

Announcement

from the Copyright Office, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. 20559

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATES ON CONFERENCE REPORTS ON THE COPYRIGHT LAW REVISION

Debates on conference reports in the Senate and the House of Representatives on copyright law revision appearing on pages SI7251 through SI7253, SI7256 through SI7257, and HI2017 through HI2018, respectively, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Volume 122, Number 150 (daily edition, September 30, 1976) are reproduced below:

Senate

COPYRIGHT LAW REVISION— CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I nit a report of the committee of conference on S. 22 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. CURTIS). The report will be stated by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 22) for the general revision of the copyright law, title 17 of the United States Code, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses this report, signed by all of the conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

The Senate proceeded to consider the report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of Sept. 30, 1976.)

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the conference report has been signed by all the conferees on the part of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

The long journey of this legislation in the Senate began on August 18, 1965, when the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights commenced hearings on a bill for the general revision of the copyright law. I said at that time that my sole objective "was to devise a new copyright statute that would encourage creativity and protect the interests which the public has in the subject matter of this legislation." I believe these

goals have been substantially accomplished in the conference report.

This is not the proper occasion to review the protracted and, at times, acrimonious history of this legislation. Much will be written on that subject in the future. Rather, I believe it is appropriate today to take satisfaction in the successful completion of this monumental legislative project, which is entirely the work product of the legislative branch. Considering the controversies that existed on certain issues in the past, it is gratifying that S. 22 passed the Senate in this Congress by a vote of 97 to 0.

I believe that the final version of this legislation is just and equitable between the creators of copyrighted materials, and the users thereof.

Mr. President, I wish to thank all of my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee and others who have worked with us in developing and processing this legislation. There were many issues that had to be resolved, there were differing opinions that had to be discussed, and a lot of give and take had to occur in order for this bill to emerge; but everyone worked in good faith, with a purpose to revise the copyright laws of this country, which had not been revised since 1909, and we do believe, now, that we have a good bill. In accomplishing that purpose, we were greatly aided by the committee staff; and, Mr. President, I would be greatly remiss in meeting my responsibilities as chairman of the subcommittee that processed this legislation if I did not acknowledge and express deep gratification for the staff assistance we were so fortunate to have throughout our drafting, revising and processing of this measure. The subcommittee staff, under

the able direction of Mr. Tom Brennan, gave expert counsel and advice at every stage of work and consideration of this bill—counsel and advice of such quality as guided the committee unerringly to a successful conclusion of the stupendous task that was involved in this important legislative undertaking. We are indeed grateful to Tom and his loyal assistants.

Again, Mr. President, I express my deepest gratitude for the assistance given to me by my colleagues who served on the committee with me.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, if there are no other Senators who wish to address themselves to the conference report, I would like, if the Senator from Arkansas does not object, to have a quorum call so that we can alert Senators to the fact that this conference report is before the Senate. I have had several Senators mention the importance of this matter. And I think we might want to have a rollcall vote; it is a very historic and important piece of legislation.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I would be very happy to. As I pointed out, it passed the Senate by a vote of 97 to 0, but it is a historic bill of great importance, as the Senator says, and the conferees were able to iron out the differences, I think, most satisfactorily to everyone.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I join in support of the conference report on S. 22, the first general revision of the copyright law since 1909. This is an historic day and one that would not have been possible without the leadership and support of the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights. I particularly commend the Senator from Arkansas for his dedication to resolving the complex issues presented by this legislation.

S. 22 contains a number of important provisions which have far-reaching implications for our society. I address myself to several of those provisions.

During Senate debate on S. 22, an amendment was proposed that would have removed the compulsory license fee for juke boxes from periodic review by the Copyright Royalty Tribunal. That amendment was defeated. It is my understanding that under the review provisions of chapter 8 of S. 22, as agreed upon by the Senate-House conferees, it will be possible to have full-periodic review of the juke box performance royalty by the Copyright Royalty Tribunal.

Section 108 of the bill is also of particular interest to me. In 1974, during Senate debate on S. 1361, I proposed an amendment to section 108 which was intended to permit libraries and archives, subject to the general conditions of that section, to make off-the-air videotape recordings of television news programs. The purpose of that clause was to prevent the copyright law from precluding such operations as the Vanderbilt University Television News Archive, which makes videotape recordings of television news programs, prepares indexes of the contents, and leases copies of complete broadcasts or compilations of coverage of specified subjects for limited periods upon request from scholars and researchers.

Mr. President, the House accepted the Senate language with reference to this matter except for the addition of the words "by lending." However, I found the reference to this clause in the House report to be confusing. As the original sponsor, my understanding of section 108(f)(3) is that it is not intended to limit the types of programs that can be reproduced or distributed under this clause to daily network newscasts. Programs that would come within the scope of the clause include local, regional, or network newscasts, interviews concerning current news events, and on-the-spot coverage of news events. Furthermore, it is not intended to limit in any way the means or physical form a library or archives may choose in which to fix or reproduce programs under the clause.

Mr. President, I bring one other section of this bill to the attention of my colleagues. During the last three sessions of Congress, I introduced legislation that would have required the Librarian of Congress to establish and maintain a repository for radio and television programs of historic importance. My purpose in proposing such legislation was to

insure that historians and other scholars studying our society have the opportunity to review the product of our electronic communications media.

Although such institutions as Vanderbilt University compile and maintain collections of various kinds of programs, there is not national repository for the preservation of news and entertainment programs.

I am, therefore, gratified that S. 22 contains authorization for the Librarian of Congress to establish the American Television and Radio Archives as a repository for the preservation of our television and radio heritage. The Librarian is authorized to obtain both entertainment and news programs and most importantly to publish catalogs and indexes of the collections and compile programs by subject matter without abridgment or editing, and distribute these compilations by loan to any person engaged in research.

Establishment of the American Television and Radio Archives will correct a serious deficiency existing in the historical records of our society. In a year when the United States is celebrating its 200th birthday, it is fitting that we should dedicate ourselves to the preservation of the material that will illuminate our Nation's performance in the next 200 years.

In closing, I commend Tom Brennan, counsel to the Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights Subcommittee, and Barbara Ringer, Registrar of Copyrights, for their untiring efforts on behalf of copyright revision.

I urge the Senate to approve the conference report on S. 22.

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. Mr. President, last February we passed the copyright bill by a vote of 97 to 0. This unanimous vote was a tribute to the skill, wisdom, and leadership of the chairman of the Patents, Trademarks and Copyright Subcommittee, the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McCLELLAN). I hope and expect that he will again achieve such fitting unanimity in the upcoming vote on the conference report.

The bill in its final form represents a fair balancing of the various interests. We have protected the interests of the consuming public—the viewers, the readers, and the listeners—without encroaching on the rights of the creators—the writers, the composers, and the actors and directors. The intermediaries also have been fairly considered.

My one regret is that we failed to enact in my last year in the Senate my performers' rights bill. I have championed this concept for my entire career in the House and Senate. The performing artist is the only contributor on the recording scene who has suffered neglect under the bill we are called upon to approve today.

I take some satisfaction, however, in pointing out that the copyright revision bill reported by the conference committee contains a provision directing the Register of Copyrights to prepare a report setting forth recommendations on a performance right for performers and

owners of copyrighted sound recordings. After advocating such legislation for more than 30 years, I am heartened to see that serious and deliberate consideration will finally be given to this issue.

Extensive hearings have already been held on my performance rights proposal during this last session, and the testimony received convinced me more than ever of the equity of, and the need for, this legislation. The United States has long been out of step with prevailing practices in most nations of the Western World with respect to performance rights in sound recordings. The impact on those who oppose it should be minimal. What is significant to the fundamental system of copyright will be enormous. It will establish once and for all that those who exploit for commercial gain the creative works of others have a legal as well as a moral obligation to compensate the creators of those works.

I earnestly hope, and urge, that the report of the Register of Copyrights will provide the vehicle for the performance rights issue to be addressed on its merits in the next Congress.

Another issue that was subject to controversy was the so-called manufacturing clause. The Senate bill had preserved this provision to safeguard the U.S. printing industry. The House, however, chose to delete it, while agreeing to an extension of the phaseout date. The extra time will enable Congress to take a close look at the dangers faced by the printing industry in this country.

To insure that Congress has adequate and accurate information on which to base its reassessment before the phaseout takes place, Senator McCLELLAN and I have written to the Register of Copyrights requesting that such a study be timely undertaken. We have received assurances that the Register would direct that such a study be undertaken.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of the letter from Senator McCLELLAN and myself be reprinted in the Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C., September 30, 1978.

Ms. BARBARA RINGER,
Register of Copyrights,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Ms. RINGER: We have discussed with you the necessity of making a thorough study of the ramifications of removal of the so-called manufacturing clause of the Copyright Bill before July 1, 1982, the phaseout date established in S. 22.

As you know, the Senate proposed that Section 601 remain in the law and not be phased out. Our position is well-developed in the Senate Judiciary Committee Report (No. 94-473) dated November 20, 1975, at pages 146 to 151.

Our conclusion appears in two paragraphs at page 148, which read, as follows:

"On balance it appears that, although there is no justification on principle for a manufacturing requirement in the copyright law, there may still be some economic justification for it. Section 601 represents a substantial liberalization that will remove many of the inequities of the present manufacturing requirement. The real issue that has be-

YEAS—75

Aboureek	Garn	Moss
Allen	Goldwater	Muskie
Baker	Gravel	Nelson
Bartlett	Griffin	Nunn
Bayh	Hansen	Packwood
Biden	Hart, Gary	Pastore
Brock	Haskell	Pearson
Brooke	Hatfield	Pell
Bumpers	Hathaway	Percy
Burdick	Helms	Proxmire
Byrd,	Hollings	Randolph
Harry F. Jr.	Hruska	Roth
Byrd, Robert C.	Huddleston	Schweiker
Cannon	Humphrey	Scott, Hugh
Case	Jackson	Stennis
Clark	Javits	Stevenson
Cranston	Johnston	Stone
Culver	Laxalt	Symington
Curtis	Leahy	Talmadge
Domenici	Magnuson	Tower
Durkin	Mathias	Tunney
Eagleton	McClellan	Weicker
Eastland	McClure	Williams
Fannin	McIntyre	Young
Fong	Metcalfe	
Ford	Morgan	

COPYRIGHT LAW REVISION—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the conference report on the bill (S. 22) for the general revision of the Copyright Law, title 17 of the United States Code, and for other purposes.

Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the adoption of the conference report on the copyright bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD, I announce that the Senator from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN), the Senator from Florida (Mr. CHILES), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PHILIP A. HART), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTGOMERY), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RUSKOFF), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Ohio (Mr. GLENN), the Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MCGOVERN), and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RUSKOFF) would vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN, I announce that the Senator from Maryland (Mr. BEALL), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON), the Senator from New York (Mr. BUCKLEY), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. STAFFORD), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT), and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT) is absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 75, nays 0, as follows:

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—25

Beall	Hartke	Ribicoff
Bellmon	Inouye	Scott,
Bentsen	Kennedy	William L.
Buckley	Long	Sparkman
Chiles	Mansfield	Stafford
Church	McGee	Stevens
Dole	McGovern	Taft
Glenn	Mondale	Thurmond
Hart, Philip A.	Montoya	

So the conference report was agreed to. (During the preceding vote, the following occurred:)

Mr. GOLDWATER, Regular order, Mr. President.

Mr. HELMS, Mr. President, before the Chair announces the vote, let us have order in the Senate, because the Senator from North Carolina is going to seek recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FORD). The Senator's point is well taken. The Senate will please come to order.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD, Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. JACKSON, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD and Mr. HELMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FORD). The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD, Mr. President, with respect to—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator suspend. I ask the Senate to come to order. Will the Senators please clear the well. The Senator is entitled to be heard. If the Senators care to carry on a conversation the cloakrooms can be used.

The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD, Mr. President, without losing my right to the floor I yield to the distinguished Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN) for not to exceed 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized. Without objection, it is so ordered.

tween Section 601 and complete repeal is an economic one, and on purely economic grounds the possible dangers to the American printing industry in removing all restrictions on foreign manufacture outweigh the possible benefits—repeal would bring to American authors and publishers.

"The committee is aware that the concern on both sides is not so much with the present but with the future, and, because they machines and devices for reproducing copy-righted text matter are in a state of rapid development, the future in this area is unpredictable: Outright repeal of the manufacturing requirement should be accomplished as soon as it can be shown convincingly that the effects on the U.S. printing industry as a whole would not be serious. Meanwhile the best approach lies in the compromise embodied in Section 601 of the present bill."

In the course of our conversations, we were gratified to learn of your willingness to undertake a study of the economic ramifications and possible dangers to the U.S. printing and book manufacturing industry if this protection were ended. Further, we were pleased to note that you intended to report to Congress on your conclusions in sufficient time prior to July 1, 1982 to allow the Congress to amend the Copyright law to retain the manufacturing clause if your conclusions suggest that such were appropriate. Your formal recommendations to the Congress would of course be given great weight.

We would suggest the parameters of such a study to be roughly as follow:

(a) Participants: Printing and book manufacturing industry, graphic arts unions, publishers and other interested parties.

(b) Subject Matter: Economic impact on U.S. book manufacturing industry; U.S. labor rates compared with those abroad; industry health, import on jobs in U.S. and U.S. industry; advances in printing technology that are relevant; progress on implementation of the Toronto Agreement of 1968; ramifications of granting copyright monopoly on book manufacturing industry; and other relevant factors that you should deem appropriate.

(c) Procedure: It would appear appropriate to have informal discussions with the parties in a relaxed atmosphere and attempt to marshal all the facts and statistics without resorting to formal hearings. Adequate public records and minutes can be kept to keep all parties apprised of what information has been furnished.

(d) Timetable: The study would be launched about January 1, 1981, and would continue for approximately four months until April 30, 1981. The Copyright Office could then prepare its final findings and recommendations for the Congress to be filed on or about July 1, 1981. This would allow the Congress approximately one year to analyze the report, conduct hearings, and make its decision whether the manufacturing clause protection should be continued beyond 1982.

We would appreciate your views on this matter at your earliest convenience.

With kind regards,

Sincerely,

HUGH SCOTT,
U.S. Senator.
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

House of Representatives

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 22, COPYRIGHT LAW REVISION

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference on the Senate bill (S. 22) for the general revision of the copyright law, title 17 of the United States Code, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of September 29, 1976.)

Mr. KASTENMEIER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KASTENMEIER) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. (Mr. KASTENMEIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report that the Senate conferees have accepted, for the most part, the House passed substitute of S. 22, revising the copyright code. The few matters on which the House conferees found it necessary to recede are as follows:

Section 105 deals with Government copyright. The House substitute had provided an exception to the general rule against Government ownership of copyrights. This exception would have permitted the Department of Commerce's National Technical Information Service to copyright a limited number of publications. In view of the promise of the Senate conferees to reconsider the matter early next year, we receded. The conference substitute, therefore, retains the existing law prohibiting copyright of Government produced works.

Section 110(5) dealing with the exemption from copyright liability of transmissions of radio broadcasts by home-type receiving devices.

The Senate bill contained language limiting this exemption to situations other than where the "transmission is further transmitted to the public." The House bill modified this to read "further transmitted beyond the place where the receiving apparatus is located." The reason the House substitute added the new language was a disagreement with the

interpretation of the Senate language in its committee report. The Senate report interpreted its version as requiring liability for royalties for use of loud-speaker devices for small business establishments such as luncheonettes. The House conferees receded to the language of the Senate bill but only after the Senate conferees agreed to interpret the language of the conference report in a manner consistent with the original House version of the bill.

Section 110(8). The Senate version of the bill provided for an exemption from copyright liability simply for "literary works" used in performances directed primarily to handicapped persons. The House substitute, in an attempt to clarify the Senate-passed measure, specifically restricted the exemption to non-dramatic literary works as opposed to dramatic literary works. The conferees agreed upon a substitute which exempts from copyright liability performances of all nondramatic literary works and dramatic works for one performance only, where the works are over 10 years old.

Section 115 dealing with the so-called mechanical royalty which is paid for the right to reproduce records. The Senate bill has provided a royalty rate of 2½ cents per record or 0.5 cents per minute, whichever is greater. The House substitute provided 2¾ cents per record, a 0.8 per minute, whichever is greater. The conferees compromised on the House per record rate of 2¾ cents and the Senate per minute rate of 0.5 per minute.

Section 601 dealing with the manufacturing requirement. The House substitute had provided for termination of the manufacturing requirement on January 1, 1981. The Senate bill contained no such provision. The conferees agreed to a termination date of July 1, 1982.

CHAPTER 9—CREATING A COPYRIGHT ROYALTY TRIBUNAL

Mr. Speaker, the Senate bill had provided for the creation of a Copyright Royalty Tribunal within the Copyright Office for the purpose of resolving disputes over the disbursement of statutory royalties and for the purpose of reviewing, from time to time, certain royalty rates. The House substitute modified the Senate bill by establishing an independent commission within the legislative branch with members appointed by the President. The House changes were made on the advice of constitutional scholars who urged that the Senate version might contain constitutional infirmities.

I am pleased to report that the Senate conferees have agreed to the basic structure for the Tribunal provided in the House bill. The conferees have agreed to use the term "tribunal" as the name of the body rather than "commission." In

addition, the joint conference agreed, at the request of the Senate conferees, to increase the number of commissioners from three to five, to provide 7-year terms for commissioners rather than 5-year terms and to require Senate confirmation of commissioners.

Mr. Speaker, the report of the conferees adopts, overwhelmingly, the House version bill. To the extent that changes have been made in the House version, these changes reflect, in part, the concerns of House Members expressed during the floor debate. Particularly, I would invite my colleagues' attention to the longer phaseout period for the manufacturing clause and the more liberal exemption for handicapped reading services to perform dramatic literary works.

I would, therefore, urge my colleagues to endorse the work of the conferees with a strong affirmative vote.

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

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUTCHINSON).

(Mr. HUTCHINSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, rise in support of the conference report to accompany S. 22, the general revision of the copyright law. I am pleased to report that the other body, in general, adopted the House version of S. 22 with five or six exceptions. Two of those exceptions, the House did not recede from, but adopted compromises that will, in fact, please many Members of the House. One of those concern section 601, the so-called manufacturing clause. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) will be happy to learn that, in response to his concern which he made known on this floor last week, the phase-out of the prohibition on the importation of books not published in this country was extended to a year and a half, to July 1982. In addition, language was agreed to and is contained in the conference report which makes clear that "If for any reason the Canadian trade groups and the Canadian Government do not move promptly in reciprocation with U.S. trade groups and the U.S. Government to remove such tariff and other trade barriers, the Congress will reconsider the Canadian exemption. In addition, if (Mr. ANDERSON) wishes our Register of Copyrights to study the pros and cons of our action in section 601 and report back to the Congress prior to such phaseout, I understand that she would welcome such a request.

Another compromise concerns the exemption of the use of dramatic works by the blind. Although this idea was defeated by a narrow margin on this floor,

The House conferees agreed to permit such use with three restrictions: That such a performance not be recorded, that it only be performed once, and that such dramatic work will have been published for at least 10 years.

On a different item of disagreement, because of lack of Senate hearings on the issue, the conferees recommend that the NTIS request for limited copyright in order to control foreign copying be considered at hearings early in the next session. In the interim, consideration should also be given to compensatory appropriations to NTIS in lieu of revenues lost as a result of unauthorized foreign copying.

All things considered, Mr. Speaker, the House did quite well in retaining its version in almost every case, and I urge my colleagues to support enactment of the conference report on S. 22.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan has served on the subcommittee over 10 years and undoubtedly remembers and recalls many of the specifics of the legislation we are about to adopt in this bill.

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

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

(Mr. DANIELSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KASTENMEIER) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUTCHINSON).

I further wish to point out to my colleagues that this conference report was signed by all of the conference managers on the part of the House and of the Senate, in both parties, so it is a consensus and I hope that all Members will support it.

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

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman knows that I am interested in one part of the bill which pertains to the Spanish-speaking radio stations along the borders with Mexico and also Canada, were those provisions retained in the conference report?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. In every respect with regard to the interest of the gentleman from Texas in the Spanish-speaking radio and cable stations and other broadcast stations, the provisions were retained and the gentleman's interest is fully reflected in the conference report.

Mr. KAZEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

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