

compassionate responsibility to compensate inhabitants of the Rongelap Atoll, in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, for radiation exposures sustained by them as a result of a thermonuclear detonation at Bikini Atoll in the Marshall Islands on March 1, 1954.

Sec. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated for such purpose out of the Treasury of the United States the sum of \$950,000 to be expended by the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") in the manner hereinafter provided. After deducting the amount provided for in section 5 hereof, the Secretary shall pay the remainder in equal amounts to each of the affected inhabitants of Rongelap, except that (a) with respect to each such inhabitant who has died before receipt of such payment, the Secretary shall pay such sum to the heirs or legatees of such inhabitant, and (b) with respect to any such inhabitant who is less than twenty-one years of age or who has been adjudged incompetent or insane, payment shall be made, in the discretion of the Secretary, to a parent, relative, other person, or institution for his benefit.

Sec. 3. The Secretary shall give advice concerning prudent financial management to each person receiving a payment pursuant to this Act, to the end that each such person shall have information as to methods of conserving his funds and as to suitable objects for which such funds may be expended.

Sec. 4. A payment made under the provisions of this Act shall be in full settlement and discharge of all claims against the United States arising out of the thermonuclear detonation on March 1, 1954.

Sec. 5. The Secretary is authorized to pay reasonable attorney fees for legal services rendered on behalf of the people of Rongelap prior to the date of enactment of this Act. Such fees shall be paid out of the funds authorized to be appropriated in section 2 of this Act, but the total of such fees paid shall not exceed 5 per centum of the appropriated funds.

Sec. 6. The decisions of the Secretary in carrying out the provisions of this Act shall be final and not subject to review.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this amendment offered by the Senate merely makes the most money payable to the individuals involved?

Mr. ASPINALL. That is correct. The House provided that the trust funds be expended under the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior. The Senate saw fit to make it a direct payment. The representatives of the people concerned were agreeable to the Senate amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3198) to promote the economic and social development of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes,

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:

Page 2, strike out all after line 15 over to and including line 20 on page 3.

Page 3, line 21, strike out "3" and insert "2".

Page 4, line 4, strike out "4" and insert "3".

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, in my report yesterday on this year's International Labor Organization Conference, there was included a scale of assessments for 1965, which appeared on page 18387 of yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Unfortunately, a page was inadvertently omitted so that the chart is not complete. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected to reflect the chart in its entirety.

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

There was no objection.

#### THE ATOM AND US

(Mr. BENNETT of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have just finished reading "Peace and Freedom Through Cold War Victory." I cannot agree with everything it says; for instance its suggestion that it is in the interest of U.S. security to give our allies control—independent of the United States—over decisions they may wish to make as to when they will launch nuclear weaponry furnished by us. Yet, there are other things said in this book that make very great sense to me. I heartily recommend that every American read this book. Certainly no Congressman or Senator should fail to read it at the very earliest opportunity.

It points out our failure to have a follow-on bomber in production now; and our failure to have launched by now an adequate shelter program as a war deterrent.

On disarmament, it sanely says that the arms race is not the cause of war but the "effect of the cold war started by the Communists."

The book rightly acknowledges that we are the best defended nation on earth but it sets even higher goals, I think attainable ones. It omits one thing that it might well have said: that if our country should gird its loins to be prepared even more adequately against war to thus secure a firmer peace, there would be real advantage in the antipoverty war now going on in our country. For instance, how many people could be em-

ployed in the new hardware and building programs envisioned? Together with the already enacted training bills we should just about have the unemployment problem and the poverty problem licked.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot agree that it is wise to further distribute abroad either knowledge or control of our nuclear secrets and weapons. An article in the August 10 edition of U.S. News & World Report pertinently observes as follows:

Experts see a time—and relatively soon—when as many as 20 countries may have their own A-bombs. The long-range prospect: a world armed to the teeth, with A-arms possibly in the hands of desperate or unstable rulers.

#### WHY THE WORRY?

Behind the mounting concern is this: Homemade atomic bombs—the kind that cost the United States \$2 billion to develop—can now be made for a fraction of that by a determined group of scientists, for perhaps 50 million. And the price is coming down.

Nuclear know-how, moreover, is no longer tightly held by just three or four nations, but is now widespread. Today, more than 40 nations own 600 atomic reactors. These "atoms for peace" reactors are for research and industrial uses, but many turn out plutonium, the key element in one type of nuclear bomb. More and more reactors are being built. In 3 years, peaceful reactors will be producing enough plutonium to make 100 A-bombs a year.

Another reason for growing concern is the new knowledge, now considered top secret by the United States about the gas-centrifuge method of producing enriched uranium, the key element in a second type of atomic bomb. The United States decided to impose its curtain of secrecy around the gas-centrifuge process after months of deliberation and worry about the spread of nuclear weaponry.

#### DANGER TO SECURITY?

It was Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara who first publicly called attention to official U.S. concern. In testimony before the present session of Congress, Mr. McNamara said that a large number of countries in addition to the four present nuclear powers—United States, Russia, Britain, and France—"will be able to acquire at least a few nuclear weapons and a crude delivery capability—possibly including medium-range rockets—during the next 10 years."

All this, said Mr. McNamara, "poses a severe threat to our national security."

Mr. Speaker, because I foresaw that sharing our secrets with our allies would lead to what has occurred, I voted against such sharing in the past. Today we must not go even further than secret sharing and turn over to foreign nationals the control of when these weapons shall be used. We may not always be able to control the situation; but as long as we can control it we should do so, in the interest of our own security and of international peace.

#### BEEF IMPORT QUOTAS NOW

(Mr. OLSEN of Montana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I note that on Tuesday, August 11, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], presented a resolution (H. Res. 814), providing for taking H.R. 1839 from

the Speaker's table, disagreeing to Senate amendments and request a conference with the Senate. I support the position taken by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] for the reason that I am advised that there is a provision in the Senate amendments which says that the beef import quota bill would not be operative, would not be effective during a national emergency declared by the President. Until learning of this, I supported House Resolution 812, which I heretofore introduced, and which would have taken H.R. 1839, the beef import quota bill, from the Speaker's table and agree with the Senate amendments and thus pass the bill; however, that would be a nullity, I am now informed. I am well advised by those who are learned in the laws and parliamentary procedure that this emergency provision would nullify the provision of the Senate bill. The situation being true, we who are interested in obtaining some real relief for the beef industry from the destructive competition of foreign imports, have reluctantly concluded that we must pass the resolution, House Resolution 814, and send the bill to conference.

I am solemnly promised by the House leadership that the Committee on Ways and Means will make every effort to bring to the floor of the House a satisfactory bill for the relief of the cattle industry. I strongly urge immediate relief as I have so repeated in this House several times. I note that the resolution presented by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] passed by a voice vote. I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks the remarks of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] which he made yesterday, Tuesday, August 11:

**FREE IMPORTATION OF WILD ANIMALS AND WILD BIRDS INTENDED FOR EXHIBITION**

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 814) providing for taking H.R. 1839 from the Speaker's table, disagreeing to Senate amendments, and requesting a conference with the Senate, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows: "Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution 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, with the Senate amendments thereto, be, and the same hereby are taken from the Speaker's table, to the end that the Senate amendments be, and the same are disagreed to and a conference is requested with the Senate upon the disagreeing votes of the two Houses."

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the usual 30 minutes to the minority side, to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. Speaker, pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this proceeding involves the question of quotas on foreign imports of cattle and beef.

A number of bills were introduced earlier in the session, including one by the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG] as well as one by me, to meet this situation. They were all referred to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House. But before any action was taken by that committee the Senate acted by attaching a similar bill, as a rider on a House bill. I

shall discuss this parliamentary maneuver at some length further on in my comments.

Mr. Speaker, specifically this resolution provides that upon its passage the bill, H.R. 1839, as amended, be taken from the Speaker's table, the Senate amendments be disagreed to, and the bill be sent to conference.

Mr. Speaker, this is a matter which is of great interest to a substantial number of the Members of this House. It affects the cattle industry of this country vitally, and would attempt to help them in a time of great stress to that industry.

Without discussing the merits of the bill, Mr. Speaker, this is a rather unusual situation. I hope the House will give me its attention while I call attention to the rather unusual parliamentary situation.

We have a situation in the Congress whereby a bill can be passed by the House dealing, let us say, with the propagation of bees, and when that bill goes over to the other body the other body can add an entirely foreign subject—say, for instance, the general question of foreign aid—to that House bill. Then the bill is sent back to the House, usually with the House provisions taken out entirely, and the amendment for foreign aid, or whatever foreign subject it might be, left in the bill.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bad way to legislate, and yet it is something which has been done repeatedly, particularly in the past few years.

As a result of this the Committee on Rules, at the instance of the chairman, set up a subcommittee to study that situation and to bring in an appropriate resolution which would revise the rules of the House so that that kind of parliamentary shenanigan could not go on. I happen to have been the chairman of the subcommittee which reported to the Rules Committee the appropriate amendment to the rules of the House. The amendment would merely provide that if an amendment placed on a House bill were not germane under the House rules it would not be germane when it came back from the Senate.

However, we have been unable to get that resolution out amending the rules. I do not know why, but sometimes it has proven advantageous, I suspect, to those who want to use it. I recall at one time there was a minor bill for the relief of some school district out in Missouri passed by the House and the other body put a whole civil rights bill onto that relief bill and sent it back here to the House. I say it is an abominable thing. That practice should not be pursued, but there is nothing we can do about it as long as the powers that be condone the practice.

Now, what does this do? This resolution would take this Senate amendment to the House bill and send it to conference.

Let me say very frankly again that an effort was made in the Committee on Rules by some of us who are very much interested in getting some relief for the cattle industry to adopt a rule that would accept the Senate amendment. You see, some of us wanted to use this procedure ourselves this time, I being among them. It all depends on whose ox is being gored, you understand, but the practice is still bad. So we wanted to use this gimmick or rule, rather, to take the bill from the Speaker's table and agree to the Senate amendments, which would purportedly give the relief to the cattle people that they crave; namely, some limitation upon imports.

As I said, I am discussing the parliamentary situation rather than the merits of the bill.

Now, that effort failed in the Committee on Rules. On the contrary, the resolution before us today, the resolution of the gentleman from Arkansas, the distinguished and able chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. MILLS], is before us to send it to conference.

I want to say with equal candor again that if I thought that the best interests of the cattle people, of the cattle industry, would be served by following out that original plan, I would ask you here today to vote down the previous question and permit us to amend the resolution by taking the Senate amendments, agreeing to them, and therefore passing the bill. However, there are two reasons why we are not going to ask that. Primarily I am not going to ask that because there is a provision in the Senate amendments which says that that bill would not be operative, would not be effective, during a national emergency declared by the President. I do not know how that got into this bill, but it is in there and the fact is that we are in a national emergency now which was declared by President Truman in the Korean war situation. We are still in it, and I am advised by those who are learned in the law and the parliamentary situation that this emergency provision would nullify the provisions of the Senate bill.

This being true, we, who are interested in trying to obtain some relief for the cattle industry from these foreign imports, have reluctantly come to the conclusion that our only course is to adopt the present resolution and send the bill to conference. The gentleman representing the industry, I am informed, agree.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the author of this resolution we are considering, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], has advised many of us, the majority leader and others interested, including myself, that if this resolution is adopted, that he will take it to conference and do his level best to work out some bill that the cattle industry could live with, some kind of compromise, something that could be signed by the President.

But so far as this humble Member of the House is concerned and one who is very much interested in getting the desired relief, I do not see any other course to follow except to send it to conference.

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

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman. Mr. MONAGAN. As I understand, although this bill, H.R. 1839, purports to apply to wild animals and wild birds, what we are considering at the present time has nothing whatsoever to do with that subject at all; is that correct?

Mr. COLMER. Except that the whole matter will be in conference when the bill goes to conference. I tried to explain a moment ago that entirely foreign substances was placed in this bill.

Mr. MONAGAN. Essentially what we are considering is the quota system to be imposed on the imports of meat?

Mr. COLMER. That is right.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the gentleman that apart from the increase in cost that might come and the effect on other countries in the world with whom we are trying to deal at the present time, the thing that concerns me is the fact that 2 years ago we voted here to set up a new policy on trade. We decided we were going to take away special treatment, we were not going to do anything except to apply this law across the board. It seems to me that in this instance we are making a very special exception wholly in opposition to that policy that applies to manufacturing industries and other enterprises and I personally see no reason for doing it.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will my friend from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. COLMER. Of course, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. I know my friend can answer the question. In order to keep the issue presently before the House, as my friend from Mississippi has pointed out, it is not at the