UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 115—PART 14

JULY 2, 1969, TO JULY 14, 1969

(PAGES 18185 TO 19496)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1969

property disposal program. I believe we need a fresh look at the act and an examination of the purposes for which surplus Federal land may be acquired by States and their political subdivisions at discounted prices.

First of all, we should analyze in the light of today's needs, the purposes for which such land may be acquired at reduced or no cost. Much as we may revere historic monuments, my view would be that a no less worthy purpose would be to permit cities to acquire surplus Federal real property for public housing.

Mayor Jerome P. Cavanagh, of Detroit, called my attention to the following situation: after the Detroit riots, the city was authorized to use certain of the old Fort Wayne military post for temporary housing. The Federal Surplus Property Division has now told the city that it must plan to vacate unless it wants to buy or lease the housing. Either purchase or lease would be at full market value, according to GSA.

The mayor suggested, and I agree, that if, in fact, the Federal Surplus Property Act does not include housing as one of the purposes for which a municipality would be eligible to purchase at less than market value, an amendment to the act should be sought which would include public housing.

Accordingly, I am today introducing such a proposed amendment. I note that the Senate Government Operations Committee's Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Surplus Property is meeting July 9 and 10 on a number of bills amending this act, and I would hope that this amendment could receive consideration, along with the other bills before the subcommittee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2563) to amend section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the disposal of surplus urban real property to public housing agencies for use for public housing purposes, introduced by Mr. HART, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 2564 AND S. 2565—INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AUTHORIZING THE ACQUISITION OF THE INHOLDINGS IN THE EVERGLADES NATIONAL PARK, FLA.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am today introducing two bills to authorize the acquisition of the inholdings in the Everglades National Park, Fla. Having spearheaded the establishment of the park when I was Governor, and negotiated with the Department of the Interior the agreement for the ultimate setting up of the park, and as Governor signed the first deed conveying State lands for ultimate inclusion in the park, I am very deeply interested in seeing that the private holdings within the park boundaries are acquired.

Since coming to the Senate I have introduced various bills relating to the park, and in 1957 I introduced a bill, cosponsored by Senator SMATHERS, to finalize the boundaries of the park by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to acquire the inholdings therein, and providing for further transfer of certain lands by the State and Federal Government, and providing for the acceptance of substantial other lands to add to the park in the vicinity of Everglades City and the Ten Thousand Islands. This legislation was enacted into Public Law 85–482 dated July 2, 1958, but due to committee action, the authorization was limited to $2 million for acquisition of the inholdings to match the $2 million which the State had already given, in addition to its gift of some 850,000 acres of land and water.

Up to 1965 efforts to obtain appropriations for the acquisition of the inholdings in the park were to no avail even though a budget request was submitted. In fiscal year 1965, however, $452,000 was included in the supplemental bill to purchase 4,420 acres. Subsequently, additional appropriations were made up to the legal authority of $2 million.

Mr. President, the limitation on authorization contained in Public Law 85–482 and the consistent refusal of Congress to fulfill the Government's responsibility to acquire the private inholdings results in the fact that there still remains some 74,638 acres yet to be acquired at an estimated cost of $20 million.

Mr. President, with all the emphasis being placed on the assurance of an adequate water supply to the park, and let me say I am in accord with the furnishing of such water supply, I believe it is incumbent upon the Government to live up to its agreement and to complete the acquisition of the inholdings in the park, which has been pending for a great number of years.

Mr. President, I introduce a bill authorizing the appropriation of $1 million for the acquisition of 6,640 acres of land, known as the Flagler tract, in the Hole in the Donut section of the park, and ask that it be received and immediately referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. President, I also introduce a bill authorizing an appropriation of $10 million for the acquisition of the remaining private inholdings in the park of some 67,998 acres of land and ask that it be received and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

For clarification, Mr. President, I have submitted two bills since there is an emergency need for the acquisition of the 6,640 acres of land contained in the first bill I have offered as the Department of the Interior currently has an option on the acreage that will expire prior to the end of the year. And while it is of great importance that all of the remaining acreage be acquired, and the sooner such acquisition is accomplished the less likely it is that the cost of acquisition will be increased, the emergency situation applicable to the Flagler tract does not apply with regard to other acquisitions, although the private owners have been waiting for years for the Government to fulfill its obligation.

Mr. President, I might also add that it is my understanding that the funds provided by Public Law 90–401, to amend title I of the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965, and for other purposes, could be used for the acquisition of the inholdings in the park provided that the authorization had been enacted. Although I understand informally that funds of the Land and Water Conservation Act for the next fiscal year have already been committed, I am hopeful that, by affirmative action on the bills I have just sent to the desk, the Department of the Interior will be able to rearrange priorities to expedite the long overdue acquisition of the inholdings in the park.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills (S. 2564) to amend the act fixing the boundary of Everglades National Park, Fla., and authorizing the acquisition of land therein, in order to authorize an additional amount for the acquisition of certain lands for such park; and (S. 2565) to amend the act fixing the boundary of Everglades National Park, Fla., and authorizing the acquisition of land therein, in order to increase the authorization for such acquisitions, introduced by Mr. HOLLAND, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2568—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL ALLEVIATING THE BORDER COMMUTER LABOR PROBLEM

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, so as to make it an unfair labor practice for an employer to employ any alien unlawfully present in the United States, or to employ aliens whose principal dwelling places are in a foreign country during a labor dispute.

Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, I am acutely aware of the adverse social and economic impact caused by commuters who cross the U.S.-Mexican border to work in Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California. Recent hearings by the Migratory Labor Subcommittee revealed the severity of this problem.

The commuters I refer to are workers, predominantly from Mexico, that gain entry into the United States for a day, or a week, or a month or more, by displaying either a form I–151—permanent alien registration card—commonly referred to as a green card—or a certificate showing a U.S. birthplace, or a temporary 3-day visa—white card—or a baptismal certificate. Large numbers of illegal entrants also come across the border to work in the United States.

The ready availability of workers along the border areas has contributed to the depression of living and working conditions in the United States and Mexico, and has created a situation resembling our 1930's depression economy. Illustrative of the commuter's adverse impact on our economy are the following data: 90 percent of commuters are in eight border areas from Texas, Arizona, and California; unemployment in Texas border cities

is almost 95 percent greater than in Texas interior cities; alien commuters work most often in the lowest skilled, most menial and lowest paid jobs; wages for seasonal farmwork in Texas border areas are over 30 percent less than in the rest of the State; firms that employ commuters tend to pay lower wages than firms that employ only U.S. residents and tend to pay lower wages than are paid U.S. residents for the same work; wage rates paid to commuters are often less than what unemployed U.S. residents say they are able to accept; California farm wage rates are lowest in the border areas where the bulk of the farm labor force is composed of commuters; commuters constitute about 85 percent of the farmwork force in California Imperial Valley, where unemployment in 1966 was 10 percent of the labor force, twice the average rate for the entire State. Furthermore, an adverse impact on the Mexican economy is created by the introduction of U.S. dollars.

Another major adverse effect is that community and union organization efforts are rendered difficult and often ineffective due to the ready availability of workers at such low wages and poor living conditions. By permitting commuters to work indiscriminately in our economy and then take their wages back to the low-cost, low-wage Mexican economy, living and wage standards of U.S. citizens are undermined, decent job opportunities are damaged, and there is an impact throughout our entire Nation. The economic depression no doubt causes U.S. citizens to migrate north, and to our cities, in a desperate search for work. Commuters too often have little or no stake in the resolution of domestic labor disputes or in a sustained effort to improve living conditions. They simply return to the Mexican economy with their earnings. It is widely recognized that commuters are used as strikebreakers during labor organizing efforts to obtain collective bargaining agreements in California and Texas. It has been reliably estimated that 40 percent of the workers at 24 struck grape ranches in the California area in 1968 were Mexican national green-card holders.

This situation has a particular impact on the migrant and seasonal farmworker who is powerless to affect his own unemployment and underemployment, powerless to fight job displacement, and powerless in union or community organization efforts to improve his living and working conditions.

A proposal that is designed to alleviate some aspects of the commuter problem is contained in a bill which I am introducing today. The proposal would add a new section 8(a)(6) to the National Labor Relations Act making it an unfair labor practice for an employer to hire any alien unlawfully present in the United States, or for an employer to hire during a labor dispute as replacements for a regular employee, any person lawfully admitted to the United States whose permanent residence is in a country contiguous to the United States. It is further proposed that the present section 10(l) of the NLRA be amended to provide mandatory and speedy injunctions for violations of the proposed new section 8(a)(6). The proposal contemplates coverage of the agriculture industry even if legislative proposals—such as S. 8—to remove the exclusion of agriculture employees are not enacted.

Other proposals relating to the border commuter labor problem are already under consideration. Today Congressman FRANK THOMPSON, of New Jersey, is introducing a bill similar to the bill I now am introducing, and hearings are scheduled on his bill for next week. Senator EDWARD KENNEDY has introduced another bill (S. 1694), which I am cosponsoring, that would amend our Immigration and Naturalization laws by refining the commuter labor system. I understand that the Judiciary Subcommittee, which has legislative jurisdiction, and on which Senator KENNEDY serves, will soon be holding hearings on that bill. There are companion bills to the KENNEDY bill on the House side. I do hope that hearings, in addition to the investigative hearings already conducted by the Migratory Labor Subcommittee, can be held soon on my proposal today.

The investigative hearings held by the Migratory Labor Subcommittee on May 28 and 29, 1969, confirmed the fact that the border commuter labor problem is quite complicated and difficult to define. It is not subject to easy solution. One matter is certain, however, and it is that the best way to cure the problems of poverty, low wages, and deplorable living conditions along our Southwestern border communities is to remove the barriers that stand in front of human beings who are trying to gain their fair share of the American dream that has been denied them for so long. A major hurdle to strong, effective, self-help union and community organization is the continuation of the commuter system as we know it today. My bill will hopefully eliminate at least one aspect of the problem by making it an unfair Labor practice under the NLRA for employers to hire illegal entrants and commuter strikebreakers. I am open to further suggestions to alleviating the problem from my colleagues and interested parties.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2568) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, so as to make it an unfair labor practice for an employer to employ any alien unlawfully present in the United States, or to employ aliens whose principal dwelling places are in a foreign country during a labor dispute, introduced by Mr. MONDALE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2568

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 8(a) and section 10(1) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, are amended as follows:

SECTION 1. Add a new paragraph to section 8(a) to read as follows:

"(6) to employ any alien unlawfully present in the United States; or to hire during a labor dispute as replacements for a person or persons ordinarily employed by such employer any alien lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence whose principal, actual dwelling place is in a foreign country contiguous to the United States; Provided that this section 8(a)(6) shall apply to any employer, whether or not he employs 'employees' as defined in section 2(3)."

SEC. 2. Amend the first sentence of section 10(1) of the National Labor Relations Act by adding the words "or section 8(a)(6)," after "or section 8(b)(7),".

S. 2569—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE BANK HOLDING COMPANY ACT OF 1956

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the bill which the senior Senator from Utah and I introduce today, by request, deals with a banking matter in the District of Columbia which we feel needs consideration. We introduce this bill so that the issue may be given attention and the matter can be given a forum.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in full in the RECORD, and I also ask unanimous consent that a summary of the proposed legislation be printed in the RECORD following the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and summary will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2569) to amend section 3(d) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. BENNETT), by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2569

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3(d) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1842(d)) is amended by deleting the period at the end of the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ": *Provided,* That the foregoing prohibition shall not be applicable in the case of any bank holding company if (1) the operations of such bank holding company's banking subsidiaries were principally conducted in the District of Columbia on the effective date of this proviso, or on the date on which such company became a bank holding company, whichever is later, and the additional bank the assets or shares of which, or other interest in which, is to be acquired is located in the National Capital region, as defined in section 103(a) of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960 (40 U.S.C. 652(a)), or (2) the operations of such bank holding company's banking subsidiaries were principally conducted in a State contiguous to the District of Columbia on such effective date, or on the date on which such company became a bank holding company, whichever is later, and the additional bank the assets or shares of which, or other interest in which, is to be acquired is located in the District of Columbia."

The summary of the bill, presented by Mr. SPARKMAN, is as follows: