with Mr. Minshall against.  
Mr. Teller for, with Mrs. Bolton against.  
Mr. Williams for, with Mr. Bow against.  
Mr. Winstead for, with Mr. Smith of California against.  
Mr. Colmer for, with Mr. Jackson against.  
Mr. Rooney for, with Mr. Becker against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Alger.  
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Wharton.  
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Pilon.  
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Martin.  
Mr. Hays with Mr. Halleck.  
Mr. Johnson of Colorado with Mr. Fino.  
Mr. McSweeney with Mr. Dague.  
Mr. Monagan with Mr. Marrow.  
Mr. Bowles with Mr. Moore.  
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Miller of New York.  
Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Mason.  
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Dooley.  
Mr. Evins with Mr. Canfield.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WAMPLER]. I voted "no." If Mr. WAMPLER were present, he would vote "yea." Therefore, I withdraw my "no" vote and vote "present."

Mr. AYRES changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at such point as they may wish in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDING COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the

Speaker's desk the bill (S. 2424) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to provide that the equal-time provisions with respect to candidates for public office shall not apply to news and other similar programs, 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 Arkansas. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: MESSRS. HARRIS, ROGERS of Texas, FLYNT, MOSS, BENNETT of Michigan, YOUNGER, and AVERY.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT REFORM LEGISLATION

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, because of many requests from Members of the House and Senate for information as to the effects of the Landrum-Griffin bill, Senator KENNEDY and I have prepared the following analysis of that bill's secondary boycott and hot cargo provisions. The following analysis sets forth the differences between the bills passed by the House and Senate:

SECONDARY BOYCOTTS AND HOT CARGO CONTRACTS

The House and Senate bills contain radically different provisions dealing with activities often brought under the misleading slogan "secondary boycotts." The phrase "secondary boycott" has no exact meaning today. The nature of the differences between the House and Senate bills can only be understood by agreeing upon more exact terminology and talking about specific kinds of activities or contracts.

Historically a "primary boycott" is a refusal to have dealings with an offending person. To induce customers not to buy from an offending grocery store would be a primary boycott. To persuade grocery stores not to buy Swift products would still be a primary boycott. For plumbing contractors not to buy the products of United States Pipe Co. would be a primary boycott. In each case the only economic pressure is leveled at the offending person—in terms of labor cases at the employer involved in the labor dispute.

The element of "secondary activity" is introduced when there is a refusal to have dealings with one who has dealings with the offending person. If housewives refuse to deal with any grocery store which deals with Swift & Co., there is a secondary boycott. It is also a secondary boycott for members of the Plumbers Union to refuse to

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is on the calendar Order No. 228, S. 1474, relating to the extension of the Reorganization Act, which bill was reported by the Committee on Government Operations.

The title of the bill indicates that it is a permanent extension, which is not the case. The bill was brought up on the Consent Calendar, and it was objected to. The authority runs out this year. I wondered when the bill was going to be brought up for debate and discussion.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I will try to determine that after the policy committee meets. The policy committee has not agreed to schedule it as yet. We have so much scheduled I do not know when we can take that up. We shall have to consider the roads bill, the civil rights bill, and the labor bill. The bill the Senator mentions is something that will have to be taken up by the policy committee. We did have some measures that were cleared, but we did not clear this one.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am not personally interested in it, but I was curious.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand. I am answering the Senator's question as best I can.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The other bill I wanted to ask the Senator about was Calendar No. 655, Senate bill 662, to amend section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, which was passed last year by the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I just announced to the Senate that bill will be taken up.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I appreciate the Senator's accommodation.

How about Calendar No. 664, Senate bill 2522, to provide for the enrichment and sanitary packaging of certain donated commodities and to establish experimental food stamp allotment programs?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That bill was reported on August 11, and the policy committee has not acted on it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to inquire with respect to Order No. 133, S. 91, a bill reported on March 24 unanimously by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Is there any prospect of that bill being called up?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes. It has been cleared. If we can stop Senators from making speeches, perhaps we can get some of these bills up for consideration. I do not think that bill will be taken up this week. I am informed the Senator from Delaware has some questions to ask about it. He has asked to be notified. But we have cleared the bill.

I hope Senators will understand that in view of all of these bills that have been enumerated and others, like the roads bill, the labor conference report, the housing bill, on which there will probably be a conference report, and the

civil rights bill, when we get to that, we are going to have to come in early and stay late if we expect to recess any time in the foreseeable future.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to have the majority leader seek a unanimous-consent agreement at a relatively early date on S. 91.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator from Delaware were present, I would propose it now.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I would be constrained to object.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I may say to the Senator I was making no such request. I was pointing out that the Senator from Delaware wanted to be notified.

#### AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, RELATING TO EQUAL-TIME PROVISIONS TO CANDIDATES FOR PUBLIC OFFICE

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House on Senate bill 2424, to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to provide that the equal-time provisions with respect to candidates for public office shall not apply to news and other similar programs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2424) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to provide that the equal-time provisions with respect to candidates for public office shall not apply to news and other similar programs, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 315(a) of the Federal Communications Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 315. (a) If any licensee shall permit any person who is a legally qualified candidate for any public office to use a broadcasting station, he shall afford equal opportunities to all other such candidates for that office in the use of such broadcasting station: *Provided*, That such licensee shall have no power of censorship over the material broadcast under the provisions of this section. No obligation is hereby imposed upon any licensee to allow the use of its station by any such candidate. Appearance by a legally qualified candidate on any bona fide newscast (including news interviews) or on any on-the-spot coverage of news events (including but not limited to political conventions and activities incidental thereto), where the appearance of the candidate on such newscast, interview, or in connection with such coverage is incidental to the presentation of news, shall not be deemed to be use of a broadcasting station within the meaning of this subsection."

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, ask for a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island explain the amendment?

Mr. PASTORE. The House amendment is much more restrictive than the bill as passed by the Senate. However, I do not think the two bodies are too far apart; and I believe that in a conference we shall be able to resolve the differences between the two Houses, and then to submit to the Senate a report which will be satisfactory.

Mr. BRIDGES. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. PASTORE, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, and Mr. SCOTT the conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### STATE TAXATION OF INCOME DERIVED FROM INTERSTATE COMMERCE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2524) relating to the power of the States to impose net income taxes on income derived from interstate commerce.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. What is the business now pending before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill now before the Senate is Senate bill 2524. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, how much time do I have left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One minute remains to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield without losing any of my time.

Mr. CARROLL. May I ask who is in charge of the opposition time?

Mr. JAVITS. I am.

Mr. CARROLL. Will the Senator yield me a few minutes?

Mr. JAVITS. I cannot. There are solicitations for time on this side of the aisle, and I cannot yield time to the Senator.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Minnesota may have an additional 5 minutes, chargeable to neither side.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that 10 additional minutes, 5 minutes to each side, be granted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. We were engaged in a discussion as to the effect of the Supreme Court's decisions. In my opinion, if we can we should have the matter clarified, by relating it to page 2, line 12, of S. 2524.

May we have order in the Chamber, Mr. President?