ment in favor of the Quapaw Tribe, and for other purposes;

S. 1904. An act to authorize the use of funds arising from a judgment in favor of the Citizen Band of Potawatomi Indians of Oklahoma, and the Prairie Band of Potawatomi Indians of Kansas, and for other purposes; and

S. 2045. An act to authorize the use of funds arising from a judgment in favor of the Coeur d'Alene Indian Tribe, and for other purposes.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following additional report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments.

S. 1928. A bill to provide for the participation of the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank (Rept. No. 487).

RECOGNITION OF THE CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF UNITY OF ITALY

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, in March of 1961, the people of Italy will mark 100 years of Italian unity. The celebration will be held in the city of Turin, the cradle of Italian unity in recognition of the progress and achievements of the people of Italy during this past century.

On Monday, July 6, 1959, the Evening Bulletin of Providence, R.I., entitled its feature editorial "Italy Gains Recognition for Loyalty to the West." I will quote excerpts from this editorial:

On the first weekend of the Geneva Conference, Secretary of State Herter flew to Rome for a conference with the heads of the Italian state. Now it is announced that Italy will take part in the preliminary conferences of the Big Three and West Germany before the resumption of the Geneva talks with Gromyko. Furthermore, Premier Antonio Segni of Italy has been invited by the President of the United States to make a state visit to Washington starting September 30.

This preferential treatment is a tribute to Italy's steadfast loyalty to the Western alliance, particularly to the United States, during the postwar era. While one of the aims of this display of American friendship is to increase the prestige of Italy in international affairs, a deeper reason is the recognition of the intelligence the Italians have shown in world politics.

None has been more dependable in furthering the idea of Western union than Italy, none more prepared to go farther to solidify Western European unity than Italy. That country long has enjoyed excellent relations with the Arab States, and since Italy seems to have put all colonial ambitions behind her, she is in a strategic position to act as an intermediary with the colonialism-hating Arabs. And through all this, Italy has maintained a stable form of government, thanks primarily to the Christian Democrats. * * * It is encouraging to see her star rising as an important nation in the free world where historically she belongs.

In keeping with the spirit of this editorial, I submit a concurrent resolution that it is the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States should extend official greetings from the United States to the people of Italy on the occasion of their centenary anniversary, in March 1961. This concurrent resolution is identical with one introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative VICTOR L. ANFUSO, Eighth District of New York. I commend to students of history Mr. ANFUSO's contribution at page 11690 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 23, 1959.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 58) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States should extend official greetings from the United States to the people of Italy on the occasion of the centennial anniversary of the unity of Italy, which occurs in March of 1961, and should provide for official participation by the United States in the celebration to be held in 1961 in the city of Turin, cradle of Italian unity, in recognition of the progress and achievements of the people of Italy during the past century.

AMENDMENT OF TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY ACT OF 1933—ADDITIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. TALMADGE (for himself and Mr. RANDOLPH) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H.R. 3460) to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE OF SCHEDULED MEETINGS OF THE SENATE JUDICIARY SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS TO CONSIDER PENDING FEDERAL CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, as Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, I wish to announce that there are two scheduled meetings of the subcommittee in the near future to consider pending Federal civil rights legislation.

The first meeting is scheduled to be held at 10:30 a.m. Friday, July 10, 1959, in room 104–B, Old Senate Office Building.

The second meeting is scheduled to be held at 10:30 a.m., Wednesday, July 15, 1959, in room 104–B, Old Senate Office Building.

Seventeen bills are pending before the subcommittee.

ADJOURNMENT TO 11 O'CLOCK TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate now stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, pursuant to the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, July 9, 1959, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate July 8, 1959:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Dudley C. Sharp, of Texas, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force, vice Malcolm A. MacIntyre, resigned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JULY 8, 1959

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 100: 5: *The Lord is good; His mercy is everlasting; and His truth endureth to all generations.*

Almighty God, may we now render unto Thee the homage of our minds and hearts and bring them into harmony with Thy holy will.

Make us wise in counsel and understanding; courageous in championing the lofty principles of democracy; conscientious about enacting programs of legislation that are just and beneficial.

Inspire and sustain us in the arduous task of safeguarding our liberties and show us how we may extend the frontiers of freedom unto the uttermost parts of the earth.

Hear us in the name of the Captain of our Salvation. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS OF COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Elections of the Committee on House Administration may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

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

There was no objection.

WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read, and, with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

JULY 7, 1959.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
The Speaker,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Agriculture has today

considered the work plans transmitted to you by Executive Communication 1022 and referred to this committee and unanimously approved each of such plans. The work plans involved are:

STATE AND WATERSHED

Washington: French Creek and Marshland.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, it is extremely gratifying to me to learn that the House Committee on Argiculture has approved the French Creek and Marshland watershed project. These projects on the Snohomish River in Washington State are necessary to prevent flooding of valuable farm property in the area.

The great need for these projects is clearly indicated by the flood which inundated a vast area of farmland adjacent to the Snohomish in late April of this year. The Secretary of Agriculture has declared this area a disaster area, and has authorized $75,000 in Agricultural Conservation Program Agency funds to repair damages and clear debris. This does not come anywhere near the amount in damage caused by the flood. It is money that could have been used for other purposes if the French Creek and Marshland watershed projects had been constructed earlier.

The French Creek project will involve more than 19,000 acres, and the Marshland project, 13,000. These projects will save thousands of dollars for the Government and for the farmers who own this land by preventing a reoccurrence of floods such as the one on April 28.

There are other benefits that will be accruing to the projects. One is the increase in yields over and above the average that is obtained under present conditions of flooding. These increases will stem from earlier seeding dates, longer-lived stands of pasture grasses, from ability to grow more productive varieties, and from the practical application of beter rotation systems.

In addition, there will be benefits from the installation of onfarm drainage measures. These measures will be made practical by the reduction in floodwater hazard.

The monetary value of these benefits has been estimated by the Soil Conservation Service. It amounts to $108,270 annually in the case of Marshland and $53,172 in the case of French Creek. In a few years these benefits will pay the cost of both projects. There also will be an additional monetary benefit resulting from the elimination of operation and maintenance charges on the existing facilities.

Mr. Speaker, again I want to express my pleasure that the committee has approved these projects. I trust the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will give its approval when this matter comes before it next week.

AUTHORIZING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A BUREAU OF NAVAL WEAPONS

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 310.

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. 7508) to amend title 10, United States Code, to establish a Bureau of Naval Weapons in the Department of the Navy and to abolish the Bureaus of Aeronautics and Ordnance. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, 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. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half of my time to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE] and at this time I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 310 makes in order consideration of the bill H.R. 7508. The purpose of the proposed legislation is to establish a Bureau of Naval Weapons within the Navy Department by a consolidation of the present Bureau of Ordnance and the Bureau of Aeronautics.

The Secretary of the Navy does not have authority to establish a new bureau or to abolish an existing bureau. Therefore, if the Bureau of Aeronautics and the Bureau of Ordnance are to be abolished and their functions combined in a new bureau, this legislation is mandatory. I urge adoption of the rule.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the adoption of the rule or to the legislation.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I 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. 7508) to amend title 10, United States Code, to establish a Bureau of Naval Weapons in the Department of the Navy and to abolish the Bureaus of Aeronautics and Ordnance.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7508), with Mr. ASPINALL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of H.R. 7508 is to abolish the Bureau of Ordnance and the Bureau of Aeronautics in the Department of the Navy, and to combine the function of these two bureaus in a single new bureau which would be designated "The Bureau of Naval Weapons."

Now, why do we need this legislation? We need it because the art of developing new and complex weapons has advanced so rapidly that we need an improved form of management to control and coordinate it.

Under existing law we have seven bureaus in the Navy. The Secretary of the Navy has wide authority to transfer functions between these bureaus, but he has no authority to abolish an existing bureau or to create a new bureau. Therefore, in order to get improved management through a single new bureau, we need legal authority.

It is common knowledge that our rapid strides in science have produced increasingly complex weapons of war. It is not so well understood that the management which controls these advances must be kept equally modern if we are to realize the full benefit of our endeavors.

The Secretary of the Navy realized that he had a problem in this area. As a consequence, on August 26, 1958, he appointed a committee to study the organization of the Navy in order to determine whether or not the present organization was responsive to the great advances in science and the development of modern weapons.

After detailed study that committee recommended that there be created a new bureau, the Bureau of Naval Weapons, and that the Bureaus of Ordnance and Aeronautics be abolished. That recommendation, approved by the Secretary on May 14, 1959, produced the legislation which is before us today.

In the field of new weapons and weapons systems, other than ships, the principal responsibility for development and production lies in the Bureau of Aeronautics and the Bureau of Ordnance. Until new weapons became so complex, the management of their development presented no substantial problem. But, as the development process became more complex, we found increasing duplication of effort between these two bureaus.

This bill seeks to overcome that duplication.

An example will better demonstrate this situation.

The Bureau of Aeronautics has cognizance of those missiles used in connection with naval aircraft. However, the Bureau of Ordnance is responsible for warheads, explosives, fuses, and rocket motors for all missiles. This results in an undesirable division of responsibility for the development of a single missile.

This division of responsibility makes necessary extensive coordination between these two bureaus.

This extensive coordination inevitably produces delays.

Such delays inevitably waste time and cost money. This is the problem we are trying to solve by the enactment of this bill.

Now, let us consider the effect of this legislation on the personnel and installations presently included in the two bureaus which would be abolished.

In the Bureau of Aeronautics there are currently 431 military and 2,179 civilians, for a total of 2,610.

The Bureau of Ordnance has 306 military and 1,442 civilians, for a total of 1,748.

This is a total of approximately 4,400 persons who are located in the Washington area.

Since all of the present functions of the Bureau of Ordnance and the Bureau of Aeronautics must be continued, it is expected that it will require substantially the same number of people, 4,400, to perform the functions of the new Bureau of Naval Weapons.

It should also be understood that this centralization of management will apply to the field establishments and personnel currently under the two bureaus that would be abolished.

At the present time, the Bureau of Aeronautics is conducting 238 separate activities at 113 locations, while the Bureau of Ordnance conducts 56 separate activities at 56 separate locations.

Some 200,000 persons are required in the operation of these activities.

So far as I know, there is no plan to stop any of these activities. But, all of them, and the personnel who manage them, would be brought under the centralized management of the new Bureau of Naval Weapons.

In summary I want to emphasize that the purpose of this bill is to provide improved management over the development and production of Navy weapons and weapons systems. The real benefit to be derived from enactment of this legislation will be in the shortening of the leadtime in the development and production of new weapons systems by placing them under central direction and control.

While no claim is made that the enactment of this bill will save money, I firmly believe that future savings will result. I base this on the belief that the elimination of extensive coordination, the elimination of dual funding, and the elimination of other duplicating actions presently required will inevitably save some money.

Mr. Chairman, I am unaware of any opposition to this bill. Not a single witness requested to be heard in opposition.

I sincerely hope that the House will promptly approve this legislation and that the other body will take similar action before adjournment. This would make it possible to accomplish most of this desirable reorganization by January 1, 1960, and to complete it not later than July 1, 1960.

The bill is approved by the Department of the Navy, the Department of Defense, and the Bureau of the Budget, and should be promptly passed.

Mr. Chairman, as I stated, this bill will bring about an elimination of duplication. While it may not accomplish immediately any savings in dollars and cents, with this coordination and the elimination of duplication, it is bound to bring about worthwhile economies.

Mr. Chairman, if there are no questions, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, the Navy has always somewhat suffered in comparison with the other services, in the number of flag rank officers they are allowed to have. I am wondering if the proposed legislation will cause an even further unbalancing of that situation?

Mr. VINSON. Did the gentleman use the word "unbalancing"?

Mr. HOSMER. Yes.

Mr. VINSON. I do not agree with the gentleman that the Navy finds itself unbalanced in flag officers. They have those flag officers whom they must have in accordance with the required billets. This will ultimately bring about, and is bound to bring about, some reduction in flag rank in connection with the operation of the single bureau. For instance, today we have one chief, one deputy, and three assistants, all of flag rank. For the time being it will be necessary to maintain these officers in their present billets, because the Bureau of Weapons will be broken down into different divisions which will continue the functions of the Bureau of Aeronautics and the Bureau of Ordnance.

But over a period of time, over a few years, I am confident that there will be an elimination of as many flag ranks in the top echelon in the Bureau as there are today in these two separate bureaus. It cannot take place immediately. No economy can be brought about immediately. The purpose of the bill is to gain in leadtime and eliminate duplication, and that will have its effect in reducing, in my judgment, within a certain length of time a reduction in the flag ranks.

Mr. HOSMER. I would hope that something could be worked out to prevent that from happening because I believe the gentleman agrees that the opportunity for promotion in these ranks is one of the considerations of the older men in the career service, and, of course, we would like to do everything possible in that respect.

Mr. VINSON. We do not want any officer to be promoted unless there is a justification and a reason why he should be promoted. As I stated, in the Bureau of Ordnance today, there is one chief, one deputy, and three assistants. The chiefs have the rank of rear admiral of the upper half. Some of them may be of the lower half. But, for the time being, these flag rank billets will have to be maintained until this coordination can be thoroughly worked out.

Mr. HOSMER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. What is meant by rank of admiral of the upper half and the lower half?

Mr. VINSON. That relates to the pay.

Mr. GROSS. It relates to the pay?

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. And it relates to rank, of course.

Mr. VINSON. Of course. For the time being, the man who holds the position of chief of a bureau may have the rank of rear admiral as his permanent rank. And on account of the billet, he may have the rank of rear admiral and he may be of the upper half pay grade or the lower pay grade. But, that is not involved in this at all.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 7508 and to completely concur in the remarks of my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

At the outset, I want to commend the Secretary of the Navy for his action which has brought this bill before us today. It proves beyond any doubt that the Navy recognizes good management to be of paramount importance in the development and production of increasingly complex weapons of war.

Thirty-eight years ago the airplane assumed its first importance as a major naval weapon. That gave rise to the creation of the Bureau of Aeronautics. That Bureau has performed well. It has made its contribution to a naval air arm that has no equal in the Navy of any other nation. So it is only natural that those who have worked closely with this Bureau have developed a great respect for its accomplishments and hold great sentiment for it.

But if this is true for the Bureau of Aeronautics, think how much more it must be true in the case of the Bureau of Ordnance which had its inception 117 years ago, in 1842.

While sentiment might urge us to resist this change, cold logic and common prudence tell us that we must make it.

As the chairman has told you, this bill is not brought here with any claim that it will save great sums of money. The Navy makes no such claims, nor does the committee. This is a management bill, not a money bill.

While no new appropriations are to be requested to implement this bill, if passed, I think we must frankly recognize that it will cost some money to consolidate the two bureaus and make the physical changes that will be required. But I sincerely believe that these modest costs will be far more than offset when the new Bureau is completely organized and the improved management which it will provide becomes a fact.

The chairman gave you an example of the duplication in management which today results from the development of a missile for a naval airplane. I would like to amplify that point just a little.

There are now in the two Bureaus 10 missile types, including Polaris, in various stages of development. Five of these missiles come within the cognizance of both the Bureau of Aeronautics and the Bureau of Ordnance. Under such circumstances duplication of effort, with resultant delays, is inevitable. So I say that the Navy is to be commended for recognizing this deficiency in management and making a recommendation to us that will overcome it.

Let me repeat, while we cannot tell you that this bill will save great sums of money, I think there is something much more important for us to keep in mind. We must not forget that any war in which we become engaged will in all likelihood be won or lost with the weapons which we have in hand when such a war begins. While we may not discuss their precise details, I am sure that all of us know that the Navy has under development new weapons. If we can shorten the leadtime for the development and production of these weapons and bring them into operational use in the Navy at the earliest possible date, who can tell how valuable such an accomplishment may be in the event we must fight for survival. I think no man can put a price tag on that kind of accomplishment. But it is precisely this result we are trying to obtain through the passage of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, as important as this bill is, it is not difficult to understand, and it requires no lengthy explanation. My distinguished chairman has given you the essential elements of the bill together with its justification. I trust that the Members will promptly pass this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, somebody is going to have to do a better job than has been done so far to sell me on this bill. It is a strange thing to me that two bureaus, the Navy Bureau of Aeronautics and the Bureau of Ordnance, are to be abolished and still no savings are expected by this action. I just do not understand how you can propose a consolidation of this kind without effecting savings in either personnel or money.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. The savings will come after the organization has been perfected. After the new bureau has been established, the Bureau of Naval Weapons, there will be a savings, and a worthwhile savings, in both dollars and personnel.

Mr. GROSS. You say you are going to eliminate duplication; if that is correct, why cannot duplication be eliminated from the time the consolidation is effective?

Mr. VINSON. I do not want to make any extravagant claims, but I am satisfied that the results will be most gratifying.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman give us some idea of how long Congress will have to wait for these results?

Mr. VINSON. I cannot state that. I do not want to get off into that line of thought. It seems to me sufficient to say that when you abolish these two bureaus, with their accompanying duplication and overlapping, you are bound to bring some savings in both personnel and money.

Mr. GROSS. I still am not convinced that this setup is going to eliminate any duplication and overlapping.

Mr. VINSON. I think it will, and if it does not, then we will probably be back here asking to reestablish these bureaus; but let us try to do it.

Mr. GROSS. There again, let us try.

Let me ask the gentleman while he is on his feet this question: What kind of a setup do you now have in the Bureau of Aeronautics, for instance? Who heads it; what classification of officers head it?

Mr. VINSON. We have one chief.

Mr. GROSS. One chief; what do you mean by chief?

Mr. VINSON. The chief is an admiral.

Mr. GROSS. A full admiral?

Mr. VINSON. He has two stripes. The organization starts with a chief of that rank.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman will have to explain that to me; I do not understand what two stripes mean; the gentleman will have to tell me. I would get a better idea if he said he was a full admiral or a rear admiral.

Mr. VINSON. That rank in the Navy is the equivalent to a major general in the Army.

Each one of these bureaus is headed by a chief. Then there is a deputy chief and three other flag officers. In the Bureau of Ordnance there would be the same thing. There are five flag officers in the bureau and none above the rank of the Army equivalent of a major general, or two-star general.

Mr. GROSS. What about the new bureau when it is set up?

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman knows and so do I that it will not be possible to utilize all 10 of these top officers in the new bureau, and I can mention one now that maybe ought to go out just as soon as the Polaris missile is developed a little further in the Bureau of Aeronautics. That position will go out.

Mr. GROSS. Why does he not go out when you set up this new organization?

Mr. VINSON. It takes time to bring about the reorganization. You cannot fire all these people and expect to operate smoothly. You have got to work these thousands of people together and all these military matters together. Just as soon as that can be effectively brought into one bureau there is bound to be an elimination of personnel, an elimination of rank, and a saving.

Mr. GROSS. What is going to be the rank of the officer who heads the combined organization?

Mr. VINSON. It will be the same rank, the equivalent of a major general, two stars.

Mr. GROSS. You will not have a full admiral running this bureau? The gentleman assures me of that?

Mr. VINSON. I assure the gentleman of that.

Mr. GROSS. This is not for the purpose of upgrading?

Mr. VINSON. The officers of this new bureau will have the same rank as the chiefs of the other six bureaus in the Navy, and they are all two-star admirals.

Mr. GROSS. So the gentleman is assuring the House of Representatives that there will be no upgrading under the provisions of this bill?

Mr. VINSON. I stated it to the committee; that question was raised in the committee.

Mr. GROSS. I want to raise it for the record on the House floor.

Mr. VINSON. It was suggested by one distinguished member of the committee, in view of the largeness of this new organization, that perhaps he should have a higher rank than the other chiefs of bureaus. I stated to the Secretary that it would be, in my judgment, very unwise to have unbalanced ranks in the Bureau. The action of the Secretary caused me to conclude that under no conditions would he think of having a three-star admiral in one bureau and a two-star admiral in another bureau.

Mr. GROSS. We have the gentleman's assurance, then, that this bill is not going to be used for the purpose of upgrading?

Mr. VINSON. We have every assurance that the ranks of all the chiefs will be the same. I have recommended that. That was the view of the majority of the committee when the hearing was taking place. Do not disturb your mind that there is going to be a bureau chief with three stars.

Mr. GROSS. I am talking about who is going to head this new setup and how long will the bureaus that are supposed to be abolished be continued with the same personnel that they have, with the officer staff they have, and a total of 4,400 employees?

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to duplication and will support the consolidation or abolishment of bureaus anywhere in Government where such action will lead to economy and efficiency. I simply cannot understand why, with 4,400 personnel involved in this consolidation of two bureaus, substantial savings cannot be promised immediately. I get the impression that somewhere along the line there has been the understanding that even though a consolidation has been effected, nothing much is to be disturbed now or later. I regret that I cannot support this bill under the circumstances.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 513 of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 5131 is amended—

(A) by inserting the words "(4) Bureau of Naval Weapons." below the words "(3) Bureau of Naval Personnel."; and

(B) by renumbering items (4) through (7) as items "(5)" through "(8)", respectively.

(2) The following new section is added after section 5153:

"§ 5154. Bureau of Naval Weapons: Chief; Deputy Chief

"(a) The Chief of the Bureau of Naval Weapons shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the

Senate, for a term of four years, from officers on the active list of the Navy.

"(b) The Deputy Chief of the Bureau of Naval Weapons may be detailed from officers on the active list of the Navy."

(3) The analysis is amended by adding the following new item at the end thereof:

"5154. Bureau of Naval Weapons: Chief; Deputy Chief."

SEC. 2. On July 1, 1960, or on any earlier date on which the Secretary of the Navy makes a formal finding that all the functions of the Bureau of Aeronautics and the Bureau of Ordnance have been transferred to the Bureau of Naval Weapons or elsewhere, chapter 513 of title 10, United States Code, is further amended as follows:

(1) Section 5131 is amended—

(A) by striking out the words "(1) Bureau of Aeronautics." and the words "(5) Bureau of Ordnance."; and

(B) by renumbering items (2), (3), (4), (6), (7), and (8) as items "(1)", "(2)", "(3)", "(4)", "(5)", and "(6)", respectively.

(2) Section 5133 is amended—

(A) by striking out the second sentence in subsection (a); and

(B) by striking out, in subsection (b), the words "or major general, as appropriate, and with retired pay based on that grade".

(3) Sections 5136 and 5144 are repealed.

(4) The analysis is amended by striking out the following items:

"5136. Bureau of Aeronautics: Chief; Deputy Chief.

"5144. Bureau of Ordnance: Chief; Deputy Chief."

SEC. 3. The unexplained balances of appropriations and funds available for use in connection with the exercise of any function transferred to the Bureau of Naval Weapons shall be transferred in the manner provided by section 407 of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended (5 U.S.C. 172f), for use in connection with the transferred functions.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 12, strike out "unexplained" and insert in lieu thereof "unexpended".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the chairman of the committee what is meant by the language on page 3, paragraph (B) reading "by striking out, in subsection (b), the words 'or major general, as appropriate, and with retired pay based on that grade' "?

What is the meaning of those words? What is that in the bill for?

Mr. VINSON. Under existing law a major general of the Marine Corps could be designated Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics and it should be that way because the Marine Corps is part and parcel of the Navy.

Mr. GROSS. What does this do?

Mr. VINSON. He cannot be Chief of the Bureau of Naval Weapons.

Mr. GROSS. A major general in the Marine Corps cannot be in command of the Bureau of Naval Weapons?

Mr. VINSON. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Why not?

Mr. VINSON. For the simple reason that we must have one who is conscious of all naval matters, not simply aeronautics. The Marines are specialists. The one who commands the Bureau of Weapons must have somewhat of a broader knowledge of ordnance and aeronautics.

Mr. GROSS. This does not mean, then, by eliminating this category of major general, this legislation will be used to upgrade the Navy head of this combined organization?

Mr. VINSON. No; not at all. Do not be worried about that.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. ALBERT, having resumed the chair, Mr. ASPINALL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7508) to amend title 10, United States Code, to establish a Bureau of Naval Weapons in the Department of the Navy and to abolish the Bureau of Aeronautics and Ordnance, pursuant to House Resolution 310, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on Small Business may sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS ACT OF 1959

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 311 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. 7645) to provide for the construction, alteration, and acquisition of public buildings of the Federal Government, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, 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. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, this bill has the unanimous approval of the Committee on Public Works and, as I remember, was unanimously reported by the Committee on Rules. It is an authorization bill for public buildings. I know of no opposition or controversy whatsever, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the adoption of the rule, and I yield back my time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I 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. 7645) to provide for the construction, alteration, and acquisition of public buildings of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 7645, with Mr. ASPINALL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 7645, the Public Buildings Act of 1959, was reported unanimously by the Committee on Public Works. I do not recall ever having any legislation in the Public Works Committee that received more careful consideration than this bill has had. The members of the Public Works Committee fully believe that this bill will bring into being an orderly and a progressive system for the construction of Federal public buildings. It gives to the General Services Administration the basic authority to repair, remodel, alter, and construct Federal buildings.

To fully understand what H.R. 7645 does it is necessary to review briefly the history of the public building program in this country. Prior to 1902 the construction of Federal buildings was brought about on an individual basis. Each new building was authorized separately. In 1902 the Congress passed the first omnibus bill granting general authority for the Federal Government to engage in the construction of public buildings throughout the country. This program was continued until the Public Building Act of 1913. This was the last of the omnibus bills.

The entire building program was suspended due to World War I and was not revived until the enactment of the Public Buildings Act of 1926. Up to today the 1926 act has been the most significant public building act enacted into law by the Congress. It was and is the basic authority for direct appropriation

construction. Not until 1954 did we again pass general legislation on the subject. This was due to the depression, World War II and the Korean war. In the 83d Congress we passed the Lease-Purchase Act and that act expired on July 22, 1957.

Under the 1926 Public Buildings Act, as amended, a total of some $620 million was authorized and appropriated for public buildings construction. The last such appropriation was in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1959 when $173 million was appropriated for the construction of public buildings. Further in 1949 we passed a site acquisition and planning bill with a total authorization of $40 million. Just a few weeks ago in the independent offices appropriation bill there was appropriated some $23 million for site acquisition. All money authorized under the 1926 act, as amended, has been expended. In fact, we have spent in excess of the amounts heretofore authorized by law. Further, the some $23 million authorized for site acquisition in the 1960 Independent Offices Appropriation Act exceeds the $40 million authorized in the 1949 Site Acquisition Act. Thus today we find ourselves without any general authority for the construction of Federal buildings. For this reason it is necessary today to pass this bill or we will have no further authority for the very needed program of construction of Federal buildings.

This bill is to a great extent a codification of existing law. We have been very careful in its preparation to take from prior acts those legislative devices that have proven to be helpful in the public buildings program. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, we feel that this legislation is not only worthwhile, but it is wise and prudent. It gives to the executive branch and the Congress the final decision as to how the public buildings program will come into being and just how much money will be spent annually for this purpose.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I notice that section 9 authorizes the Administrator to carry out construction or alteration of public buildings by contract whenever he deems it to be most advantageous to the United States.

Does the gentleman have in mind regulations that will spell out what is to the advantage of the United States? I ask that question for this reason. When the Federal building in Philadelphia was constructed, it was recognized that the building was not adequate and that at some future date additional floors would have to be constructed. We now find ourselves in a position where there are three or four judges without chambers and, of course, without courtrooms in which to hold court. I am just wondering whether or not that type of situation would not give it a priority in determining what is in the best interests of the United States.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I might say to the gentleman that section 9 embodies one of the real purposes of the bill. The Public Works Committee recognizes the fact that in the construction of public buildings there should be an equitable distribution throughout the United States, and certainly need would be an important factor in the consideration of a prospectus to be approved by the Committees on Public Works of the House and Senate. For example, if there is great need in the city of Philadelphia for additional Federal office space, the General Services Administration could make an examination of the situation, include this fact in the prospectus to be submitted to the committee, and the committee would undertake to give this project proper consideration along with the other projects before the committee. You must remember the amount of money available for the annual program would also have to be taken into consideration.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. May I say first to the gentleman, I appreciate the courtesy he has shown me in connection with the Federal post office building in my district at Camden, Ark. In the recent appropriation bill for General Services, which passed the House, and which I believe has already been considered by the other body, there were appropriations for the purchase of sites and planning for certain needed Federal post office buildings.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS. And, of course, that would involve the construction as soon as that is completed. Would this in any way interfere with those projects for which appropriation has already been made under present law, for them to be originated?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Let me explain to the gentleman from Arkansas that the appropriations made this year for site acquisition were made under the Site Acquisition Act of 1949. That act only gave the authority to acquire sites. It was intended under the 1949 act that eventually we would carry out a program for the construction of a Federal building in every congressional district. Of course, the gentleman from Arkansas realizes as well as I do that it would be impossible to embark upon a program of such gigantic proportions. The authority for the appropriation of moneys for the construction of the Camden Post Office or for any Federal building would have to be obtained under the 1926 act. But all the authorization contained in the 1926 act as amended has expired. There is no further monetary authority for public buildings construction and unless this bill is enacted into law, there can be no construction of the Federal building in Camden, Ark., or in any other community including the District of Columbia.

Mr. HARRIS. I had understood the 1926 act did not have any limitation to the amount, and, therefore, according to the record made before the Committee on Appropriations, they received the funds and named the buildings in the country, and it was started this year just as it did last year and the year before last.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. There is no question as to the expiration of monetary authority under the 1926 act. The counsel for the General Services Administration and the Bureau of the Budget have separately examined the 1926 act and all its amendments and have reached the conclusion that in their opinion all monetary authority has expired. As a matter of fact, I will say to the gentleman from Arkansas, the $620 million authorized by the 1926 act as amended has already been spent, and the reason that that situation has occurred is the fact that the Committee on Appropriations has brought in bills for specific buildings such as the Atomic Energy Building and the Central Intelligence Agency Building for which there had been no specific authorization.

Mr. HARRIS. Coming back to the original question, this would not in any way interfere with the appropriation for the purpose I just mentioned that was included in the recent bill?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. It would not interfere with the site acquisition funds but there is no hope of constructing a building at Camden, Ark., as I said a moment ago, unless this bill is enacted into law.

Mr. HARRIS. In other words, this would implement the appropriation for that purpose in the recent bill?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. There must be further monetary authority—that is the answer—before an appropriation would be in order.

Mr. HARRIS. In other words, this would clear up any possible question there might be under present law?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. There is no question that what the gentleman says is correct. All monetary authorization has expired.

Mr. HARRIS. That is not in accordance with the hearings before the Appropriations Committee to which I referred the gentleman and to which he referred me.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I do not think there is any need of our debating that question, because as long as the GSA and the budget are of the opinion they have no further authority to construct new buildings Congress would be limited in its ability to carry out a construction program.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], chairman of the Subcommittee on Buildings and Grounds, has given us in detail a comprehensive report on the provisions and objectives of this legislation.

This legislation is needed in the field of public buildings to clarify and codify many existing laws. It is also required, Mr. Chairman, to bring a tighter rein and tighter control on the authorization and appropriations made for the construction of Federal buildings. This bill does provide a tighter rein. It requires authorization by the Public Works Committees of the House and Senate if any general purpose building is to be repaired or modernized where the cost is in excess of $200,000; and of any new buildings exceeding $100,000 in cost.

Any request from the Administrator of General Services for authorization to build a new building must be accompanied by a description of the building to be erected or altered, the general location of the structure, and its maximum cost. The statement must set forth that no other Federal space is available for the agencies to be served or private rentable space available at costs commensurate in costs with the space to be provided in the new project.

This statement must also set forth the rentals being paid by the agencies that will be housed in the new or altered structure. If the maximum costs of construction or alteration should, due to price advances, be increased by more than 10 percent, the Administrator must secure further additional authorization of the congressional committees.

Precautionary provisions against the program getting out of hand are carried in this bill. It provides that if an appropriation is not secured within 1 year after authorization from either Committee of Public Works, that of the House or Senate, may rescind the authorization for alterations costing more than $200,000 or of any new building costing more than $100,000.

The bill prohibits an authorization list of more than 30 buildings at any one time for which appropriations have not been made. If 30 buildings are under authorization but for which no appropriations have been made, no additional buildings can be authorized until appropriations have been made for some of the 30 buildings theretofore authorized or some previous authorizations are rescinded.

This bill is the best we could produce in the House Committee on Public Works and comes to you with the unanimous approval of the committee, as well as the approval of all executive agencies of the Government—the Post Office Department, the General Services Administration, and the Budget Bureau.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I join in support of this bill which is unanimously reported by the committee. Very briefly I want to complement what has already been said by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], chairman of the subcommittee. Also, I wish to say that it has been a great pleasure to work with the gentleman in drafting and consulting on this bill, and I wish to acknowledge his cooperative spirit in accepting many amendments taken from H.R. 6782, my bill on the same subject.

He correctly stated that at the present time there is no available method of authorizing additional public buildings constructed under lease-purchase agreements. There is no existing authorization available exclusive of the lease-purchase program for the types of general-purpose buildings constructed under that program or under the act that has been in existence since 1926. That authorization under the 1926 act, too, has expired. Those programs provided for the construction of multiple-purpose buildings throughout the country, and the Members of Congress are just as much interested in their construction as they are in the construction of Federal buildings in Washington. This bill provides for a fair apportionment of these buildings throughout the United States, where needed.

There were three methods available to provide these facilities.

First, there was direct appropriations which expired with the 1926 act authorization being used up.

Second, there was and remains the lease of space for varying periods of time with the Government acquiring no equity in such property. That authority, of course, presently exists in existing law with the Post Office Department in particular being the largest user; and the provisions in this bill specifically retain that authority under section 16, particularly retained the authority of the Post Office Department for not only this lease program but also for the modernization program already approved as well.

The third method under which Federal buildings could previously be constructed was the lease-purchase program. That act, of course, expired on July 22, 1957. Those buildings that have been constructed pursuant to the 1926 act since the expiration of lease-purchase have been constructed under that act prior to the time the 1926 act authority expired in fiscal year 1959 were pursuant in large part to authorizations provided through lease-purchase procedure through the Public Works Committee. That 1926 program died when the 1926 authorization expired. Lease-purchase, as such, with private financing and committee authorizing powers, died on July 22, 1957.

Let me say and repeat that so far as I am concerned I favor lease-purchase as a third method of authorizing and paying for public building projects. I favored lease-purchase from the beginning; I favored its extension before it expired on July 22 of 1957 because it was a tried method by which buildings could be constructed through the use of private enterprise funds if Congress decided they did not want to directly appropriate money for that purpose.

I still think it is a sound program, for private enterprise and private funds get into the picture and a greater number of buildings can be constructed for the less annually appropriated money.

This bill provides for an organized procedure under the direct appropriation method and provides adequate and proper and wise congressional control over the public buildings program throughout the country.

This procedure was established, I might point out, that is the requiring of a prospectus to be filed with the Committee on Public Works, with the Committee on Public Works approving these prospectuses under the lease purchase program itself.

There are, of course, projects authorized—I have a list of them which I will insert in the RECORD—under lease purchase which have not yet acquired funds for their construction, and those must have additional committee authorization under this bill if they are going to go forward. This bill provides the needed authority for Congress to permit them to go forward.

There were, too, some 200 projects—and I will include that list in the RECORD also—which were under consideration under lease purchase, and again it will be possible to construct those projects in the future as the GSA may determine that the need exists.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The other projects which the gentleman from Florida refers to were in the year-before-last report on the Construction Act reported out of the committee; is that correct?

Mr. CRAMER. Yes. That is the list contained in report 894 on the Jones bill that was voted out by the committee in the 85th Congress, 1st session.

The following is a list of 200 lease-purchase projects—GSA—which were being considered for submission to committees of Congress for approval, Public Law 519, 83d Congress, when this act expired:

Location	*Member*
Alabama:	
Birmingham	Huddleston.
Montgomery	Grant.
Tuscaloosa	Seldon.
Alaska:	
Anchorage	Rivers.
Juneau	Do.
Seward	Do.
Arizona: Holbrook	Udall.
Arkansas:	
Camden	Harris.
Fayettesville	Trimble.
Harrisburg	Gathings.
Jonesboro	Do.
Pine Bluff	Norrell.
California:	
Bakersfield	Hagen.
Eureka	Miller.
Fresno	Sisk.
Los Angeles, FBI	McDonough.
Los Angeles, West	Jackson.
Los Angeles	King.
Do	Hosmer.
Do	Holifield.
Do	Smith.
Do	Hiestand.
Do	Holt.
Do	Doyle.
Do	Lipscomb.
Do	Kasem.
Do	Roosevelt.
Menlo Park, Geological Survey.	Younger.
Pomona	(Los Angeles.)
San Diego	Utt.
San Francisco, FSS WHSE.	Mailliard.
San Francisco	Shelley.
San Luis Obispo	Teague.
San Mateo	Younger.
Santa Rosa	Miller.
Connecticut:	
Greenwich	Irwin.
Meriden	Giaimo.
Middletown	Bowles.
New Haven	Monagan.
Willimantic	Bowles.
Delaware: Wilmington	McDowell.
Washington, D.C.: National Metropolitan Center, etc.	
Florida:	
Gainesville	Mathews.
Jacksonville	Bennett.
Tampa	Cramer.

Location	Member
Georgia:	
Athens	Paul Brown.
Hazlehurst	Blitch.
Thomasville	Pilcher.
Hawaii: Honolulu	Delegate Burns.
Idaho:	
Boise	Budge.
Pocatello	Do.
Twin Falls	Do.
Illinois:	
Alton	Price.
Aurora	Hoffman.
Belleville	Price.
Champaign	Springer.
Chicago	Dawson.
Do	O'Hara.
Do	Murphy.
Do	Derwinski.
Do	Kluczynski.
Do	O'Brien.
Do	Libonati.
Do	Rostenkowski.
Do	Yates.
Do	Collier.
Do	Pucinski.
Do	Boyle.
Do	Marguerite Church.
East St. Louis	Price.
Mount Vernon	Shipley.
Springfield	Peter Mack.
Urbana	Springer.
Indiana:	
Anderson	Roush.
Indianapolis	Barr.
Muncie	Harmon.
Iowa:	
Ames	Neal Smith.
Des Moines	Do.
Fort Madison	Schwengel.
Keosauqua	Do.
Kansas:	
Great Bend	Breeding.
Topeka	Avery.
Kentucky:	
Benton	Stubblefield.
Frankfort	Watts.
Henderson	Natcher.
Lexington	Watts.
Louisiana:	
Baton Rouge	Morrison.
Houma	Willis.
Natchitoches	McSween.
New Iberia	Willis.
Maine:	
Portland	Oliver.
Wiscassett	Coffin.
Massachusetts:	
Amesbury	Edith Nourse Rogers.
Lawrence	Bates.
Do	Lane.
Do	Macdonald.
New Bedford	Keith.
Michigan:	
Detroit	Machrowicz.
Do	Diggs.
Do	Rabaut.
Do	Dingell.
Do	Lesinski.
Grand Rapids	Ford.
Lansing	Chamberlain.
Owosso	Bentley.
Saginaw	Do.
Minnesota:	
Roseau	Langen.
Virginia	Blatnik.
Mississippi:	
Jackson	Williams.
Natchez	Do.
Quitman	Winstead.
Tupelo	Abernethy.
Missouri:	
Independence	Christopher.
Do	Bolling.
Montana:	
Billings	Leroy Anderson.
Bozeman	Metcalf.
Butte	Do.
Great Falls	Leroy Anderson.
Nebraska:	
Lincoln	Weaver.
Nebraska City	Glenn Cunningham.
North Platte	McGinley.
Nevada: Reno	Baring.
New Hampshire:	
Concord	Bass.
Nashua	Do.
Portsmouth	Merrow.
New Jersey:	
Camden	Cahill.
Morristown	Freylinghuysen.
Newark	Rodino.
Do	Addonizio.
Do	Wallhauser.
New Mexico:	
Carlsbad	Morris.
Roswell	Do.
Santa Fe	Do.
Socorro	Do.
New York:	
Buffalo	Dulski and Pillion.
Rochester	Weiss.
Syracuse	Riehlman.
North Carolina:	
Bryson City	Hall.
Fayetteville	Lennon.
Lexington	Kitchin.
Raleigh	Cooley.
Winston-Salem	Ralph Scott.
North Dakota:	
Bismarck	Burdick.
Fargo	Do.
Mandan	Short.
Minot	Do.
Williston	Do.
Ohio:	
Canton	Bow.
Cleveland	Feighan.
Do	Vanik.
Do	Frances Bolton.
Columbus	Devine.
Dayton	Schenck.
McArthur	Moeller.
Youngstown	Kirwan.
Oklahoma:	
Altus	Morris.
Durant	Albert.
Guthrie	Steed.
Lawton	Morris.
Wagoner	Edmondson.
Tulsa	Belcher.
Oregon:	
Medford	Porter.
Portland	Edith Green.
Pennsylvania:	
Harrisburg	Mumma.
Philadelphia	Barrett, Kathryn Granahan, James Byrne, Nix, Wm. J. Green, Toll.
Rhode Island:	
Bristol	Aime Forand.
Providence	
Westerly	John Fogarty.
Woonsocket	Aime Forand.
South Carolina: Charleston	Rivers.
South Dakota:	
Huron	McGovern.
Mitchell	Do.
Pierre	Do.
Rapid City	Berry.
Tennessee:	
Bristol	Reece.
Oak Ridge	Howard Baker.
Texas:	
Austin	Thornberry.
Corpus Christi	Young.
Dublin	Burleson.
El Paso	Rutherford.
Fort Worth	James C. Wright.
Levelland	George Mahon.
Mineral Wells	Burleson.
San Antonio	Paul Kilday.
San Augustine	Jack Brooks.
Sherman	Sam Rayburn.
Texas City	Clark Thompson.
Tyler	Beckworth.
Utah: Ogden	Dixon.
Vermont: Montpelier	Meyer.
Virginia:	
Roanoke	Poff.
Suffolk	Watkins Abbitt.
Washington:	
Aberdeen	Russell Mack.
Dayton	Catherine May.
Everett	Jack Westland.
Olympia	Russell Mack.
Pasco	Catherine May.
Richland	Do.
Seattle	Tollefson.
Tacoma	Do.
Vancouver	Russell Mack
Wisconsin:	
Madison	Kastenmeier.
Milwaukee	Zablocki.
Do	Reuss.
Wyoming:	
Casper	Keith Thomson.
Cheyenne	Do.
Cody	Do.
Rock Springs	Do.
Worland	Do.

In addition to that, it will make it possible for GSA to consider, and for Congress to properly consider, 71 additional projects that might be constructed on presently owned Government sites where a necessity and need exists. It will provide the authorizing machinery needed to get these projects properly considered on the basis of need.

None of these 200 projects could be submitted to the Committees on Public Works since the time for securing approval under the lease-purchase law—Public Law 519, 83d Congress—has now expired and no other procedure is available for authorizing these projects.

The following is a list of 71 Government-owned sites which may be used for new public buildings projects if this bill, H.R. 7645, becomes law:

State	Member
Alabama:	
Florala	George Grant.
Livingston	Armistead Seldon.
Moulton	Robert Jones.
Arkansas:	
Ashdown	Oren Harris.
Augusta	Wilbur Mills.
Harrisburg	Ezekial Gathings.
California:	
Bakersfield	Harlan Hagen.
Los Angeles (terminal annex).	(Various Congressmen.)
Florida: Monticello	Robert Sikes.
Georgia:	
Hogansville	John Flynt.
Metter	Prince Preston.
Thomasville	John Pilcher.
Vienna	Elijah Forrester.
Warm Springs	John Flynt.
Illinois:	
Casey	Peter Mack.
Eureka	Leslie Arends.
Fairbury	Do.
Indiana: Bicknell	William Bray.
Iowa: Ames (College Station).	Neal Smith.
Louisiana: Coushatta	Overton Brooks.
Maine: Wilston	Frank Coffin.
Michigan:	
Dearborn (Monroe Blvd. station).	John Lesinski.
Milan	George Meader.
Tecumseh	Do.
Minnesota: Roseau	Langen.
Mississippi:	
Quitman	Arthur Winstead.
Tupelo	Thomas Abernethy.
Missouri:	
Cape Girardeau	Paul Jones.
Independence	George Christopher.
Moberly	Morgan Moulder.
St. Louis (Richmond Heights Branch).	(Various Congressmen.)
Montana: Whitefish	Lee Metcalf.
New Jersey:	
Carteret	James Auchincloss.
Garwood	Florence Dwyer.
Newton	William Windall.
New York:	
Dannemora	Dean Taylor.
East Syracuse	Walter Riehlman.
Mohawk	Pirnie.
Montour Falls	John Taber.
North Carolina: Scotland Neck.	L. H. Fountain.
Ohio:	
Akron	William Ayres.
McArthur	Moeller.
Oak Hill	Do.
Oklahoma:	
Mountain View	Toby Morris.
Wagoner	Ed Edmondson.
Pennsylvania:	
Beaver	Frank Clark.
Branckenridge	Robert Corbett.
Clifton Heights	Milliken, Jr.
Downingtown	Paul Dague.
Emmaus	Willard S. Curtin.
Greencastle	Richard Simpson.
Jersey Shore	Alvin R. Bush.
Newport	Walter Mumma.
Reynoldsville	Leon Gavin.
South Carolina:	
Charleston	Mendel Rivers.
Lyman	Robert Ashmore.
Tennessee:	
Etowah	James Frazier.
Hartsville	Joe Evins.
Sharon	Everett.
Texas:	
Dublin	Omar Burleson.
Levelland	George Mahon.
Madisonville	John Dowdy.
New Boston	Wright Patman.
Orange	Jack Brooks.
San Augustine	Do.
Virginia: Waynesboro	Burr P. Harrison.
Wisconsin:	
Evansville	Flynn.
New London	Melvin Laird.
Tomahawk	Alvin O'Konski.
Hawaii: Wailuku	Delegate John Burns.

The committee was obviously and justifiably concerned with the amount of money that might be involved and the number of projects that might be authorized and for the need for congressional control, so that we would not get in the position that we are in with regard to rivers and harbors and basin authorizations, where you have billions of

dollars of authorized projects on the books and the obvious inability of the executive branch, the Appropriations Committee and of Congress itself to provide adequate funds to finance them. Therefore, the language in this bill states definitely that one of the objectives of this bill is to limit authorizations authority to 30 projects that have not been approved and appropriated for by the Appropriations Committee. The objective of that is to control the number of authorized projects, so that you do not have an endless list of projects authorized and not appropriated for. Secondly, it gives the Congress and the Committee on Public Works the opportunity to review these projects to determine whether a need continues to exist with regard to them.

I submit this bill is a very sound approach to this very serious problem with regard to public buildings throughout the country, not only in Washington but in every congressional district. I know many Members of the House are concerned over the fact, with the demise of lease purchase and with the authorization under the 1926 act having expired, that this is a very real problem. There is no congressional authority available to go forward with this program. This will provide the needed authority to do so.

It is also provided in the bill, of course, that Congress itself can initiate a request for a prospectus through the Committee on Public Works of the House and Senate. That was a provision contained in a bill I previously introduced, H.R. 6782, on this same subject matter.

I trust this bill will be adopted.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The prospectus comes to the Congress?

Mr. CRAMER. Yes. It is then submitted to the Committee on Public Works of the House and Senate.

Mr. GROSS. It does come to Congress?

Mr. CRAMER. That is correct. It is similar to the procedure we followed under lease purchase. The prospectus and the required information are exhaustive. That is presented to the committee. The committee holds hearings. The initial report is submitted to the Congress. The agency cannot go forward with the public buildings projects under the bill without consulting the Congress. That is why I stated that this brings some order out of the chaotic situation that exists with regard to public buildings today.

H.R. 6342 introduced in the 83d Congress by the then chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the Committee on Public Works (the late Mr. McGregor) became Public Law 519 of the 83d Congress—the Lease-Purchase Act—and was adopted to supplement the building authority of the Public Buldings Act of 1926 because little construction had been approved over a long period of years under the 1926 act.

Public Law 519 set up a method of approval for public buildings projects very similar to the procedure provided in H.R. 7645, the legislation now before this House. However, pursuant to the provisions contained in Public Law 519 the time within which projects could be approved by the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and the House expired within 3 years after July 22, 1954, the date of its enactment, or an expiration date of July 22, 1957.

In order to extend the time within which projects might be approved by the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and the House for an additional period of 3 years the Senate passed S. 2261 on July 3, 1957. This bill contained amendments to improve the operation of Public Law 519 and corresponded substantially with H.R. 6993, introduced by the late Mr. McGregor. The majority of the House Committee on Public Works, however, refused to go along with the Senate and substituted the text of H.R. 4660, introduced by Mr. JONES of Alabama, for the Senate passed S. 2261. The minority supported S. 2261, as passed by the Senate, but not S. 2261 as reported by the House Committee on Public Works for the reasons set forth in the minority report contained in House Report 894, 85th Congress, pages 36 to 50.

I still believe that the continuation of the Lease Purchase method of procedure is the most desirable in the light of the present fiscal condition of our Government; furthermore such a method constitutes a private enterprise operation that results in tax payments to the United States Treasury. However, in the interest of securing much needed legislation for the construction of public buildings the minority joined with the majority in the development of H.R. 7645 and we now support the bill H.R. 7645 as reported by the committee provides for an approval procedure very much in line with that set up in Public Law 519 of the 83d Congress but it provides for construction by direct appropriation. I believe that H.R. 7645 represents best legislation that may be obtained at this time and should be approved by the House.

During consideration of H.R. 7645 the General Services Administrator advised the committee that, at this time, 20 previously approved building projects would require congressional committee reapproval as I stated before under the provisions of H.R. 7645 as follows:

Projects which cannot be carried out without additional public buildings authority and which would require congressional committee reapproval under provisions of H.R. 7645—GSA status report on approved building projects for which construction funds have not been appropriated

	Current cost estimate	Cost category		Balance required to complete		Total
		Site and expenses	Improvement costs	Site and expenses (funds available)	Improvements (to be appropriated)	
Los Angeles, Calif.	$31,154,000	$2,660,000	$28,494,000	$538,000	$28,494,000	$29,032,000
San Francisco, Calif.	48,022,000	3,769,000	44,253,000	687,971	44,253,000	44,940,971
Denver, Colo.	19,595,000	2,205,000	17,390,000	285,191	17,390,000	17,675,191
Hartford, Conn.	9,130,000	1,306,000	7,824,000	160,400	7,824,000	7,984,400
Miami, Fla.	7,793,000	508,000	7,285,000	175,000	7,285,000	7,460,000
Chicago, Ill.	98,000,000	10,340,000	87,660,000	2,165,000	87,660,000	89,825,000
Baltimore, Md.	21,594,000	2,572,000	19,022,000	2,572,000	19,022,000	21,594,000
Boston, Mass.	29,435,000	2,416,000	27,019,000	1,416,000	27,019,000	28,435,000
New York, N.Y.	68,062,000	6,336,900	61,725,100	1,119,000	61,725,100	62,844,100
Bismarck, N. Dak.	3,565,000	415,000	3,150,000	77,000	3,150,000	13,227,000
Cincinnati, Ohio	23,133,000	4,107,300	19,025,700	378,285	19,025,700	9,403,985
Toledo, Ohio	5,183,000	792,500	4,390,500	136,066	4,390,500	4,526,566
Pittsburgh, Pa.	24,820,000	2,387,000	22,433,000	547,000	22,433,000	22,980,000
Memphis, Tenn.	11,500,000	1,500,000	10,000,000	180,000	10,000,000	10,180,000
Dallas, Tex.	24,250,000	2,224,100	22,025,900	313,900	22,025,900	22,339,800
FOB 5	29,295,000	3,810,000	25,485,000	440,000	25,485,000	25,925,000
FOB 8	17,475,000	1,467,710	16,007,290	117,048	16,007,290	16,124,338
FOB 9	24,000,000	2,590,800	21,409,200	427,410	21,409,200	21,836,610
FOB 10	44,125,000	3,379,000	40,746,000	726,969	40,746,000	41,472,969
Geological Survey	23,085,000	1,200,000	21,885,000	1,200,000	21,885,000	23,085,000
Total	563,216,000	55,986,310	507,229,690	13,662,240	507,229,690	520,891,930

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I support this sound and necessary legislation.

I cosponsored this bill because it will bring order out of the chaotic conditions which exist with respect to the construction of Federal public buildings and will allow for construction, alteration, and exchange of Federal buildings where a need for such buildings exists.

The first overall law relating to the acquisition and construction of public buildings is a patchwork of measures dating back to 1902. The present basic authority for the appropriation of funds for direct construction of public buildings stems largely from the Public Buildings Act of 1926 and the many amendments made to it. This act carried a total authorization of $115 million for Federal buildings and assembled much of the worthwhile legislation that had been enacted from time to time in the past for such construction. At the onset of the depression, an emergency construction program was set up by Congress, only to be forced to a halt by an economy drive in the next year. During the decade 1930 to 1940, Congress directly authorized the sum of

$318,500,000 to the Public Buildings Administration or other similar Government agencies, under several emergency construction acts for public-building construction. From 1939 to 1949, due to World War II, the entire building program came to a halt once again; by 1949, Government activity had increased by leaps and bounds and the Federal Government found itself with a highly inadequate physical establishment to carry on its multitude of activities in an efficient and businesslike manner. The Public Buildings Act of 1949 then authorized about $70 million for new construction and for improvement of existing federally owned buildings. The same Congress saw the establishment of the General Services Administration, to which was transferred the functions of the Federal Works Agency, the Public Buildings Administration, and all other such agencies.

The last significant change in public buildings construction law came about in 1954 when Congress adopted the lease-purchase program whereby buildings were constructed by private capital on a 10- to 25-year deferred payment basis, title remaining in the private owner during the payment period, at the end of which title vested in the Federal Government. Under this act, 29 public buildings have been or are being constructed. This lease-purchase act expired in 1957 and under direction of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1959, further lease-purchase contracts were prohibited. Study had indicated that it cost $1.64 under the lease-purchase arrangement to buy the same amount of building as $1 does by direct appropriation.

In recent years, authorizations for the construction of several public buildings of the classes and types which were clearly the responsibility of the Administrator of General Services have been granted by Congress to the agencies concerned, bypassing the Administrator of General Services. As a result, there has been no orderly or systematic approach to the provision of general purpose public buildings. The bill under consideration would return to the Administrator of General Services responsibility for authorizing general purpose and related classes of public buildings required to accommodate the various activities of the Government.

The bill provides continuing and permanent authority for carrying out a program for the repair, remodeling, improvement, and new construction of public buildings of the classes under the control of the General Services Administration. Special purpose facilities closely related to the program activities of the various departments and agencies of the Federal Government are not encompassed by the bill. Such facilities include Veterans' Administration hospitals, U.S. properties abroad, buildings on Indian lands, military installations, agricultural, recreational, and conservation areas.

The Administrator will have complete charge of the construction and improvement program provided for under this legislation. He will submit annual reports to Congress on the location, cost, use, and status of each project, which must be approved by the House and Senate Committees on Public Works. While providing for adequate controls by the Congress, the Administrator is allowed sufficient flexibility to administer this program in an efficient and businesslike manner.

There are at present 20 Federal buildings proposed to be built for which site acquisition and architectural planning moneys have been appropriated and spent. Since all authorizations under the Public Buildings Act have been exhausted, new legislation is required in order for these already approved buildings to be constructed. One of these projects is the proposed new Federal Building in Miami which is designed to house 14 Government agencies. It is expected that the final working drawings will be completed within the next 4 months. Because there is no present authority for construction funds, this and the remaining 19 badly needed Federal buildings will be delayed until funds are included in the budget for their construction. Without this legislation, there will be no construction funds in any subsequent budgets. Therefore, this legislation is necessary to allow continuance of already approved projects and to avoid any further delay in the continuance of essential new construction.

I commend the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], and the members of his committee, for reporting this very important piece of legislation. I enthusiastically cosponsor this bill and hope all of the Members of the House will give it their speedy approval.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI].

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 7645, which is now before this body, is a bill which will solve one of the most pressing problems facing the Nation today. It will facilitate the early construction, at the least possible cost, of Federal buildings throughout the country.

I am certain that every Member of this body is fully aware of the fact that over the last 30 years the public buildings program, in this country, outside of construction on an emergency basis, has been, to a great extent, a nullity. Since 1926 there has been no planned public building program enacted by the Congress. As a result, there has been no organized building program in the country since that time. What the Jones bill does is to provide a statute which would give to the Administrator of General Services the authority and responsibility he needs for acquiring, constructing, altering, repairing, remodeling, improving, or extending public buildings.

I would like to say a few words in praise of Mr. Franklin Floete, Administrator of the General Services Administration. He has done an excellent job in that difficult position. He has cooperated fully with the Committee on Public Works at all times. He and his staff have helped tremendously in the preparation of this bill which is before this body today. We are fortunate to have a man of the caliber and experience of Mr. Floete to head this fine agency, the General Services Administration.

This bill is the result of many months of intensive work by the Public Works Committee. It is a bill which has the full support of all interested agencies in the Government building construction field. It is a bill that has been unanimously reported by the House Committee on Public Works.

Today there is a tremendous demand throughout the country for the construction of new public buildings. This bill takes care of this situation. It is needed because there is no longer available any funds for further building construction since all authorizations that have been enacted into law since the 1926 building act was first set up have not expired. Unless it is enacted into law no further public building construction can take place.

This is a bill that deserves the wholehearted support of every Member of this body. It is one that contains the best features of the public buildings laws that have previously been enacted by the Congress and adds to it those features that through experience over the years have been shown to be necessary to carry out a worthwhile public building program.

Speedy action on this bill will go a long way toward solving a pressing problem that affects every community in the Nation. I urge its immediate passage.

Mr. Chairman, it has been a pleasure for me to serve on the subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works headed by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] and I want to thank him for making it possible to have this important legislation before this body for a vote today. This is one of the finest committees of the House, believe me, and I have served on many of them. It is not a Republican or a Democratic committee. It reminds you of one happy family. Also may I say to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK] and my friends over there, it has been a pleasure to serve with you, because we never have any arguments in our committee. We are just a happy group.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. The gentleman from Illinois would not say it was the best committee in the House. I am familiar with another subcommittee on which the gentleman serves that is much more important and, I think, at times much more pleasant.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Oh, it is no more pleasant than the Public Works Committee.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 7645. This bill is the result of many months of study and deliberation by the Public Works Committee, particularly by the subcommittee which has handled this bill. It is a bill that came out of the committee by

unanimous vote, supported by all members of both parties on the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take the opportunity at this time to pay tribute to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES]. The gentleman from Alabama has devoted a great deal of effort to this bill. He has given every witness an opportunity to present views on the measure. He has given all members of the committee an opportunity to express themselves on it. He has been very fair and impartial in his development of this bill, and I think he should receive commendation for the work he has done on this measure.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I take these few minutes in order to voice some of the opinions heard in the cloakrooms and in this Chamber, to seek answers to questions I am asked back home relative to the buildings presently under construction. I would like to ask a number of questions.

We are now building a third office building for the House. Are the same people constructing that building that erected the building for the other body? What possible confidence can we have that similar mistakes will not be made in our building?

Is the subway from our new building going to meet the old subways? Are the doors going to be too long? Are the trucks going to be able to get in? Are the ceilings going to be so low that one will feel as though they were going to fall on top of one's head? Can we be assured that due consideration by the commission of four, will be given the plans, the contracts of the actual building in addition to the careful oversight of the Administrator?

I have had a good deal to do with the building of hospitals, university buildings, and so on. I have never found it very satisfactory not to have the responsibility in the hands of some one man, one who really knew the job. Might it not be that the Administrator in such a broad job as this would have difficulty in handling the details of the many contractors that apparently have to be called in on these enormous buildings.

I would like very much to have a statement of the cost of our third building, including the extra cost of dealing with the subterranean waters apparently not known to the builders.

I will say to the chairman, if he does not care to make that statement now, I would be very happy to have it from him at some later date.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to accommodate the gentlewoman now. There is nothing in this bill that applies to the House or Senate Office Building Commission. That authority remains in them to construct or to alter or to repair the Capitol Building and the various House and Senate Office Buildings. We do not here disturb their authority. I am quite sure that if there is any apprehension that the work is not progressing as it should, it would be advisable for the gentlewoman to direct her inquiries to the House Office Building Commission.

Mrs. BOLTON. Then the gentleman's committee has nothing whatever to do with the new office building? I thought his committee had to do with the building of Government buildings.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. No; that authority, as I say, is vested in this Commission. Further to allay any apprehensions the lady may have, I call her attention to section 10 of the bill which vests authority in the General Services Administrator to procure the necessary architectural skills to be employed on extraordinary Federal buildings, so that he may have the advice of the best known architects in the country. Certainly we would not give him authority without giving him the tools to work with to accomplish just what the gentlewoman seeks to obtain.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield, gladly.

Mr. MACK of Washington. It is my understanding that when the third office building was started, there was authorized an appropriation for a survey costing $25,000. That was authorized by the House Committee on Public Works in the 80th Congress. No action was taken over a period of 7 years. I think it was in the 84th Congress when the Committee on Appropriations provided $25,000 for a survey to study whether a new building was needed or whether the old building should be repaired. On the floor of the House an amendment was offered providing funds for the start of construction. Such an amendment, of course, would have been subject to a point of order on the basis that it was legislation on an appropriation bill. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] did attempt to make such a point of order, but the presiding officer ruled that the point of order came too late. So, in a way, the House of Representatives was responsible for the construction of the third House Office Building. The matter was fought out on the House floor and those who were opposed to its construction, of whom I was one, lost out by a margin of 30 votes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I happen to have been the one who offered the motion to recommit the bill and there is a record vote on the subject.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. Yes, indeed.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. It is my understanding, and if I am wrong, I would appreciate being corrected, that Mr. Franklin Floete, the head of the General Services Administration, and a very able gentleman, cannot in any way be blamed for any of the difficulties in connection with the New Senate Office Building or the New House Office Building, inasmuch as he has no jurisdiction or control over the construction of those buildings.

Mrs. BOLTON. Who does have that control or jurisdiction?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I cannot answer that.

Mrs. BOLTON. I think that is a question that should be answered, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly endorse H.R. 7645. I want to congratulate Chairman JONES and the members of his subcommittee for their successful effort in working out a bill which will allow a reasonable public buildings program and at the same time keep it fully under the control of the Congress. I am very pleased to join in sponsorship of this legislation. I hope the Congress will pass this bill without any delay.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I would like the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES]. I would like to ask him a question concerning the language on page 4 of the bill, lines 13, 14, 15, and 16, which provide "if such construction, alteration, or acquisition has not been approved by resolutions adopted by the Committee on Public Works of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively."

My question is this: Does this mean that the Committees of Public Works of the House and Senate are to be the sole authorities as to what public buildings are going to be constructed throughout the country?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. It does not mean that at all. In the first place, the need for a Federal building would be ascertained by the General Services Administration in cooperation with the Post Office Department or any other agency that has the space requirement. After a survey is made, a prospectus would be transmitted to the Congress and duly referred to the Committee on Public Works. The bill goes on to state what shall be contained in the prospectus to make sure that there is careful consideration by the Committee on Public Works to see that there is wise and prudent use made of the funds. After the prospectus is approved, it follows the normal appropriation process accorded every other project approved by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; but the provision to which I referred and, incidentally, it is contained in two or three places in the bill, provides that your committee and the Senate committee has full authority, and I take it that nothing would be approved that had not been previously screened and approved by your committee and its counterpart in the Senate.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. All right. Then you are arrogating to the House Public Works Committee and its counterpart in the

other body, the authority to tell the Congress what it can and cannot do.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I will say to the gentleman that the reverse is true. What we are trying to do is to provide another step in the orderly analysis of these projects to see that the Congress is protected.

Mr. GROSS. What is the other step?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Section (b) of section 11 gives the authority to the Committee on Public Works to initiate the consideration of prospectuses in addition to the authority that is conferred on the General Services Administration. Rather than limiting the House and the other body in the consideration, it gives another step to make sure.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, but in the original premise, you determine where these buildings can be constructed, leaving out the exemptions of $100,000 and $200,000. If the costs exceed those figures, then the Committee on Public Works of the House or Senate brings in a resolution which says you can or cannot have a public building in a district or State.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Well, I cannot give assurances because I do not know what the policy will be and what fiscal policy will be adopted by the Congress. But, certainly, there is no need for the Committee on Public Works to authorize $500 million when there is an annual appropriation or an anticipated annual appropriation of $100 million. That is one of the virtues of these proceedings. It is to give the Committee on Public Works that authority to assist the Members of the House to analyze all projects.

Mr. GROSS. But, you go further than assisting. If the gentleman thinks the House of Representatives should decide the location of Federal buildings, let me ask him this question—would he have any objection to an amendment substituting "Congress" in place of "Senate Committee on Public Works" and "House Committee on Public Works" as the determinant? In other words, let all the Members participate in the process of selecting where these structures shall be located, rather than the comparatively few Members who compose two committees.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to the gentleman from Iowa that if we follow the congressional pattern of approval this would further delay the program. We would have to have an individual authorization for each project. The result could be that we would have more projects authorized than there are funds available for construction. I think it would be a source of embarrassment to future Congresses for a preceding Congress to approve projects well knowing there would not be sufficient money for their construction.

Under this bill if Congress want to appropriate for 10 buildings a year, then they in their judgment can make that decision; if they want to appropriate for a hundred buildings they will still have that authority. I do not see any objection to this procedure. The lease-purchase program showed that this prospectus method was workable. There is ample precedent in the military public works appropriation act as well as the watershed act. The Committee approval method has worked well. Not a single objection to any of these procedures has been voiced as far as I know.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. We have altogether too many legislative enactments.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I think it is the sense of the Congress to scrutinize its own doings more closely.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Is it not a fact that it has to be reviewed by the Appropriations Committee in the bills we pass?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Absolutely. This does not take away any rights from the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL].

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I want to indicate my support of this bill. I serve on the Public Works Committee, and I want to agree with what the gentleman from Illinois has said about the work of the Public Works Committee.

I agree with what the gentleman from Illinois has said about the work of the Public Works Committee, and at this time I am happy to join with the gentleman from Illinois in the tribute he paid to Mr. Franklin Floete. We from Iowa are especially proud, because this gentleman from Iowa has served unselfishly, ably, and with great distinction in many areas of public service. As head of the General Services Administration he is continuing to give his Government and our people the benefit of his splendid administrative abilities.

I also want to add at this time an expression of the pleasure I experienced in serving under our chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee.

I feel that this bill is worthwhile, and I hope that it passes.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCFALL].

Mr. MCFALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill which I believe to be highly necessary and desirable. In addition to recodifying a large segment of the existing building statutes, it adds new features that should asist the Congress in devising a workable public building program in the future.

May I also add my compliments to those already made concerning the fine work of the chairman of the subcommittee and the author of the bill, Mr. JONES of Alabama. The form and substance of the bill has largely resulted from his hard work and excellent leadership.

It was a privilege to work with him and the other members of this subcommittee on this legislation.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCFALL. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I want to direct a question to the chairman of the committee, for whom I have the highest regard and who I think has done a fine job, except I would like to see what we can do to cut out some building instead of making it easier to build.

I call the gentleman's attention to this language on page 10:

> (c) The Administrator in carrying out his duties under this Act shall provide for the construction and acquisition of public buildings equitably throughout the United States with due regard to the comparative urgency of the need for each particular building.

What does that mean?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That means that we want to get a distribution of public building construction that will be equitable to all parts of the country and not construct these buildings in just one locality.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I know the gentleman has, as I have, ever since he has been here heard about the decentralization of government, yet still we are building more buildings to put more people, to congest traffic here in the District, and to further compound the problems that are besetting this Capital City.

Can the gentleman tell me if anything he knows of is being done by any agency of the Congress, including his committee, to try to bring about the decentralization of the Government in the District of Columbia so they can carry out their work more efficiently? Is anything being done about spending less money for buildings in the District of Columbia?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Let me say to the gentleman from Missouri that the purpose of this bill is to achieve an equitable distribution of these buildings. The committee did not undertake to consider whether it was wise to make a decentralization of agencies located in the District of Columbia. Certainly this bill affords an opportunity for the Congress in the future to decide the location of the buildings, the number of the buildings, and how much we will annually appropriate for this matter.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I just wanted to make this point clear that I will vote against any bill, either authorization or appropriation which has for its purpose the building of any more buildings in the District of Columbia for bringing more people in here to further congest this community.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I may say to the gentleman that he will lose none of his rights to object to the location of a building either in the District of Columbia or in any other community. The proper forum for that discussion will be in the consideration of the annual appropriation bills.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCFALL. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. I want to ask the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, chairman of the subcommittee, in line with the colloquy with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES], likewise that language does not mean either that

there will be the old system of putting a building in each congressional district whether it is needed or not? It does not imply that?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The committee does not have such ambitions. I do not know what future Congresses will decide, but certainly it is not for us to make that determination in the consideration of this bill.

Mr. COLMER. I am glad to hear the gentleman make that statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. I want to commend the Committee on Public Works for bringing this bill to the floor of the House for consideration, and refer specifically to section 7, subsection (d), which restricts the number of projects approved yearly by the Committee on Public Works. It is my understanding that this restriction is limited to 30 projects and there will be no authorizations for any projects beyond that number?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Thirty authorized projects for which appropriations have not been made at the expiration of a year.

Mr. BOLAND. When it falls below 30 it is possible for the committee to approve an additional number?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The committee can approve a hundred, but if the Committee on Appropriations does not by making appropriations, reduce that number to below 30 at the end of the year, we would be precluded from approving additional projects for appropriation.

Mr. BOLAND. If the Committee on Appropriations does not want to make any appropriation, then, of course, no buildings would be built?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. BOLAND. But with reference to this section, as the gentleman has indicated and as the gentleman from Florida indicated, this restriction is a good one because it does take away the tremendous amount of pressure that is placed on the particular subcommittees of the full Appropriations Committee with reference to instant projects. We have these in reference to public works projects, rivers and harbors and navigation projects, flood control projects throughout America. I think this particular section of the bill is a good one, and I compliment the committee for putting it in.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOOLEY].

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to compliment the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Alabama, for a very fine piece of work in connection with this legislation, and also for bringing it to the floor of the House for consideration at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Public Buildings Act of 1959".

SEC. 2. No public building shall be constructed except by the Administrator, who shall construct such public building in accordance with this Act.

SEC. 3. The Administrator is authorized to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, donation, exchange, or otherwise, any building and its site which he determines to be necessary to carry out his duties under this Act.

SEC. 4. (a) The Administrator is authorized to alter any public building under his control, and to acquire in accordance with section 5 of this Act such land as may be necessary to carry out such alteration.

(b) No approval under section 7 shall be required for any alteration and acquisition authorized by this section the estimated maximum cost of which does not exceed $200,000.

SEC. 5. (a) The Administrator is authorized to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, donation, exchange, or otherwise, such lands or interests in lands as he deems necessary for use as sites, or additions to sites, for public buildings authorized to be constructed or altered under this Act.

(b) Whenever a public building is to be used in whole or in part for post office purposes the Administrator shall act jointly with the Postmaster General in selecting the town or city wherein such building is to be constructed, and in selecting the site in such town or city for such building.

(c) Whenever the Administrator is to acquire a site under this section, he may, if he deems it necessary, solicit by public advertisement, proposals for the sale, donation, or exchange of real property to the United States to be used as such site. In selecting a site under this section the Administrator (with the concurrence of the Postmaster General if the public building to be constructed thereon is to be used in whole or in part for post office purposes) is authorized to select such site as in his estimation is the most advantageous to the United States, all factors considered, and to acquire such site without regard to title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended.

SEC. 6. (a) Whenever the Administrator deems it to be in the best interest of the United States to construct a new public building to take the place of an existing public building, he is authorized to demolish the existing building and to use the site on which it is located for the site of the proposed public building, or, if in his judgment it is more advantageous to construct such public building on a different site in the same city, he is authorized to exchange such building and site, or such site, for another site, or to sell such building and site in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) Whenever the Administrator determines that a site acquired for the construction of a public building is not suitable for that purpose, he is authorized to exchange such site for another, or to sell it in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended.

(c) Nothing in this section shall be deemed to permit the Administrator to use any land as a site for a public building if such project has not been approved in accordance with section 7.

SEC. 7. (a) In order to insure the equitable distribution of public buildings throughout the United States with due regard for the comparative urgency of need for such buildings, except as provided in section 4, no appropriation shall be made to construct any public building or to acquire any building to be used as a public building involving an expenditure in excess of $100,000, and no appropriation shall be made to alter any public building involving an expenditure in excess of $200,000, if such construction, alteration, or acquisition has not been approved by resolutions adopted by the Committee on Public Works of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and such approval has not been rescinded as provided in subsection (c) of this section. For the purpose of securing consideration of such approval the Administrator shall transmit to Congress a prospectus of the proposed project, including (but not limited to)—

(1) a brief description of the building to be constructed, altered, or acquired under this Act;

(2) the location of the project, and an esimate of the maximum cost of the project;

(3) a comprehensive plan for providing space for all Government officers and employees in the locality of the proposed project, having due regard for suitable space which may continue to be available in existing Government-owned buildings and in rented buildings;

(4) a statement by the Administrator that suitable space owned by the Government is not available and that suitable rental space is not available at a price commensurate with that to be afforded through the proposed action; and

(5) a statement of rents and other housing costs currently being paid by the Government for Federal agencies to be housed in the building to be constructed altered, or acquired.

(b) The estimated maximum cost of any project approved under this section as set forth in any prospectus may be increased by an amount equal to the percentage increase, if any, as determined by the Administrator, in construction or alteration costs, as the case may be, from the date of transmittal of such prospectus to Congress, but in no event shall the increase authorized by this subsection exceed 10 per centum of such estimated maximum cost.

(c) In the case of any project approved for construction, alteration, or acquisition by the Commitees on Public Works of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, respectively, in accordance with subsection (a) of this section, for which an appropriation has not been made within one year after the date of such approval, either the Committee on Public Works of the Senate or the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives, may rescind, by resolution, its approval of such project at any time thereafter before such an appropriation has been made.

(d) The Committees on Public Works of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, respectively, shall not approve any project for construction, alteration, or acquisition under subsection (a) of this section whenever there are thirty or more projects the estimated maximum cost of each of which is in excess of $200,000 which have been approved for more than one year under subsection (a) but for which appropriations have not been made, until there has been a rescission of approval under subsection (c) or appropriations are made which result in there being less than thirty such projects.

SEC. 8. (a) In carrying out his duties under this Act, the Administrator shall acquire real property within the District of Columbia exclusively within (1) the area bounded by E Street, New York Avenue, and Pennsylvania Avenue, Northwest, on the north; Delaware Avenue, Southwest, on the east; Virginia Avenue and Maryland Avenue projected in a straight line to the Tidal Basin, Southwest, on the south; and the Potomac

River on the west (including properties within said area belonging to the District of Columbia; but excluding those portions of squares 267, 268, and 298 not belonging to the District of Columbia, the square known as South of 463, all of square 493, lots 16, 17, 20, and 21, and 808 in square 536, and lots 16 and 45 in square 635); and (2) the areas designated as squares 11, 19, 20, 32, 33, 44, 59, and 167, all of said areas being within the District of Columbia.

(b) The purposes of this Act shall be carried out in the District of Columbia as nearly as may be practicable in harmony with the plan of Peter Charles L'Enfant and such public buildings shall be so constructed or altered as to combine architectural beauty with practical utility.

(c) Whenever in constructing or altering a public building under this Act in the District of Columbia the Administrator determines that such construction or alteration requires the utilization of contiguous squares as a site for such building, such portions of streets as lie between such squares and such alleys as intersect such squares are authorized to be closed and vacated if such closing and vacating is mutually agreed to by the Administrator, the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and the National Capital Planning Commission. The portions of such streets and alleys so closed and vacated shall thereupon become part of such site.

SEC. 9. The Administrator is authorized to carry out any construction or alteration authorized by this Act by contract, if he deems it to be most advantageous to the United States.

SEC. 10. (a) The Administrator whenever he determines it to be necessary, is authorized to employ, by contract or otherwise, and without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, or to the civil service laws, rules, and regulations, or to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, the services of established architectural or engineering corporations, firms, or individuals, to the extent he may require such services for any public building authorized to be constructed or altered under this Act.

(b) No corporation, firm, or individual shall be employed under authority of subsection (a) on a permanent basis.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section the Administrator shall be responsible for all construction authorized by this Act, including the interpretation of construction contracts, the approval of materials and workmanship supplied pursuant to a construction contract, approval of changes in the construction contract, certification of vouchers for payments due the contractor, and final settlement of the contract.

SEC. 11. (a) The Administrator shall submit to Congress each January, promptly after the convening of Congress, a report showing the location, space, cost, and status, of each public building the construction, alteration, or acquisition of which is to be under authority of this Act and which was uncompleted as of the date of the last preceding report made under this Act.

(b) The Administrator and the Postmaster General are hereby authorized and directed to make such building project surveys as may be requested by resolution by either the Committee on Public Works of the Senate or the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives, and within a reasonable time shall make a report thereon to the Congress. Such report shall contain all other information required to be included in a prospectus of the proposed public building project under section 7(a) of this Act.

SEC. 12. (a) The Administrator is authorized and directed to make a continuing investigation and survey of the public buildings needs of the Federal Government in order that he may carry out his duties under this Act, and, as he determines necessary, to submit to Congress prospectuses of proposed projects in accordance with section 7(a) of this Act.

(b) In carrying out his duties under this Act the Administrator shall cooperate with all Federal agencies in order to keep informed of their needs, shall advise each such agency of his program with respect to such agency, and may request the cooperation and assistance of each Federal agency in carrying out his duties under this Act. Each Federal agency shall cooperate with, advise, and assist the Administrator in carrying out his duties under this Act as determined necessary by the Administrator to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(c) The Administrator in carrying out his duties under this Act shall provide for the construction and acquisition of public buildings equitably throughout the United States with due regard to the comparative urgency of the need for each particular building.

SEC. 13. As used in this Act—

(1) The term "public building" means any building, whether for single or multitenant occupancy, its grounds, approaches, and appurtenances, which is necessary for the functioning of a Federal agency; but shall not include buildings (A) on the public domain (including that reserved for national forests and other purposes), (B) on properties of the United States in foreign countries, (C) on Indian and native Eskimo properties held in trust by the United States, (D) used as a part of Federal programs for agricultural, recreational, and conservation purposes, including research in connection therewith, (E) on or used in connection with river, harbor, flood control, reclamation, power, and chemical manufacturing or developing projects, (F) housing and residential projects, (G) on military installations (including any fort, camp, post, naval training station, airfield, proving ground, military supply depot, military school, or any similar facility of the Department of Defense), and (H) used by the Veterans' Administration for hospital or domiciliary purposes on installations under its jurisdiction, or to other buildings on such installations; and shall not include any other building the exclusion of which the President may deem, from time to time hereafter, to be justified in the public interest.

(2) The term "Administrator" means the Administrator of General Services.

(3) The term "Federal agency" means any executive agency or any establishment in the legislative or judicial branch of the Government (except the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the Architect of the Capitol and any activities under his direction).

(4) The term "executive agency" means any executive department or independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government including any wholly owned Government corporation and including (A) the Central Bank for Cooperatives and the regional banks for cooperatives, (B) Federal land banks, (C) Federal intermediate credit banks, (D) Federal home loan banks, (E) Federal Deposit Insurance Corporations, and (F) the Federal National Mortgage Association.

(5) The term "alter" includes repairing, remodeling, improving, or extending or other changes in a public building.

(6) The terms "construct" and "alter" include preliminary planning, engineering, architectural, legal, fiscal, and economic investigations and studies, surveys, designs, plans, working drawings, specifications, procedures, and other similar actions necessary for the construction or alterations, as the case may be, of a public building.

(7) The term "United States" includes the several States, the District of Columbia, the Territory of Hawaii, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

SEC. 14. This Act shall not apply to the construction of any public building—

(1) for which an appropriation for construction is made out of the $500,000 made available for construction of small public building projects outside the District of Columbia pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of May 25, 1926, as amended, in the third paragraph, or for which an appropriation is made in the fourth, sixth, seventh, and eighth paragraphs, under the heading "GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION" in title I of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1959,

(2) which is a project referred to in the first proviso of the fifth paragraph under the heading "GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION" in title I of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1959,

(3) for which an appropriation for direct construction by an executive agency other than the General Services Administration of a specified public building has been made before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 15. The performance, in accordance with standards established by the Administrator of General Services, of the responsibilities and authorities vested in him under this Act shall, upon request, be delegated to the appropriate executive agency where the estimated cost of the project does not exceed $200,000.

SEC. 16. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to limit or repeal—

(1) existing authorizations for the leasing of buildings by and for the use of the General Services Administration or the Post Office Department, or

(2) the authorization for the improvement of public buildings contained in title III of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a postal policy, to adjust postal rates, to adjust the compensation of postal employees, and for other purposes", approved May 27, 1958 (72 Stat. 134; 39 U.S.C., secs. 1071, 1075).

SEC. 17. The following provisions of law are repealed except as to their application to any project referred to in section 14:

(1) The first sentence of section 6 of the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, nineteen hundred and seventeen, and for other purposes", approved September 1, 1916 (40 U.S.C. 23).

(2) The first sentence of the last paragraph under the side heading "LIGHTING AND HEATING FOR THE PUBLIC GROUNDS" under the subheading "UNDER ENGINEER DEPARTMENT" under the heading "UNDER THE WAR DEPARTMENT" in the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, nineteen hundred and twelve, and for other purposes", approved March 4, 1911 (40 U.S.C. 24).

(3) The proviso in the sixth paragraph under the side heading "In the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency" under the heading "TREASURY DEPARTMENT" in the Act entitled "An Act making additional Appropriations and to supply the Deficiencies in the Appropriations for the Service of the Government for the fiscal Year ending June thirty, eighteen hundred and seventy, and June thirty, eighteen hundred and seventy-one, and for other Purposes", approved July 15, 1870 (40 U.S.C. 32).

(4) Section 9 of the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, nineteen hundred and eight, and for other purposes", approved March 4, 1907, as amended (40 U.S.C. 33).

(5) That part of the fourth from last paragraph under the subheading "BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS IN AND AROUND WASHINGTON" under the heading "UNDER THE WAR DEPARTMENT" in the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the government for the fiscal year

ending June thirtieth, eighteen hundred and eighty-four, and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1883 (40 U.S.C. 59), as reads "; and all officers in charge of public buildings in the District of Columbia shall cause the flow of water in the buildings under their charge to be shut off from five o'clock postmeridian to eight o'clock antemeridian: *Provided*, That the water in said public buildings is not necessarily in use for public business".

(6) Section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to suspend work upon the public buildings", approved June 23, 1874, as amended (40 U.S.C. 254).

(7) The thirty-first and thirty-second paragraphs under the subheading "PUBLIC BUILDINGS" under the heading "UNDER THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT" in the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, eighteen hundred and ninety, and for other purposes", approved March 2, 1889, as amended (40 U.S.C. 260 and 268).

(8) The fifth from the last paragraph under the subheading "PUBLIC BUILDINGS" under the heading "UNDER THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT" in the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, nineteen hundred and ten, and for other purposes", approved March 4, 1909, as amended (40 U.S.C. 262).

(9) The proviso in the fortieth paragraph under the subheading "PUBLIC BUILDINGS" under the heading "UNDER THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT" in the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the government for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, eighteen hundred and eighty-three, and for other purposes", approved August 7, 1882, as amended (40 U.S.C. 263).

(10) The proviso in the last paragraph of section 5 of the Act entitled "An Act to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, to authorize the enlargement, extension, remodeling, or improvement of certain public buildings, to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings, to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, and for other purposes", approved March 4, 1913 (40 U.S.C. 264).

(11) Section 35 of the Act entitled "An Act to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, to authorize the enlargement, extension, remodeling, or improvement of certain public buildings, to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings, to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, and for other purposes", approved June 25, 1910, as amended (40 U.S.C. 265).

(12) Section 3734 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (40 U.S.C. 267).

(13) The last paragraph under the subheading "PUBLIC BUILDINGS" under the heading "UNDER THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT" in the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, eighteen hundred and ninety-six, and for other purposes", approved March 2, 1895, as amended (40 U.S.C. 274).

(14) The second and fourth provisos in the paragraph with the side heading "Furniture and repairs of furniture" under the subheading "PUBLIC BUILDINGS, OPERATING EXPENSES" under the heading "TREASURY DEPARTMENT" in the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, nineteen hundred and seventeen, and for other purposes", approved July 1, 1916, as amended (40 U.S.C. 275 and 282).

(15) The fourth from the last paragraph under the subheading "PUBLIC BUILDINGS" under the heading "UNDER THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT" in the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, nineteen hundred and one, and for other purposes", approved June 6, 1900, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276).

(16) That part of the proviso in the last paragraph under the subheading "PUBLIC BUILDINGS" under the heading "UNDER THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT" in the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, eighteen hundred and ninety-three, and for other purposes", approved August 5, 1892, as amended (40 U.S.C. 277), which reads ": nor shall there hereafter be paid more than six dollars per day to any person employed outside of the District of Columbia, in any capacity whatever, whose compensation is paid from appropriations for public buildings in course of construction, but the Secretary of the Treasury may, in his discretion, authorize payment in cities of eighty thousand or more inhabitants of a sum not exceeding eight dollars per day for such purposes".

(17) So much of the eighth from the last paragraph under the subheading "PUBLIC BUILDINGS" under the heading "UNDER THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT" in the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, eighteen hundred and eighty-eight, and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1887, as amended (40 U.S.C. 278) as reads ", and hereafter where public buildings shall be completed with the exception of heating apparatus and approaches but one person shall be employed by the Government for the supervision and care of such building".

(18) Titles I and III and sections 401 and 406 of the Public Buildings Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 352, 353, 354, 297, 297a, 298, and 298c).

(19) Except for sections 3 and 8, all of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes", approved May 25, 1926, as amended (40 U.S.C. 341 and the following).

(20) The proviso in the next to last paragraph under the subheading "MISCELLANEOUS PUBLIC BUILDING PROJECTS" under the heading "TREASURY DEPARTMENT" in the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes", approved December 22, 1927 (40 U.S.C. 342a).

(21) Section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire certain lands within the District of Columbia to be used as sites for public buildings", approved January 13, 1928, as amended (40 U.S.C. 348).

(22) Subsections (c) and (e) of the Act entitled "An Act To amend the Act entitled 'An Act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes,' approved May 25, 1926 (Forty-fourth Statutes, page 630); the Act entitled 'An Act to amend section 5 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes," approved May 25, 1926,' dated February 24, 1928 (Forty-fifth Statutes, page 137); and the Act entitled 'An Act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire certain land within the District of Columbia to be used as space for public buildings,' approved January 13, 1928 (Forty-fifth Statutes, page 51", approved March 31, 1930, as amended (40 U.S.C. 349 and 350a).

(23) The Act entitled "An Act To authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to accept donations of sites for public buildings", approved June 27, 1930, as amended (40 U.S.C. 350).

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be reported and considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments: Page 6, line 13, strike out "$200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$100,000".

Page 10, strike out line 20 and all that follows down through and including line 17 on page 11 and insert the following:

"(1) The term 'public building' means any building, whether for single or multitenant occupancy, its grounds, approaches, and appurtenances, which is generally suitable for office or storage space or both for the use of one or more executive agencies or mixed ownership corporations, and shall include: (i) Federal office buildings, (ii) post offices, (iii) customhouses, (iv) courthouses, (v) appraisers stores, (vi) border inspection facilities, (vii) warehouses, (viii) record centers, (ix) relocation facilities, (x) similar Federal facilities, and (xi) any other buildings or construction projects the inclusion of which the President may deem, from time to time hereafter, to be justified in the public interest; but shall not include any such buildings and construction projects: (A) on the public domain (including that reserved for national forests and other purposes), (B) on properties of the United States in foreign countries, (C) on Indian and native Eskimo properties held in trust by the United States, (D) on lands used in connection with Federal programs for agricultural, recreational, and conservation purposes, including research in connection therewith, (E) on or used in connection with river, harbor, flood control, reclamation, power, chemical manufacturing or development projects, (F) on or used in connection with housing and residential projects, (G) on military installations (including any fort, camp, post, naval training station, airfield, proving ground, military supply depot, military school, or any similar facility of the Department of Defense), (H) on Veterans' Administration installations used for hospital or domiciliary purposes, and (I) the exclusion of which the President may deem, from time to time hereafter, to be justified in the public interest."

Page 13, line 18, immediately after "shall," insert "except for the authority contained in section 4,".

Page 13, line 20, strike out "$200,000." and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$100,000, and may be delegated to the appropriate executive agency where the Administrator determines that such delegation will promote efficiency and economy. No delegation of responsibility or authority made under this section shall exempt the person to whom such delegation is made, or the exercise of such responsibility or authority, from any other provision of this Act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have a question or two that I did not have time to ask a short time ago. On page 7 of the bill I note this language: "Whenever in constructing or altering a public building under this act in the District of Columbia the Administrator determines that such construction or alteration requires the utilization of contiguous squares, streets, alleys," and so on and so forth. What is the meaning of that? Is that by any chance to take care of the streets

which will be closed where this new super-duper House Office Building is being built?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that is the present law which was enacted in 1926. As I said earlier in the discussion on the bill, this is a recodification of the law, and we carried forward what has been in the law since 1926.

Mr. GROSS. Then it has no relation to that palace, the new House Office Building?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. None whatsoever.

Mr. GROSS. Now let me ask the gentleman a question concerning the language on page 6 of the bill, "In carrying out his duties under this act, the Administrator shall acquire real property within the District of Columbia," and it goes on to set forth where this property is located. What is involved here?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That is the same language contained in the 1926 act.

Mr. GROSS. Well, what is involved? Why restate it in this bill?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Well, it was carried in the 1926 act. It represents an area that has already been declared to be in a taking area for the use of Federal public buildings, and there has been no question raised about it by any of the agencies or departments of the Government so far as I know.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, this bill, I suggest to the gentleman from Iowa, is a recodification of existing law concerning Federal buildings, and therefore it is necessary to carry forward the provisions in the present 1926 act that are good, in the nature of a recodification, and that is why this entire section 8 is in the bill. I ask the gentleman from Alabama if that is not correct.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Then this is not paving the way for acquiring a lot of new property?

Mr. CRAMER. This is merely a description, I will say to the gentleman from Iowa, of the area within the District where the Federal Government is authorized to acquire property.

Mr. GROSS. And there is already authority in law to acquire this property?

Mr. CRAMER. They already have such authority, that is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, however good a job the committee has done on this bill—and I understand they have done a remarkably fine one in rewriting present legislation—there is little in it that will be helpful to those of us who want to limit the cost of public buildings.

I ran away over the 4th and went home to Michigan and I learned a couple of brothers, young men, who have been in the contracting business in a small way, had a tale of woe: They would like to know what I have been wasting my time down here for. And, I said, "What was biting them?" I was told, they took a contract to build a couple of schoolhouses over south of South Haven, and after their signatures were on the contract then along came the carpenters' strike for a raise. They asked, "Isn't the Congress going to do anything to prevent unions raising wages after a contract is entered into?" You see the situation there?

Well, I said, "I cannot do anything about it." I was told, "If you do not do something about it, we will send somebody else down there." That does not bother me too much, because it is always a matter of whether the voters or the undertaker first gets a chance, but it will make some difference to younger Members.

If this House does not pass a labor bill and if the Senate does not join in and we correct some of these evil practices, which have been called to the public's attention by the McClellan committee, there are some Members I see here now, younger men, who are not going to be around here in 1960.

I suppose my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER] who is a member of the Committee on Labor, disagrees with me, but his district may not be the same as some other districts. Some folks are interested in what it costs for construction and they are getting very, very tired of having to pay more and more whenever they spend a dollar and, in addition, they are becoming exasperated because Jimmy Hoffa and his racketeers—and Reuther, too, for that matter—you do not need to excuse him, although the McClellan committee seems to have gone rather soft on him, probably because they have too much work—are permitted to continue their unfair and, in many instances, illegal practices. And, unless there is some legislation that limits this continuing extortion, there will be trouble for some of us at election time. I may want to run again, I do not know. But if we will not give the people and the workers protection, the Department of Justice will have to get on the ball and get a few convictions.

I wish it were possible for the Members of this House to earn a position in history by enacting legislation which will curb at least some of this racketeering and extortion, and also induce the Department of Justice to bring charges against open violation of laws that are now on the books.

Of course, I am a Republican and I am not saying anything against any Republican officeholder who may be down in the administration. I think it is all right to guess that perhaps sometime, unless the Department of Justice does get busy and enforce the Hobbs Act—you remember the Hobbs amendment to the racketeering statute; I read it again this morning and it seems to cover a lot of situations and a lot of the incidents that have occurred in the last few years and which have shocked so many—this country will be the extortionists' plum tree.

I do not suppose it is possible to write anything in here, to cut costs but I know that the Republicans at least are going to do their best to get out a labor bill which will be fair to the union workers, nonunion men and the public.

Believe it or not, the members of the unions are the boys who are kicking the most right now because the take of Hoffa, Reuther and all the rest of the extortionists is getting so big that it is becoming oppressive, unbearable. Added to the high cost of living, some of those fellows who have four or five or more kids are having difficulty bringing home the food that is actually needed, to say nothing about the new clothing and other desirable things that they might wish to add.

Why should either workers or consumers continue to pay for soft living for professional crooks.

So I appeal to the Members of the House, if that is proper under the rules, to give a little encouragement to the Committee on Education and Labor to bring out a bill that will be fair, something which is not a conduit through which the crooks can steal a part of the employees wage. The Democrats have 20 members on that committee. That is an overwhelming majority. Republicans have but 10. They can bring out a bill here that will end the outrageous stealing that is now going on.

How about it? Think it over, if you have time and the inclination to protect the average employee, the consumer—the citizens.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the chairman of the committee if I am correct in an impression I have. I refer to page 8, section 10, which says that the Administrator, whenever he determines it to be necessary, is authorized to employ by contract or otherwise, and so forth.

Will he have to go before the Committee on Appropriations and get a specific appropriation before he can employ a specific architectural firm or an architect to make plans?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. He would have to get the necessary appropriation for site acquisition and planning. This I assume would include funds for architectural services.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Is it the intention of the committee that the Administrator make a specific request before the Committee on Appropriations for each specific parcel of land, each specific building, each specific job, each specific architect that he is going to employ; or does he go in and get a bulk appropriation and then spend that money as he determines to be necessary? What I want to find out is what is the limitation on the Administrator.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The gentleman from Missouri ought to propound that question to the Committee on Appropriations. I do not know what scrutiny they will give to who is employed for each project. This provision is for extraordinary services on some of the larger buildings, which require a departure from a prototype building. There is no need for the Federal Government to employ high-priced architects on a permanent basis.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I would disagree with the gentleman there, because I do not think anybody has ever accused

the Government of not paying liberal fees to architects or to anyone else.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I did not mean to engage in any debate with the gentleman on the general policy of the executive branch of the Government in spending money. What I am trying to say to the gentleman is that in the employment of these architects on a temporary basis, they are excluded from the Classification Act of 1949.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I hope the gentleman will pardon me if I am making myself burdensome, but what I am trying to find out is what was the intent of your committee when you accepted this language and if there were going to be any restrictions other than the Committee on Appropriations, then, if so, to what extent would there be a limit put on it?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. If the gentleman will read the bill, section 7 shows the procedures.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I am talking about section 10. Just this one thing.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Section 7 describes the procedures that will be adopted requiring the prospectus to be submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Public Works. The committees will examine the prospectus for all of the requirements established under section 7 to see that there are no excessive expenditures in the procurement of extraordinary type of employment.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If the gentleman will permit an interruption, the reason I made the statement is that just a few weeks ago they came in before the Committee on House Administration on the Congressional Library situation, and they were talking about building another addition to the Library, and they asked for $75,000 for a preliminary architectural survey. Then I got to inquiring, and it turns out they were talking about building another $45 million building to supplement the space in the Congressional Library. When you spend $75,000 down in my part of the country that is a lot of money, and $75,000 to an architect to tell you that you need a building and you do not even get any architectural drawings or anything like that is a lot of money to be paying for that service. I just want to see if we cannot save some of this money and cut out some of these expenditures.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I cannot see how the committee could have gone through greater labor and put greater safeguards in the bill to protect the very thing the gentleman from Missouri is talking about.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I have every confidence in the chairman and his committee, and if they would just assure me that they will be keeping an eye on the situation I will be satisfied.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I can give the gentleman the assurance that the Committee on Public Works will give it their attention.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I am glad to hear that, and I appreciate it.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to support H.R. 7645, the Public Buildings Act of 1959. I believe it is necessary and worthwhile legislation. It is a bill which when enacted into law will go a long way toward getting underway throughout the Nation a very necessary program of Federal building construction.

The history of the building construction program in this country from 1902 up to date discloses that there has been only one basic law placed on the books for overall Government building construction. That is the Public Buildings Act of 1926. H.R. 7645 is the first basic and fundamental change to be presented to the Congress since the enactment of the 1926 act. It contains the best features of the 1926 act and adds as well those features which through the years have proved to be workable ones in the development of a sound public building program. It places the authority for public building construction squarely where it belongs, in the hands of the Administrator of General Services. It gives to the Congress the necessary control for a coordinated public building program. It is a bill which was unanimously reported by the House Committee on Public Works, of which I am a member. It has been carefully worked out over a long period of time.

In my opinion, this is one piece of legislation that should be enacted into law during this session of the Congress. As I have stated before, here is a bill that contains the best features of the previous public building laws, adds new features that will further enhance the program and will, when enacted, finally bring about the implementation of a much needed building program. I am happy to support this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ASPINALL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7645) to provide for the construction, alteration, and acquisition of public buildings of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 311, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read a third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 7645.

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

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the District of Columbia appropriation bill, 1960, may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDING FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 299) providing for the consideration of H.R. 4049, a bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to authorize free or reduced-rate transportation for certain additional persons, 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. 4049) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to authorize free or reduced-rate transportation for certain additional persons. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, 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, I yield the usual 30 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE]; and pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 299 makes in order the consideration of H.R. 4049, which would amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to authorize free or reduced-rate transportation for certain additional persons. The resolution provides for an open rule and 1 hour of debate.

The purpose of this legislation is to give air carriers and foreign air carriers statutory authority to provide free or reduced-rate transportation to certain categories of persons in addition to those now specifically provided in the Federal Aviation Act of 1958. In addition to those already covered by existing law, this legislation would cover three additional categories of persons: First, retired directors, officers and employees and their immediate families; second,

the parents of officers and employees, and of retired officers and employees—whether or not living in the immediate household of the officer or employee concerned; and, third, the parents and members of the immediate family of any person injured or killed in an aircraft accident for travel in connection with the accident.

The proposed legislation is permissive. It would permit appropriate carrier action subject to the control of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

The Board proposed H.R. 4049 to clarify the situation regarding free or reduced-rate transportation privileges. Following conclusion of the hearings held by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, at which no one appeared in opposition to this legislation, the Committee offered two amendments. One committee amendment will give the carriers and the CAB ample latitude to provide necessary transportation for members of the immediate families of persons injured or killed in accidents, thus providing them with free or reduced-rate transportation "where the object is to transport such persons in connection with such accident." The second committee amendment is intended to prevent abuses of such transportation privileges which may be authorized by the CAB. It is intended that persons provided such free or reduced-rate transportation shall be treated as standby passengers eligible for transportation only if space is actually available at the time the aircraft is ready to depart, after cargo scheduled for the particular flight has been loaded, and all regular revenue passengers desiring transportation on the particular flight have been accommodated. The only exceptions to this requirement relate to the transportation of persons injured in aircraft accidents and the transportation of physicians and nurses attending such injured persons.

The Bureau of the Budget has no objection to the enactment of this legislation.

I urge the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to the adoption of the rule and I have no requests for time.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I 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. 4049) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to authorize free or reduced-rate transportation for certain additional persons.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 4049, with Mr. BOLLING in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] for 30 minutes.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 4049, introduced by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], was reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which recommended that it pass.

Hearings were held by the subcommittee. Consideration was given to it by the committee and the bill was reported with two amendments which will be considered here today.

I might advise that after the reporting of the bill some question developed about the second committee amendment but that matter will be taken care of by a substitute amendment which will be offered.

In writing the Civil Aeronautics Act in 1938, Congress strictly limited authority of the airlines to grant passes or reduced-rate fares.

In 1957 the Civil Aeronautics Board, after a lengthy investigation, found that airlines were issuing passes and reduced-rate transportation to certain groups without authority of law. These included:

First. Retired employees, officers, and directors.

Second. Members of the immediate families of persons killed or injured in aircraft accidents.

Third. Parents of officers and employees not living in the immediate household.

The Board, however, suspended enforcement of its new interpretation until September 1, 1958, to give Congress an opportunity to study the problem.

The Senate then passed legislation to authorize free and reduced-rate transportation to retired employees, officers, and directors. Certain employee groups asked that the legislation be broadened to let the airlines determine the membership of the immediate family for purposes of issuing free or reduced-rate transportation. The Board objected to this proposal, saying it could lead to abuses, but agreed to extend the effective date of its order another year to permit the Board staff to prepare legislation to meet the entire problem.

Early this session the Board submitted this legislation, which would add three new categories to make the groups mentioned above eligible for free and reduced-rate transportation, under rules prescribed by the Board.

For a detailed explanation of the bill I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], who is both author of the bill and chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics. His subcommittee held hearings on the bill and he can explain it very thoroughly to the membership. I would like to say as I recognize the gentleman from Mississippi and his subcommittee that I commend them for the fine work they have done on this and other difficult problems dealing with transportation and aviation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, this legislation was introduced at the request of the Civil Aeronautics Board. The purpose of the legislation is to give air carriers and foreign air carriers statutory authority to provide free or reduced-rate transportation to certain categories of persons in addition to those now specifically provided for in the Federal Aviation Act of 1958.

When the Civil Aeronautics Act was passed in 1938, Congress severely limited authority for free or reduced-rate air transportation because of the abuses that had grown up in other forms of transportation. They found that in rail transportation and other forms of regulated transportation great abuses had arisen through the granting of free and reduced rate privileges.

Existing law permits the airlines, under terms prescribed by the Civil Aeronautics Board, to provide free or reduced-rate transportation to a very limited category of persons. The Board has ruled that free or reduced-rate transportation is permissible only in the following cases:

First. Directors, officers, and employees of air carriers or foreign air carriers.

Second. Immediate families of directors, officers, and employees of air carriers or foreign air carriers.

Third. Witnesses and attorneys attending any legal investigation in which any such air carrier is interested.

Fourth. Persons injured in aircraft accidents.

Fifth. Physicians and nurses attending persons injured in aircraft accidents.

Sixth. Any person or property with the object of providing relief in cases of general epidemic, pestilence, or other calamitous visitation.

Seventh. In the case of overseas or foreign air transportation, such other persons and under such other circumstances as the Board may prescribe.

Eighth. Ministers of religion—limited to reduced rates on a space-available basis.

The amendment to existing law proposed by this legislation would permit such transportation for three additional categories of persons, namely: One, retired directors, officers, and employees, and their immediate families; two, the parents of officers and employees and of retired officers and employees—whether or not living in the immediate household of the officer or employee concerned; and, three, the parents and members of the immediate family of any person injured or killed in an aircraft accident for travel in connection with the accident.

The proposed legislation is permissive. It would permit appropriate carrier action subject to Board control.

It does not require that the airlines grant free or reduced rates to anyone, but permits them to do so within the framework of the regulations proposed by the CAB and the authority of this act.

The problem which this legislation is intended to meet came about following an interpretation made June 30, 1953, by the Civil Aeronautics Board severely restricting the categories of persons eligible for free or reduced-rate transportation. Many of the carriers and employee groups found this ruling to be un-

duly narrow in its construction, and requested the Board to reconsider. In October 1957 the Board reaffirmed its 1953 interpretation.

The Board's interpretation eliminated passes and reduced-rate transportation for parents of employees not actually residing in the "immediate" household, although a number of carriers had been granting such benefits. The ruling also eliminated passes and reduced-rate transportation for retired directors, officers, and employees. In addition, it has been the longstanding practice of carriers to permit free transportation for members of the immediate families of persons injured or killed in aircraft accidents. This was likewise eliminated by the Board's ruling.

Upon representations by the industry that the Board's ruling would result in hardships by eliminating practices of longstanding which had been imbedded in the industry's public and employee relations structure, the Board on February 13, 1958, suspended the effective date of its ruling until September 1, 1958, to give the Congress opportunity to consider legislation on the subject.

On March 6, 1958, the Senate passed legislation—S. 2919, 85th Congress—to authorize free or reduced-rate transportation for retired officers, directors, and employees, and members of their immediate families.

Subsequently certain employee groups urged that the definition of the term "immediate family" be broadened to give the carriers authority to determine the meaning of the term "immediate family" for the purpose of granting free or reduced-rate transportation.

Certain objections were raised to this proposal on the grounds that giving the carriers wide latitude to construe the words "immediate families" might invite abuses. The Civil Aeronautics Board then agreed to extend the effective date of the ruling previously made to September 1, 1959, to permit further consideration.

The pending legislation was introduced at the request of the Board.

The committee has amended the bill to clarify the intent with reference to the transportation of members of the immediate families of persons injured or killed in aircraft accidents. As introduced, the language of the bill might be construed as limiting such transportation to and from the scene of the accident. This is not the intent of the committee. In some cases, for example, accident victims might be moved to hospitals at considerable distance from the scene of the accident. The first committee amendment will give the carriers and the Civil Aeronautics Board ample latitude to provide necessary transportation for members of the immediate families of persons injured or killed in accidents. This amendment provides that members of the immediate families—including parents—of persons injured or killed in aircraft accidents may be furnished free or reduced-rate transportation "where the object is to transport such persons in connection with such accident."

The second committee amendment is intended to prevent abuses of free and reduced-rate transportation privileges which may be authorized by the Civil Aeronautics Board. This amendment limits free and reduced-rate transportation authorized to space not required for regular revenue-producing passengers and all cargo, including freight, express, and mail. The only exception to this requirement relate to the transportation of persons injured in aircraft accidents and the transportation of physicians and nurses attending such injured persons.

As the chairman mentioned a few minutes ago, after this amendment had been accepted by the committee and reported to the House, information was furnished to us which convinced us that the amendment was too restrictive in character. Certainly it was not the purpose of the committee in accepting this amendment to require that persons traveling in the interest of the regular business of the air carrier should be required to travel on a space-available basis. For instance, it is necessary for these carriers to ferry their crew members from place to place quite often on company business; to carry their pilots and stewardesses from one place to another. I am certain that it was not the intent of the committee to require that they be transported only on a space-available basis. Therefore the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE], who was the author of the original amendment, plans to submit a substitute which will provide that such free transportation as is granted under this act, which is for travel or vacation purposes, be on a space-available basis. It is my understanding that the airlines are not entirely satisfied with that language, but will reluctantly agree to it in order to help get the bill enacted and thus clarify the law respecting free and reduced rate transportation. Frankly, I feel that the language of the substitute amendment is very proper and will carry out the purposes originally intended to be carried out by the committee.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. I have a question. I wonder why we must include this privilege, which is sort of a fringe benefit, to parents and immediate families of officers and employees and immediate families of directors. This is a loose term. I presume it would extend to nephews and nieces and perhaps grandchildren.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; not necessarily.

Mr. VANIK. Why should not stockholders be included among those people? What were the arguments propounded with respect to the need for extending this reduced fare privilege to people who are in the same family as those of employees and officers?

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the gentleman will turn to page 4 of the report, he will see the definition of "immediate family" as it has been determined by the CAB. It includes several categories:

(a) To spouse and minor children, including minor children who receive the benefits of adoption.

(b) To immediate household, including persons permanently residing at the residence without the necessity of payment for board and room and on terms of approximate equality with the persons abovenamed.

Mr. VANIK. That would include nonrelatives if they lived in the same household.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It includes members of the immediate family in the immediate household. The term "immediate family" takes care of that.

Mr. VANIK. Am I also to understand, then, that it is the committee's intention that this will not include nonfamily members of the household?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I think the answer to the gentleman's question is clearly outlined in the report under (b) which says "to immediate household, including persons permanently residing at the residence without the necessity of paying for board and room." It may be an adopted child.

Mr. VANIK. Would it include nonrelated people?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, it could very well do that, if they are permanent residents there and they are supported by the family. That is the purpose of this.

Mr. VANIK. That answers my question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I remind the gentleman that this is already in the present law.

Mr. VANIK. Is this identical to the language in the present law?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The purpose of this legislation is to clarify the intent of the present law. Now, if you will go down to (c) you will find included in the "immediate family" also "for the purpose of traveling with any person above named, to such persons as are employed or retained to live in the household, having care of, or authority over, or being on terms of approximate equality with such a person, to tutor, nurse, supervise, attend, or be a companion to such a person."

Now, I would remind the gentleman that this is permissive legislation. There is no requirement that the airlines grant these privileges, but if the airlines want to carry all members of a family, and it is in line with the law and the CAB regulations, then I see no objection to it.

Mr. VANIK. I want to say that I object to this authorization for hauling large retinues of people, traveling at reduced fares. I think it is a very bad precedent to establish, and I want to say that I oppose it.

Mr. HARRIS. I would like to say to the gentleman from Ohio that I am fearful he does not understand precisely what this does. Now, there is under present law, as interpreted by the Civil Aeronautics Board, certain procedure with reference to free or reduced rates. Now, the Board in its 1953 and 1957 interpretations has construed very strictly certain categories.

As a result of this, certain employees and their families have been restricted from this reduced rate or free travel. As an example, when they had the Grand Canyon accident some 2 or 3 years ago, whenever it was, there was

a request that such permissive authority be granted to certain people who certainly would have been entitled to it, but the Board's interpretation, being strict as it was, those people were not eligible to receive free transportation. The purpose here is to permit those people who everyone recognizes should have the benefit of this program, to get it.

Mr. VANIK. With respect to that group of travelers, I do not think anyone in this House would have any objection.

Mr. HARRIS. That is all this does.

Mr. VANIK. But we are concerned about the authority provided in this bill to authorize reduced rates for directors, officers, and so forth.

Mr. HARRIS. That is already under the present provision.

Mr. VANIK. This extends it, further liberalizes it, does it not?

Mr. HARRIS. No. It is going to be restricted, as a matter of fact, more than under the present law when the substitute amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE] is offered.

Mr. VANIK. Will that be taken care of by the amendment?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes.

Mr. VANIK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. For the information of the House, I submit a letter from the president of the Air Transport Association which explains the problem sought to be corrected by the amendment mentioned previously by the gentleman from Mississippi. The letter is as follows:

AIR TRANSPORT ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., June 11, 1959.

HON. OREN HARRIS,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The second committee amendment to H.R. 4049, the free or reduced-rate air transportation bill, which the committee reported out June 9, poses several serious problems for the airlines, to which I would like to invite your attention.

The provisions of the present law on this subject have been in existence since the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 was first enacted. The principal purpose of H.R. 4049 is to correct a situation arising from an unduly narrow interpretation of the law made by the CAB in 1956, an interpretation which disrupted long-standing practices of most of the carriers with respect to certain categories of persons previously considered eligible to receive free and reduced rate transportation. The subject matter of the committee's second amendment which requires that all transportation herein authorized at free or reduced rates shall be on a "space-available basis only" is one that was never an issue between the CAB and the industry, nor was it an issue at the time the subcommittee held hearings on H.R. 4049.

This question was not raised by the subcommittee in its public hearings. If it had been, the air carriers would have had an opportunity to point out some of the problems which the imposition of this restriction by legislation would produce. We understand that some people, in private conversations, have made the statement that all such transportation is on a space-available basis anyway. This is not accurate.

It is true that the vast percentage of travel under this section is on a space-available basis and under the strict control of each airline. That has been true historically and is true today. Since the carriers are in business to make a profit while providing a safe, adequate and efficient public transportation service, we feel certain they will continue to administer this provision in such a way as to produce the maximum revenue and provide the greatest benefit to the public within their statutory obligations under the Federal Aviation Act.

To attain these objectives, the present law permits, and wisely so, discretion on the part of airline management to allow a reservation to be made in the limited number of cases where the public and the airline will benefit by such transportation.

By way of illustration, consider the following situations which would be confounded by this amendment.

1. Companies commonly ferry pilots and other crew personnel from one base to another on a positive space basis, when such transportation is necessary to maintain company services through the adjustment of flight and crew schedules. Without the discretion to do this, the company would have to purchase the transportation at extra expense, including the added bookkeeping costs, plus the transportation tax, and the space would still be taken on a positive basis.

2. Other company travel for emergency purposes or official company business of an urgent nature could not be performed with a reservation under the amendatory proviso of this bill. It may be said that such travel can be performed through the purchase of regular transportation at no extra cost to the company except increased taxes. However, there is the added cost of bookkeeping and the ultimate result that the transportation is still performed on a positive space basis but at an extra expense to the company. The decision as to the necessity of such travel still remains in the hands of the company.

3. In the case of subsidized carriers, the necessity to purchase necessary company travel in lieu of permitting positive space transportation adds to the subsidy requirements of that carrier, not only because of the cost of travel on its own system, but because of the necessity, on some occasions, of purchasing travel on other carriers to attend important CAB proceedings or other business meetings. Under the present law without this amendment, such carriers may be issued positive space transportation.

4. The amendment would preclude positive space for emergency travel for employees or their families in the case of death, serious illness, etc., when it is of great importance to be able to assure immediate transportation.

5. The amendment would partially negate one of the other amendments of the same bill in that it would prevent the positive transportation of the immediate families of persons injured or killed in an accident in connection with such accident. This was a matter to which the subcommittee in its hearings devoted considerable attention.

6. The inability for any carriers to provide positive space even on a reduced fare basis will eliminate this revenue producing medium for the carrier, since employees would be unwilling to pay a reduced fare for travel unless they could make a reservation. Thus, the employee who would be willing to pay a 50 percent or other reduced fare in return for a reservation, would instead travel on a space available basis at no revenue to the company.

7. As a general rule, airline policy with respect to free or reduced-rate transportation prohibits employee travel when it would deprive a fare-paying passenger of space, even when an employee is traveling on positive space on company business.

8. On deluxe trips or preferred service schedules, most companies will not permit employee travel, either for business, or personal purposes, either at free or reduced rates.

For these and other reasons, the airlines feel that this amendment is unnecessary and if enacted into law, would unduly restrict the sound policy of the present law by depriving management of its discretion to permit reservations in those limited number of cases where the urgencies of business or humane considerations warrant transportation other than on a space available basis. We urge your consideration of these issues to the end that the appropriate procedure may be followed to either delete the amendment or give further consideration to the issue before the legislation advances.

With appreciation for your thoughtfulness.

Very truly yours,

S. G. TIPTON.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], has made a very detailed and careful explanation of this bill. I support the legislation. I had a bill in myself covering this program. I have no requests for time on this side, Mr. Chairman, and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I feel that H.R. 4049 is necessary to correct the present misunderstanding relative to the airline pass privilege.

As a Representative of an area which includes two international airports, with 22,000 persons directly associated with the airline trades, and a section vitally responsive to the health of the aviation industry, I am well aware of the existing situation.

Therefore, I am pleased to cosponsor H.R. 4049. This bill will clearly deliniate the Civil Aeronautics Board's authority to allow airlines the pass privilege for certain classifications. Groups affected by the free or reduced rate privilege would be:

First. Retired airline personnel and their immediate families.

Second. Parents of airline officers and employees.

Third. Parents and immediate families of any person injured or killed in an aircraft accident for travel in connection with the accident.

The Federal Aviation Act of 1958 did not intend to restrict the pass privilege of these groups. However, interpretations of the act by the Civil Aeronautics Board eliminated parents of employees and all retired employees from the list of those eligible. Another interpretation ended the longstanding practice of providing transportation for the families of accident victims.

This legislation is presented on the request of the Civil Aeronautics Board. The Board desires to have the intent of Congress expressed in law.

Support of the bill is by no means limited to the Civil Aeronautics Board. Airline employees have long considered the pass privilege as one of the primary fringe benefits of employment in the aviation industry. In this respect the airline pass resembles similar inducements offered in virtually every industry, both large and small.

The airline management supports this legislation as a valuable tool in improved public and labor relations. This established practice of U.S. airlines has proved a useful method of increasing employee morale and incentive.

The joint cooperation of employees and management in supporting this legislation and the recognition of their mutual self interest will be well received by all those interested in the continued prosperity of the aviation industry.

This bill will have only the effect of returning the pass privilege to the position it occupied prior to the recent interpretation. The bill has the support of employees, management, and the governing agency. There is no valid reason for further prolonging the current confusion.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like also to express my appreciation to this committee for bringing out this needed legislation. This bill means a great deal to the many airline employees who reside in areas where the airlines have operating centers or bases. I know it is keenly desired by them and by the people who realize their reliance upon the family travel benefits.

I strongly support the bill.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the right of airlines to provide transportation for employees' families is one of the great incentives to airlines employment, and is a privilege which has long been recognized. Unless we pass this bill, this privilege is going to be curtailed.

I know, from conversations with airline people in my own district, that loss of this privilege will fall as a real blow upon many families, and greatly reduce the attractiveness of airline employment.

It certainly is in the public interest to encourage experienced airlines personnel to stay on the job—both from the standpoint of public safety and efficient public service. The employees have also earned this privilege, and deserve to retain it.

I urge the passage of H.R. 4049.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend the remarks I made in the opening debate and that all Members may have the privilege of revising and extending their remarks, if they so desire.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 403(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 is amended by striking out the second sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Nothing in this Act shall prohibit such air carriers or foreign air carriers, under such terms and conditions as the Board may prescribe, from issuing or interchanging tickets or passes for free or reduced-rate transportation to their directors, officers, and employees (including retired directors, officers, and employees), the parents and immediate families of such officers and employees, and the immediate families of such directors; witnesses and attorneys attending any legal investigation in which any such air carrier is interested; persons injured in aircraft accidents and physicians and nurses attending such persons; immediate families of persons injured or killed in aircraft accidents for transportation to and return from the place in which the accident occurred; and any person or property with the object of providing relief in cases of general epidemic, pestilence, or other calamitous visitation; and, in the case of oversea or foreign air transportation, to such other persons and under such other circumstances as the Board may by regulations prescribe."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 6, strike out the words "immediate families or persons injured or killed in aircraft accidents for transportation to and return from the place in which the accident occurred" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "immediate families, including parents, of persons injured or killed in aircraft accidents where the object is to transport such persons in connection with such accident."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 13, immediately before the period insert the following: ": *Provided,* That all transportation herein authorized at free or reduced rates, except for those persons injured in aircraft accidents and physicians and nurses attending such persons, shall be on a space-available basis only."

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. KILGORE: On page 2, line 16, after the word *"Provided"* strike all the remainder of line 16 and all of lines 17, 18, 19, and 20, and in lieu thereof insert the following: "That the free transportation authorized herein which is for pleasure or vacation travel, shall be on a space-available basis."

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Chairman, when this bill came before the Commerce Committee, I, not having been a member of the subcommittee which had held hearings on it, but having listened to the discussions in the full committee, offered an amendment to the bill which appears on page 2 of the bill, and it constitutes the last four or five lines of the bill itself, as it is before you. After the bill was reported from the committee, and after some additional information with respect to the current practices of the carriers came to my attention, I am of the opinion that the language of the amendment which I offered and which was adopted is unduly restrictive. While it accomplishes what I set out to accomplish, it did some other things which I think would not be to the best interests of the carrier and the traveling public. For that reason, I offer now this substitute language. The substitute language will permit the continuation of the issuance of passes by air carriers to their personnel who are on company business. The language of the amendment which I offered prohibited that particular practice. I think it is perfectly proper that a company be able to transport its personnel on its own system in the continuation of company business. It would also permit the transportation of attorneys or witnesses on official business of the carrier and under such circumstances as have heretofore been provided by law. In effect, the amendment would prohibit the one particular thing which I sought to prohibit and that was the free transportation of any personnel for vacation or pleasure purposes except on a space-available basis. It was my feeling then, and it is my feeling now, that there should be in this bill that sort of a restriction, a restriction which I think would certainly be of benefit to the traveling public, and in the long run to the benefit of the carriers because necessarily it will permit them to preserve the greatest percentage of their space for the traveling public, and the purchasing traveling public. For those reasons, Mr. Chairman, I have offered the substitute language.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman's amendment omit the words "reduced rates"?

Mr. KILGORE. It does omit the words "reduced rates." And, for this reason: There exists the practice now, and it is a practice that I cannot be particularly critical of, under which employees, and the practice differs somewhat from carrier to carrier, employees may travel on vacations on a reduced-rate basis. I doubt that there ever will be any particular abuse of that right because although it may be at a reduced rate, it still is expensive.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. YOUNGER. Is it not true in that case that they must file a tariff with the CAB on all reduced-rate cases?

Mr. KILGORE. The gentleman may know that to be a fact, but that is something that is not within my knowledge. It may very well be true.

Mr. YOUNGER. Yes; that is the fact.

Mr. KILGORE. In further answer to the question of the gentleman from Iowa, may I say that when the prohibition is limited to free travel, most of the possible abuses will be taken care of. If we were to prohibit reduced-rate travel for vacation purposes, we would make it virtually impossible for an employee to take his family, particularly if he has minor children, because they might get bumped somewhere and be left in an impossible situation where they just could not be able to pay for whatever expense they might be put to.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. That is exactly the point that I was trying to bring out, namely, that you took out the reduced-rate language in your amendment for the reason that you have just stated.

Mr. KILGORE. That is right. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and rise in support of the substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 4049 was introduced at the request of the Civil Aeronautics Board to clarify the authority

of the airlines to issue free or reduced-rate transportation to certain categories of persons which the Board has ruled are not eligible under the present law. However, the Board recognized that its ruling would eliminate practices of long standing, which the carriers and their employees had long believed authorized by the law.

The bill, as it was originally introduced, was directed solely to clarifying the doubts caused by the Board's ruling. Moreover, the bill as introduced would have permitted the continued discretion on the part of airline management as to the manner in which or the terms under which the specified categories of persons would be granted free or reduced-rate transportation.

The bill would have clarified the present law so that parents of employees, officers and directors; and retired employees, officers and directors; as well as the the families of persons killed or injured in an aircraft accident, could be granted transportation.

There was no issue before the subcommittee in the bill as introduced that the proposed categories of persons could be provided transportation on a space-available basis only. There was no review of airline policies or practices under the present law on this point. There were no questions with respect to the desirability of requiring any such transportation to be on a space-available basis only. No questions were asked of the industry witness on this point. However, the full committee, in executive session, added language which requires that not only the authority granted in the present bill, but the authority which was granted by the original Civil Aeronautics Act in 1938, should be confined to a space-available basis.

It is true that several witnesses before the subcommittee mentioned that most free or reduced-rate transportation is on a space-available basis. And that, of course, is true. That is the practice which prevails under the present law. However, there are times when companies must have positive space to perform their business, and for other purposes. The committee's amendment goes much too far. Certainly the substitute is an improvement.

A question arises in my mind as to why we are singling out the airlines by imposing mandatory restrictions on the judgment of their management in this area, while we continue to permit railroad management to operate executive cars on trains, steamship management to decide how their space should be handled, and leave to them considerable discretion as to free or reduced-rate transportation.

While I support the substitute amendment as an improvement, I hope very much that the other body will go into this question more thoroughly than did our committee, so that the air carriers have an opportunity to present all the facts on the issue.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VANIK: On page 2, lines 1 and 2, after the word "employees", strike out "the parents and immediate families of such officers and employees, and the immediate families of such directors."

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I submit this amendment because I am not fully convinced that this language in the law is not new language. The bill is written as though it were new language as an amendment to the Aviation Act of 1958. I feel there is an opportunity for confusion.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VANIK. I wish the gentleman would permit me to finish my statement.

Mr. YOUNGER. I just want to correct the gentleman's statement. I can read the gentleman, if he wants me to, the language of the 1958 act. Would the gentleman care to have that read?

Mr. VANIK. Yes; I would.

Mr. YOUNGER. It reads "Directors, officers, employees, and their immediate families." That is the wording of the Aeronautics Act of 1958.

Mr. VANIK. This bill adds the words "their parents" does it not?

Mr. YOUNGER. Yes.

Mr. VANIK. So this is actually a further liberalization of the act of 1958. Is not that correct?

Mr. YOUNGER. No; not exactly.

Mr. VANIK. If I heard the gentleman correctly, the word "parents" was included in this new language in the bill.

Mr. YOUNGER. What gave rise to this whole situation was that a number of the airlines were making arrangements with their employees and had been granting passes to parents and then in the interpretation of the CAB limiting "immediate families" they eliminated parents. That was back in 1953, and that has been going back and forth between the employees, their unions, and the CAB because it was a change in the practice of the various airlines.

All that we are doing in this bill is trying to bring it back to what the practice was before the CAB made their limiting interpretation.

Mr. VANIK. Am I correct, then, in understanding that the language in this bill extends the privilege of reduced rate fares to parents over and above the present law as interpreted by the CAB?

Mr. YOUNGER. Yes; where the parents live in the same household with the employees; that is correct.

Mr. VANIK. Will the gentleman tell me why and for what reason relatives of directors and members of their household, such as traveling companions, cooks, nurses, butlers, and so on, should ride at reduced rates as part of a big caravan on these airlines? The airlines are subsidized tremendously by the people of America. It seems to me this is certainly a burden on the airline system and takes space that might otherwise be available at lower rates to the general traveling public. The added cost of carrying these passengers is included in the computation of rates and operating expenses.

What logical reason is there for this fringe benefit nepotism and the right of members of the family to travel on the airlines at reduced rates.

Mr. YOUNGER. The gentleman is blowing this up to an absurdity. Those privileges that have been granted are used sparingly, and they are within the control of the airlines. This is only permissive, it is not mandatory, and if there is any abuse at all the airline would have complete authority to terminate it and to end such abuse. Also, the gentleman would stop everything except where they are going on vacation or for pleasure. Otherwise, they must go on a space-available basis. I think that has been cleared up. We are doing only that which the airlines have previously agreed to do and which have been in contracts with their employees. It is a matter of relationship between the employee and the airlines in fringe benefits.

Mr. VANIK. Does the gentleman believe in the doctrine of expanding fringe benefits in our economy which do not reflect in the salary that a person gets on a job or in his income tax return? This is the sort of thing that demoralizes our tax structure.

Mr. YOUNGER. I am in favor of having it as a part of the labor salary and negotiations as between employee and employer.

Mr. VANIK. Director, officer, and employee?

Mr. YOUNGER. They are employees whether you call them directors or not.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK].

Mr. Chairman, I can appreciate the concern of some people regarding this problem, especially when we might not be familiar with it enough to understand precisely what the situation is. If our distinguished friend from Ohio did understand the problem and just what is involved here, he would probably not have offered his amendment. As a matter of fact, should the gentleman's amendment prevail, there would be little necessity for this bill at all.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. As I understood the gentleman's amendment when it was read, it would deny authority to the airlines to grant parents and the immediate families of such officers and employees and the immediate families of such directors this free or reduced transportation; is that correct?

Mr. VANIK. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am certain that the gentleman does not realize fully what his amendment would do. As the gentleman from California stated, one of the fringe benefits that has come about as a result of negotiation between labor and

management in the airline industry is the free or reduced rate transportation benefit which is extended not only to the employee himself but to the members of his immediate family. For instance, in the case of pilots and stewardesses, and they, as employees, would be affected by the gentleman's amendment, one of the fringe benefits they enjoy is the privilege of taking their families with them on vacations. If the gentleman's amendment were adopted, it would deny to the pilots or to the employees the right even to negotiate these fringe benefits as a part of their contracts. I am certain that the gentleman does not desire that this bill be quite that restrictive; and, of course, I hope that the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. HARRIS. Let me further explain to the gentleman under the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and under the new Federal Aviation Act of 1958, which the Congress passed last year, this language was included:

Nothing in this act shall prohibit such air carriers or foreign air carriers under such terms and conditions as the Board may prescribe from issuing or interchanging tickets or passes for free or reduced rate transportation to their directors, officers, and employees and their immediate families.

The gentleman's amendment would strike that language from the law altogether. That would leave us in this most unusual situation where it would not only affect the fringe benefits of the employee, but the only people left who would be eligible would be witnesses and attorneys attending legal investigations and physicians and nurses attending persons in connection with an air accident. Therefore, the provision of the law which has worked so well throughout the history of the act itself would be eliminated, and, therefore, as I say, if that were to happen, then there would not be that strict interpretation of the Board, because the whole thing would be out.

Mr. VANIK. Well, my only objection is that these fringe benefits are not taxable. Now, if these people want to negotiate for higher salaries, let them fight for whatever salary they can obtain from their employers. It seems to me, however, that this may be a very expensive fringe benefit.

Mr. HARRIS. Well, it has not worked out that way over the past 20 years and it has worked quite satisfactorily, as a matter of fact. There have been no abuses reported; there has been nothing in connection with it that has been adverse to the public, and consequently we think that it will enhance the aviation program; we think that it will give stability to not only the companies and the airlines themselves but the employees.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Moss as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. VANIK: On page 2, line 1, after "the" strike out "parents and."

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, the effect of this substitute would leave in the language of the bill everything necessary to continue the practice which has prevailed under the previous section 403(b). I think there is adequate precedent to grant, as part of the fringe benefit package, free or reduced transportation to the immediate families of employees. I think it is rather difficult, however, in an industry which enjoys subsidy to the extent many of the air carriers do, to authorize directly and specifically the granting of passes, free or reduced transportation, to parents. There is no requirement here that parents be domiciled with the employee. We just blanket them in and they are entitled to these benefits. I do not think it is good practice for us to do that.

While I might, on an individual case basis, find considerable merit that they be included, I think it is rather farfetched to just specifically and automatically include parents; parents who are in no way dependent upon the employee.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SANTANGELO. I have been led to understand that most of these stewardesses are normally single girls who live with their families and upon whom the families usually depend. Is it a fact that most of the stewardesses who are working on these commercial airlines are single and live with their parents?

Mr. MOSS. I have not the slightest idea.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Well, from the information I have received, I think it is one of the rules of the airlines that married girls are not permitted to work as stewardesses.

Mr. MOSS. Well, after almost a quarter of a century of being married, I have not been at all concerned with the marital status of the hostesses.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Well, you are concerned with the status of the parents.

Mr. MOSS. I am only primarily concerned with the status of the industry, and even though the gentleman's premise were correct, I point out that hostesses constitute but a small part of the total number of employees of the airlines, and I do not think there is a valid ground for blanketing in all parents, regardless of the status of the parents or the dependency the parent might have on the individual for some degree of support.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Can you or anybody on the committee advise us how much it will cost or how much the carriers will lose by reason of the extension of these free rides or reduced rates?

Mr. MOSS. I cannot tell you at this moment. I am far more concerned with the effect it has on the overall operation which brings about payment of subsidy from the Government. We are talking here of the local carriers, of an industry which is heavily subsidized. Now, that is not true of the main trunk carriers, but it is true of the local carriers, and this right would be granted to the employees of the local carriers. I do not think it is entirely a matter of concern between the industry and its employees. This is an area where we in the Congress, because there are Federal funds involved, have the responsibility to make certain that we act soundly. And, I cannot, in my own judgment, justify the granting of this right to the parents of employees.

Mr. SANTANGELO. In other words, the loss of this revenue to the carriers will have to be made up by the Government in an amount of subsidy?

Mr. VANIK. No; by the other passengers.

Mr. MOSS. In part; no one can tell.

Mr. SANTANGELO. And if so, to what extent?

Mr. MOSS. I cannot tell the gentleman that. I offered this as a substitute. I shall be happy to yield to my chairman. I know he will not deny that to some degree this loss of revenue will have to be made up by the Government.

Mr. HARRIS. The local service carriers of the Nation are being subsidized, except one of the local carriers in Alaska. But none of the trunk carriers, as the gentleman said a moment ago, which are the ones most vitally affected, are receiving any subsidy whatsoever.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] has expired.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. I think my chairman will agree that I have correctly stated the facts. To some extent, and we have not determined the exact extent, any loss of revenue would be made up from the Federal subsidy. Granted we do not at the moment have any trunk carriers on subsidy, but virtually all of the local service carriers are on subsidy.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Will it make a great deal of difference as long as you limit it to a space-available requirement, so far as the subsidy is concerned?

Mr. MOSS. We are only limiting to space-available the free transportation. If the airline charged 10 percent, that would not be on a space-available basis. The amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE] is to exempt from the space-available requirement, or to confine to space-available only that transportation which is given free.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MOSS. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman is talking about the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE], which relates to space available, for vacations.

Mr. MOSS. I am assuming that most parents under this language would be traveling on vacations.

Mr. HARRIS. Not necessarily, at all.

Mr. MOSS. The gentleman will agree that there is no evidence in the hearings to indicate anything in support of his position or the contrary.

Mr. HARRIS. I certainly would readily agree so far as the hearings are concerned that this question was not brought up as one of real concern. It only came about in consideration of the bill in executive session when one member offered an amendment, which he was entitled to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] has again expired.

(Mr. MOSS (at the request of Mr. HARRIS) was given permission to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MOSS. I am certainly happy to yield further to the chairman.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO] I think put his finger on the important point of the gentleman's amendment, when he referred to the fact that these young ladies who are working as stewardesses are, as I understand it, single girls and do live at home with their parents, in most instances. Certainly you would not want to deprive them of the same benefits that other people with families would receive for members of the same household. But if you struck this language, they would not have the same benefit. I question the gentleman's amendment as well as that of the gentleman from Ohio on that point.

Mr. MOSS. On the contrary, I believe, while it would be very nice to say to all of these young ladies, you now have a job on the airlines; the fact that some of them are subsidized should not in any way affect your rights. You can take both of your parents now, and travel free, around the world, if you wish.

I assume that in the interchange of passengers on airlines there must be some charge from one airline to another. There must be some agreement to help shoulder this cost to make up for the space which is committed. And I point out that this can be an important item of expense. Again, the number of employees who are stewardesses out of the total number in the airlines, is very small, and if we were dealing only with them I might not be so concerned. The only reason I offered this amendment is this. After hearing the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio I asked myself, "Can you defend opposing his amendment?" And I looked over his language. I can readily defend the immediate family, the children and the wife of an employee on an airline, getting this benefit, but in good conscience I could not defend the same benefit to a parent who might in no way be dependent upon the employee.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MOSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. I just want to make this one observation. I do not want the House to get the idea that these airlines are abusing the privilege, that we have families of employees and others—attorneys and nurses and doctors and everybody else—utilizing all the airline space of the country. That simply is not true. In case anyone would get any such idea, I want to point out there is a very limited amount of this kind of travel, and furthermore it is under the supervision of the Board. The law specifically says that it must be with the approval of the Board, as the gentleman from Mississippi has stated.

Mr. MOSS. I recognize that fact, but I think every member of this committee has had the experience of not being able to make airline reservations.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in opposition to both amendments.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I want to say to my friend, the gentleman from California, that the reason the word "parents" is included is to take care of a situation which has resulted in a great deal of discrimination among employees, and particularly with reference to the stewardesses. Under the definition of "immediate family" as it has been interpreted by the CAB in their regulations, whenever a stewardess is actually living with her parents, then the parents are a part of her immediate family and they can ride at reduced rates as members of the immediate household. However, as all of us know, these stewardesses are single girls and they have to move to an operational base of the airline. For instance, consider the case of the Delta Airlines. They hire girls from Mississippi, Alabama, Louisiana, Texas and many other places, and have a large base of operations in the city of Atlanta. Therefore, many of these girls have to move to Atlanta and work out of that city, thereby removing themselves from the immediate household, according to the definition of the CAB. Now consider the case of a girl employed by Delta Airlines who lives in the city of Atlanta and who is able to live with her parents. She is permitted to take her parents on vacations at free or reduced rates. But, if she does not happen to live with her family in the city of Atlanta, she is denied this privilege. That is the purpose of putting that language in the bill; is it not?

Mr. YOUNGER. I thank the gentleman. I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio if he is not willing to grant the same privileges to employees of airlines that are now enjoyed by employees of railroads.

Mr. VANIK. Well, I feel that frankly these privileges——

Mr. YOUNGER. Please answer the question. Are you willing to take away the privileges that the railroad employees now have?

Mr. VANIK. Let me answer in this way. I feel that the privilege should be carefully guarded. I think we ought to try to get as much income into our tax structure and into the Treasury as we possibly can. These fringe benefits are actually tax loopholes. We find that the cost of recreation and recreation travel takes up a greater part of our budget every year. I think this loophole ought to be closed up. I think the employees ought to be paid more money if necessary so they can pay more taxes on their income. I think that we should not in any way legalize these fringe benefit tax loopholes.

Mr. YOUNGER. Will the gentleman answer the question? Are you willing to limit the employees of the railroads and take away the benefits that they now enjoy?

Mr. VANIK. We should carefully restrict the further extension of free travel as a fringe benefit.

Mr. YOUNGER. All right. I am glad to know that.

Mr. VANIK. I might also say that the railroads are not subsidized. There is no Federal contribution involved.

Mr. YOUNGER. Well, the railroads had their subsidies before the gentleman was born, and they had such subsidies in great quantities, with oil lands, timber lands, and everything else.

Mr. VANIK. Of course, I cannot apologize for my predecessors. I can only say that we must do what we can to prevent the continuation of abuses that developed in earlier times.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, neither amendment will accomplish anything, and for this reason. Under the interpretation which the CAB has already placed on "immediate families" it includes parents, and immediate household including persons permanently residing at the residence without the necessity of the payment of board or room.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOSS. The gentleman says the amendment will not accomplish anything. Is the gentleman telling me that the Board is not going to be mindful at all of the history involved in the passage of this provision here on the floor? Are they so arrogant that they will ignore completely the actions of this Committee and of the House?

Mr. YOUNGER. I am saying that if the parents live in the household they are entitled under the interpretation of "immediate family" to passes.

Mr. MOSS. They are not entitled if they do not live in the household. Under the amendment I am proposing they would pay something. If the Board ignored it they could be called to account by the Congress.

Mr. YOUNGER. They could very well move in, and that would include the parents of stewardesses, according to my interpretation, because the stewardess would be living with the parents and not the parents with the stewardess.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGER. I yield.

Mr. VANIK. Can the gentleman visualize the situation where an airline is going to tell its director that there is no space available to him on a space available basis, for the director, his relatives, and the people who travel with him, the nursemaids?

Mr. YOUNGER. Yes. I was traveling recently on one of the airlines between

San Francisco and Los Angeles and a director was kicked off at Santa Barbara.

Mr. VANIK. I believe that is an isolated instance.

Mr. YOUNGER. I do not think it is an isolated case. I think you are trying to read in an interpretation on the part of the management of the airlines that does not exist.

And, bear in mind, this is permissive, and if they permit it to the point of abuse you might well come in here and change it. But I think we ought to recognize the arrangements and contracts that have been made with employees. That is the only thing I have to say. We are trying here to give these employees benefits they have been enjoying over the years until the CAB made their interpretation that runs back to 1953, and then to 1958 at the time they made their interpretation and finally put it into force. It was then we persuaded the CAB to suspend it. They did until August of last year; then they again extended the suspension until September 1 of this year to give Congress an opportunity to legislate in that field, and that is what we are attempting to do at the present time.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGER. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments to the bill close in 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to both these amendments. I believe they would destroy the effectiveness of this legislation. I believe they would be a mortal blow to the morale of our personnel who work on the airlines of the country.

I think both amendments are undesirable and should be defeated.

I am particularly disturbed by the amendment offered by my good friend from California who singles out parents and says they should be excluded from this bill. I think that a great number of the employees on the airlines are employees who are not married and do not have children.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I think the House should understand that this legislation comes here at the request of the Air Line Pilots Association and has their support and approval.

In the hearings, it was supported by the Air Line Agents Association, the Air Line Pilots Association, the Air Line Stewards and Stewardesses Association, the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, the Flight Engineers International Association, the Air Transport Division, Transport Workers Union, AFL–CIO, and the legislative representative of the AFL–CIO. It was introduced at the request of the Civil Aeronautics Board. It has the approval of the airlines themselves, except they did not like the restrictive amendment referred to by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. That is the support and backing this bill has and which these amendments would completely destroy.

Mr. EDMONDSON. It must be remembered that the employees of the airlines under these practices are getting nothing that is not enjoyed by families of the railroad employees of the country and I believe they are getting nothing that is going to cost the taxpayers anything.

I had the experience with a colleague of waiting to board a plane in Kansas City the other day. Also waiting to board the plane on a space-available basis was an airline family. When departure time came neither we nor the airline family could find space on the plane, which was fully loaded, but had space been available I do not see how it would have hurt anybody to have let that family ride.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am most interested in the little people who work for the airlines. They have always enjoyed certain privileges. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio would deny them these privileges, but I think they are nothing but what they should enjoy to this extent at least, the same fringe benefits and privileges that are enjoyed by people who work in other forms of transportation.

Mr. JARMAN. If the gentleman will yield, it seems to me the thing the members should remember is that this is permissive, not mandatory legislation.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I agree with the gentleman, and I hope both these amendments will be defeated and the bill as amended by the committee will be passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired, all time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss], as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK].

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BOLLING, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4049) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to authorize free or reduced-rate transportation for certain additional persons, pursuant to House Resolution 299, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who may desire to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY TO MONDAY NEXT

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

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

DESIGNATING NEW LOCK ON THE ST. MARYS RIVER AT SAULT STE. MARIE, MICH., AS THE JOHN A. BLATNIK LOCK

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 7808) to designate the new lock on the St. Marys River at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., as the John A. Blatnik lock.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in recognition of the fine leadership of Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK, and in tribute to his dauntless championship of the Saint Lawrence Seaway over a long period of years, and his persistent and successful efforts for harbor improvements and connecting channels on the Great Lakes, the new lock to be constructed to replace the existing Poe Lock on the Saint Marys River at Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan, be designated as the John A. Blatnik Lock as a fitting tribute to this congressional leader for his contribution in

making the Great Lakes-Saint Lawrence Waterway system a reality.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATE TAXATION ON INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today legislation designed to cope with the problems faced by business firms in complying with multistate taxation of income derived from interstate commerce. This problem is causing concern throughout the Nation.

On February 24, 1959, the Supreme Court in deciding two cases, upheld the constitutionality of "State net income tax laws levying taxes on that portion of a foreign corporation's net income earned from and fairly apportioned to business activities within the taxing State when those activities are exclusively in furtherance of interstate commerce."

A week later the Court, in another decision, brought instrumentalities of interstate transportation, such as trucks and other motor carriers, under the same rule as manufacturers and sellers; and failed to review a decision which held that an interstate business which sent promotional salesmen to the State was subject to its business income tax. In effect, this decision upheld the right of States to tax the many business enterprises merely sending salesmen across State lines but whose main base of operations remains in their home State.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that this is an extremely difficult problem. I further realize the States today face evermounting revenue needs and business income tax is a big source of revenue. However, I am also concerned with the thousands of small businesses that now cross State lines but do not do any appreciable volume of business in any but their home State. Often times the administrative costs of paying State business income tax is greater than the amount of the taxes paid. To quote Justice Frankfurter in his dissenting opinion, "The cost of such a farflung scheme for complying with the taxing requirements of the different States may well exceed the burden of the taxes themselves, especially in the case of small companies doing a small volume of business in several States." Small businesses today devote much of their time and energy to improving efficiency and avoiding unnecessary duplication in an effort to reduce their overhead. If they are compelled to take on all of the additional expenses represented by this new tax burden, it may be enough to sound the death knell for many of the small enterprises which are now fighting for survival.

Another danger in the recent decisions is the possibility that some businesses, when taxed by a great number of States, will be taxed on more than 100 percent of their income. This is an ever increasing danger and is highly inequitable.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the above reasons, the lack of uniform State laws and formulas for apportioning income to the various taxing jurisdictions, and the burdens of complying with the multiplicity of State and municipal laws and regulations, I am firmly convinced that a remedial change in the Federal law is very definitely needed in this field.

The bill I have introduced would have a twofold purpose. It would give immediate relief in that it would provide that—

> No State or political subdivision shall impose a tax upon the income of any business engaged in interstate commerce for any taxable year unless, during such year, such business has maintained a stock of goods, an office, warehouse, or other place of business in such State or has had an officer, agent, or representative who has maintained an office or other place of business in such State.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, this provision would set out a clear-cut definition of what constitutes doing business in a State, and would exempt those business enterprises which merely send a traveling salesman in interstate commerce or whose interstate business is only a fraction of their total intrastate business. Further, since I feel that a definite formula should be set up which will guide the States in taxing business enterprises doing business in interstate commerce, my bill also provides for the appointment of a five-man Commission on State Taxation of Interstate Commerce which would have until February 1, 1961 to formulate and recommend to Congress a concrete legislative proposal providing for uniform standards which the States will be required to observe in imposing income taxes on businesses engaged in interstate commerce. It shall not question the right of States to impose any such taxes that are not discriminatory. Appointments to the Commission will be made by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, in light of the seriousness of the problem in question, it is my belief that the Congress should act without delay. I therefore strongly urge prompt and favorable consideration of my bill.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a resolution.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, this past Monday the Senate passed Senate Joint Resolution 111. This resolution calls upon the President to proclaim the third week of July Captive Nations Week. This measure is a very significant step taken by the Senate at a time when we are engrossed in all sorts of negotiations with Moscow over Berlin and other issues. It is nothing short of amazing that the subjugation of the captive millions throughout the Communist empire has not even been mentioned. In its drive for a summit meeting Moscow has been, and is, primarily motivated by a desire to gain free world acquiescence to the permanent captivity of these hundreds of millions of subjugated peoples.

Declaring a Captive Nations Week in the month of July, the very month of our own Independence Day, is most symbolic. Such a week of dedication on the part of the American people to moral and political principles in direct application to the captive nations and their eventual liberation, confirms in itself the significance that we attach to our own Declaration of Independence.

This resolution means that we deeply share the aspirations of all the captive nations for their national independence, freedom, and individual liberty. It also signalizes to Moscow that it should make no mistake about our spiritual alliance with the captive millions and that in no circumstances will we ever sacrifice their goals for national independence, freedom, and individual liberty in any deal.

Before the resumption of the Geneva talks by the Foreign Ministers and the intensification of Moscow's drive for a summit meeting it is well that the entire world knows, and in particular the captive peoples in Europe and Asia, that the United States and its people will never renounce their moral responsibility in the advance of freedom everywhere.

Today I have introduced House Joint Resolution 459, identical with Senate Joint Resolution 111. The resolution is as follows:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 459

Joint resolution providing for the designation of the third week of July as Captive Nations Week

Whereas the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having been able, through the democratic process, to achieve a harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious, and ethnic backgrounds; and

Whereas this harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere and to recognize the natural interdependency of the peoples and nations of the world; and

Whereas the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other peoples; and

Whereas since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation of

the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others; and

Whereas these submerged nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom, for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, Moslem, Buddhist, or other religious freedoms, and of their individual liberties; and

Whereas it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas it is fitting that we clearly manifest to such peoples through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July 1959 as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities. The President is further authorized and requested to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world.

NUCLEAR ARMAMENTS

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, on July 2 seven Members of the House introduced concurrent resolutions opposing agreements that would spread the use of U.S. nuclear armaments and secrets to seven other nations. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show among other things how Western Germany will be able to exercise a certain amount of veto power over our foreign policy. Other of our colleagues are concerned and expect to introduce similar resolutions, but the need for action is immediate because the agreements become effective unless the House acts to disapprove them. On July 5, an article in the New York Herald Tribune included such statements as:

The worst internal crisis in the history of the North Atlantic Alliance, caused by a head-on disagreement between France and the United States, showed signs of improvement this week.

President Charles de Gaulle's government has quietly scaled down its political and nuclear demands against the United States. It is still asking a great deal, but diplomats involved do not now consider the situation insoluble.

The conflict between traditionally friendly and allied countries has its roots in General de Gaulle's conviction that "France cannot be France without grandeur." To restore France to the rank of a great power, the de Gaulle regime has pressed a series of demands, including:

1. An equal voice with the United States and Britain in the leadership of NATO and in the formulation of political and military strategy throughout the world.

2. Access to U.S. nuclear secrets and nuclear weapons as befits a nation occupying a central geographic position in NATO.

SUPPORT IN ALGERIA

3. Support for French policy in rebellion-torn Alegria, which France regards as the key to the defense of Africa against communism.

So far none of these requests has been fully satisfied and, to make his points, General de Gaulle has staged a sitdown strike within NATO. This has worried leaders of the alliance since it came at a time of confrontation between NATO and the Soviet Union.

In its long list of disagreements with the NATO command, France has refused to accept U.S. medium-range missiles and to stockpile nuclear weapons on its territory. It has refused to integrate its fighter aircraft into a unified NATO air defense system and, in March, reneged on its pledge to place part of its Mediterranean fleet under NATO command in case of war.

The impasse reached the crisis stage earlier this month when it became known that NATO was considering moving some 200 U.S. fighter-bombers out of France to bases in other countries where nuclear weapons could be stockpiled for the aircraft.

France replied with a statement, sounding very much like General de Gaulle, that "there is no question of making new commitments with NATO" (meaning missiles and stockpiles) until France's demands are met.

INOPPORTUNE TIME

Some diplomats felt that the Franco-American dispute in NATO became public knowledge at an inopportune time and, as a sign of disunity, may have stiffened Russia's bargaining position at the Geneva Conference of Foreign Ministers on the Berlin crisis.

French Foreign Minister Maurice Cuove de Murville took pains to make a public statement that the argument between France and the United States was over strengthening the alliance. He added that if Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei A. Gromyko thinks it strengthens his position "he makes a gross miscalculation."

Mr. Couve de Murville also publicly disclosed that his government has dropped its demands for atomic secrets and nuclear weapons, which an act of Congress prevents the United States from furnishing to France. He said:

"We are realistic enough to know what is the situation in the United States. There is law. There is a Congress. There is a parliamentary system. And we have no intention of putting any pressure on this parliamentary system. Things are as they are now and we can't change them.

"All that we are asking for is closer cooperation on the general ground of politics and strategy in the world."

EXPLANATION GIVEN

A high official has explained privately that by close cooperation General de Gaulle means that France should share in the decision before the United States could use nuclear weapons anywhere in the world.

The official confirmed that France is seeking a greater say than Britain has over the use of nuclear weapons by the United States. Britain holds a veto only over the use of American weapons deployed on its territory.

If this condition is met and if France is admitted to the councils of the great powers, the official said, there will be prompt approval of missile ramps and weapons stockpiles in France and the nation's other difficulties with NATO will disappear.

He said that despite statements by high Government officials, United States support for France's Algerian policy was not now a condition for his country's military cooperation with NATO.

Even when narrowed down in this way, Franco-American differences are considerable because the United States is not likely to give another country a broad veto over its potential military actions.

COMPROMISE SEEN

But diplomats of both countries are convinced that a compromise can be found. They believe that a meeting between President Eisenhower and General de Gaulle must be arranged. The general is reported to regard Gen. Lauris Norstad, NATO commander, as rather a junior officer and not his opposite number for such negotiations.

Even arranging an Eisenhower-De Gaulle meeting is complicated. General de Gaulle has a standing invitation to visit the White House, but will not go. A stickler for protocol, he recalls that President Vincent Auriol visited the United States some years ago and America owes France a presidential visit. Mr. Eisenhower's trip to Paris for the 1957 NATO conference was not viewed as a state visit.

Most informed diplomats believe that an Eisenhower-De Gaulle understanding will be necessary before there can be any effective ban on nuclear weapons tests. As the United States, Britain, and Russia move toward an agreement at Geneva to stop testing, France is approaching the detonation of its first atomic bomb, possibly next year.

Those talking up a Franco-American summit meeting admit there is always a chance nothing will be settled. General de Gaulle previously was exposed to the persuasiveness of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Winston Churchill and proved himself an uncommonly difficult negotiator when he felt France's prestige or position was at stake.

THE IMPACT OF INFLATION: NO. II—ITS EFFECTS UPON LABOR, FOREIGN TRADE, AND SMALL BUSINESS, INCLUDING FARMERS, TEACHERS, AND PROFESSIONAL PEOPLE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, for the past several weeks I have been taking time on the floor of the House to discuss the problem of inflation. This is the third of a series of four I had planned. Today I propose to talk on the impact of inflation and its effect on labor, foreign trade, small business, farmers, teachers, and professional people.

Some economic and financial thinkers of considerable renown tell us that some degree of inflation is good for the national economy. Let those of us who are in responsible position not be hoodwinked into embracing such convenient irresponsible thinking. Let us not be

deluded into believing that fistsfull of dollar bills spell an everlasting, lush prosperity for our citizens. We must not be beguiled by the dazzling appearance of the goddess of luck and easy money.

Inflation has shaken the economic apparatus of our Nation to the very core. Although our United States is the richest country in the world, many millions of families live on limited if not actually inadequate incomes. The latest survey of consumer finances by the Federal Reserve Board revealed that last year one-fifth or 20 percent of all so-called spending units, including those who live on pensions, that is, families or related persons living together who pool their finances had incomes of less than $1,890 before taxes. Three-fifths of all spending units had incomes of less than $5,139 before taxes. In these days of skyrocketing prices, $5,000 will by no means support a family in extravagant luxury.

What is going to happen to the living standards of these 60 percent of our families if prices take another spurt? How can these Americans maintain themselves in any kind of dignity or decency if our economy experiences further rises in the cost of living?

Financial and economic experience demonstrates that there can be no such thing as a little inflation. Price rises characteristically gain momentum. We have been living through a period of vicious price spiralling. Over the past, wages have been chasing prices and prices chasing wage costs. Where will this dizzy whirl end? Those who think that a little inflation provides a tonic for the economy might reflect upon the following. Since 1939, consumers' prices have more than doubled. These fantastic advances in prices have left us with a 48-cent dollar.

We must not be blinded by the fact that the latest reports tell us that during March of this year, the Consumer Price Index remained steady. The index held firm at 123.7, or almost 24 percent above the average in 1947–49. When will the surge in prices be renewed? Will we be aroused from our complacent inaction before consumer prices double again?

Furthermore, as the Committee for Economic Development has recently stated, continuing inflation will "undo one of the major achievements of recent generations. Never before have so many people, even of the lowest income groups, owned some liquid assets—bank deposits, savings bonds, insurance policies, and savings and loan shares. With this has come a great independence and freedom of the average man. Inflation will eat away the values of these savings. Workers who now have a large investment in private and public pension funds would be among the chief victims of the process, since they will be forced to rely on fixed pensions whose value has been eroded by inflation to support themselves after they retire." Under these circumstances thrift and financial planning, the foundation stones of democratic capitalism, become meaningless words.

America must not be oblivious to the heartrending lessons of the experiences of foreign countries with inflation. History is replete with examples of governments that have folded because they would not control the value of their currency. Runaway inflation has drastic political repercussions. Inflation is the archenemy of political as well as economic freedom and stability.

We must not forget the German experience with inflation after World War I. The printing-press inflation was so severe that it was not at all unusual for employees to trundle their week's wages home in a wheelbarrow. Another example of the intense economic crisis in Germany is the case of the $65,000 trust fund, which by 1923, could command just one good meal and no more. I don't have to remind you that the economic situation in Germany became so desperate that the people finally turned to Hitler.

We may view events abroad with apathetic smugness. We may think to ourselves, "It can't happen here." But our very comfortable complacency may prove to be our undoing, unless we awaken to the great peril in modern times.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken previously at some length on the acute dangers of inflation and of those groups in our society who have been cruelly penalized by the effects of inflation.

Today I would like in particular to discuss labor and inflation. At year-end 1958 average weekly wages of production workers stood at slightly over $88. This is about three and one-half times higher than the 1940 figure of $25.20. At the same time, skyrocketing prices have cut this apparent bonanza in half.

It is true that today most American wage and salary earners are rewarded for their labors by many more dollars than 18 years ago. But the family budget has also mounted. Food costs have been upped two and one-half times; housing costs more than 50 percent; clothing and transportation costs both have doubled. These are the chief items in the family budget. Medical care is also a vital factor in family costs. Doctor's and hospital charges are likewise twice their 1940 levels. Furthermore, the tax bite of every taxpayer's income has increased tremendously.

When we discuss labor and inflation, we must distinguish between union and nonunion labor. In recent years labor unions have become an increasingly, and in most cases, fortunately, a more powerful force in the economy. About half of all production workers are now organized. Almost all so-called blue-collar workers in the steel industry, the automobile industry, rails and aircraft, the building trades, and the electrical industry are union members. The largest firms are unionized, and these concerns, of course, set the wage pattern.

Unions have been in a strong bargaining position to insure compliance with their demands. Union labor has devised an ingenious scheme to meet the onslaught of the inflationary erosion of the dollar. This is the escalator clause in union wage contracts which ties wage rates to the cost-of-living index.

About 3.5 million workers are covered by the so-called cost-of-living escalation provisions. These workers are guaranteed a boost in hourly wages whenever the cost of living advances.

Wages of nonunionized labor in such businesses as finance, insurance, and a few other types of enterprises, have generally lagged behind highly unionized industries.

Although wages have succeeded in outpacing prices, I submit that now labor, too, will inevitably feel the pinch of renewed inflation. The spectacle of wages and prices dizzily chasing one another cannot continue forever. The wage dollar will shrink until labor's present gains will most certainly be destroyed.

Let me turn to foreign trade and inflation. Many authorities are warning us that persistent rises in prices will surely narrow the markets for our exports.

Let me quote from the statement of one of our leading financiers, Mr. William F. Butler, vice president of the Chase Manhattan Bank, before the Joint Economic Committee.

> It is a fact that U.S. exporters are running into intense competition from foreign suppliers. We have lost business abroad in lines we had pretty much to ourselves until recently. And more foreign producers are invading the U.S. market. Why is this so? For the first time in the postwar period, foreign producers generally have excess capacity. Moreover, many of them have installed modern plant and equipment and have adopted many of our techniques. Thus they can compete more effectively with us. * * *
>
> It seems to me that our problem can be phrased in this way: Given the handicap of inflation, U.S. business could run behind in the race for world markets. If we should fail to contain inflation, our domestic costs and prices would rise faster than those in the rest of the world. If that should happen, many U.S. exports would be quickly priced out of world markets.

Not only are U.S. exporters meeting intense competition abroad, but our costs and prices have surged forward to such a degree that in the case of certain American products, steel, for example, foreign manufacturers can and are underselling us in our own American markets.

Mr. Speaker, for years we have been singing psalms of praise to small business, the bulwark of the American system, of the American way of life. We have been shaking our heads and wringing our hands over the plights of the small businessman. I speak earnestly when I say that I firmly believe that small enterprise is the foundation of our democratic society. I firmly believe that without small economic units our way of life as we know it cannot survive. I believe we must be greatly concerned with the future of small business.

While we have been mouthing words of sympathy for the fate of independent enterprise, we have allowed inflation to attack the mainsprings of our economy, inflicting havoc upon small business.

The major problem of small business is credit. The small businessman needs financial backing to establish his venture and credit to carry on his enterprise.

In periods of surging inflation, the Federal Government has followed from time to time a tight credit policy in an

attempt to check the rise in prices. This policy has met with only indifferent success. Meanwhile borrowing becomes more expensive to the borrower and more selective on the part of the lender. And because of his less favorable credit rating, it is the small businessman who bears the brunt of the credit squeeze.

Furthermore, inflation takes its toll of profits of small business. Inflation may give a spurt of good times to small as well as big business. A prolonged and steep inflationary trend, however, must inevitably clamp a cost-price-profit squeeze upon small companies.

Some time ago, the head of a small firm, in analyzing high prices and tight money summed up his point of view as follows: "We little fellows are out of luck."

Much has been said of the disastrous effects of inflation on the members of the professions. Yes, inflation has taken a heavy toll of certain professional groups. I am not particularly worried about the physicians, the dentists, and the lawyers today. Average income of physicians advanced from $4,229 in 1939 to $17,000 in 1957, a gain in "real" income; that is, income measurement in terms of purchasing power, of 98 percent. Dentists made gains in so-called "real" income of 54 percent, the average for this profession increasing from $3,096 in 1939 to $9,700 in 1957. Lawyers also registered real gains in income. From an average of $4,391 in 1939, lawyers' incomes on the average jumped to $11,430 in 1956, the latest year for which these data are available. This marked increase represented a 34-percent gain in purchasing power during the years 1939–56. However, it should be noted that history records that runaway inflation ruins them, too, and that their retirement plans have already been affected.

Now, my friends, suppose we investigate the situation of the teaching profession, the "poor" teachers, as people sometimes say.

Inflation has taken a heavy toll of certain members of this profession, the primary and secondary school teachers and the college and university teaching staffs. In 1940 the average salary of classroom teachers, principals, supervisors and other instructional personnel of the public schools was $1,450. This figure is far lower than those for the three other professions I have just been discussing. By the school year 1958–59, the figure had risen to slightly more than $4,900. But, as we have seen, in the span of years from 1940 through 1958, the value of the dollar was reduced to $0.48.

Therefore, instead of making vital and necessary gains which would have raised average teaching salaries to the full value of $4,900, the real income, in terms of 1940 purchasing power was raised only to $2,380, a meager gain in comparison with most other professions.

Teachers in the primary and secondary schools did at least make some gains in real income salarywise, infinitesimal though they were. In contrast, the picture for instructional staff at colleges and universities is far less favorable.

Instructional salaries at five large State universities in 1939 averaged $3,461. This figure rose to $7,637 in 1957. The gain in real income was all of 9 percent.

And listen to this. At 28 private institutions, instructional salaries averaged $4,015 in 1939. In 1957, however, the average of $7,459 actually represented a decline of 8 percent in purchasing power. My friends, this is the result of the devastating action of the inflationary spiral. This is the result of the very unfair hidden tax levied by inflation. And when we take into account the effect inflation has had on retirement plans for the teachers we find an even more disastrous situation.

We have been prone to call those who are interested in education and learning "eggheads." As a matter of fact, in some places, the term "egghead" unfortunately has become a dirty word. We tragically have heaped scorn upon the thinkers, and all our praise upon the doers. All too often, learning has been regarded as effete.

My friends, today we must face a bitter truth. The security of our Nation and that of the entire free world has been challenged by the U.S.S.R., a monolithic Communist state, ruled by a ruthless dictatorship. The Soviets were first with their earth satellite, the sputnik. We have been warned that the Communists may also be first to launch a manned satellite into space.

The unmitigated truth is this, the achievements of Soviet science have outmatched ours. The Soviets are bending all their energies toward the development of young scientists, physicists, mathematicians, and engineers. They have classified education as "top priority." The Soviets, struggling for supremacy in the field of technology, see scientific success as the basis of control of the entire world.

In order to maintain our national might, in order to hold fast the security of the free world, we must exert every effort to strengthen our scientific progress. What is the basis of progress in science? Educated scientists.

How can we develop the ranks of our scientists without teachers?—Teachers on all levels who will impart invaluable knowledge to their students. In addition to the sciences, other fields—the social and political sciences and languages—are of vast importance in this "cold war" between east and west.

In the final analysis, the battlefields of the next war—may such a barbaric holocaust never burst upon our shores—have already been chosen, the classrooms.

We need the services of the best brainpower in all fields, to match the aggressions of our adversaries. How can we be armed with the highest caliber of teachers if we allow the robber inflation to reduce to a pittance the already shockingly low salaries of our teachers?

Before closing my talk to you today, I must not overlook the question of how the farmer has fared under inflation. I am, of course, a Congressman from Iowa, one of the greatest farm States in the Nation and therefore have a very vital interest in the farm economy. Between 1940 and 1946, the rise in farm prices was beneficial to the farmer. We must remember that in 1939 and 1940 farm prices were still relatively lower than industrial prices.

Postwar inflation, however, has meant just one thing to the farmer—a cost-price squeeze. Per capita farm income reached a peak of $1,096 in 1948, then skidded until 10 years later, in 1958 the average was only $999. By contrast, in this same year, 1958, per capita nonfarm income was $1,985

As the farmer's income has declined over the past decade, the prices which he has had to pay for materials, goods, and services have advanced sharply. The cost of farm machinery, building materials and trucks have climbed up and up; the wages of farm labor have likewise advanced markedly.

The most graphic means of expressing the relative well-being of the farmer is the parity ratio. This ratio indicates the relationship between the prices received by the farmer and those which he must pay out. The parity index registered a record high of 123 in October 1946. Two months ago, in May 1959, the parity ratio had catapulted to 82.

This, my friends, explains to us in no uncertain terms how the farmer has fared during these postwar years, which, on the whole, may be regarded as lush and prosperous. The position of the farmer has deteriorated more seriously that that of any other economic entity in our Nation.

Part of the trouble, which Congress has been reluctant to recognize, lies in the fact that we put the farmer into a production program designed for wartime needs and have not seen fit to free him from this treadmill during these years of peace.

We have, however, taken delight in playing politics with his welfare. We still want to regiment him: tell him what to grow, how much to grow and how much he can expect to get for his efforts. If we were just as adept at putting the same type of controls and regimentation on the inflationary forces which rob the farmer as they do everybody else, the farmers' economic position would be stronger today.

Playing politics with anyone's welfare is a deplorable practice. We are abusing the blessings of representative government when we do it. We would be carrying out our obligations to our constitutents and to the Nation in a more statesmanlike manner if we were to direct our energies into those channels which will curb the inflationary spiral.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen how inflation subtly strangles our economy. I would like to close with quotations from two eminent Government officials. First of all Secretary of the Treasury, Anderson, says:

> I fear however, that price pressures may eventually revive, if we do not finally close the budget gap. I sincerely believe that a nation as rich and productive as ours must in times of prosperity, at least pay its way.

And Mr. Stans, Director of the Budget, has warned us:

> This (i.e., containment of prices) is an essential condition of our economic health,

without which we can have neither adequate military security nor the adequate provision of other needed governmental services.

This is not a partisan matter. The fight against inflation involves all Americans. Leaders of business, labor and industry must share leadership in this fight together with Members of Congress and the administration. A positive program against inflation must be undertaken without delay.

Next week I propose to discuss what I believe are some answers to this problem that should be discussed and thought about.

DEFENSE FACILITIES PROTECTION ACT OF 1959

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, on January 29 I introduced H.R. 3693 which, if passed by this Congress, will be known as the Defense Facilities Protection Act of 1959. This bill has now languished in the Judiciary Committee for more than 5 months. No hearings have been scheduled.

As pointed out in a speech I made on the floor the day this bill was introduced, the Department of Defense has been requesting the enactment of this legislation ever since 1952. Two weeks ago on June 29 the Supreme Court of the United States rendered a decision in the case of William L. Greene against Neil H. McElroy, Secretary of Defense, which makes the passage of H.R. 3693, with perhaps some amendments, immediately imperative.

If the decision of the Supreme Court in the Greene case is allowed to stand, we will have wrecked the security program of this country, if we have not already done so. In fact, we might as well send directly to the archives of the Kremlin every weapon secret in the Pentagon.

If you think I am exaggerating, listen to what Justice Clark said in the last sentence of his dissenting opinion about the decision of the majority. He said that, if the decision is allowed to stand, "the present temporary debacle will turn into a rout of our internal security."

Under the decision in the Greene case, the Government of the United States as of this moment cannot prevent a known Communist espionage agent or potential saboteur who may be employed by an industrial plant having a defense contract from having access to the most vital secret information of the United States Government which may be essential in the execution of the defense contract.

Mr. Speaker, and Members of this House, do you say that this cannot happen, that this is not true? Well, just read the decision of the Court in the Greene case.

Prior to this decision all of us who are concerned with this problem of internal security felt that there was no question but that the Government, in the interest of national security and survival, had a right to deprive any person, firm, or corporation from access to vital defense secrets if there were reasonable grounds to believe that such secrets might be used contrary to the best interests of the United States. For years, the Department of Defense, after careful scrutiny and investigation, has given clearance to those persons, both in and out of Government, who it felt had sufficient intelligence, moral integrity, courage, emotional stability, and loyalty to the United States to warrant their being entrusted with the vital secrets of the Nation.

Since the defense of this Nation cannot be carried on in a vacuum, it becomes essential that Government, through certain citizens of the Republic, provide for the defense of the nation. It is obvious to even a schoolboy that this job must not and cannot be done either by incompetents or by moral degenerates who, even though basically loyal, might be easily blackmailed. Above all, access to vital secrets must be denied those concerning whose loyalty there is a question of a doubt.

The Supreme Court in the Greene case comes to the conclusion that neither Congress nor the President has authorized the Department of Defense to deprive such individuals, if employed by a company having a defense contract, from having access to vital defense secrets. While I believe as does Justice Clark who wrote the dissenting opinion that there is such ample authority flowing from both the President and the Congress to the Department of Defense, I go with Tom Clark a step further. It seems axiomatic that the Government, the President, and consequently the Secretary of Defense have the inherent right and duty to deprive any person of secret and classified information which might be used adversely to the United States. If it is not an inherent right, then certainly the President as Commander in Chief of the Armed Services of the United States under the Constitution, has not only the right but the duty not to deliver our defense weapons into the hands of the enemy.

Depriving an individual of access to Government secrets does not actually deprive him of a job although it may indirectly result in the loss of a job. It should be pointed out that no company has a constitutional or basic right to a Government defense contract especially one involving classified data. It could be argued just as readily that the company is depriving the individual of the job because it does not want to give up handling defense contracts. In Greene's case he was vice president of the company. He could have continued in his job as vice president if the company, after Greene was denied clearance, would have stopped doing defense work which carried with it secret information. The company could have retained all of its Government contracts which required only the production of conventional defense equipment and which carried with them no classified information. But all this is beside the point.

Mr. Speaker, it should be obvious to the least learned that, if a man does not have a basic or constitutional right to Government secrets, then how and why should the Government be called upon to disrupt or possibly destroy its whole investigative and intelligence service by compelling it to publicly furnish to the enemy information and sources of information about an individual which might also be highly secret and vital to the national security? Defense secrets belong to the Government and should be given and taken away at will. To hold otherwise imperils the safety of the Nation.

As Justice Clark said:

> Surely one does not have a constitutional right to have access to the Government's military secrets.

The majority of the Court says in its distorted reasoning that Greene could not be deprived of defense secrets because the Defense Department has not been authorized by Congress or the President to adopt procedures to deprive Greene of access to defense secrets in which he was not afforded the safeguards of confrontation and cross-examination. The safeguards of confrontation and cross-examination apply to judicial proceedings. In case after case the Supreme Court itself has stated that the right of cross-examination and confrontation of witnesses is not permitted in administrative actions. As Justice Clark said:

> The Court confuses administrative action with judicial trials.

While the majority of the Court says that it decided the Greene case solely on the issue that such procedures were not authorized by the President or the Congress, it then goes on to clearly indicate that, even if the Congress or the President should establish procedures which do not require cross-examination and confrontation, the Court will strike them down.

Mr. Speaker, in this decision we see again the arrogance of the Court. It is slowly but surely, as night follows day taking over, in violation of the Constitution, the powers, duties, and prerogatives of the President and the Congress.

How long are we going to tolerate this extension and usurpation of power by the Court? If we continue to place in the hands of the Soviets by decisions such as the Greene case the tools for our destruction, perhaps we will not have to wait as long as some of us think. Only then will our judicial ostriches who have buried their heads in the ivory towers of the Court across the way understand what Justice Clark meant when he wrote in his dissenting opinion:

> We should not be that blind Court * * * that does not see what all others can see and understand.

Now while we may not agree with the decision of the Court in the Greene case, nevertheless unfortunately it is the law of the land. As I said at the outset, the Supreme Court in the Greene case has said that the Defense Department cannot; under its present procedures deprive a person, no matter how subversive, of access to vital defense secrets if he is employed by a defense contractor because the Congress or the President has not authorized the Defense Department to do so. It therefore devolves upon the

Congress to pass immediately such legislation which it feels will correct this sorry and deplorable situation.

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, when I introduced H.R. 3693 in January of this year, all of us assumed that there was no question about the Department of Defense being able to deprive such individuals of access to vital secrets. I introduced H.R. 3693 because since 1952 the Department of Defense has been asking for legislation whereby it could bar from access to defense facilities individuals who, there is reasonable ground to believe, might engage in sabotage, espionage, or other subversive acts even though they may not have access to classified information or vital secrets.

How serious is the threat or danger?

The security agencies of this Government know that there are at least 2,000 potential saboteurs working in defense plants in this country today, that it is necessary to our security and survival that such persons be removed from primary and secondary defense facilities whether or not they have direct access to Government secrets or classified material.

The Attorney General, the chief law-enforcement officer of the Nation, within the last 60 days in a television program said:

> At the present time the Soviets are intensifying their espionage activities in the United States. They are interested in all types of intelligence, especially military, atomic, missile, and related data. Also, a revitalization of the party's internal structure is now under way. Leaders completely loyal to the Kremlin are in control. The result is a renewed party activity aimed at strengthening the Communist apparatus.

The Attorney General was not talking about what was happening in faraway places but here in the good old complacent and gullible U.S.A.

J. Edgar Hoover, 3 weeks ago, on June 16 to be exact, said:

> Soviet espionage activities in this country expose the fallacy of so-called peaceful coexistence. In recent years, pseudoappeals for peace by Communists have been more than matched by intensified Communist espionage efforts in the United States. Using blackmail, bribery, and similar techniques, Communist agents, many with diplomatic immunity, are stepping up their efforts to obtain our military, scientific, and industrial secrets for use against us. * * * Foremost in the present battle plans of the Communist Party, U.S.A., are well-calculated efforts to embarrass the American economic system; to infiltrate and gain control in our labor organizations; and to secure footholds in basic American industries, such as transportation, manufacturing, communications, and chemicals. Success of these Red objectives will be destruction for our way of life.

The Greene case and other Court decisions will make their espionage tasks a cakewalk.

Some time back, Hoover, in connection with a discussion of the Internal Security Act, stated that 48 percent of the Communist Party were in basic U.S. industry.

Just 4 months ago, on March 10, 11, and 12, 1959, the Committee on Un-American Activities held public hearings in Pittsburgh, Pa., dealing with problems of security in industrial establishments holding defense contracts.

Mr. A. Tyler Port, Director of the Office of Security Policy, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, Personnel, and Reserve, accompanied by Mr. Robert Applegate of the same office, and by Mr. Robert T. Andrews, of the Office of the General Counsel, Office of the Secretary of Defense, testified that:

> U.S. industry is a prime target of the Communist movement in the United States. It is a primary concern to the Communist movement that it obtain from American industry information concerning the defense structure of the United States, particularly with reference to modern weapons of war. To this extent, the Communist Party has been consistently interested in penetrating defense industries where classified work is being performed and also basic industries, which, while not engaged in classified work, may be in support of industries performing modern weapons' manufacture.

Continuing, Mr. Port testified that, under existing law and procedures, Defense Department contracts do not preclude employment of Communists within a defense facility, or from working on material that may eventually become part of a highly classified weapon, provided they do not have access to classified information. This testimony was given by Mr. Port before the decision in the Greene case. You can see that Mr. Port felt that subversives under the law could be barred from getting classified information.

Mr. Port testified further that, under existing law, the Defense Department is not empowered to preclude Communists from supporting defense facilities such as powerplants and communications facilities. Mr. Port warned:

> The potential for bringing defense production to a halt by sabotage of power facilities is enormous and the repercussions would be, I think, disastrous because, if the power itself is cut off, defense plants cannot produce, and we would thus be denying ourselves the weapons which are so essential to our national defense effort.

He stated that there are five prime contractors in the Pittsburgh area having contracts with the Department of Defense in plants in which the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America have bargaining rights. Mr. Port also asserted that a Communist-dominated and controlled labor organization holding such bargaining rights for workers within defense facilities could serve the cause of international communism by calling strikes, collecting dues from members of the union to provide financial help to the Communist operation, and engaging in propaganda activities.

Mr. Port testified in the Pittsburgh hearings that the situation described in 1955 by General Brucker, now Secretary of the Department of the Army, is substantially the same as it was in 1955.

There was included in the record of these hearings a compilation listing persons who now hold, or have held in the recent past, key positions in UE and who have been identified as members of the Communist Party.

Four officials of the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America and its general counsel appeared in response to subpenas, and were interrogated during this phase of the hearings.

Thomas Quinn, a field organizer for UE, who had been previously identified by two witnesses as a member of the Community Party and who, in 1953, invoked his constitutional privilege against self-incrimination when interrogated by a congressional committee respecting Communist Party membership, denied both present and past membership in the Communist Party. In 1953, Mr. Quinn was president of Local 601, UE, in East Pittsburgh, and was employed in the Westinghouse Electric Corp. plant in East Pittsburgh. Subsequent to his appearance in 1953 before another congressional committee, Mr. Quinn was discharged from the Westinghouse Electric Corp. plant but was then hired in his present position as UE field organizer.

Thomas B. Wright, the managing editor of the UE News, invoked his constitutional privilege against self-incrimination when interrogated by the committee in response to a number of questions in regard to the Trade Union Service, Inc., which previously printed the UE News. Mr. Wright estimated the circulation of the UE News to be around 100,000; that it is issued every other week, and that the dues of the individual members pay for the publication of UE News, which is sent to each member of the union. Mr. Wright further testified that Julius Emspak is the editor of UE News, and that James J. Matles, director of organization of UE, participates in the operation of UE News. Mr. Wright denied membership in the Communist Party at the time of the hearings in Pittsburgh, but invoked his constitutional privilege against self-incrimination when interrogated with respect to membership in the Communist Party immediately prior to his appearance.

John W. Nelson, president of UE Local 506 in Erie, Pa., denied present membership in the Communist Party, but refused to answer questions concerning Communist Party membership prior to 1949, at which time he had signed a non-Communist affidavit under the Taft-Hartley Act.

Robert C. Kirkwood, business agent of UE Local 610, denied present Communist Party membership, but refused to answer questions concerning Communist Party membership prior to 1949, at which time he had signed a non-Communist affidavit under the Taft-Hartley Act.

Frank J. Donner, who had been identified by responsible witnesses under oath before the committee as a member of the Communist Party and who on June 28, 1956, invoked constitutional privileges in response to questions respecting his membership and activities in the party immediately prior to his appearance, testified in the instant hearings that he became general counsel to UE a short time after his appearance before the committee on June 28, 1956. Mr. Donner denied present membership in the Communist Party, but invoked,

by reference to previous testimony, his constitutional privileges in response to questions respecting past membership in the Communist Party.

Earlier, in 1957, the Committee on Un-American Activities conducted an investigation of Communist penetration of communication facilities.

The chief purpose of the hearings of the Committee on Un-American Activities in this field of Communist access to defense facilities was to test the adequacy of existing law in furtherance of the duty of the committee to maintain a continuous watchfulness over internal security laws. The testimony of all of the witnesses from the Pentagon and the communications industry was to the effect that notwithstanding Communist access to defense facilities, there is no violation of the present law.

Here, for example, is an excerpt of the testimony given before the committee several months ago by A. Tyler Port, Director of the Office of Security Policy, Office of the Secretary of Defense:

Mr. ARENS. Is the record clear, gentlemen, that the Defense Establishment is of the judgment that present law is inadequate to cope with the problem of Communists and their access to the vital communications facilities of the Defense Department?

Mr. PORT. That is correct, Mr. Arens. I might say, if I may, that as the speed, range, and complexity of our modern weapons systems advance, our communications system on a global basis become increasingly vital to modern military operations.

Here are some further excerpts from the testimony, Mr. Speaker:

Paul Goldsborough, staff director, Communications Division, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense—Supply and Logistics—testified that there is a potential possibility of sabotage of communications facilities which process defense messages by any "subversive element that might be so minded."

Michael Mignon, a representative of the Communications Workers of America, AFL–CIO, testified that he had formerly been a member of the Communist Party of the United States. Mr. Mignon pointed out the importance that the Communist Party places upon control of the communications industry in times of emergency. He stated:

To the best of my recollection, sir, it was always pointed out to me that the importance of obtaining control of the communications industry in times of stress or in revolutionary times was a primary factor, and therefore the efforts of the Communist Party in subsidizing the union and offering whatever assistance they could in building the union in the communications industry was primarily the main objective.

Mark Anthony Solga, employed as a radio operator by the Radio Corp. of America, testified before the committee that he had also been a member of the Communist Party. When asked whether he believed that the employment of Communists in the communications industry constituted a serious menace to the security of the United States, Mr. Solga stated:

Potentially, I honestly believe that it does. In the event of any further conflict between the East and West, as that tension increases during the so-called cold war, if it should ultimately develop to a stage where it becomes rather hot, then I do honestly believe they are in a potentially dangerous position to inflict harm on our national security.

Samuel Rothbaum, who is employed as an assistant repeater chief by the Western Union Telegraph Co., testified that he had been a member of the Communist Party and that, in his opinion, based upon 22 years of experience in the communications industry, a saboteur could inflict "an awful lot of damage" in time of crisis.

Mrs. Concetta Padovani Greenberg, who has been employed by the Western Union Telegraph Co. since 1927, also appeared as a friendly witness during the course of the hearings. She testified that she had been a member of the Communist Party for a period of years. When questioned regarding the possibility of access to confidential and coded messages by members of the Communist Party, Mrs. Greenberg testified that persons known to her as having been members of the Communist Party do have access to confidential messages transmitted over facilities of certain segments of the communications industry. She stated that she has seen confidential messages relating to the tests made upon the atomic and hydrogen bombs.

In order to complete the record, may I insert here other testimony on this subject taken in the past before the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate. May I say that the reason Mr. Arens' name appears in both the hearings of the House and of the Senate is that until about 2 years ago when he became staff director of the Committee on Un-American Activities, he was staff director of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate.

In 1951 the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate conducted a series of hearings respecting subversive infiltration in the telegraph industry. Here are excerpts from the testimony in those hearings:

Mr. ARENS. Do the defense departments of the United States Government lease any wires from Western Union which go through New York?

Mr. MITCHELL. They do.

Mr. ARENS. Do the other departments of the Government of the United States, which deal with problems of defense and defense production, lease wires which go through New York?

Mr. MITCHELL. They do.

Mr. ARENS. Those are leased from the Western Union Co.?

Mr. SHUTE. Some of them.

Mr. ARENS. Are the messages which go over those wires subject to monitoring by ACA people?

Mr. WILCOX. Yes, they are.

Mr. ARENS. Then am I clear in our interpretation of what you are saying that information which is transmitted by the defense facilities of this Government is available to the monitoring process or otherwise to the employees represented by the American Communications Association?

Mr. WILCOX. Yes.

Mr. ARENS. Is that information on the leased wires available to the stewards who are appointed by the officials of the American Communications Association?

Mr. WILCOX. It is possible; yes.

Mr. ARENS. Why do you qualify it as being possible?

Mr. WILCOX. In the sense that it may not be always the steward that is monitoring that particular circuit, but if he did, why, of course, it would be available to him.

Mr. SHUTE. Not all stewards have access to monitoring facilities.

Mr. WILCOX. It is only the particular stewards who might represent the technicians in that particular section of the industry.

Mr. WATERS. But the opportunity is there.

Mr. WILCOX. But the opportunity is there.

Mr. ARENS. May I ask this question here, to pose a hypothetical case. Let us assume that an official in the Pentagon, who is concerned with the armament problems of a North Atlantic Pact nation, sends a cable over a leased wire from Washington by New York on to the Atlantic Pact nation respecting armament problems; would that cable or the information contained therein be subject to monitoring in New York by a person who is a member of the American Communications Association?

Mr. WILCOX. The answer is "Yes."

Mr. ARENS. What is your appraisal of that, as a man who has had vast experience in the communications field, from the standpoint of the security interest of this Nation?

Mr. WILCOX. I think it is extremely hazardous.

Mr. ARENS. Why?

Mr. WILCOX. Well, if such a person had subversive tendencies, they could monitor such information. I don't know whether he might have access to the code or whatever else he might have—he could pass it on to whom he might wish. There is a potential danger there, as I see it.

Mr. ARENS. Am I clear in my interpretation of your testimony that the defense agencies of this Government do have leased wires going through New York City?

Mr. SHUTE. That is correct.

Mr. ARENS. And those leased wires are serviced by employees of the Western Union Co., who are members of the American Communications Association?

Mr. WILCOX. That is correct.

Mr. ARENS. Which has been ejected from the CIO because of its promoting the purposes of the Communist Party?

Mr. WILCOX. That is correct.

Now, these people have access to traffic moving over some 450 leased circuits and 250 telemeter channels terminating at New York City that are also susceptible to monitoring. By telemeter channel I might explain that is a method Western Union has developed for, say, splitting what is normally termed a channel into various segments so that the one channel can be used by a number of different customers.

Mr. ARENS. Would you pause there a minute? I want to ask you another question. Is the company empowered to discharge an employee solely because that employee is a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. WILCOX. No. In fact, we would be guilty of several things if we tried it, I am afraid.

Mr. ARENS. Am I clear in my impression from your testimony that the company was obliged to bargain with the American Communications Association?

Mr. WILCOX. Yes; they very emphatically were.

* * * * *

Mr. ARENS. Have you, in the course of your employment during the period of time you were in ACA and in the Communist Party, had occasion to see restricted messages?

Mrs. YEWELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. ARENS. Could you tell us about them?

Mrs. YEWELL. The last restricted message that I saw was about a movement of rubber. The first word of the message, which was a Government message, was "restricted." To myself, I didn't think that message had any right even on Western Union's wires. It gave the number of the cars, the destination, and the name of the railroad. It was a long tabulated message about this rubber and its movement.

Mr. ARENS. Have you also, Mrs. Yewell, while you were a member of the Communist Party and a member of the American Communications Association in the course of your work with the Western Union, seen messages on production?

Mrs. YEWELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. ARENS. Were they restricted, too?

Mrs. YEWELL. They did not have the word "restricted."

Mr. ARENS. What did they have on them?

Mrs. YEWELL. Different defense companies saying reasons why they couldn't fill orders. We have all the messages coming through with an assigned number, DO number.

In April 1955 Secretary of the Army Wilber Brucker, who was then Counsel to the Army, appeared before the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate. Here are excerpts from his testimony:

Mr. ARENS. Are you aware of the fact that the tie lines and leased lines out at the Pentagon at this very hour are serviced by the American Communications Association which has been repeatedly found to be a Communist-controlled organization?

Mr. BRUCKER. I see your point and I am very glad that you raised that. Yes, and we are disturbed.

Mr. ARENS. Is there any way, Governor, that the Defense Department could preclude access under existing law, preclude access to the tie lines and leased lines out at the Pentagon to persons in the American Communications Association, a Communist-dominated organization?

Mr. BRUCKER. I know of none.

Mr. ARENS. In other words, at the present time, although the ties lines and leased lines out at the Pentagon are serviced by a Communist-controlled organization, the Defense Department is, under existing law, helpless to protect itself?

Mr. BRUCKER. To that extent it certainly is.

Mr. ARENS. Are you cognizant of the fact that there has been testimony before the Internal Security Subcommittee to the effect that persons under discipline of the Communists controlling the American Communications Association now have access to messages coming from the Pentagon by a monitor system whereby they can plug in, listen to conversations——

Mr. BRUCKER. Regrettably, yes, I know that.

Mr. ARENS. Are you conversant with the facts which have been revealed by the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate to the effect that restricted telegrams coming in from the Pentagon have been intercepted by persons under discipline of the Communist-controlled American Communications Association?

Mr. BRUCKER. I am aware of that.

Mr. ARENS. Are you conversant with the fact that the North Atlantic cable which carries very important messages vital to the security of our Nation is now serviced by the American Communications Association, a Communist-controlled labor organization?

Mr. BRUCKER. I have learned that, too.

Mr. ARENS. And I take it, if I am not being a little bit redundant here, that under the present law and under the present powers vested in the Defense Department, the Defense Department is absolutely helpless to cut off that access to the messages?

Mr. BRUCKER. That is correct.

Senator BUTLER. As is every other agency of Government that you know of?

Mr. BRUCKER. That is right, every other agency.

Mr. ARENS. Would you propose, Governor, if this bill should become law, that steps would be taken as soon as possible to preclude access to the tie lines and leased lines out at the Pentagon and to the North Atlantic cable of persons under discipline of the Communist-controlled American Communications Association?

Mr. BRUCKER. I would certainly anticipate that steps would be taken to get at that precise problem.

Mr. ARENS. Governor, are you at all conversant with the general, not the specific, the general technique of trying to break a code, one nation trying to break the secret code of another nation?

Mr. BRUCKER. Yes; I am.

Mr. ARENS. You know, of course, do you not, Governor, that one of the techniques of trying to break a code is to have access to messages involved in sending that code; is that not correct?

Mr. BRUCKER. That is.

Mr. ARENS. Is it not true that coded messages of the Pentagon, highly confidential coded messages of the Pentagon which go out over the tie lines and leased lines serviced by the Communist-controlled American Communications Association are in such situation or status that they can be available by a monitoring system even though in code to persons under disciplines of the Communist-controlled American Communications Association?

Mr. BRUCKER. You have described it correctly.

Mr. ARENS. And do you, as the General Counsel of the Department of Defense, who has access to the security information of the Department of Defense, feel that that condition, that situation, is a large or at least a situation of grave concern to this Government?

Mr. BRUCKER. I feel, sir, that that situation is nothing short of deplorable to be allowed to continue any longer than is absolutely necessary.

Senator BUTLER. And, Governor, in addition to the existing situation so far as monitoring is concerned, those people are always there to sabotage those very important communication lines, aren't they?

Mr. BRUCKER. They are, and while I would not describe or give any information of an unclassified nature, I know a place or places where that could occur with disastrous results.

Senator BUTLER. In other words, you have a double threat that is presently right here at this moment?

Mr. BRUCKER. That is right.

Senator BUTLER. Breaking the code through the frequency of messages obtainable by them or to which they have access, and also the chance of sabotage of these very important communications in the event of emergency?

Mr. BRUCKER. Yes, sir.

Here is an excerpt of testimony during these same hearings from a representative of the Pentagon:

Mr. STOHL. The ways and means employed by a saboteur to inflict damage are as varied as human imagination. However, when such talents are exercised against vital areas of facilities considered highly essential to our Nation's defense, the loss can be as serious as a major military reverse. The employment of known Communists in this type of facility enhances the possibilities of sabotage. Common sense dictates the removal of such individuals from these plants.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say the following:

1. It is not now, nor has it ever been, the purpose of the bill, nor the intention of the Department of Defense to enter into a program of nationwide screening. The intent is to remove a relatively few known dangerous persons from a relatively small number of our most vital facilities.

2. I want to assure this committee that this problem has been considered over a number of years in the executive branch of the Government at the highest levels. Each time, over this period of years, the conclusion has been reached that our security program is not adequate so long as we are aware of the fact that hundreds of known Communists are in our most vital industrial facilities without legal authority to remove them.

3. Unless this legislation is enacted, we are not in a position to assure the Congress and the American people that all reasonable measures are being undertaken to safeguard our national security.

Senator BUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Stohl.

The well-known, able, and respected columnist Victor Reisel discussed the need for this legislation within the last 10 days. Here is what he said:

It would cost us $100 million to make a Soviet-type moon shot, Pentagon scientists, afflicted with a bad case of budget-itis, tell you in awe. By comparison, the big missile is dirt cheap, just $35 million, though one twisted wire or one badly soldered electronic part can burn up before it gets higher than the commanding officer's temper.

Yet, despite the high cost of lifting one of these celestial gadgets, this Government has been forced to permit some 2,000 known Communists and professional saboteurs to work in classified plants which turn out parts and assemble component sections of missiles for the big race.

For well over a year the Pentagon has been seeking the power to get these workers fired—or at least shifted completely out of the secret plants. They told the House Un-American Activities Committee about it in detailed testimony.

That was on October 9, 1957. On that day, five top Pentagon counterintelligence and security officers went up the Hill. They are all respected men. They said there were 2,000 known saboteurs. They warned that they could not guarantee adequate protection against industrial espionage and sabotage. To make this record solid, here are the men who testified: A. Tyler Port, Director, Office of Security Police; Robert Applegate, Staff Director, Industrial Security Programs Division; Paul Goldsborough, Staff Director, Communications Division; John H. Fanning, then Director of Domestic Programs; and Jack L. Stempler, Assistant General Counsel of the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

Port said: "Acts of sabotage and espionage are usually committed by an individual or several individuals, rather than by an organization. Consequently, any preventive or corrective measures taken should be directed against such misguided persons and not necessarily against organizations to which they belong."

The Pentagon simply wanted a law which could move some 2,000 identified potential saboteurs not only from a secret department but from the factory itself. At the moment, the Pentagon can only lift a suspect out of a classified division. It cannot, for example, get a janitor fired even if he is a known member of the Communist Party. That's a fact.

A proposed law was written. It was called the Defense Facilities Protection Act. No one heeded the House Un-American Activities Committee. The bill died. Committee member GORDON SCHERER, Cincinnati, finally reported on the floor of the House the other day the estimate of 2,000 potential spies, but it was lost in the torrent of words from others. * * *

Just one 10-cent phone call would have revealed that the Pentagon has spent millions tracing these workers.

Operating through its industrial security program, the Pentagon has checked upward of 3 million workers on a front ranging from the palm trees of the Florida coast to the icebound ships now part of the Arctic distant early warning system.

Of these, 2 million have been cleared for confidential information. Another 750,000 workers were cleared for top secret and secret data. There were 3,459 suspect cases

at the time of the last count. Of these, clearances were denied or revoked in 1,006 cases. But it was all wasted. Many were just shifted to other floors and departments. The law doesn't permit us to do any more. Now that's a handy crowd to have around gadgets costing $35 million each.

The text of the bill follows:

A BILL TO AUTHORIZE THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO GUARD STRATEGIC DEFENSE FACILITIES AGAINST INDIVIDUALS BELIEVED TO BE DISPOSED TO COMMIT ACTS OF SABOTAGE, ESPIONAGE, OR OTHER SUBVERSION

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Defense Facilities Protection Act of 1959."

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds that—

(1) the history of modern warfare has established that the defense of any country is greatly dependent upon the effective and continued operation of its industrial economy and the full utilization of its productive capabilities. In time of war or of preparation for defense from attack by a potential aggressor, injury to the industrial economy or impairment of the productive capabilities of a country may severely curtail its military effectiveness, and such injury or impairment has become a major objective of aggressor nations in their preparation for and prosecution of war;

(2) there exists in the United States a limited number of individuals as to whom there is reasonable ground to believe they may engage in sabotage of the industrial economy and productive capabilities of the United States, espionage, or other subversive acts in order to weaken the power and ability of the United States to cope with actual or threatened war, invasion, insurrection, subversive activity, disturbance, or threatened disturbance of international relations;

(3) in such circumstances it is essential that, without impairing the rights or privileges of the great bulk of loyal United States citizens, such individuals be barred from access to facilities injury to which would be harmful to the industrial economy and productive capabilities of the United States, and, therefore, to its military effectiveness.

SEC. 3. (a) Whenever the President finds by proclamation or Executive order that the security of the United States is endangered by reason of actual or threatened war, or invasion, or insurrection, or subversive activity, or of disturbance or threatened disturbance of the international relations of the United States, the President is authorized to institute such measures and issue such rules and regulations as may be necessary to bar from access to any defense facility or facilities individuals as to whom there is reasonable ground to believe they may engage in sabotage, espionage, or other subversive acts. The President may perform any function vested in him by this Act through or with the aid of such officers or agencies as he may designate.

(b) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, no measure instituted, or rule or regulation issued, pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall operate to deprive any individual of access to any defense facility or facilities unless such individual shall first have been notified of the charges against him and given an adequate opportunity to defend himself against the charges. Such charges shall be sufficiently specific to permit the individual to respond to them, and such opportunity shall, if the individual so desires, include a hearing. The Administrative Procedure Act shall not be applicable to proceedings under this Act. Nothing contained in this Act shall be deemed to require any investigatory organization of the United States Government to disclose its informants or other information which in its judgment would endanger its investigatory activity: *Provided, however,* That in the event that such information is not disclosed the individual charged shall be furnished with a fair summary of the information in support of the charges against him.

(c) The measures instituted, or rules or regulations issued, pursuant to subsection (a) hereof may operate to bar summarily any individual from access to any defense facility or facilities provided that such individual shall be notified in writing of the charges against him within fifteen days from the time he is so barred and given an adequate opportunity to defend himself against such charges, including, if he so requests, a hearing within thirty days of the date of such request. Reasonable continuances may, however, be permitted if consistent with expeditious disposition of the matter. A determination shall be made and transmitted to the individual affected within thirty days from the date of the termination of the hearing or, if no hearing is requested, of the submission of the individual's defense to the charges, and if administrative proceedings are provided by the rules or regulations for review of any such determination they shall be promptly determined. In the event that the summary bar against such individual is removed as a result of any proceeding, the individual shall be compensated by the United States solely for his loss of earnings in or in connection with any defense facility during the period he was so barred.

(d) As used in this Act the term "defense facility" shall have the same meaning as it has in title I of the Internal Security Act of 1950, as amended, but shall not include vessels, piers, or waterfront facilities.

SEC. 4. Whoever willfully violates any rule, regulation, or order issued pursuant to the provisions of this Act, or knowingly obstructs or interferes with the exercise of any power conferred by the Act, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

SEC. 5. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to deprive any individual of any rights or benefits conferred upon him by the National Labor Relations Act, as amended by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947.

CARE AND TREATMENT OF RETURNING U.S. CITIZENS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill to authorize the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to make more equitable and orderly provision for the care and treatment of returning U.S. citizens who become mentally ill in a foreign country.

This legislation would provide for American citizens in other foreign countries the same degree of protection from their Government now provided for those in Canada. It would also relieve public and institutional authorities in ports of entry from their present unfair burden of care for mentally ill repatriates.

Under the bill, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be authorized to make arrangements to receive, temporarily care for and hospitalize such repatriates pending arrangements for their suitable continuing care and treatment. The Department would also be authorized to assume responsibility for any such patient until the individual's State of residence is ascertained and arrangements are completed for his transfer and release to the appropriate public authorities or to a relative who has assumed responsibility for him in writing, or until it is determined that the individual is entitled to care under some other Federal program.

THE NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FLYNN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned about the size of the national debt as I know most Members of Congress are. I believe that all of us agree that it is essential that the national debt be retired as speedily as possible. This is for the welfare of our country.

In debate last week on the vault-cash bill, we came to realize that the Federal Reserve Bank does not need, for its purposes, $20 billion of the approximate sum of $27 billion that it has in its reserve. This money belongs to the people of the United States. It can be used by the people through an act of Congress, for the benefit of the United States and its citizens. I propose, according to a bill that I have introduced today, to have the Federal Reserve Banks turn over to an Administrator of a Federal Debt Retirement Trust Fund this $20 billion in Government bonds in exchange for non-interest bearing notes to be issued by the United States Treasury. I propose to have said Administrator of said Debt Retirement Fund invest and re-invest the proceeds from these bonds for a period of 60 years and insofar as possible to invest them in Government obligations, or obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States, or obligations of States, Commonwealth or political subdivisions thereof. I am advised by the Library of Congress that such an investment program would yield adequate return in 60 years to pay off the entire national debt of $285 billion and to permit a return to the Federal Reserve Bank at the end thereof, of the original $20 billion that started the Fund and in addition thereto, adequate interest would be earned to pay the entire cost of administering this program during the 60-year period and in addition thereto, would pay in profit at the end of said period over and above the other items, the sum of approximately $50 billion to the United States Treasury.

I believe that there is no better, sounder or logical means of retiring our national debt than to use our own assets in an investment program, tailored insofar as possible to investments in our own debt to retire our national debt. I am

causing to be printed herewith a copy of the bill which I have today introduced.

A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE RETIREMENT OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Debt Retirement Act".

SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Treasury.

(b) The term "Fund" means the Federal Debt Retirement Trust Fund.

(c) The term "Administrator" means the Administrator of the Federal Debt Retirement Trust Fund.

SEC. 3. There is hereby established an agency of the United States which shall be known as the Federal Debt Retirement Trust Fund, which shall be under the direction of an Administrator who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term of 10 years unless such appointment is made after July 1, 2014, in which case it shall be for the duration of the existence of the Fund.

SEC. 4. The Board of Directors of the Federal Reserve System shall direct each Federal reserve agent to transfer to the Secretary of the Treasury an amount of interest-bearing obligations of the United States held by him as security for Federal reserve notes such that the aggregate of the face amounts of the obligations so transferred shall equal $20,000,000,000. Such transfers shall be effected not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury, upon receipt of the obligations transferred to him pursuant to section 4, shall issue in exchange therefor to each Federal reserve agent, for the account of his bank, special notes of the United States in an amount equal to the face amount of the obligations so transferred. Such special notes, the issuance of which is hereby authorized, shall not bear interest.

(b) Upon a finding by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System that such action is necessary in order to enable any Federal Reserve bank to meet its own obligations, the Board may permit such bank to present such special notes, in such amounts and at such times as the Board may prescribe, to the Secretary of the Treasury for redemption, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall thereupon redeem such notes at face value.

SEC. 6. The Secretary shall transfer to the Administrator, immediately upon receipt thereof, the securities transferred to the Secretary by the several Federal reserve agents pursuant to section 4. The Administrator shall have power to sell such securities on the open market or hold the same to maturity, and shall invest and reinvest the proceeds thereof in accordance with section 7.

SEC. 7. The Administrator may invest the assets of the Fund in—

(1) direct obligations of the United States;

(2) obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States; and

(3) obligations of States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any political subdivisions thereof.

SEC. 8. The Administrator shall direct his investment policies toward securing the maximum return on the assets of the Fund. He shall not have the duty of supporting or attempting to influence the course of the domestic money market or any segment thereof, but shall take reasonable precautions to avoid abrupt shifts in investment policy which would have serious disruptive effects upon such market or any segment thereof.

SEC. 9. (a) The Administrator shall pay all of the expenses of operating the Fund from the gross income thereof. After payment of, or provisions for, such administrative expenses, the Administrator shall reinvest the net earnings of the Fund as authorized in section 7.

(b) The Administrator shall annually make a full report of the operations of the Fund to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, who shall cause the same to be printed for the information of the Congress.

SEC. 10. (a) On July 1, 2024, the Administrator shall transfer all of the assets of the Fund to the Secretary, who shall thereupon cancel and retire all direct obligations of the United States comprising a part of the assets so transferred, and shall make appropriate disposition, for the benefit of the United States, of the remainder of such assets.

(b) Upon the completion of the transfer directed by subsection (a) of this section, the Administrator shall wind up the affairs of the Fund as expeditiously as may be practicable, and shall render a final report to the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The Fund, and the office of the Administrator, shall thereupon cease to exist.

PENALTIES FOR DESTRUCTION OF COMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide Federal criminal penalties for the willful injury or destruction of communications facilities used or useful in the military or civilian defense functions of the United States.

Our current Federal law is inadequate to safeguard the backbone of the Nation's defense—our vast communications networks. Section 1362 of title 18 of the United States Code makes it a criminal offense to willfully or maliciously injure or destroy communications facilities operated or controlled by the United States but no specific Federal protection is accorded the vast majority of our communications lifeline which is neither operated nor controlled by the Federal Government and which is vitally necessary to the country's defense.

Last year a bill similar to the one I have introduced today was introduced in the Senate, S. 1571. This bill was submitted to the Department of Defense for its comments and this is what the Department said:

> The Department of Defense is one of the largest users of commercial communications in the United States. Commercial circuits are utilized for the aircraft control and warning network, Ground Observer Corps telephone system, military air raid warning system, Strategic Air Command communications network, and other systems and networks necessary for weather reporting, command, and logistical support. In view of the responsibility of the Department of Defense, the disruption by willful or malicious acts, of any commercial communications system so employed, could gravely endanger the national existence.
>
> The Department of Defense has long recognized the need for an amendment of the nature proposed by S. 1571. In fact, this Department forwarded to the 83d Congress a legislative proposal of similar import, which was introduced as S. 3644 and H.R. 9507 of the 83d Congress. The Department of Defense feels that enactment of S. 1571 would establish a deterrent which would do much to protect the integrity of commercial communications systems utilized by the military departments.

The absence of adequate Federal statutory protection of communications facilities is surprising when one considers that all railroad facilities used in interstate or foreign commerce are protected by a Federal criminal statute—title 18, United States Code, section 1992. Similar protection exists for all interstate and foreign shipments—title 18, United States Code, section 659—and for vessels within the United States or on the high seas—title 18, United States Code, sections 2271–2279. Several years ago a bomb placed in a scheduled airliner exploded in flight killing 44 persons, and Congress almost immediately enacted a law—title 18, United States Code, section 32—making the destruction of aircraft or aircraft facilities a Federal criminal offense. Certainly vital communications facilities upon which so much depends are entitled to equal protection.

Several existing Federal laws touch upon the protection of communications facilities but none of them is adequate today. Section 2155 of title 18 of the United States Code places a penalty upon destruction of communications facilities but is limited to plants specifically used to supply facilities of communication to national defense premises or to the military and naval forces. It further requires proof of specific intent to injure the national defense of the United States. Other laws apply only in time of war—title 57, United States Code, section 606, and title 18, United States Code, section 2153. In the case of section 1362 of title 18, which my bill would amend, the protection is only accorded to facilities operated or controlled by the United States.

Today, as you well know, many of our defense facilities are located hundreds and even thousands of miles from control centers which will warn of the approach of enemy planes or missiles, calculate the retaliatory action to be taken and send the instruments of retaliation on their way. Most of the communications facilities involved in this tremendous defense network are neither operated nor controlled by the United States. Instead they are supplied by commercial communication companies. I am advised that it would cost the Government untold billions of dollars to replace these commercial facilities with Government-owned lines which would still not be as satisfactory as the present arrangement with the commercial companies who have scores of alternate routes to bypass areas where communications facilities may have been knocked out by enemy action.

I feel that the Congress must accord the safeguard of Federal criminal sanctions against the malicious destruction of these commercial facilities so vital to our defense. In the past, the Congress has determined, and wisely I believe, to

afford the protection of a Federal criminal law to the major commercial modes of transportation. Today when minutes or even seconds could spell the difference between the destruction of an enemy missile or the destruction of a great American city, with all its population, our total communications system represents the frontline of our defense. I think that the Congress would be more than negligent if it fails to cover this chink in our armor. I am advised informally that the agencies of the Government charged with civilian defense and atomic development feel the same way as the Department of Defense that this legislation is highly desirable because the disruption of commercial communications systems could gravely endanger our national existence.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mr. CHAMBERLAIN), for 10 minutes, on tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. VINSON, and to include a very able argument and statement by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] on retired military officers.

Mr. HARRIS, the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today on H.R. 4049 and to include therein letter received from the president of the Air Transport Association dated June 11, 1959.

Mr. LEVERING and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CELLER.

(At the request of Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. DAGUE.

(At the request of Mr. SLACK, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. DENT in three instances.

Mr. NIX.

Mr. SANTANGELO.

Mr. GIAIMO.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 42. An act to authorize the utilization of a limited amount of storage space in Table Rock Reservoir for the purpose of water supply for a fish hatchery;

S. 96. An act to govern the salaries and personnel practices applicable to teachers, certain school officers, and other employees of the dependent schools of the Department of Defense in overseas areas, and for other purposes;

S. 211. An act for the relief of Aurelia Marija Medvesek-Pozar;

S. 449. An act for the relief of Clarita Martinez;

S. 451. An act for the relief of Mohammed Ali Halim;

S. 459. An act for the relief of Penelope Carnavas Kafos;

S. 692. An act to authorize the sale of certain lands to the State of Missouri;

S. 707. An act for the relief of Demetrios Pappathakis;

S. 854. An act for the relief of Luther M. Crockett;

S. 917. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Fred A. Fletcher;

S. 1034. An act for the relief of Asae Nishimoto;

S. 1903. An act to authorize a per capita distribution of funds arising from a judgment in favor of the Quapaw Tribe, and for other purposes;

S. 1904. An act to authorize the use of funds arising from a judgment in favor of the Citizen Band of Potawatomi Indians of Oklahoma, and the Prairie Band of Potawatomi Indians of Kansas, and for other purposes; and

S. 2045. An act to authorize the use of funds arising from a judgment in favor of the Coeur d'Alene Indian Tribe, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 904. An act to name the New Richmond locks and dams in the State of Ohio as the Capt. Anthony Meldahl locks and dams;

H.R. 1547. An act for the relief of T. Sgt. Walter Casey;

H.R. 2065. An act for the relief of Arthur J. Dettmers, Jr.;

H.R. 2497. An act to add certain lands located in Idaho to the Boise and Payette National Forests;

H.R. 3368. An act to extend the special enlistment programs provided by section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended;

H.R. 4072. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the regulation of the practice of dentistry in the District of Columbia, and for the protection of the people from empiricism in relation thereto," approved June 6, 1892, as amended;

H.R. 4454. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901, to eliminate the requirement that that certain District of Columbia corporations be managed by not more than 15 persons;

H.R. 5534. An act to designate the bridge to be constructed over the Potomac River near 14th Street in the District of Columbia, under the act of July 16, 1946, as the George Mason Memorial Bridge, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5914. An act for the relief of Dr. Radboud Lourens Beukenkamp;

H.R. 6662. An act to amend the District of Columbia Hospital Center Act in order to extend the time during which appropriations may be made for the purposes of such act; and

H.R. 7062. An act to provide for payment of annuities to widows and dependent children of Comptrollers General.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 9, 1959, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1180. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the Wichita project, Cheney division, Kansas, pursuant to section 9(a) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) (H. Doc. No. 198); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1181. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "a bill to improve the active duty promotion opportunity of Air Force officers from the grade of captain to the grade of major"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1182. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "a bill to amend the Uniform Narcotic Drug Act of the District of Columbia, as amended, to permit paregoric to be dispensed by oral as well as written prescription"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1183. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "a bill to provide for more effective administration of public assistance in the District of Columbia; to make certain relatives responsible for support of needy persons, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1184. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the report of the activities of the Department of Justice for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1958, pursuant to law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 866. An act to amend the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1911, and for other purposes", approved May 18, 1910; without amendment (Rept. No. 638). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. NATCHER: Committee of conference. H.R. 5676. A bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 639). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MORGAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 2067. A bill to authorize the Honorable Thomas F. McAllister, judge of the U.S. court of appeals, to accept and wear the decoration tendered him by the Government of France; without amendment (Rept. No. 635). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORGAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 5477. A bill to authorize Maj. Gen. Bernard W. Kearney, U.S. Army (retired), a former Member of Congress, to accept and wear the Philippine Legion of Honor in the degree of commander, conferred upon him by the Government of the Philippines; without amendment (Rept. No. 636). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 7907. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate St. Ann's Infant Asylum, in the District of Columbia", approved March 3, 1863, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 637). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 8137. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code with respect to property exempt from execution or attachment, and the procedure for asserting such exemptions; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 8138. A bill to amend section 1362 of title 18 of the United States Code in order to provide penalties for malicious damage to certain private communication facilities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 8139. A bill to provide for the construction, alteration, and acquisition of public buildings of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FLYNN:

H.R. 8140. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to provide for Federal Reserve support of Government bonds when market yields equal or exceed 4¼ percent; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 8141. A bill to provide for the retirement of the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 8142. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 300th anniversary of the founding of Hopkins Grammar School; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H.R. 8143. A bill to provide for the adoption in the Nation's Capital of the practice common to many other cities in the United States with regard to cultural activities by depositing in a special fund 1 mill out of each $1 of tax revenue of the government of the District of Columbia to be used for such programs, to advance the National Cultural Center and its educational and recreational programs, to provide financial assistance to the nonprofit art programs of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, by amending the act of April 29, 1942; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico:

H.R. 8144. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 350th anniversary of the founding of the city of Santa Fe, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 8145. A bill to grant to the city of Farmington, N. Mex., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the sand and gravel in or on certain real property; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 8146. A bill to extend the benefits of the Panama Canal Construction Service Annuity Act of May 29, 1944, to certain additional civilian officers and employees; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H.R. 8147. A bill to amend section 203 of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of earnings individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from their benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.R. 8148. A bill to bring about greater uniformity in State taxation of business income derived from interstate commerce; to establish a Commission on Taxation of Interstate Commerce; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITENER:

H.R. 8149. A bill to implement the Constitution by amending title 4 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.J. Res. 459. Joint resolution providing for the designation of the third week of July as Captive Nations Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H.J. Res. 460. Joint resolution to provide for the erection of a marker at Cape Canaveral, Fla., to memorialize the launching of Explorer I, the free world's first earth satellite; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. Con. Res. 294. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to official recognition by the United States of the centennial anniversary of the unity of Italy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H. Con. Res. 295. Concurrent resolution extending greetings to the Parliament of the Kingdom of Nepal; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. Res. 312. Resolution providing additional funds for the Committee on House Administration; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. MORRIS of Oklahoma: Resolution calling upon the Congress of the United States to institute appropriate action for the construction of the Markham Ferry Dam and Reservoir project on Grand River in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, resolution taking cognizance of the importance of completing certain road construction contracts involving State Highway 199; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 8150. A bill for the relief of Elma Wolf, Jane Wolf, Michael Wolf, and Thomas Wolf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 8151. A bill for the relief of Guillermo Manuel Garcia Vazquez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 8152. A bill for the relief of Dr. Sang Moon Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 8153. A bill for the relief of Michael A. Fouflis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 8154. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marguerite Lucas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H.R. 8155. A bill for the relief of Despina and Myrophora Papadopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 8156. A bill for the relief of Jack Kent Cooke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Russian Propaganda and Bluff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1959

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the question of just how much of Russia's claim to superiority in all phases of defense is sheer propaganda should be evaluated and toward that end we should have information concerning the sources of the data which certain columnists and politicians so glibly recite as indicative of the supremacy of the Russians over the Western democracies in the field of aeronautics, missiles and nuclear weapons.

The Washington Evening Star of July 6 carried the report showing the latest figures released by the Soviet Government from which we now find how badly we were misled by the Communists as to their real losses in World War II and how such misinformation shaped our policy toward the U.S.S.R. at a time when the free world was trembling at the threats of an aggressor whose gun, we now know, was quite evidently not loaded.

As a matter of fact, the Russian war losses had so decimated her manpower reserves that quite evidently she has never been and is not now in a position to wage successful war with the free world. Also it is to be noted that women outnumber men 55 to 45 percent and that 48 percent of her population is concentrated in her cities.

Mr. Cecil Holland, the author of the Star report, in quoting the July issue of Population Bulletin has this to say:

"The postwar crisis in manpower," the study adds, "might be the key to this secretiveness, because the U.S.S.R. certainly was aware that the demographic (population) facts would reveal a serious, inherent weakness impairing her bargaining position, a weakness from which she could not quickly recover."