

mountain-walled canyon, technicians continued to work at their task of readying the third and fourth units for service.

T. E. Roach, Idaho Power president, said the company's startup of the first two Oxbow units was designed to help fill the heaviest irrigation-pumping demand in its history.

He reported that this season's anticipated irrigation load of some 200,000 kilowatts alone will be double the company's entire system load for all purposes in 1948.

"Now that Oxbow has gone into production to take its place beside Brownlee Dam as a great new source of power, we hope the public will visit this development that is so important to the economy of our area," Roach said. "In addition to the power projects themselves, there are numerous recreation areas open for the enjoyment of the public."

The utility president said a new park being developed by Idaho Power near the upper end of Oxbow's constant-level reservoir now is open for public use. Named for the late Fred McCormick, an Idaho Power engineer who directed Brownlee construction, the park is located at the mouth of Wildhorse Creek.

Four major recreation areas already have been developed on the Brownlee Reservoir, including one built by Idaho Power about 3 miles above the dam.

Recreation areas also are planned by the company on the reservoir to be formed by Hells Canyon Dam, third project in its \$164 million development. The utility already has started preliminary work on the Hells Canyon project.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon, on Monday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, July 24, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 20, 1961:

BUREAU OF CUSTOMS

George K. Brokaw, of California, to be collector of customs for Customs Collection District No. 28, with headquarters at San Francisco, Calif.

Anton Sestric, Jr., of Missouri, to be collector of customs for Customs Collection District No. 45, with headquarters at St. Louis, Mo.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidate for personnel action in the regular corps of the Public Health Service subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

To be senior sanitarian

John C. Eason, Jr.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 20, 1961:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMISSIONER

John B. Duncan, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF LABOR

George L-P Weaver of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

U.S. ATTORNEY

David M. Satz, Jr., of New Jersey, to be U.S. attorney for the district of New Jersey for the term of 4 years.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate July 20, 1961:

POSTMASTER

Charles E. Organ to be postmaster at Waynesville in the State of Illinois.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JULY 20, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Isaiah 40: 31: *They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength.*

O Thou who hast revealed Thyself as a prayer inviting, a prayer hearing, and a prayer answering God, always willing and able to renew our strength when it is in danger of becoming depleted, grant that daily we may experience and enjoy the blessings of Thy grace in an ever-increasing measure.

May our faith in the reality of spiritual resources, the power of righteousness, and the strength of justice, never become eclipsed by doubt and extinguished by despair in these perilous days when our President, our Speaker, and the Members of Congress are trying to solve our difficult national and international problems.

We earnestly beseech Thee that they may be inspired with divine wisdom and counsel as they seek to promote and preserve those ideals and principles which will make for amity and peace among all nations.

Humbly and confidently we offer our prayer, in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report on the military construction appropriation bill for 1962.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JONAS reserved all points of order on the bill.

PRIME MINISTER OF THE FEDERATION OF NIGERIA

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Wednesday, July 26, 1961, for the Speaker to declare a

recess for the purpose of receiving the Prime Minister of the Federation of Nigeria.

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

There was no objection.

PRINTING AS A HOUSE DOCUMENT TRIBUTES TO SPEAKER SAM RAYBURN

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 342) with a Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Senate amendment. Page 1, line 6, strike out "twenty-five" and insert "twenty-seven".

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NORTHEASTERN WATER AND RELATED LAND RESOURCES COMPACT

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 378, Rept. No. 745) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

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. 30) granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, 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 5-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.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS TO NASA

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 6874) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction of facilities, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I assume the gentleman will take some time to explain this, particularly the additional half billion dollars, as I understand it, or nearly half billion dollars, that was added by the other body; is that correct?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Four hundred and eight million dollars.

Mr. GROSS. And the gentleman will take time to explain that?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Certainly, I want to take time to explain it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 742)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6874) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction of facilities, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year 1962 the sum of \$1,784,300,000, as follows:

"(a) For 'Salaries and expenses', \$226,686,000.

"(b) For 'Research and development', \$1,305,539,000.

"(c) For 'Construction of facilities', \$252,075,000, as follows:

"(1) Langley Research Center, Hampton, Virginia, \$3,980,000.

"(2) Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, California, \$5,680,000.

"(3) Lewis Research Center, Cleveland, Ohio, \$3,590,000.

"(4) Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Maryland, \$9,212,000.

"(5) Wallops Station, Wallops Island, Virginia, \$6,313,000.

"(6) Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Pasadena, California, \$3,642,000.

"(7) Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Alabama, \$12,891,000.

"(8) Atlantic Missile Range, Cape Canaveral, Florida, \$49,583,000.

"(9) Pacific Missile Range, Point Arguello, California, \$998,000.

"(10) At various locations, including those specified in subsection 1(c) (1)-(c) (9), and including land acquisitions therefor, \$146,186,000.

"(11) Facility planning and design not otherwise provided for, \$10,000,000.

"(d) Appropriations for 'Research and development' may be used (i) for any items of a capital nature (other than acquisition of land) which may be required for the performance of research and development contracts, and (ii) for grants to nonprofit institutions of higher education, or to nonprofit organizations whose primary purpose is the conduct of scientific research, for purchase or con-

struction of additional research facilities; and title to such facilities shall be vested in the United States unless the Administrator determines that the national program of aeronautical and space activities will best be served by vesting title in any such grantee institution or organization. Each such grant shall be made under such conditions as the Administrator shall determine to be required to insure that the United States will receive therefrom benefit adequate to justify the making of that grant. None of the funds appropriated for 'Research and development' pursuant to this Act may be used for construction of any major facility, the estimated cost of which, including collateral equipment, exceeds \$250,000, unless the Administrator or his designee notifies the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate of the nature, location, and estimated cost of such facility.

"(e) When so specified in an appropriation Act any amount appropriated for 'Research and development' and for 'Construction of facilities' may remain available without fiscal year limitation.

"(f) Appropriations other than 'Construction of facilities' may be used, but not to exceed \$20,000, for scientific consultations or extraordinary expenses upon the approval or authority of the Administrator and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government.

"(g) The amount included for personnel security investigations in the sum authorized by section 1(a) in the discretion of the Administrator may be increased by not more than \$2,000,000, but the aggregate sum provided by section 1(a) for salaries and expenses may not be exceeded by reason of any such increase.

"Sec. 2. Authorization is hereby granted whereby any of the amounts prescribed in subparagraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), (10), or (11) of subsection 1(c) may, in the discretion of the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, be varied upward 5 per centum to meet unusual cost variations, but the total cost of all work authorized under such subparagraphs shall not exceed a total of \$262,075,000.

"Sec. 3. Not to exceed 3 per centum of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsections 1(a) and 1(b) hereof may be transferred to the 'Construction of facilities' appropriation, and, when so transferred, together with \$30,000,000 of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(c) hereof, shall be available for expenditure to construct, expand, or modify laboratories and other installations at any location (including locations specified in subsection 1(c)), if (1) the Administrator determines such action to be necessary because of changes in the national program of aeronautical and space activities or new scientific or engineering developments, and (2) he determines that deferral of such action until the enactment of the next authorization Act would be inconsistent with the interest of the Nation in aeronautical and space activities. The funds so made available may be expended to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment. No portion of such sums may be obligated for expenditure or expended to construct, expand, or modify laboratories and other installations until the Administrator or his designee has transmitted to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate a written report containing a full and complete statement con-

cerning (1) the nature of such construction, expansion, or modification, (2) the cost thereof, including the cost of any real estate action pertaining thereto, and (3) the reason why such construction, expansion, or modification is necessary in the national interest. No such funds may be used for any construction, expansion, or modification if authorization for such construction, expansion, or modification previously has been denied by the Congress.

"Sec. 4. The Administrator is hereby authorized to transfer, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, funds appropriated pursuant to this Act, to any other agency of the Government whenever the Administrator determines such transfer necessary for the efficient accomplishment of the objectives for which the funds have been appropriated. Not more than \$20,000,000 of the funds authorized by this Act may be transferred by the Administrator under this section, and no transfer in excess of \$250,000 shall be made under this section unless the Administrator has transmitted to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate and to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives a written statement concerning the amount and purpose of, and the reason for, such transfer, and (1) each such committee has transmitted to the Administrator written notice to the effect that such committee has no objection to that transfer, or (2) thirty days have passed after the transmittal by the Administrator of such statement to those committees."

And the Senate agree to the same.

OVERTON BROOKS,
GEORGE P. MILLER,
OLIN E. TEAGUE,
VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,
JAMES G. FULTON,
J. EDGAR CHENOWETH,

Managers on the Part of the House.

ROBERT S. KEER,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
STUART SYMINGTON,
STYLES BRIDGES,
ALEXANDER WILEY,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6874) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction of facilities, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The amendment of the Senate struck out all after the enacting clause of the House bill and substituted a new text. The Committee of Conference has agreed to accept the Senate amendment with certain amendments made by the managers on the part of the House.

The differences are explained as follows:

Total appropriations authorized by the Senate amendment for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year 1962 are \$1,784,300,000. This represents an increase over the House bill of \$407,400,000, to which the managers on the part of the House agree.

The Senate amendment authorized for salaries and expenses \$226,686,000. This is an increase of \$27,400,000 over the House bill, to which the managers on the part of the House agree.

The Senate amendment authorized for research and development \$1,295,539,000. This is an increase of \$272,000,000 over the House bill. The managers on the part of the House sought to increase this figure by \$10,000,000 to \$1,305,539,000. The purpose of this amendment is to make available further research in the amount of \$7,100,000 for solid and semisolid fuels, and in the amount of \$2,900,000 for electrical propulsion. Both are considered vital to the furtherance of the national space program. The managers on the part of the Senate agreed to this amendment.

The Senate amendment authorized for construction of facilities \$262,075,000. This is an increase of \$123,000,000 over the House bill. Managers on the part of the House requested that \$10,000,000 be deleted from this item in order to provide the necessary funds for research and development, as described above, without increasing the total authorization. Managers on the part of the Senate agreed to this amendment.

The Senate amendment eliminated \$15,000,000 which had been contained in the House bill for emergency construction of facilities. In its place is a provision agreed to by the managers on the part of the House, authorizing additional latitude for shifting funds from salaries and expenses and research and development to construction of facilities under certain conditions. This provision is described in the next to last paragraph below.

The Senate amendment included a new provision authorizing research and development funds of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to be used for grants to nonprofit institutions and authorized the vesting of title to research facilities constructed under such grants in the grantee organization. The Administrator must justify all grants, and no grants involving the construction of facilities, including collateral equipment, may be made above \$250,000 without notification of the Congress as to nature, location, and estimated cost of such facilities. Managers on the part of the House asked for an amendment which would place title to such facilities in the United States unless the Administrator makes a positive determination that the national aeronautics and space program will best be served by vesting title in the grantee. Managers on the part of the Senate agreed to this amendment.

The Senate amendment eliminated a provision of the House bill which would have authorized freedom to use up to \$2,000,000 more than has been budgeted for security investigations of personnel within the National Aeronautics and Space Administration during fiscal year 1962. Managers on the part of the House asked that the substance of this provision be reinstated, which amendment was agreed to by the managers on the part of the Senate.

The Senate amendment authorized the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to transfer up to 5 percent of the funds appropriated for salaries and expenses and for research and development to the construction of facilities portion of its program. It also permitted \$50,000,000 of the funds earmarked for construction of facilities to be applied to projects or facilities the exact nature of which is as yet undetermined due to certain unknown scientific quantities in the space program. Managers on the part of the House asked for a reduction in these figures and reached agreement with the managers on the part of the Senate to 3 percent of the funds appropriated for salaries and expenses and for research and development to be transferred, and on \$30,000,000 of the funds appropriated for construction of facilities to be available without specification.

The Senate amendment added a new section to the bill which would permit the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to transfer, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, funds appropriated under this act to other Government agencies if the Administrator deems it necessary to accomplish the objectives for which the funds have been appropriated. The new section contains a provision that not more than \$20,000,000 may be transferred to any agency without the written acquiescence of the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House and the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate, or until notification of such committees has been made and 30 days have passed without action by them. Managers on the part of the House asked for an amendment to limit the total transferable amount under this act to \$20,000,000 and to require that any amount in excess of \$250,000 shall not be transferred without being subject to the foregoing limitations. Managers on the part of the Senate agreed to this amendment.

OVERTON BROOKS,
GEORGE P. MILLER,
OLIN E. TEAGUE,
VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
JAMES G. FULTON,
J. EDGAR CHENOWETH,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the statement of the managers really explains this situation very well. We went to conference yesterday morning on this bill to iron out the differences between the House and the Senate. We came out of the conference with a unanimous report from the conferees on both sides of the aisle.

The authorization bill as we present it to the House of Representatives embodied roughly about \$1,364 million. At the time we presented it to the House of Representatives we informed the House that the reports coming to us were that the executive branch of the Government had in mind a program which would increase the tempo of the space program, push it forward more rapidly than our bill contemplated. Our committee had taken the position all along that the program should be pushed. We took the position that there is no room for second place in the race in space. We could, as someone said, sit back and wait on Russia to do all of the development in space.

In that event we would just take the development in research and science from the Russians and tag along in second place. That position is unthinkable, and the committee of conference thought it was unthinkable.

When the Senate received the bill, we had by that time obtained the recommendations from the White House in reference to the matter. These recommendations raised the amount contemplated in the House bill by some \$408 million. We had hearings before the Committee on Science and Astronautics, full hearings, at least 3 days of them, in which we went over each and every addition placed by the Senate in the bill.

Following that, the conferees were appointed and we went to conference. We agreed generally to the figures in the Senate bill. The Senate on the other hand agreed almost entirely to our ob-

jections to the Senate bill and went along with the House conferees.

We had five objections. One of them that I considered very important was the security amendment. We insisted in the House bill that not more than \$2 million be set aside to push the examinations and investigations being made of the employees of the Space Administration. Some of them had been on the payroll for some time. They had been taken over from the Army. They were not completely cleared for security reasons. There were almost 4,000 of them, as I remember, who had not been cleared. The committee felt that this was extremely important and, therefore, these people ought to be cleared as soon as reasonably possible. We provided in the bill, and the Senate accepted it, that not more than \$2 million should be used for that purpose.

The matter regarding facilities was substantially kept in line with the House bill. We shifted some funds. The Senate had a provision in this bill that not exceeding 5 percent of the funds under appropriation pursuant to certain sections of the bill should be used as the Space Administration felt it advisable that they should be used; in other words, they might be shifted from one portion of the bill to another portion. We changed that, and we reduced in conference the amount to not exceeding 3 percent and not exceeding \$30 million that should be shifted in any respect in the course of the administration of this bill.

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

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. More than \$400 million additional went into this bill in conference. Is that correct?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That is correct; \$407,400,000.

Mr. GROSS. Did your committee formally vote on that?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. We did not vote as a formal committee, no. We had hearings on it.

Mr. GROSS. What did you have by way of hearings? This is a lot of money. This is close to half a billion dollars. What did the hearings amount to? How many witnesses did you have before your committee?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. We had the principal officials of the NASA before us, and we went over each item in the bill.

Mr. GROSS. You had two witnesses before your committee and your hearings lasted less than 2 days; is that correct?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. We had more than two witnesses. As I remember, it was 3 days, and we had perhaps 8 or 10 witnesses there. To back up the whole bill, the committee all the way through had had many hearings and we had asked the witnesses from NASA if they could not use more money to speed up this program. All the way through hearings this committee had generally shown an interest in speeding up this program. When we came here to the floor of the House, we took the

same position as we spoke, that the program should be speeded up.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman tell the Members of the House how this additional \$400 million is going to be spent?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Surely, most of it is going to be spent in research and development. For instance, let me tell the gentleman what will be spent on salaries—

Mr. GROSS. It would be interesting to have the details of how this money is going to be spent for research and development.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. If the gentleman will permit me, I will go further into the matter of research and development. On research and development, we plan to spend \$1,305,539,000. That will be spent in the major phases of the research and development program. For instance, the Saturn program was included, the Apollo program, the Nova program is included, and a number of other programs as well. There is money here for the space communications program. We have money for the meteorological program, that is the weather program. That comes in the additional amount that we put into the bill as a result of this conference. So I can tell you that this bill, as it comes to you today, provides for the speeding up of the whole program all along the line. It means not only that space communications will be more nearly a reality today than it has ever been before, and this means a speeding up of the communications program and the weather program. We are deeply interested in that, too.

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

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. It should be pointed out that the Science and Astronautics Committee hearings were very extensive. Both the other body and the committee of the other body on space, as well as the committee on our side on space, has gone into these programs thoroughly. The decision has been made to speed up the program. The decision was agreed to by the majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the minority leader of the other body, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. The minority leader said we should not risk the dangers that are inherent in not moving ahead and speeding these programs of research and development, and space progress.

I was impressed by the witnesses before our Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House who emphasized that this was not just a trip to the moon, but that there were security and strategic considerations involved in these programs. For example, any country or group of nations that can get maneuverable space platforms or vehicles operating in orbit at a minimum or apogee of 89 to 120 miles above the surface of the earth, when they can be controlled at 18,000 miles an hour would have the ability to drop guided nuclear weapons which within the space of from 10 to 15 minutes could wipe out any city in the world. We are not fooling with just a program going over cornfields and

wheatfields for the purpose of sailing over fields. We are operating this research and development program for the benefit of the security of the American people and the research and development necessary for the defense of the free world.

After having had many executive committee sessions, it is my judgment likewise, together with Senator DIRKSEN and our good leader on our side of the House committee, Representative JOSEPH MARTIN, of Massachusetts, that we go ahead with these science and space programs as recommended.

It should be pointed out that at the conference meeting we held yesterday on this legislation, the report was unanimous of both Republican and the Democratic conferees appointed and serving on the conference committee. There is no difference of opinion whatever on the conference committee that this amount of money is necessary. We need the backing of the House, and if the chairman does not call for a rollcall vote, I would like to do so because we want to show the American people we are united on these programs, also every spending bill should have a record vote. We want to show the American people we in the United States should be first in research and development in space and likewise that we should be first in peaceful constructive programs like the weather satellites and communications satellites. We should be first in navigation satellites. Yes, we should be first in research and development that will benefit us in many ways that we do not even know. As to the people in the farm areas, of course, the sooner we can get the weather satellites the better. If we have adequate weather satellites, we will be able to tell whether there are going to be droughts, tornados, storms, and so on.

We will be able to protect the country by advance warnings of rains and storms causing floods. It is estimated by the Weather Bureau that it will save from \$2 billion or more a year if we have an adequate weather satellite program. You can see that this is really a question of economic and public benefit in these programs, to our U.S. economy, and to the safety and security of America. We should go ahead. This legislation is not a case of pouring money down the drain.

With regard to the transfer of funds to other agencies of the Government by the Administrator of the National Astronautics and Space Administration, there is a provision that not more than \$20 million may be transferred to any agency under this conference report.

I have been very interested in electrical and bacteriological basic research both in civilian agencies as well as in the military services, and particularly the Navy. It will be a tremendous thing if we can go ahead with some of the developments of these projects both for helping with desalinization and changing the chemical composition of sea water, for possible thermal and propulsion, keeping ships and boats clear of barnacles, and on shore installations, providing suitable protection for metallic surfaces.

This research will be of tremendous help to municipalities as well as to fleets of ships.

In conclusion I want to join with the chairman in strongly backing these programs and the conference report, because I feel it is necessary not only to keep the United States first in research and development but also necessary for our security and our defense.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for a very excellent statement. I want to say that Dr. Reichelderfer, who is the head of the Weather Bureau, told our committee some time back that by the development of these weather satellites we could save for the people of the United States as much as \$3 billion a year. I want also to say that we have a satellite now in operation, and that we are using the weather satellite in practical ways at this very moment in projecting weather reports, in anticipating storms, especially down in the gulf, and in other operations.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. We should go ahead with the communication satellite programs on a stepped-up basis. We have the proposal of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. to construct the satellites and put them in orbit without cost to the U.S. Government. The U.S. Government will supply the base and pad facilities, but the A.T. & T. will even pay for the boosters and the facilities for the purpose of getting the research and development of the communication satellites program into operation. I recommend a prompt contract and prompt action. Secondly, we have research and development going on that will within 15 to 18 months result in a communications satellite system in actual partial operation. That would mean enormous advance toward international telephone and telegraph communications as well as radio and worldwide television. Such constructive and beneficial programs would really be a first in space that the people of the world would respect, and it would make the first to the moon or the first to orbit in space a spectacular exhibit but a smaller accomplishment for the progress and peace of all the world's peoples. The American people are ahead in these communications programs, and I hope we will vote to keep ahead. This is the kind of rivalry, competition, and progress that is all for the good and constructive, and is the kind I like. These programs under this conference report, for expanded research and development in the peaceful uses of space and science for the progress and security of our people, are the American people and Congress at their best.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Bass].

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this conference report. It provides for an additional \$400 million, most of which is to

accelerate on a crash basis this man-to-the-moon program to get there before 1970, and it is because of this crash moon program that I appear in opposition to this conference report. I do so for these reasons.

The Russians are now ahead of us by 3 or 4 years in big booster development, and going to the moon depends mainly on big booster development. So even if we do accelerate this program on a crash basis, there is no guarantee that we can beat the Russians to the moon. In fact, in my best judgment we cannot, because we are so far behind in the big booster field.

I say it is far better for us to direct our resources and efforts primarily in those areas in space exploration where we do excel, namely scientific satellites, communications satellites, weather satellites, oceanography, and the like. Here are areas in space where we do excel. Here is where we can beat the Russians, and at the same time be of direct benefit to mankind. But one sure way to lose out to the Russians in this space race is to try to outmatch them in their own grounds in this area of spectaculars of little benefit to man.

What direct benefit to mankind is going to come from going to the moon? It has some scientific value, but it has very little direct benefit to mankind.

We are told, Mr. Speaker, this program will now cost on a crash basis about \$20 billion. The expenditure of \$20 billion means that we will be diverting our resources into this moon shot proposition, and inevitably away from those areas where we do excel and where we should concentrate.

One other point. We read today that the President is going to ask us for an additional \$3 billion for new mobilization efforts on account of the Berlin crisis. In fact there is every indication that defense spending will skyrocket even more in the next few years. And so, I say this is a poor time for us to be embarking on a man-to-the-moon project costing \$20 billion, of doubtful benefit to mankind and with no military or defense significance when we are going to have to devote a great deal of our resources to the cold war effort.

Do not let anyone tell you going to the moon has any military significance. We had a distinguished array of military witnesses before the Space Committee, and not one of the military experts told us going to the moon had any military value. There have been many loose statements made here that this moon project affects our security. It does not. It would be far better to direct our resources and effort right here on earth rather than engage in probably a futile effort to beat the Russians to the moon before 1970.

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

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the opposition to this crash program to land a man on the moon, which the gentleman has expressed. I think the gentleman from New Hampshire is absolutely right.

We can well spend the money in other ways, which would benefit our Nation and humanity in better fashion. I have expressed opposition to this program in the past. I shall vote against the conference report on this account.

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the parliamentary situation is such that we can vote down the conference report and instruct our conferees to come in with a different type of report.

So, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I say that I trust we will vote down this conference report so that we may then instruct our conferees to come back with something in line with the original authorization we passed a couple of weeks ago in connection with this space program.

Mr. FULTON. If we vote down the conference report at this stage, I believe that would be the end of the bill.

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. No. That is not my understanding. We have done this before.

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

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman said something about an authorization contained in this bill for communication satellites and meteorological satellites. Could the gentleman advise the House how much authorization is contained in the bill for communication satellite purposes?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Ninety-four million six hundred thousand dollars is placed in the bill for communication satellites, and that is the program that is very urgent at this time. We are working on it to get it out and actually to put into operation a program for communicating messages by means of communication satellites.

Mr. HARRIS. Yes. The gentleman from Arkansas is familiar with what the program is, but I would like to ask the gentleman if this \$94 million is for research and development.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it in any way for operation or installation of a communication satellite program to operate worldwide communication or otherwise?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. It is for research and development.

Mr. HARRIS. Solely for research and development?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. At this particular time it is for research and development.

Mr. HARRIS. I would like to suggest to the gentleman, in view of the jurisdiction of his committee, which I had some knowledge of at the time of the establishment of his committee and the purposes of the committee at the time—that his committee does have jurisdiction over research and development, and we certainly recognize that, and the committee is doing a good job in that field. But, I read one or two of the reports in which it appears to me that the committee is beginning to get into the operational field and the field of regulation. I would like to say to the

gentleman that the rules of the House do very definitely and clearly define jurisdiction in these matters, and the question of regulation in the operation of communications and the Weather Bureau comes under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. May I say that the gentleman from Arkansas is a great leader of a great committee and has done a great job for the United States Congress. This bill, however, to which the gentleman refers, covering meteorology and communication satellites deals with research and development.

Mr. HARRIS. Research and development only?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Research and development only.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman, but I have read some reports of the committee, and it occurred to me that there is rather specific language otherwise, and that is the reason I wanted to bring this to the attention of the House at this time.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. May I say further that we are very zealous in our efforts to try to avoid in any way treading upon the jurisdiction of the committee of the gentleman from the State of Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I am glad to have the assurance from my distinguished friend and chairman of a great committee.

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Is it not true that by far the bulk of this increase of \$400 million goes into research and development for accelerating the moon project, a man to the moon project, with very little for these other programs?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Yes, but let me answer the gentleman very briefly. A great military leader told me that every bit of space between here and the moon is of military significance. This was an Air Force officer, and I believe it just as firmly as I believe anything I can believe, that every cubic foot of space between here and the moon is of military and commercial significance. If we let the Russians develop their program of space, the use of space between here and the moon, we are jeopardizing the very security of this Nation; the very foundation on which this Nation rests. I say this, unless we back up this program, we are not going to know how to utilize space either from a commercial or military viewpoint, and we are taking a serious chance on our own security.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman one question, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is not the question here today simply this: Do we want to actually compete with

the Russians in the missiles field, and in all conquest of space, or do we want to proceed in a leisurely way and let the Russians excel? It seems to me that is the question. We are taking what the administration says is absolutely necessary for this success.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Of course. Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will yield further, if we defeat the bill, Congress is taking all responsibility of defeating it. Of course, if we want to stay in the race we have to support this measure.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 354, nays 59, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 116]

YEAS—354

Abbutt	Church	Gallagher
Abernethy	Clark	Garland
Adair	Coad	Garmatz
Addabbo	Cohelan	Gary
Addonizio	Collier	Gathings
Albert	Conte	Gavin
Alexander	Cook	Gialmo
Andersen,	Cooley	Gilbert
Minn.	Corbett	Glenn
Andrews	Corman	Goodell
Anfuso	Cramer	Goodling
Arends	Cunningham	Granahan
Ashley	Curtin	Grant
Ashmore	Curtis, Mass.	Green, Oreg.
Aspinall	Curtis, Mo.	Green, Pa.
Auchincloss	Daddario	Griffin
Avery	Dague	Griffiths
Ayres	Daniels	Gubser
Bailey	Davis,	Hagan, Ga.
James C.	Hagen, Calif.	Haley
Baldwin	Davis, John W.	Halleck
Baring	Davis, Tenn.	Halpern
Barrett	Dawson	Hansen
Barry	Dent	Harding
Bass, Tenn.	Denton	Hardy
Bates	Derounian	Harris
Becker	Derwinski	Harrison, Va.
Beckworth	Diggs	Harrison, Wyo.
Bell	Dingell	Harvey, Ind.
Bennett, Fla.	Dominick	Harvey, Mich.
Bennett, Mich.	Donohue	Hays
Blatnik	Dooley	Healey
Blicht	Dorn	Hechler
Boggs	Downing	Hemphill
Boland	Doyle	Henderson
Bolling	Durno	Herlong
Bonner	Dwyer	Hoeven
Boykin	Edmondson	Holland
Brademas	Elliott	Holtzman
Bray	Ellsworth	Hosmer
Breeding	Everett	Huddlestone
Brewster	Evin	Hull
Brooks, La.	Fallon	Ichord, Mo.
Brooks, Tex.	Farbstein	Ikard, Tex.
Broomfield	Fascell	Inouye
Broyhill	Feighan	Jarman
Buckley	Fenton	Jennings
Burke, Ky.	Fisher	Joelson
Burke, Mass.	Finnegan	Johnson, Calif.
Burleson	Fino	Johnson, Md.
Byrne, Pa.	Flood	Johnson, Wis.
Byrnes, Wis.	Flynt	Jones, Ala.
Cahill	Fogarty	Jones, Mo.
Carey	Ford	Judd
Cederberg	Forrester	Karsten
Celler	Fountain	Karsh
Chamberlain	Frazier	Kastenmeier
Chelf	Frelinghuysen	Kearns
Chenoweth	Friedel	Kelly
Chiperfield	Fulton	

Kilday	Murphy
Kilgore	Murray
King, Calif.	Natcher
King, N.Y.	Nelsen
King, Utah	Nix
Kirwan	Norblad
Kitchin	Norrell
Kluczynski	O'Brien, Ill.
Knox	O'Brien, N.Y.
Kornegay	O'Hara, Ill.
Kowalski	O'Hara, Mich.
Kunkel	Olsen
Landrum	O'Neill
Lane	Ostertag
Langen	Passman
Lesinski	Patman
Libonati	Perkins
Lindsay	Peterson
Loser	Pfost
McCormack	Philbin
McDonough	Pike
McDowell	Pilcher
McFall	Pillion
McIntire	Pirnie
McSween	Poage
McVey	Poff
Macdonald	Powell
MacGregor	Price
Machrowicz	Pucinski
Mack	Qule
Madden	Rabaut
Magnuson	Rains
Mahon	Randall
Malliard	Ray
Martin, Mass.	Reifel
Mathias	Reuss
Matthews	Rhodes, Ariz.
May	Rhodes, Pa.
Meador	Riehlman
Merrow	Riley
Miller, Clem.	Rivers, Alaska
Miller,	Rivers, S.C.
George P.	Robison
Miller, N.Y.	Rodino
Millikin	Rogers, Colo.
Mills	Rogers, Fla.
Moeller	Rogers, Tex.
Monagan	Rooney
Montoya	Roosevelt
Moore	Rostenkowski
Moorhead, Pa.	Roush
Morgan	Rutherford
Morris	Ryan
Morrison	St. Germain
Morse	Saund
Moss	Saylor
Moulder	Schneebell
Multer	Schweiker
	Schwengel

NAYS—59

Anderson, Ill.	Gross
Ashbrook	Hall
Baker	Harsha
Bass, N.H.	Hiestand
Battin	Hoffman, Ill.
Beermann	Hoffman, Mich.
Belcher	Horan
Berry	Jensen
Betts	Johansen
Bolton	Jonas
Bromwell	Keith
Brown	Laird
Bruce	Latta
Clancy	Lennon
Colmer	Lipscomb
Devine	McCulloch
Dole	Marshall
Dowdy	Martin, Nebr.
Dulski	Mason
Findley	Michel

NOT VOTING—24

Alford	Kee	Santangelo
Aiger	Keogh	Shelley
Bow	Kilburn	Short
Cannon	Lankford	Thompson, La.
Delaney	McMillan	Thompson, N.J.
Gray	Nygaard	Weis
Hébert	Osmer	Williams
Hollifield	Roudebush	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Williams against.
Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Lankford with Mr. Short.
Mr. Santangelo with Mrs. Weis.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Roudebush.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Alger.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Nygaard.
Mr. Alford with Mr. Osmer.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. O'KONSKI changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE TO MAKE A CORRECTION IN THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 6874

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. Con. Res. 353) authorizing the Clerk of the House to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 6874 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 6874) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction of facilities, and for other purposes, is authorized and directed to make the following correction:

In section 2 of the bill strike out "\$262,075,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$252,075,000".

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

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 5 OF 1961—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 328) disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 5 transmitted to the Congress by the President on May 24, 1961.

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 further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 328) with Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous consent agreement of yesterday, further general debate on the resolution will continue for not to exceed 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CLEM MILLER].

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I take this time because I feel a most important point has been unresolved or left unanswered by the debate on yesterday regarding the protection of litigants. My credentials to speak here today is the fact that I was an employee of the board for a substantial period of time and while I do not presume to be the greatest expert, I do feel that on this point I am qualified to speak.

Yesterday, it was stated by the gentlemen from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM and Mr. FLYNT], that the courts have no opportunity to rule on the facts, and that if a Board decision is supported by substantial evidence, then the court becomes a rubber stamp for the findings of fact. Now, in truth, I fail to understand how this can be seriously advanced.

Because the fact is that the courts can and do find on the facts. They find on the basis of the complete record, the record as a whole. I might add that the Board must find on the preponderance of the facts, and this one word—this one word “preponderance”—has become the most important single word in the National Labor Relations Act.

Mr. Chairman, the word “preponderance” is the most important single word in the National Labor Relations Act because, in effect, the words “the preponderance of the evidence” and “substantial evidence” has become intertwined as one. To find substantial evidence on the record, considered as a whole, they have necessarily applied themselves to the requirement that the Board’s decision be based on a preponderance of the evidence. The courts have said if the Board does not find on the preponderance of the evidence, then it is not supportable, and they have overruled it. They have done this in case after case after case overruling long-established Board precedent.

As an agent of the Board, I have read hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of court decisions where they have examined the facts and looked into the record fully. For anyone to come into this Chamber and in the face of these court decisions say that the courts are now prohibited from looking into the facts, is simply not looking at these court decisions.

The trial examiner’s report is a full statement of the facts. The court has this plus the entire transcript of the case. On this basis I would say that the litigants are getting full and ample protection to a review of the facts, and this resolution should be voted down.

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

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. In view of the gentleman’s statement, surely he must be familiar with section 10(e) of the Labor-Management Relations Act. I should

like to read one sentence from that section:

The findings of the Board with respect to questions of fact, if supported by substantial evidence—

Not preponderance of evidence—on the record considered as a whole shall be conclusive.

Did I understand the gentleman to indicate that the statement I have just read is not the law? Or does he say that the courts do not follow the law?

Mr. CLEM MILLER. The courts certainly do follow the law. But in deciding what is substantial evidence, they have adopted the practice of requiring a preponderance of evidence. At any rate, under your version or mine the fact is that the courts do examine the facts of the case, and that is the crucial issue. They do determine the facts—whether there is sufficient or whether there is substantial or whether there is a preponderance, the rights of the litigants are protected in having that record fully and completely examined in toto. That is the crucial point. What I object to is the failure of this debate to make this point. To say, as has been said that any evidence is sufficient to preclude examination by the court is not right.

Mr. GRIFFIN. If I understand the argument of the gentleman, he is saying that the preponderance of the evidence is the same thing as substantial evidence.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. I say precisely that. Substantial evidence on the whole record.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I must respectfully disagree, as a lawyer.

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

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Yes, I yield.

Mr. FASCELL. Is it not true that the very section of the law which was read by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] on which he has disagreed with your interpretation has been interpreted by the court in the Universal Camera case and in many other cases, the citations of which I put in the RECORD yesterday?

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Yes, that is precisely correct, and all you have to do is to read the court cases.

We can come in here and talk endlessly about what this word means or that word means, but when you get down to it it is what the courts have done in their day-to-day work that really counts, and anyone who has examined those cases and who says that the litigants are not protected—and I will have to say this respectfully—is simply not fully conversant with the way the cases work out in practice.

It would certainly be appropriate at this point to say a word about the NLRB staff, the civil servants who have received so much attention in this debate. It may be high time to speak up for civil servants. As I say, I was one of these. I have worked for the Federal Government for 8 years. Five of those years were spent with the NLRB.

It is my judgment, in knowing literally hundreds of these fellow workers that

they do a good job, an effective job, and a conscientious job. Labor Relations Board work is a technical field. It is a particular field. Board personnel have to know their stuff, and do. They know a great deal more than the labor specialists. This is so because there is a labor field, of which NLRB is only a small part, however large it may loom in current affairs.

These Board people are good technicians, good craftsmen, and it is unfortunate that an inference has been drawn that proper administration has been somehow illy served by the Board’s civil servants.

Yes, I know that critics will claim they are not criticizing the personnel, only the methodology, or at least I presume they would say this, but the clear inference of inferiority is there.

This inference will not be left unchallenged. In fact, I could go further, and say that in the essential and unceasing battle between bureaucrats and legislators, the latter very frequently come off second best. Legislators cannot master the intricacies. They frequently climb in where they are poorly armed with the facts, and are often guilty of egregious errors. I know whereof I speak. For a brief but very significant period, I served with congressional liaison with the National Labor Relations Board. I was appalled and shocked at the depth of ignorance displayed by many legislators who were presumed to be experts. It was a lesson I have never forgotten.

Not that the executive, the administrators, the bureaucrats should not be checked by Congress. Of course they should. I feel very strongly on that. In whatever state the facts may be in, Congress must put a checkrein on the executive.

But occasionally it should be on the record that there is another side; that it is rarely heard in these chambers as we indulge ourselves in the favorite pastime of bureaucrat knocking. It would seem to me in the essential task of governing, that a little less emphasis on recrimination would be better, a more serious effort at establishing the responsible nature of civil servants would be better. It is on the basis of a million daily decisions made by a million individuals that the true integrity of our Government, even our future, rests. If they fail, we fail. And if they are constantly upbraided from pillar to post, then their resolve to do the job cannot help but be weakened.

There has been a lot said here about trial examiners. They are presumed to be slothful because they have not handled X number of cases, or because one of them handled only five. Do these critics know how a trial examiner works? Do they know the circumstances and conditions under which he works? I would suggest not. Hearings may last forever and a day. Because of the particular circumstances surrounding Board history, trial examiners bend over backwards to give every litigant full opportunity to be heard whether or not his evidence bears directly on the point or not. Going through these transcripts takes days and days. He has no assist-

ants to help him as do members of the judiciary. His position with respect to the litigator is extremely precarious because he must seek settlement if he can but be always aware that his power of decision renders him subject to challenge at all times. This takes time, patience, and courtesy.

His decision must be good. It is long and detailed. No per curiam. It must be his own work.

This is just one example. I could list hundreds of others of cases where the civil servant, without any public forum of his own, is subjected to criticism. Thus, to these allegations with respect to the National Labor Relations Board I enter a general denial.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, in considering whether or not we should allow this reorganization plan to become effective I think we have first to look at whether it should have been submitted in the first place. In the first place, the Reorganization Act probably is not broad enough to cover a quasi-judicial body. This fact was brought out very effectively by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM] yesterday. In other words, we are dealing here with a body which has a judicial function. It is not an independent agency. The legislative history shows it is not. It is not a part of the executive branch. If I could, Mr. Chairman, I would demur to this reorganization plan being here. I do not think it fits under the Reorganization Act.

In the second place, is it a necessary thing? Certainly the National Labor Relations Board has been behind in its docket for years. Everybody knows this. Something should be done about it. However, in the Landrum-Griffin Act last year we did provide certain remedies which I think will have a beneficial effect on the size of the docket in the future.

For instance, on last May 15 the regional directors of the National Labor Relations Board got the authority to handle representation cases. In fiscal year 1961, the Board itself disposed of 2,172 representation cases. It has been estimated by the Board that in fiscal year 1962, review will be sought in only 600 representation cases, and of this number, only 10 percent, or 60 cases, will be granted review. This is a great difference in the workload of the Board. Possibly it will mean the difference between the Board's being able to catch up on its work or staying behind. We do not yet know, and will not know until the plan has worked for a time. So, reorganization may not be necessary.

If the plan does become effective, what difference does it make? It makes this difference. You are putting judicial functions into the hands of the trial examiner. You are making a judge out of an individual who may or may not be qualified to be a judge. I do not mean to say that the trial examiners we have are not competent gentlemen. I do not know whether they are or not. I feel

that they probably are. However, let me point out to you that these people are not appointed for life, they are not confirmed by the Senate, and—get this—they do not have to be lawyers. Therefore, they are not judges in any sense of the word. The Civil Service Commission in setting up the classification for a trial examiner has not provided that a trial examiner has to be a lawyer. The Administrative Procedures Act does not provide that a trial examiner must be a lawyer.

What can this trial examiner do? He holds a hearing as the sole judge of the admissibility of evidence, yet, as I say, he does not have to be a lawyer. He decides what will go in the record. This record becomes very important because, as those who have followed the debate know, this record is the basis on which two members of the Board either decide to take up a matter on appeal, or they do not. As of now, of course, any person who is a litigant has an absolute right to appeal to the Board. Since this right would no longer exist, the record acquires even more importance. If the Board decides not to take up the case, there may be an appeal to the circuit court of appeals. And what do we go upon? This same record, which was prepared under the supervision of a man who may or may not be a lawyer.

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

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. It is very obvious to me that the proponents of this plan recognize that there is a fatal, overriding weakness in the plan, and that is that there is no review guaranteed by the Board from decisions by trial examiners or employees. So now they frantically turn to what they say is the right of review by the circuit court of appeals. In all my time in Congress I have been up and down through this substantial evidence rule, whether it should be based on substantial evidence or on consideration de novo. I insist that it is on the substantial evidence rule, which means that if there then is evidence to support the finding it is final. That is the fatal weakness of this plan.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I certainly agree with the gentleman from Indiana. If the last speaker from the other side is correct, somebody has written a brand-new book on evidence since I was in law school. In other words, to say that the substantial evidence rule is synonymous with preponderance of evidence certainly is contrary to anything that I learned in law school.

Mr. Chairman, I have some ideas as to what should be done to cut down the backlog of the National Labor Relations Board, if further action is needed. I think we should look back to the hearings which the Committee on Education and Labor had in the years 1953 and 1954. At that time we went rather carefully into the work of this Board, and some of us at least became convinced that this Board which is a quasi-judicial body is performing functions which no quasi-judicial body should be allowed to

perform. They are performing functions which are not quasi-judicial, but absolutely judicial. Can you imagine a case which is more of an adversary case than an unfair labor practice case? Can you imagine any possibility of having a case which should be tried in a Federal court any more than some of the unfair labor practices cases which we have had? To me, Mr. Chairman, it would be much more to the point to analyze the jurisdiction of this Board and to realize we have put things in that jurisdiction which never should have been included. I think, for instance, unfair labor practices cases should be sent to the Federal courts. We have just passed a law providing for 80 new Federal judges. Oh, I admit they have not been filled and I suppose they probably will not be filled at least until the end of this session of the Congress. But, at the same time this will greatly enlarge the Federal judiciary so that the argument which was made some time ago that the Federal judiciary cannot handle this load probably is not a valid argument at this time. So, to me, it would be much wiser to take these unfair labor practices cases out of the jurisdiction of the Board and put them into the Federal court where they belong and let the Board then concentrate on those functions of labor law which should be in a Board of this type—in other words, representation cases and the cases involving certification of bargaining agents. This would reduce the backlog very quickly. There is a lot to be done by a Board like this, without having to act as a judge in a situation in which a real tribunal set up with the dignity which we ascribe to the Federal judiciary system, should be the forum.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I want to leave this one thought. You are giving this trial examiner who is not a lawyer the authority to issue orders. The language states that he can issue an order covering any of the functions of the Board. Now, when will this order become effective? Most orders become effective as soon as they are issued. I hope these will not, but I do not know. In paragraph C of plan No. 5 it says that these orders issued by a trial examiner shall be "deemed to be the action of the Board" after the Board has refused to review, or no such review is sought within the time limit set up by the Board. The words "deemed to be the action of the Board" undoubtedly are designed to define the time the action becomes final so that it can be appealed to the CCA. The language does not say specifically and clearly that such an order does not become effective before it is "deemed to be the action of the Board." In fact, there is certainly ground to believe and ground to fear that these orders become effective immediately upon their promulgation. This would result in a reversal of the present situation. Now, an order becomes effective only after the time for an appeal to the Board has expired or until the appeal has been decided. This language seems to indicate that an order issued by the trial examiner—who is not a lawyer—can become effective instantly, subject only to being upset by later appeal.

The time it takes to have an order issued after appeal to the Board now averages 195 days from the day upon which the trial examiner completes his hearing. Thus, the trial examiner's order may well be in effect, and obeyed by all parties for 195 days. This would be true of sensible orders, and nonsensical orders. Great damage could be done in that time. Unions could be broken, businesses could fail, and even reversal on appeal might not serve to make amends.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe this Congress wants to place such great power in the hands of any officer, however competent, who has not at least been examined as to his views and qualifications by the Senate. I ask for an "aye" vote for the resolution, and therefore, the rejection of Reorganization Plan No. 5.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to attempt to clarify the confusion which I believe the gentleman from California [Mr. CLEM MILLER] has brought upon the right of review of a trial examiner's finding of fact. He correctly described the present situation by saying that the Board makes the findings of fact, and it is the Board's findings of fact which must be accepted by the court if there is substantial evidence to support them.

Reorganization Plan No. 5 takes this power that is vested in this five-member Board and permits them to pass it down to the trial examiner. The trial examiner would then make the findings of fact if upon a preponderance of the testimony he thinks that any person named in the complaint is guilty of an unfair labor practice. That finding of fact is not that of the Board, it is that of the trial examiner because the Board had delegated that authority to him.

The only way the trial examiner's findings of fact can be reviewed by the Board is if two members of the Board grant an appeal in the nature of a certiorari. There is no guaranteed right of review. Plan No. 5 in effect makes the findings of fact of a trial examiner binding upon the court of appeals if there was substantial evidence on the matter. The holdings of the circuit court of appeals have uniformly been that the findings of the Board cannot be overturned if those findings are supported by substantial evidence. Under plan No. 5 that holding will apply to trial examiners' findings of fact, where no review by the Board has been allowed.

There are very important rights involved in this delegation of the power to make findings of fact and to enter cease-and-desist orders; and I say to you it is a very dangerous thing in this explosive field of labor relations to place any such broad final authority in the hands of a trial examiner, authority which Congress consciously vested in a Board of five members.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, Reorganization Plan No. 5 follows the same general pattern as Reorganization Plans 1, 2, 3, and 4. Surely, any member of the House who voted against the four plans will find very little justification or reason to reverse his position with respect to plan No. 5.

In addition to the principles and reasons that are common and apply as to all of the plans, 1 through 5, there is the additional argument used very effectively by the distinguished Speaker and the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with respect to plan No. 2, affecting the FCC. They made the point, you will recall, that plan No. 2 would have amended fundamental law as written into the Communications Act by this Congress, through the device of a reorganization plan. That same argument applies with equal force and effect to plan No. 5 because if plan No. 5 is not disapproved it will amend a fundamental provision of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act as it was enacted by Congress in 1959.

In addition to those important reasons for disapproving this plan 5, there is another very fundamental and basic argument which is peculiarly applicable to this particular reorganization plan. I refer to a significant point made in the House yesterday by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM] to the effect that the Executive has no statutory authority under the Reorganization Act to reorganize the National Labor Relations Board. Section 7 of the Reorganization Act specifically provides that only an agency in the "executive branch of the Government" can be reorganized through the device of a reorganization plan.

Now, there has been some argument about several of the other agencies, the FCC, the SEC, and so forth, as to whether they are agencies in the executive branch of the Government subject to the Reorganization Act. The argument made as to those agencies may have been a bit hazy and fuzzy. But let me remind the Members of the House that the legislative history establishing the National Labor Relations Board is very clear. When this Congress and this House adopted the conference report by which the Wagner Act became law the question I have raised was settled clearly and definitely.

In the conference on the legislation which became the Wagner Act, the conferees adopted a House amendment eliminating language in the Senate bill which would have described the National Labor Relations Board as "an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government."

That language was stricken out of the bill. The managers on the part of the House, in their report to the House, explained that action taken in conference in these words, and I quote from the report:

The Board, as contemplated in the bill, is in no sense to be an agency of the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. Chairman, that is the legislative history. I submit that there is no jurisdiction, there is no authority to reorganize the NLRB through a reorganization plan. We would be wasting our time and only creating a bit of chaos here today if we should vote to approve plan 5 and attempt in that way to reorganize the NLRB.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to make another point. Many Members are concerned about the centralization of authority inherent in the several plans. Consider for a moment the operation of the NLRB trial examiners who would be elevated to the status of Federal judges if plan 5 becomes effective. When a litigant goes into a Federal district court, of course, he takes his chances with a judge who has been appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

The NLRB trial examiners operate out of a pool here in Washington. The Administrative Procedure Act provides, in language which seems not to be very meaningful, that trial examiners should be assigned on a rotation basis insofar as practicable.

I have been serving as a member of a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] which has been investigating the NLRB and its procedures. One of our witnesses was the Chief Trial Examiner, Mr. Ringer. I was interested in how cases are assigned to the various trial examiners. Let me quote from the transcript of the hearing:

Mr. GRIFFIN. Who actually makes the assignment of the case to a trial examiner?

Mr. RINGER. I do, with the assistance of my associates.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Do you or do your associates review the file before you make this assignment?

Mr. RINGER. We review the pleadings; yes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Why?

Mr. RINGER. So that we can see what the length of the case is going to be and to put a man on that case who can get out an intermediate report in the case he has heard a month before or 2 months before, as soon as he has heard this case, and can come back and work on the intermediate report he hasn't yet gotten out, and we would not, if a man has three intermediate reports unissued for example, send him out on a case that looks like it is going to take a month.

Then later:

Mr. GRIFFIN. That is interesting because without intending to be critical of * * * Mr. Ringer, * * * I would say that the intent of Congress was that it be an automatic type of rotation. That is exactly what Congress was intending, and that if one trial examiner should happen to get four so-called long cases certainly that would be taken into account by his supervisors in evaluating his record, but the thing that Congress is concerned about would be to have someone in a position like yourself, for example—with no criticism of you—who reviews the file and decides, "Well, let's see. Let's send this case over to John Jones. I think we know how he will decide that one."

This testimony provides some insight as to a danger that could easily develop. Unfair labor practice cases could be decided, in effect, by the person who makes the assignment, particularly if there is no right to review by the Board.

I want to make it clear that I do not question the competence or integrity of the present Chief Trial Examiner who has served ably and well in that position for a long period.

But I do make the point that if plan No. 5 goes into effect, a Chief Trial Examiner would have a great deal of power concentrated in his hands which could easily be abused in affecting the course of justice.

Mr. Chairman, plan No. 5 should be disapproved.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the resolution and support Reorganization Plan No. 5. The following reasons point up the soundness of the plan:

I. GENERALLY, PLAN NO. 5 IS DESIGNED TO GIVE BOARD MEMBERS MORE TIME FOR CONSIDERATION OF MAJOR POLICY MATTERS BY PERMITTING A MORE LIMITED REVIEW OF THE SO-CALLED RUN-OF-THE-MILL CASES

The purpose of plan No. 5 is set forth in the President's transmittal message to "relieve the Board members from the necessity of dealing with many matters of lesser importance and thus conserve their time for the consideration of major matters of policy and planning." This objective is to be achieved by permitting the delegation of Board functions "to a division of the Board, an individual Board member, a hearing examiner, or an employee or employee board." The Board is required by the plan to retain a discretionary right to review all matters, and the plan provides that "the vote of a majority of the Board less one member thereof shall be sufficient to bring any such action before the Board for review." This obligation to exercise a discretionary power of review requires the Board members to screen each and every case "upon its own initiative or upon petition of a party" to see if the case falls within the category of situations warranting a full and de novo review.

II. SPECIFICALLY, PLAN NO. 5 CONTEMPLATES DELEGATING A GREATER DEGREE OF FINALITY IN UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICE CASES TO THE TRIAL EXAMINERS WHO PRESIDE AT THE HEARINGS

Plan No. 5 authorizes the Board to delegate "any of its functions," subject to the discretionary review on vote of a minority of the Board. In practical terms, however, this means and can only mean, the delegation of a greater degree of finality in unfair labor practice cases to the experienced trial examiners who preside at the hearings and have first-hand information concerning the witnesses and their evidence.

The Labor Board has two principal functions: deciding representation-election cases and deciding "unfair labor practice cases" against employers and unions. The 1959 Landrum-Griffin Amendments to the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, authorized the delegation of greater finality in representation-election cases to regional directors. The only important matter left for delegation is the unfair labor practice area of cases.

Plan No. 5 expressly provides that the delegation of decision-making powers "to any employee and employee board" shall be limited by section 7(a) of the Administrative Procedure Act. Section 7(a) of this act requires that a hearing

examiner—appointed by the Civil Service Commission pursuant to the rigorous requirements of section 11 of that act—shall preside at all contested cases of an adjudicatory nature. Unfair labor practice cases fit this description.

III. THE PRINCIPLE OF PLAN NO. 5 HAS BEEN APPROVED BY EVERY IMPARTIAL STUDY GROUP (BOTH IN AND OUT OF CONGRESS) FOR ALMOST 20 YEARS

The principle of plan No. 5—that the triers of disputed facts in administrative cases should have greater finality—is nothing new. It has been considered and approved by every major study group for approximately the past 20 years.

First. The Administrative Procedure Act of 1946: In 1946, Congress adopted the Administrative Procedure Act. This act was the result of the long study by the Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure which began in 1939 and which was continued by a special committee of the American Bar Association. It was introduced by Senator Pat McCarran and Representative FRANCIS WALTER as the codification of best practices in administrative procedure. This act—section 11—created a special corps of seasoned and independent trial examiners whose decisions were intended to have finality subject to a limited and certiorari-type of review—section 8.

Second. The Taft-Hartley Act of 1947: In 1947 Congress made a major overhaul of the then Wagner Act, and, recognizing the increasing workload of the Labor Board, authorized the Board to sit in panels.

Third. The Landrum-Griffin amendment of 1959: In 1959 Congress again gave a general scrutiny to the major labor law of the Nation, and considering the workload of the Labor Board and the then delay in processing cases, authorized the Board to delegate greater authority to its regional directors in representation-election cases. Congress did not consider in its proposals or debates the problem arising from the backlog of unfair labor practice cases.

Fourth. The 1959 McKinsey & Co. report: In 1958 the Bureau of the Budget retained the management consultant firm of McKinsey & Co. to evaluate the organization and administration of the Labor Board and recommend improvements. One of the major recommendations resulting from a 6-month study was that the Board delegate more authority in unfair labor practice cases to the trial examiners.

Fifth. The 1959 Cox Committee report: In 1959 the then Senator Kennedy appointed a panel of 12 outstanding labor lawyers representing the public, management, and labor to advise the Senate Committee on Labor on matters concerning the National Labor Relations Board. This Cox Committee recommended that the decisions of trial examiners in unfair labor practice cases be given greater finality.

Sixth. The 1961 report of the Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practices and Procedure: On April 14, 1961, a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary—Chairman CARROLL, members HART and DIRKSEN—

issued a report making nine major recommendations. One of these conclusions was that the readiest instrument available for a concerted effort to eliminate backlogs and delays in the administrative processes is the utilization of the existing hearing examiner corps by increased delegation of authority, increased finality of their decisions, and increased authority to control the course of hearings.

IV. THE NEED FOR PLAN NO. 5 GROWS MORE ACUTE AS THE BOARD CASELOAD INCREASES, THEREBY CREATING A GREATER TIMELAG, WHICH IN MANY INSTANCES IS FATAL TO THOSE SEEKING A RELIEF WHICH IS RIGHTFULLY THEIRS

The genesis of every administrative agency is the demonstrated need for an inexpensive, expert, and speedy determination with the remedy tailor made to the facts of the individual situation. Certainly, relief at the Labor Board is not speedy, and the denial of justice means in effect that the parties seek remedy elsewhere or do without.

The population explosion, the expanding industrial complex, the increased technicality of our labor laws make it certain that the caseload—already staggering—will continue to mount. The intake figures, that is, the number of unfair labor case appeals filed with the Board each of the last 3 years, bear this out. For fiscal year 1959 the Board received 380 appeals in unfair labor practice cases. In fiscal 1960 the number jumped to almost double—612. In fiscal 1961 the number continued to mount to the number of 740. The backlog of undecided cases correspondingly increased. In 1959 the number was 196; in 1960 it was 312; and for fiscal 1961, 443.

In sum, unless something is done to ease the load at the Board level, the door to administrative relief will become so clogged by a long waiting line that litigants, perforce, must turn to the law of the jungle.

V. CONCLUSION

The final witness in the congressional hearings on plan No. 5 was Boyd Leedom, former Chairman of the Labor Board during much of the Eisenhower administration and presently a member serving on the Board. His final words were these:

I cannot see any valid objection that has been raised to the plan, and I think that enactment is an important thing to the Board in trying to keep up with the Board's terrific caseload. And I sincerely hope that the Republican members—and I say that because I am a Republican—will see fit to support this plan. I can't see that it is a partisan issue at all. I can't see that it is an issue between labor and management. I say it is simply streamlining, expediting things that should be enacted.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, the objective of plan 5 is to assure that the Labor Board may delegate to its hearing examiners the authority to issue "initial decisions" instead of "intermediate reports," subject to a discretionary review by the Board on a certiorari basis. I emphasize that ultimate review by a circuit court of appeals as a matter of right is not affected.

The bases of review by the Board will not be determined until the Board shall

have afforded to representatives of management and labor, as well as to other interested persons and members of the bar, an opportunity to present their positions for full and serious consideration by the Board. It may be safely assumed, however, that the rules to be formulated will assure that all five members of the Board will consider every petition for review, and that review will be granted at least in, first, all cases which appear to contain demonstrable errors of law or fact, or failure to accord fair procedure; second, all cases which present substantial, novel, or important questions of law or administrative policy; and third, all cases in which as few as two of the five members of the Board favor review.

Plan 5 does not involve any denial or lack of due process to litigants. In this connection, I make two points. First, the plan does not involve any modification of the Administrative Procedure Act. Section 12 of that act provides that—

No subsequent legislation shall be held to supersede or modify the provisions of this Act except to the extent that such legislation shall do so expressly.

The Supreme Court of the United States held in *Shaughnessy v. Pedreiro*, 349 U.S. 48, and *Marcello v. Bonds*, 349 U.S. 302, each decided during 1955, that the 79th Congress, which enacted the Administrative Procedure Act, could and did bind subsequent Congresses by the quoted provision. Moreover, the reference in plan 5 to section 7(a) of the Administrative Procedure Act is a guarantee that that act shall continue in effect.

My second point is that plan 5 envisions only the removal of any question that the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, prohibits the Labor Board's utilizing procedures which the Congress itself specifically authorized in the Administrative Procedure Act. In other words, plan 5 assures to the Labor Board the right to function procedurally in a manner already approved by the Congress for the various departments and agencies. The Administrative Procedure Act, in section 8(a), authorizes the departments and agencies first, to provide that their hearing examiners may issue initial decisions; and second, to limit review of such decisions. In limiting review pursuant to section 8(a), according to the legislative history, a department or agency may restrict its review to questions of law and policy or, where it is alleged that erroneous findings of fact have been made by the hearing examiner, to determining whether cited portions of the record disclose that the findings are clearly wrong. The majority report of the House Committee on Government Operations, in reporting House Resolution 328 unfavorably, pointed out in footnote 3 that plan 5 will serve to make it clear that the Labor Board may accord to determinations of hearing examiners the status which the Congress intended when it enacted the Administrative Procedure Act. Already, two other agencies of Government, the Atomic Energy Commission and the Federal Trade Commission, utilize review procedures similar to that which plan 5 en-

visions for the Labor Board. If the limitation of review by those Commissions does not involve a deprivation of rights to litigants, surely a limitation of review by the Labor Board would not involve a deprivation of rights either.

I. THE LABOR BOARD IS IN CRISIS

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, the National Labor Relations Board is in crisis. It is smothered by a workload that prevents expeditious handling of routine cases and thoughtful consideration of policy. Employers tell us that they win their cases before the Labor Board, but victory comes too late—after they have been forced out of business by an illegal boycott or other unfair labor practice. Unions complain that their Labor Board triumphs are Pyrrhic; they win the litigation but lose the battle. Employees beset by unions or their company merely shrug it off and walk away; a favorable decision a year and a half away makes no difference.

All—the AFL-CIO, the NAM, the chamber of commerce—are agreed that some remedial action is necessary. The statistics bear this out. In fiscal 1960, the Board members issued decisions in 4,122 cases of all types. This averages to over 11 decisions a day throughout the entire year. Should we permit the Board members a 2-week vacation plus Saturday afternoon and Sundays, the per-day decision load is 15. Moreover, the problem grows daily more acute.

In unfair practice cases alone, the intake of appeals at the Board level continues to mount. In fiscal 1959, the Board received 380 appeals in this type of case; in 1960, the figure was 612; and in 1961, it rose to 740, almost double the figure just 2 years earlier, almost 3 unfair labor practice cases per working day. The Board's backlog has more than doubled and is at the highest level in its history. No Board member, whatever his intelligence, his physical stamina, his ingenuity, can keep abreast. Something must be done about the situation.

II. PLAN NO. 5 OFFERS A MAJOR SOLUTION TO THE PROBLEM OF DELAY AT THE BOARD LEVEL

The Presidential message accompanying plan No. 5 recites that its purpose is to relieve the Board members from the necessity of dealing with many matters of lesser importance and thus conserve their time for the consideration of major matters of policy and planning. This end is to be achieved by permitting the Board to delegate any of its functions to a division of the Board, an individual Board member, a hearing examiner, or an employee or employee board, subject to the provisions of section 7(a) of the Administrative Procedure Act, and subject to the right of a discretionary review upon its own initiative or upon petition of a party.

What this means in everyday terms is that plan 5 permits the Board to delegate greater authority to the independent trial examiners who now initially decide the unfair labor practice cases, screening all cases wherein review is sought, giving full deliberation to those cases which more than one member believes wrongly decided or otherwise important.

The chaff now buries the wheat in the grist of the NLRB unfair labor practice mill. Expert testimony confirms that many frivolous appeals are taken for selfish time-delaying reasons. Most of the cases which do get to the Board are not difficult or policymaking. Nine out of ten call for no more than the resolution of factual issues; the Board acts with unanimity in about 80 percent of the unfair labor practice situations. Thirteen percent of the cases are reversed by the Board in part, 6 percent are reversed in full, and 3 percent are remanded for further proceedings. These are frequently the tough cases, the policymaking cases, the cases that deserve full Board attention if error is to be undone. But now the median time for decision—from filing of complaint to Board decision—is 404 days; plan 5 would enable the Board to grant limited review to all cases but would permit longer review of the important cases and would cut the time consumed in the decision process by 4 to 5 months.

III. THE PRINCIPLE OF PLAN NO. 5 (DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY SUBJECT TO DISCRETIONARY REVIEW) HAS BEEN APPROVED BY EVERY PUBLIC BODY FOR OVER 20 YEARS

The principle of plan No. 5—that the resolution of disputed facts in administrative cases by trial examiners should have greater finality—is nothing new. It has been considered and approved by every major study group for over the past 20 years.

In 1939, the Attorney General appointed a Committee on Administrative Procedure which subsequently continued a study under the auspices of the American Bar Association. This committee suggested legislation which became the Pat McCarran-Francis Walter Administrative Procedure Act of 1946. This act authorizes the creation of a corps of independent hearing examiners—section 11—authorizes them to preside at contested cases of a judicial nature—section 7—and gives finality—subject to limited review—to their decisions—section 8.

In 1947, Congress considered the problems of labor relations and of the Labor Board and in the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, sought to solve the problems of administrative delay by authorizing the Labor Board to delegate its functions to panels of Board members.

In 1959, the problems of labor relations again arose in the Congress, and the Landrum-Griffin Act attacked the problem of administrative delay by permitting the Labor Board to delegate a greater degree of finality in representation-election cases to its regional directors.

Three special groups of independent experts studied the problems of delay at the Labor Board—the Cox Committee, appointed in 1959 by Senator Kennedy to recommend improvements in Labor Board procedures; the management consultant firm of McKinsey & Co., retained in 1958 by the Bureau of the Budget to study the operations of the Labor Board; and the Landis Task Force on Administrative Agencies, appointed by President-elect Kennedy in 1960—and arrived at the same conclusion: that the

Board should be permitted to grant greater finality to the decisions of the trial examiners in unfair labor practice cases.

In 1961 the Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Procedure, chaired by Senator CARROLL, made a report in which one of its major recommendations was that the trial examiners be given a greater role in the decision of contested adjudicatory cases.

In sum, every public and independent study group over the past 20 years which has studied the problem of administrative operation, both generally and at the Labor Board, has found that delay is a major problem and that a key to solving this problem is the solution provided by plan No. 5.

IV. THE OBJECTIONS TO PLAN NO. 5 ARE WITHOUT MERIT

There have been many objections to plan No. 5. While those objecting to the plan are highly motivated and intelligent persons, it is submitted that the substance of their objections does not withstand close scrutiny.

A. THE LOSS OF RIGHTS ARGUMENT

During the hearings on plan No. 5 some witnesses testified that plan No. 5 should not be adopted because it would result in a loss of rights. The right claimed is the right to a complete de novo Board review upon request of every trial examiner decision.

Many of the arguments made in this regard are self-defeating in that they would nullify the very right they seek to guarantee.

First, it is argued that the problem of delay can be solved by tightening the Board's jurisdictional standards, thereby depriving the small businessman of any review, full or otherwise, and

Second, it is argued that the plan is unnecessary as the Board has inherent authority to adopt the content of plan 5 on its own initiative, thereby suggesting that plan 5 would give the Board no more authority than it already possesses.

In any event, the objection lacks merit. No one has a right to full and complete Board review of a frivolous appeal taken for selfish, time-delaying purposes. These are the kinds of cases which will be denied further review under plan No. 5, and the right to full review on the vote of two—of the five—Board members assures that the meritorious appeals will be spotted. Furthermore, judicial review remains available for those cases which somehow fail to catch the attention of more than one Board member.

B. THE "FLOOD THE COURT" ARGUMENT

Witnesses have opposed plan 5 on the theory that it will result in a rash of court appeals. The argument goes like this: Litigants will not be satisfied with decisions of the trial examiners, and if and when the Board denies an appeal, the litigants will perforce seek judicial review.

Tears are wept at the unhappy consequences to the court calendars and dockets, but the tears are "crocodile," for these same witnesses in other areas of their testimony suggest as an alternative to plan 5 that the Labor Board be de-

prived of jurisdiction in these matters and that the whole problem be turned over to the Federal district courts or to special administrative courts to be created.

The fear that plan 5 will release the judicial floodgates need not frighten anyone, for the Federal courts have proved time and again their ability to cope with specious and unwarranted appeals. All others, of course, should be decided, but it is not to be assumed that many mistakes will occur at the administrative level in view of the careful Board screening contemplated by plan No. 5.

C. THE "FACELESS HEARING EXAMINER" ARGUMENT

An argument often advanced against plan 5 has nothing to do with its principle but pertained solely to hearing officers who would be delegated additional authority. This argument went through a narrowing process.

First, it was argued that the plan authorized delegation of authority to the grade 9 clerk. When it was pointed out that the delegation of authority is limited by the terms of section 7(a) of the Administrative Procedure Act—which means that unfair labor practice cases can be heard only by independent hearing examiners—this argument was dropped. Congressman GRIFFIN, who originally advanced this argument, admitted for the record that further study convinced him of his original error.

Second, the argument centered around the NLRB trial examiners, and it was suggested that they should not be delegated this authority as many were non-lawyers. The record shows that all but two are members of the bar, and this argument was abandoned.

Third, the argument then moved to the contention that the trial examiners had a prolabor bias because of their experience during the Wagner Act days. The record shows that 45 percent joined the NLRB during the Eisenhower administration; 65 percent since enactment of the Taft-Hartley law; and that only 35 percent had started during the Wagner Act period. The record also shows that the "prolabor" decisions of certain trial examiners, which were alleged to prove bias, approximated the overall percentage of unfair-labor practice cases filed against employers.

Fourth, it was argued that the trial examiners are "faceless" and not appointed by the President. It is true that the trial examiners are not appointed by the President, but they are not "faceless." They are selected and placed on a special register by the Civil Service Commission pursuant to the mandate of section 11 of the Administrative Procedure Act after FBI screening for loyalty and Civil Service Commission screening for competence. They are further screened by the Board itself before appointment. Their ability, integrity, and judicial conduct has been attested in a number of ways. Prior Board members and employer representatives who have known the trial examiners for many years vouch for them in the strongest terms. Perhaps the greatest attestation of their ability is the degree

to which their services are sought by other agencies in Government and by other organizations outside of Government.

D. OTHER ARGUMENTS AGAINST PLAN NO. 5 WHICH HAVE BEEN VOICED NEED BUT SHORT ANSWER

There are other arguments which have been voiced against the plan. They are inconsistent, based on erroneous reading of the law, and self-defeating.

1. PLAN CREATES A LABOR CZAR

It has been suggested that the plan be rejected because it elevates the Chairman of the Labor Board to the position of a czar. This is just not so. The reorganization plans for the Federal Communications Commission and other agencies did in fact have a section giving additional powers to the chairmen of those commissions and boards. Plan No. 5, contrariwise, contains no such provision. The Chairman will continue, as before, to be prima inter pares—first among equals. Despite this clear legislative history, opponents to plan No. 5 conjure up a complicated argument that goes something like this: "any function" can be delegated to a "Board member"; the Chairman is a "Board member"; ergo, the Board members—Republican and Democratic alike—would flout the express provisions of the plan and delegate their powers to the Chairman. Such a hobgoblin argument should be left for bedtime stories. It has no place in the actualities of modern life. Should the members of the Labor Board abdicate their functions to a single member, they would clearly violate their oaths of office, the terms of the plan, and would be called to account in court whenever the first litigant filed a mandamus proceeding in the district court.

2. PLAN IS ULTRA VIRES AND ILLEGAL

The Reorganization Act of 1949 authorizes the President to submit reorganizations plans for agencies "within the executive branch of the Government." It is argued that the Labor Board is not within the executive branch of the Government. It is true that the Reorganization Act of 1939 expressly exempted the Labor Board and other specified agencies. A Labor Board reorganization plan under that statute would have been ultra vires and illegal. However, the subsequent 1945 Reorganization Act was amended to eliminate the exemption of the Labor Board—but not certain other agencies. In the 1949 act, Congress exempted only the Comptroller General and the General Accounting Office. It is clear, therefore, that Congress in the 1949 act intended the President to have power and authority to submit plans concerning the reorganization of the Labor Board.

3. PLAN NO. 5 IS UNNECESSARY AS THE AUTHORITY IT PURPORTS TO GRANT ALREADY EXISTS IN THE LABOR BOARD

Opponents of the plan suggest that it not be adopted because it is unnecessary; the Labor Board has authority already to delegate its decisional authority—subject to discretionary review—to trial examiners in unfair labor practice cases. It is suggested that the Labor Board go

ahead full steam until it runs aground on the legal shoals when the issue can then be litigated in the courts. This course of suggested conduct would subject the Board to legitimate charges of usurping powers withheld by Congress, and as a practical matter, would create administrative havoc as proceedings could grind to a halt awaiting the 2 years or more of court litigation concerning the procedure by which the Board should operate.

In any event, this argument is self-defeating. Assuming the Board already has the powers contained in plan No. 5, there can be no objection to approval of plan No. 5, as it would do nothing more than restate the existing situation. The correct and best approach to this problem is for Congress to approve the President's plan and thus eliminate in limine the legal doubts concerning the Labor Board's powers to delegate greater authority to the independent trial examiner.

V. THE ALTERNATIVE SUGGESTIONS TO MEET THE ADMITTED PROBLEM OF DELAY ARE FARFETCHED, IMPRACTICAL AND IMPOSSIBLE OF ENACTMENT AT THIS TIME. THEY REFLECT OPPOSITION TO ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCIES IN GENERAL, NOT TO PLAN NO. 5, WHICH IS NOW BEFORE US FOR CONSIDERATION

Every witness before the House and Senate committees on plan No. 5 admitted that a serious problem existed. The chamber of commerce witness, for example, testified that "we again agree that reform of the NLRB is imperative." Rather than support plan No. 5 which is now before the Congress, the opponents of the plan offered alternative suggestions for coping with the problem.

A. REDUCE CASELOAD BY TIGHTENING JURISDICTIONAL STANDARDS

Some witnesses suggested that the problem of delay could be approached by tightening the jurisdictional standards and thereby lightening the caseload. This, of course, would result in freezing out the small businessman who could not meet the future increased monetary standard, for example, the Wall Street Journal's "roofer" who was recently accorded Labor Board relief from predatory union practices. In effect, it is to argue that only the rich should have "rights" protected by Federal law and Federal action. Congress, in any event, rejected such an alternative in the 1959 Landrum-Griffin Act when it expressly provided that "the Board shall not decline to assert jurisdiction over any labor dispute over which it would assert jurisdiction under the standards prevailing upon August 1, 1959." (Section 13(c).) Nothing presented in the testimony affords reason for Congress to reconsider the legislation it enacted less than 2 years ago.

B. CONGRESS SHOULD TURN THE MATTER OVER TO THE STATES

Some witnesses suggested that the Labor Board should go out of business, that the problem of labor relations should be returned to the States. This, of course, would turn the clock back to pre-Wagner Act days, when the only law of labor relations in many, if not most of the States, was the law of the jungle. This contention reflects a fear

and distrust of all Federal agencies—a fear and distrust which was not felt by the Founding Fathers when they scrapped the Articles of Confederation in favor of a workable national scheme of operations in which Congress delegated the power and authority to regulate "interstate commerce."

C. CONGRESS SHOULD TURN THE MATTER OF UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES OVER TO THE FEDERAL COURTS (FLOOD THE COURTS?)

Some opponents of plan 5 suggest that the Labor Board go out of the unfair labor practice business and that these matters should be decided by the Federal district courts. This suggestion is not an attack on plan 5 as such, but is a broadside attack on the entire concept of administrative agencies as alternative forums where the litigants can obtain expert, prompt and inexpensive justice. It is suggested here that administrative agencies not be jettisoned, but that they be made effective. Plan 5 is a step in that direction.

D. CONGRESS SHOULD REJECT PLAN 5 AND ENACT LEGISLATION TAILOR MADE TO THE NEEDS OF THE LABOR BOARD

Some witnesses against plan 5 made a "flank attack." Plan 5, they argued, was one of several similar reorganization plans and not tailor made to the particularized situation at the Labor Board. Therefore, the argument went, Congress should defeat plan 5 and turn itself to the task of creating a more particularized version thereof. The proponents of this suggestion well know that it is plan 5 or nothing; that it is impossible for Congress to act on this matter with any degree of dispatch. Indeed, the inability of Congress to act with dispatch on matters of administrative organization is the reason why Congress enacted the Reorganization Act.

VI. CONCLUSION

The choice is between plan 5 and a more efficient Labor Board or rejection of plan 5 and a Labor Board which is way behind in its caseload—and this in an area where justice delayed is indeed justice denied. The only ones who can possibly oppose plan 5 are those who thrive on delay and confusion. Those who favor an efficient, up-to-date administrative agency giving practical enforcement to the laws we have drawn must support the President's plan No. 5.

I would like to note that plan No. 5 has received bipartisan and unanimous support from all the members of the Labor Board. Boyd Leedom, Chairman of the Labor Board during much of the Eisenhower administration, testified as follows:

I cannot see any valid objection that has been raised to the plan, and I think that enactment is an important thing to the Board in trying to keep up with the Board's terrific caseload. And I sincerely hope that the Republican members—and I say that because I am a Republican—will see fit to support this plan. I can't see that it is a partisan issue at all. I can't see that it is an issue between labor and management. I say it is simply streamlining, expediting things that should be enacted.

Let us give the Democratic and Republican Members of the Labor Board who testify that plan No. 5 is essential,

the opportunity to get on with their work in an efficient manner with the tools required by the measure of the task.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a few minutes remaining to review and to summarize the position of the majority of the committee.

First of all, we must agree that there is one fact upon which everybody agrees, and that is that something needs to be done. But, as with most proposals there is always somebody against it.

It reminds me of the 100-year-old man who was having a birthday party. All of his children and his grandchildren gathered around him. One of them went up to the old gentleman and said, "Grandpappy, you have seen a lot of changes in your time, haven't you?"

Grandpappy says, "Yes, son, and I have been agin every one of them."

No matter what is proposed, there will be people against it, but the changes have to be made.

What alternative changes have been proposed? We are faced with a situation where everybody agrees changes must be made. Let us figure out what changes could be made if this is not going to be the one. I was very much impressed by the Hoover Commission report, after hearing all of this debate, because they alleged that the Congress itself could not be depended upon to initiate the needed changes to give us efficiency and economy in Government. I think we are seeing a good example here today to support that contention.

Now, we should remember that we are dealing here with a two-headed agency: One part is the Board, and the other facet of it is the General Counsel. Unlike other agencies of the Government, the General Counsel here does not advise the Board as their lawyer. They have their own counsel. The General Counsel has separate and distinct duties and responsibilities himself. His office is separate and distinct in this particular agency. This plan does not change in any respect, the duties of the General Counsel so we are not dealing with that at all. All we are dealing with is the Board.

As was said yesterday, the Board has two principal functions: One is in regard to representation cases and the other in regard to unfair labor practices cases. Now, a representation case, if I might be a little bit explanatory of that, is simply a matter of determining what employees or workers, in a factory or employed by an employer, will be within a particular unit or particular union and be able to vote when it comes time to vote on whether they want to be represented by a union. The authority with regard to representation cases was previously delegated to the regional directors. There are 28 of them. So, we are not really dealing with that, either. The impact of this plan has to do with unfair labor cases.

Now, in regard to unfair labor cases, we find that there are trial examiners that examine these cases, hear all of the

evidence, and then enter an order. Under the present system, this order is automatically appealable to the Board. The impact of this legislation is to make it so that every last case is not automatically appealed to the Board. If, for example, a party thinks that he has been wrongfully dealt with, and if he has any reason to back it up, then they can file a motion with the Board for permission to appeal. If they, on this motion, show they have reasonable grounds for appeal, then at that time they will be granted a right to appeal. On the other hand, if it develops that this is just chaff, that all they are doing is trying to delay, then in that case the Board will deny the appeal. Then you have a final order with which to go to court. What good would it do to go to the Board if they are sure to sustain their examiners anyway? All they are doing is using the money of the Government and the operation of this agency in a wasteful way. I think the import of this plan is limited to review procedure, and the purpose of the plan is to eliminate this one step in those cases where it is obvious to the Board that an appeal would change the result anyway.

Someone mentioned here that 25 percent of these examiners' reports are overruled. That is just another way of saying that 75 percent are sustained. It is the 75 percent we are talking about. Of course, 25 percent are overruled, and they will still overrule probably about 25 percent, but they will sort out the chaff and they will take up cases that deserve being taken up. The others then can go to court and give the Board the time they need to work on this 25 percent of the cases.

Now, a lot has been said about hearing examiners relative to their competence. I point out to you that the law requires that they be, in the terms of the law, "qualified and competent." They have said that under the grandfather clause two were blanketed that were not competent. I am surprised really to hear some people talking about incompetency as if the courts are all competent when I have heard the same people allege that the Supreme Court of the United States is not competent. Whether it is the courts or a trial examiner, you will find that some are not as good as others, but in this case you can depend on it that the trial examiners must meet competence requirements in order to obtain that status. We find if they issue an order, the Board under this plan would determine whether or not they might overrule it if it came before the Board. If they think they would not, then they deny appeal and it is eligible for appeal to the court. Now, that is the impact of the plan. So much has been said here about what the plan will do which, in fact, it would not do that I think I should go on and develop what it will not do.

It seems that some people will go behind every word and see a big bear or something. It is like the little girl who was playing out in the driveway and a little dog came around and upset her playhouse. She ran into the house and said, "Mommy, a great big black bear upset my playhouse." Mother said, "I

know better than that. I saw that it was your little dog. You go into the bedroom and pray for forgiveness."

So she went into her bedroom and in a little while she came out and her mother said, "Louise, did he forgive you?" "Yes, he forgave me. Yes, he said he would forgive me this time. But, as a matter of fact, at first glance he thought it was a bear, too."

It is somewhat the same here. At first glance some people look at these words and find a big bear behind every one of them.

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out some of the things that this plan will not do that it has been alleged it will do. It does not in any way whatsoever delegate any of the powers of Congress. This deals simply with the powers that the Board has already been given by previous acts of Congress. In no way do we delegate any powers of Congress under this act.

Another thing it does not do, it does not delegate, as did plans 1, 2, 3, and 4, any of the powers of the Board to the chairman. That is not in this plan at all. It is not in any way similar in that respect.

It does not amend the National Labor Relations Act. I defy anyone to find in there any mention whatsoever of amendments to the National Labor Relations Act. It does not amend that act at all.

It does not change the General Counsel's authority and responsibilities in any way. It does not in any way affect any of those responsibilities under the General Counsel, because it does not deal with the General Counsel's Office at all. Those remain as they have been.

So all the plan does is simply this—It merely provides that in certain cases the Board may determine, upon a motion for permission to review, that it does not want to review that case, because it would not change the result anyway. That is all this plan does.

It was stated here that at the present time one member of the Board can always get the others to review any representation case. This same situation would be used with regard to the unfair labor practice cases. Of course, this is a matter of courtesy, but as a matter of right, a minority of the Board can use the Supreme Court rule where a majority less one have the right to bring that case up, whether or not the majority wants to.

All we are doing here is to adopt what has been used in the courts for years. I say to you why should we close the doors of the court to these people until they have gone through this extra useless step that takes another 120 days? That is what turning down the plan would do. That would close the doors of the court to these people for another 120 days.

I notice also that there is complaint about even dropping this one review step on these cases, and yet in the Landrum-Griffin Act the Congress denied all steps to thousands of small businessmen and their employees. We legalized the Board skipping all steps for those engaged in or working for businesses engaged in activities affecting interstate

commerce which do not meet certain dollar volumes of business in a year. How can those who would deny all steps to those small businesses and their employees logically oppose skipping one step in cases where it is obvious delay is the real object and result of the appeal. Procedures used by appeal courts all over the United States should not be considered so bad for this administrative agency in the exercise of quasi-judicial responsibilities.

I do not understand the partisan activity on this plan. Mr. LEEBOM, the chairman of the National Labor Relations Board under the Eisenhower administration, has made a statement to the Labor Committee to the effect that if Richard Nixon had been elected President, this plan would have been submitted as the Nixon administration reorganization plan.

In the name of efficiency and economy in Government and to help increase the service of this agency, the majority of the committee request a "no" vote against the resolution to veto the plan so the plan can go into effect.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives does not favor the Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 transmitted to Congress by the President on May 24, 1961.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the resolution back to the House with the recommendation that the resolution be not agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Resolution 328, disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 5 transmitted to Congress by the President on May 24, 1961, had directed him to report the resolution back to the House with the recommendation that it be not agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives does not favor the Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 transmitted to Congress by the President on May 24, 1961.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. In order that the Members may understand the manner in which the vote comes, is it correct that if one wants to vote to disapprove the plan or vote against the proposed plan the vote would be "aye"?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 231, nays 179, answered "present" 2, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 117]

YEAS—231

Abbott	Flynt	Morse
Abernethy	Ford	Mosher
Adair	Forrester	Murray
Alexander	Fountain	Nelsen
Andersen,	Frazier	Norblad
Minn.	Frelinghuysen	Norrell
Anderson, Ill.	Garland	Nygaard
Andrews	Gary	O'Konski
Arends	Gavin	Ostertag
Ashbrook	Glenn	Passman
Ashmore	Goodell	Pelly
Auchincloss	Goodling	Pitcher
Avery	Grant	Pillion
Ayres	Griffin	Pirnie
Baker	Gross	Poage
Baldwin	Gubser	Poff
Barry	Hagan, Ga.	Quie
Bass, N.H.	Haley	Ray
Bates	Hall	Reece
Battin	Halleck	Reifel
Becker	Hardy	Rhodes, Ariz.
Beckworth	Harrison, Va.	Riehlman
Beermann	Harrison, Wyo.	Riley
Belcher	Harsha	Rivers, S.C.
Bell	Harvey, Ind.	Robison
Bennett, Mich.	Harvey, Mich.	Rogers, Fla.
Berry	Hemphill	Rogers, Tex.
Betts	Henderson	Rousselot
Blitch	Herlong	Rutherford
Bolton	Hiestand	St. George
Bonner	Hoeven	Schadeweg
Boykin	Hoffman, Ill.	Schenck
Bromwell	Hoffman, Mich.	Scherer
Brooks, La.	Horan	Schneebeli
Broomfield	Hosmer	Schweiker
Brown	Hull	Scott
Broyhill	Ikard, Tex.	Scranton
Bruce	Jensen	Selden
Burleson	Johansen	Short
Byrnes, Wis.	Jonas	Shriver
Casey	Jones, Mo.	Sibal
Cederberg	Kearns	Sikes
Chamberlain	Keith	Slack
Chelf	Kilgore	Smith, Calif.
Chenoweth	King, N.Y.	Smith, Miss.
Chipperfield	Kitchin	Smith, Va.
Church	Knox	Springer
Clancy	Kornegay	Stafford
Collier	Kunkel	Stephens
Colmer	Kyl	Stubblefield
Cooley	Laird	Taber
Cramer	Landrum	Taylor
Cunningham	Langen	Teague, Calif.
Curtin	Latta	Teague, Tex.
Curtis, Mass.	Lennon	Thomson, Wis.
Curtis, Mo.	Lindsay	Tollefson
Dague	Lipscomb	Tuck
Davis,	Loser	Tupper
James C.	McCulloch	Utt
Davis, John W.	McDonough	Van Pelt
Davis, Tenn.	McIntire	Vinson
Derounian	McSween	Wallhauser
Derwinski	McVey	Watts
Devine	MacGregor	Weaver
Dole	Malliard	Westland
Dominick	Martin, Nebr.	Whalley
Dooley	Mason	Wharton
Dorn	Mathias	Whitener
Dowdy	Matthews	Whitten
Downing	May	Widnall
Durno	Meador	Wilson, Calif.
Dwyer	Michel	Wilson, Ind.
Ellsworth	Miller, N.Y.	Winstead
Everett	Milliken	Wright
Ewins	Minshall	Young
Fallon	Moore	Younger
Fenton	Moorehead,	
Findley	Ohio	
Fisher	Morris	

NAYS—179

Addabbo	Bray	Corman
Addonizio	Breeding	Daddario
Albert	Brewster	Daniels
Alfuso	Brooks, Tex.	Dawson
Ashley	Buckley	Dent
Aspinall	Burke, Ky.	Denton
Bailey	Burke, Mass.	Diggs
Baring	Byrne, Pa.	Dingell
Barrett	Cahill	Donohue
Bass, Tenn.	Carey	Doyle
Bennett, Fla.	Celler	Dulski
Blatnik	Clark	Edmondson
Boggs	Coad	Elliott
Boland	Cohelan	Farbstein
Bolling	Cook	Fascell
Brademas	Corbett	Feighan

Finnegan	Kluczynski	Price
Fino	Kowalski	Pucinski
Flood	Lane	Rabaut
Fogarty	Lesinski	Rains
Friedel	Libonati	Randall
Fulton	McCormack	Reuss
Gallagher	McDowell	Rhodes, Pa.
Garmatz	McFall	Rivers, Alaska
Gathings	Macdonald	Rodino
Giulmo	Machrowicz	Rogers, Colo.
Gilbert	Mack	Rooney
Granahan	Madden	Roosevelt
Gray	Magnuson	Rostenkowski
Green, Oreg.	Marshall	Roush
Green, Pa.	Merrrow	Ryan
Griffiths	Miller, Clem.	St. Germain
Hagen, Calif.	Miller,	Saund
Halpern	George P.	Schwengel
Hansen	Mills	Seely-Brown
Harding	Moeller	Sheppard
Harris	Monagan	Shipley
Hays	Montoya	Siler
Healey	Moorhead, Pa.	Sisk
Hechler	Morgan	Smith, Iowa
Holland	Morrison	Spence
Holtzman	Moss	Staggers
Huddleston	Multer	Steed
Ichord, Mo.	Murphy	Stratton
Inouye	Natcher	Sullivan
Jarman	Nix	Thomas
Jennings	O'Brien, Ill.	Thompson, N.J.
Joelson	O'Brien, N.Y.	Thompson, Tex.
Johnson, Calif.	O'Hara, Ill.	Thornberry
Johnson, Md.	O'Hara, Mich.	Toll
Johnson, Wis.	Olsen	Trimble
Jones, Ala.	O'Neill	Udall
Karsten	Osmers	Ullman
Karth	Patman	Vanik
Kastenmeier	Perkins	Van Zandt
Kelly	Peterson	Walter
Kilday	Pfost	Wickersham
King, Calif.	Philbin	Willis
King, Utah	Pike	Yates
Kirwan	Powell	Zelenko

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Conte

Saylor

NOT VOTING—25

Alford	Kee	Roberts
Alger	Keogh	Roudebush
Bow	Kilburn	Santangelo
Cannon	Lankford	Shelley
Delaney	McMillan	Thompson, La.
Hébert	Mahon	Wels
Hollfield	Martin, Mass.	Williams
Judd	Moulder	Zablocki

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Martin of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Saylor against.

Mr. Conte for, with Mr. Santangelo against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Williams for, with Mr. Hollfield against.

Mr. Alford for, with Mr. Shelley against.

Mr. Judd for, with Mr. Zablocki against.

Mr. Bow for, with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana against.

Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Moulder against.

Mrs. Wels for, with Mr. Delaney against.

Mr. Alger for, with Mr. Lankford against.

Mr. Roudebush for, with Mrs. Kee against.

Mr. SHEPPARD and Mr. BUCKLEY changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]. If he were present, he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO]. If he were present, he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT MATTERS APPROPRIATIONS, 1962

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 7577) making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President, the Department of Commerce, and sundry agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House, be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 744)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7577) "making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President, the Department of Commerce, and sundry agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4, 16, and 25.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 14, 22, 23, 24, 26, and 27, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$5,517,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$18,725,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$14,185,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$33,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,990,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amend-

ment insert "\$1,162,983,264"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$35,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$56,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 3, 12, 13, and 15.

GEORGE ANDREWS,
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
CLARENCE CANNON,
IVOR D. FENTON,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
ESTES KEFAUVER,
ALAN BIBLE,
CARL HAYDEN,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
STYLES BRIDGES,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
(with reservation SBA),
THOMAS H. KUCHEL,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7577) making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President, the Department of Commerce, and sundry agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I

Bureau of the Budget

Amendment No. 1—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$5,517,000 instead of \$5,423,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,571,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

General Administration

Amendment No. 2—Salaries and expenses: Provides \$2,000 for entertainment instead of \$1,500 as proposed by the House and \$2,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3—Aviation War Risk Insurance Revolving Fund: Reported in disagreement.

Bureau of the Census

Amendment No. 4—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$10,594,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$10,785,400 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees intend that \$76,000 of the amount agreed to will be used for foreign trade and shipping statistics (air cargo statistics). The additional \$180,000 requested for the consumer buying anticipation survey has been deferred without prejudice.

Amendment No. 5—1963 Censuses of Business, Transportation, Manufactures, and Mineral Industries: Appropriates \$1,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$667,000 as proposed by the House.

Coast and Geodetic Survey

Amendments Nos. 6 and 7—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate \$18,725,000 instead of

\$18,525,000 as proposed by the House and \$19,015,000 as proposed by the Senate, and insert language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8—Construction of surveying ships: Appropriates \$14,185,000 instead of \$11,965,000 as proposed by the House and \$16,725,000 as proposed by the Senate. The funds provided include \$4,760,000 for construction of a class II vessel in lieu of \$2,540,000 previously included for construction of a class III vessel.

Business activities

Amendment No. 9—Salaries and expenses: Eliminates House language as proposed by the Senate.

Office of field services

Amendment No. 10—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$3,163,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Business and Defense Services Administration

Amendment No. 11—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$4,211,800 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Foreign Commerce

Amendment No. 12—Salaries and expenses: Reported in disagreement.

Promotion of international travel

Amendment No. 13—Salaries and expenses: Reported in disagreement.

Maritime activities

Amendment No. 14—Operating-differential subsidies (liquidation of contract authorization): Eliminates House language as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 15—Operating-differential subsidies (liquidation of contract authorization): Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 16—Maritime training: Eliminates language proposed by the Senate. If this authority continues to be necessary it should be resubmitted for consideration in connection with a future supplemental appropriation request.

Bureau of Public Roads

Amendment No. 17—Limitation on general administrative expenses: Provides \$33,400,000 instead of \$33,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$33,800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 18 and 19—Federal-aid highways (trust fund): Appropriate \$2,990,600,000 instead of \$2,990,200,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,291,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, and adjust amount of 1961 fiscal year authorization being appropriated.

National Bureau of Standards

Amendment No. 20—Construction of facilities: Appropriates \$35,000,000 instead of \$25,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$40,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Weather Bureau

Amendment No. 21—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$56,250,000 instead of \$55,595,000 as proposed by the House and \$56,671,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount agreed to by the conferees includes funds for all programs and projects included in the reports of the Committees of the House and Senate on this bill in such amounts as are specified therein.

Amendment No. 22—Establishment of meteorological facilities: Appropriates \$5,250,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$4,800,000 as proposed by the House.

General provisions—Department of Commerce

Amendment No. 23—Sec. 203: Includes Senate language authorizing employment of experts at not to exceed \$75 per diem.

TITLE III—THE PANAMA CANAL

Canal Zone Government

Amendment No. 24—Capital outlay: Establishes unit cost limit of \$16,500 for construction of quarters as proposed by the Senate in lieu of average unit cost of \$13,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Small Business Administration

Amendment No. 24—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$6,750,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$6,950,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26—Salaries and expenses: Eliminates House language as proposed by the Senate.

Subversive Activities Control Board

Amendment No. 27—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$395,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$305,000 as proposed by the House.

GEORGE W. ANDREWS,
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
CLARENCE CANNON,
IVOR D. FENTON,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

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

The previous question was ordered. The conference report was agreed to. The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement. The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 3: Page 6, line 15: "AVIATION WAR RISK INSURANCE REVOLVING FUND

"The Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds available pursuant to section 1306 of the Act of August 23, 1958 (72 Stat. 803), and in accordance with section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U.S.C. 849), as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for aviation war risk insurance activities under said Act: *Provided*, That this fund shall be effective only upon the enactment into law during the Eighty-seventh Congress of legislation extending the provisions of title XIII of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958. (72 Stat. 800-806.)"

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ANDREWS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement. The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 12: Page 10, line 14:

"BUREAU OF FOREIGN COMMERCE *Salaries and expenses*

"For necessary expenses of the Bureau of Foreign Commerce, including trade centers abroad; employment of aliens by contract for service abroad; rental of space, for periods not exceeding five years, and expenses of alteration, repair, or improvement; advance of funds under contracts abroad; payment of tort claims, in the manner authorized in the first paragraph of section 2672 of title 28 of the United States Code, when such claims arise in foreign countries; the purchase of commercial and trade reports

and not to exceed \$10,000 for representation expenses abroad; \$5,006,000."

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ANDREWS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "\$4,900,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 13: Page 11, line 4, insert the following:

"PROMOTION OF INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL
"Salaries and expenses

"For necessary expenses of promotion of travel to the United States, including travel offices abroad; employment of aliens by contract for service abroad; rental of space, for periods not exceeding five years, and expenses of alteration, repair, or improvement; advance of funds under contracts abroad; payment of tort claims, in the manner authorized in the first paragraph of section 2672 of title 28 of the United States Code, when such claims arise in foreign countries; and not to exceed \$9,600 for representation expenses abroad; \$3,000,000."

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ANDREWS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "\$2,500,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 15: Page 13, line 17, insert the following: "Provided further, That no part of any appropriation in this Act for the current fiscal year shall be used for the payment of an operating-differential subsidy for the operation of any passenger vessel as defined in Public Law 87-45, Eighty-seventh Congress, on any voyage which touches at a port or ports regularly served by another subsidized operator at rates in excess of the rates applicable to any other subsidized operator regularly serving this area."

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ANDREWS moves that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we could have some discussion of this situation. I should like to be recognized at the appropriate time.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose?

Mr. SIKES. I should like to ask the gentleman from Alabama to explain this, if possible.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may offer a preferential motion. If the gentleman does not offer a preferential motion, the question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SIKES moves to recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 15.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, this amendment in the Senate bill would have nullified the provision of an act passed by the House and Senate and enacted into law back in April of this year, known as the cruise bill. In my opinion, the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill. It could not have prevailed in the House if a point of order had been made against it.

My understanding of the Senate amendment is, as I stated, that it nullifies the provisions of the act passed in April or May of this year. Before going to conference I called the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], and asked his opinion of the amendment in the Senate bill, I received a letter from Mr. BONNER dated July 17, 1961, in which he wrote:

In view of all the circumstances, I must say that it does not seem to me it would be right that authorizing legislation which has become law pursuant to full legislative hearings by the committees having jurisdiction should be subject to frustration through amendments to appropriation bills. In my opinion, the amendment in question is legislative in both intent and effect rather than a normal limitation on appropriations.

I also communicated with the Secretary of Commerce asking for his opinion as to the amendment in the Senate bill which is the subject of this motion. I received a letter from Paul A. Johnston, executive secretary to the Secretary of Commerce, dated July 14, 1961, in which he stated:

Now further, there is the matter of the rider added as Senate Amendment No. 15 to the language of the appropriation for operating-differential subsidies. Cruise ships operating out of their usual routes would receive subsidy at the rate allowed for ships normally operating in the cruise area, if the new cruises touch a port served by a usual operator. This is more restrictive than the formula provided by the recently passed Public Law 87-45, which cut subsidies to the lower rate referred to above, on a daily basis, while the new cruise ships were actually in such ports. In view of the fact that all operators concerned had the opportunity to express their views on the legislative bill, and that no warning or voice was given to all operators in the passage of this appropriation rider, the Department does not favor the amendment.

The opposition, Mr. Speaker, on the part of the conferees of the House to the amendment was, first, in our opinion it was legislation on an appropriation bill and, second, it nullified or drastically altered the provisions of an act of Congress which became the law in May of this year. We took the position if there was any inequity in the legislative bill which became law in May of this year that that inequity should be ironed out in a proper forum which is the legislative committee of this House or before the Maritime Administration.

So, Mr. Speaker, the conferees on the part of the House were unanimous in op-

posing the acceptance of that amendment in the Senate bill.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, the chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS] has certainly given the House a correct interpretation of just how the conferees of the House came to the conclusion of disagreeing with the Senate regarding amendment No. 15. I am in full accord with his statement.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, this is a most unusual situation. In April of this year, as the chairman of our committee and chairman of our conferees has stated, a bill was introduced in the House which passed both bodies after extensive hearings and became law. It is a law which affects the shipping interests of the United States and various lines engaged in shipping. All of the shipowners and operators were given an opportunity to come before the legislative committee to present their testimony. The bill passed the House in April, as the chairman said, but it did not actually become law until May 27, 1961. Now before the ink dries on that law, we have here an amendment added by the other body to an appropriations bill which practically nullifies the law. This action cannot be based upon any experience under the law because it has not been in effect long enough to provide any experience thus far. The Appropriations Committee is frequently accused here in the House of Representatives of trying to usurp the authority of the other legislative committees. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations I can assure you that is not true, and here we have gone out of our way to be certain that we do not in any way encroach upon the Maritime Commission which has considered this matter, and upon the action of the Congress which enacted the law. I am certain that in view of these circumstances, this House will want to defeat the preferential motion and insist upon striking the amendment from the bill.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, of course, this is legislation on an appropriation bill. That does not make it bad legislation. There have been many instances when needed legislation was appended to appropriation bills. The only matter in which we should be interested is whether this is good legislation. I consider that it is and I seek to secure its approval by the House. The language was placed in the bill by the other body as an amendment, and it is now before the House for approval or rejection.

The fact that Congress has previously passed a law does not in any way prevent a change in that law, when proposals to do so are properly before us, if the Congress in its judgment considers it advisable to do so.

Let me tell you just what is proposed. It is a very simple matter. It is an effort to save money. It could and probably will run into millions. I do not know how many of us knew the details of the bill which was passed to pay certain subsidies to certain ships in certain areas. I did not and I doubt that most of the membership did. We are busy people. Some measures, particularly those on the Consent Calendar contain legislation much broader and more general than we realize, or even that the sponsoring committees realize.

The facts are that U.S. ships in the North Atlantic draw an operating subsidy of 72 percent. This is because operating costs are higher in the North Atlantic. By contrast U.S. ships that operate in the Caribbean draw an operating subsidy of 57 percent. Shipping is seasonal. There is a greater demand for passenger space on the North Atlantic in summer, and in the Caribbean in winter. Some of the lines which operate in the North Atlantic want to send a part of their fleet to the Caribbean in winter, when shipping is slack in the North Atlantic. Since operating costs are lower there, they can make a double profit because of their higher subsidy rate. That is what the present law does.

The Senate amendment would do just this simple thing. It would specify that ships which normally are assigned to the North Atlantic run on a 72-percent operating subsidy would, when they are assigned seasonally to the Caribbean and touch Caribbean ports, draw the 57-percent subsidy that other ships normally assigned to the Caribbean also draw. In other words, we are trying to take out of the law a situation where one group of ships would be drawing a 72-percent subsidy in the Caribbean and another group of ships would draw only 57 percent. If a subsidy of 57 percent is enough to assure a fair operating profit, and to keep the American flag flying on those ships which normally operate in the Caribbean, why is it necessary to allot a 72-percent subsidy to those ships which are sent to the Caribbean only on a seasonal basis?

Please remember that they are competing in the same waters, for the same passengers, bound for the same ports, presumably with the same operating costs.

It is a very simple proposition to save a few dollars for Uncle Sam. Unfortunately we do not seem to get many opportunities here in Congress to save money for the taxpayers. Here is such an opportunity. Subsidies are extremely costly. They are constantly increasing. Particularly is this true of shipping subsidies. I hope the time will come when the Congress or the administration will take a long and careful look at all subsidies. I hope there can be a general reduction in the subsidies our Government pays. Thus far the trend has been the other way. What I propose here is a comparatively minor item, although it can run into a saving of millions. I believe the Senate proposal is a fair one which will do no harm. The Senate considered the legislation prob-

ably as much as the House considered the original bill which this language seeks to amend. Be that as it may, the Senate adopted the amendment. I propose that the House do the same.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Our committee is extremely interested in this particular rider which was attached to the appropriation bill in the other body. Let me say at the outset that my views are in direct contradiction to those expressed by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], who says that it will result in a money savings to the Government. The reverse will take place if this amendment is adopted. Uncle Sam will not make any money by it. The reverse will be completely true, and I will try to explain why. Let me give you the general background of this legislation.

In recent years the cruise ship business in the Caribbean has been built up. As I recall—I may be off a few thousand—during the last season about 100,000 or 130,000 American passengers cruised in the Caribbean area not on American-flag ships but foreign-flag ships. Only 5,000 of that number went on American-flag ships. So the American operators operating normally in the North Atlantic trade saw an opportunity to get into what might be called good winter business in the Caribbean because passenger traffic across the North Atlantic falls off very markedly during the winter season. But they could not be taken off the regular routes assigned to them, could not deviate from them, without the permission of Congress or the Maritime Commission. So they came to our committee, pointed out this situation, told us of the lack of passenger traffic in the winter season and that if they could be allowed to operate in the Caribbean it would mean some increase of revenue.

Representatives of the operators came before our committee and we finally arrived at a compromise agreement to satisfy one line and only one line that was pressing for this amendment. The other 14 were not so interested. This bill was reported out of our committee unanimously, passed the House and went over to the other body, and the other body amended it. We accepted that amendment in conference. But as the chairman has said, hardly was the ink dry before this one operator, a very fine company, succeeded in inducing one Member of the other body to offer this rider to the appropriation bill.

In the first place, I think this is a slap in the face, not only to our committee but the committee on the Senate side.

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

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Is it not also true that the amendment was written into the bill without a hearing, without a single witness testifying and without any ship owner or operator being given an opportunity to explain the effects of the

amendment. I refer to this amendment in the appropriation bill that our committee recommends be stricken.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. That is right.

We have heard a lot about backdoor spending this year. This is backdoor legislating, which I do not like.

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

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I have not objected in the slightest to a transfer of North Atlantic vessels to the Caribbean. I object to paying them a subsidy twice. That is what I think is done when a 72-percent subsidy is paid to vessels operating in the same waters, competing for the same passengers, serving the same ports, with the same operating costs as other ships which receive a 57-percent subsidy.

How does the distinguished gentleman possibly feel the Government will lose money if the operating subsidies are reduced? Surely he knows these subsidies cost many millions of dollars. To me it is elemental that a lower subsidy means less cost to the Government and to the taxpayers who foot the bills.

Bear in mind that the ships in the North Atlantic shipping lanes are given a 72-percent operating subsidy, those in the Caribbean are given a 57-percent subsidy. Surely those from the North Atlantic lanes which are sent seasonally to the Caribbean should be content with the same profit from their operations which are assured to those which operate year round in the Caribbean. Remember the Caribbean cruise ships must operate in the lean months as well as the lush months without an increase in subsidy. Yet the Atlantic cruise ships expect to take the cream of their operating season and to compete in the best months of the Caribbean season and to receive a 72-percent subsidy throughout. This hardly seems realistic or a necessary burden on the Government.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. As a practical matter, that is not the way it is going to work. On the strength of legislation we passed, the lines that desire to go into the Caribbean area for winter cruises have now made up their schedules, put out their advertising, and they have begun to make reservations for their cruises. If this amendment is adopted, I dare say they are not going through with their cruise program. As a consequence, they will continue to lose money on their winter operation because they will not go down there, and because of that loss in operations, their recapture position, as we call it, is damaged. They will not be able to pay back to the Government under their contract the required 50 percent of their earnings over their 10 percent profit.

Mr. SIKES. If the ships that normally cruise in the Caribbean and operate and presumably make a profit with a 57 percent subsidy, why is it necessary to pay ships on another line a 72 percent subsidy when they operate in the Caribbean? How can the gentleman justify two sets of subsidies on ships operating side by side, possibly within sight of each other, and out of the same ports?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. They will not do that. Let me say in response to the gentleman's question, this is not exactly what they will do. They will not cover the same ports exactly.

I want to say to the gentleman from Florida, he is concerned about subsidies paid to one operator. I agree that the subsidy payments to that particular operator are low, because when the subsidy was arrived at by the Maritime Administration they took too high a foreign cost base for determining what the subsidy should be. The subsidy should be raised, but that is beside the point here.

Mr. GARY. Is it not true that the current law which fixes subsidies puts certain restrictions on these other lines that go into the Caribbean merely for cruise purposes? They cannot carry one dollar's worth of cargo, and cargo is one of the best sources of revenue.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. That is correct.

Mr. GARY. They can only carry round trip passengers, and run special cruises during the tourist season. They need the additional subsidy for that reason.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. That is correct. They will not be competing with the operator who is presently down there. May I say there is another American operator in that area who does not believe that we should accept the Senate rider.

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

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

Mr. MAILLIARD. I would like to also point out that the basic law itself says that this is going to adversely affect the interests of another flag carrier when the Maritime Administrator determines he is not permitted to serve that area. So, the protection is in the administration of the law. Also may I point out that just because one of the North Atlantic fleet operators moves to the Caribbean, his higher expenses continue. He still has to pay his crews the wages he paid on the North Atlantic run. It is not comparable. The bill we passed says that if they are actually in the ports of another operator, that their subsidy shall be reduced, but this would apply while they are in the entire area, even in ports that the other operator does not serve at all. I think this would cripple the cruise operators, and the net loss to the Government would be substantial.

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

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Is it not true that the law not only says when they are in port that their subsidy shall be reduced, but it says when they are in port for any portion of the day their subsidy shall be reduced for that entire day?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. That is correct.

Mr. GARY. In other words, if they are only in there for 1 hour, they take the reduced subsidy for the entire day. Now, the Senate amendment, on the other hand, which is contrary to the law that was recently passed, says that if they are in port for an hour, then

they shall take the lower subsidy for the entire voyage.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. That is correct. We think that the bill that we approved in our committee, which is now law, gives adequate safeguards to the one operator that is contending. These people—and they are very fine people, good operators—are entitled to a higher rate of subsidy. They have an application for a higher rate, and I hope that the Maritime Administrator grants it. But, the bill itself that we adopted gives this one operator adequate protection, and I want to assure the gentleman from Florida that under our bill the Maritime Administrator must intervene if that one operator is damaged by this operation.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. HARDING].

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge the adoption of the conference report by the House which includes an appropriation making possible a coordination of Federal, State, and local efforts to provide essential weather service to our agricultural areas in southern Idaho.

I represent a State where the No. 1 industry is agriculture—a State which ranks third in the Nation in total acres irrigated—a State where farm operators realize a net income of over \$11 billion each year.

More than 900,000 acres of this productive farmland is located in the Magic Valley area in south central Idaho. It is in this area that we are extremely anxious to have an adequate weather service reporting system established.

At the present time farmers in this area must rely on the reports received from the weather stations at Boise and Salt Lake City, which are a considerable distance away. Consequently, these reports are so general that they are of little value, particularly due to the high elevation and highly localized weather conditions which exist in the Magic Valley area.

While potatoes are synonymous with Idaho, there are many other crops which are grown in this area—sugarbeets, corn, various types of seed, wheat, peas, and beans. In addition to these row crops there is also a considerable amount of fruit raised.

The diversified nature of these crops requires far more accurate information than has previously been needed to insure crop success. Conventional forecasts coming from some distance away do not meet this need. Also, increased use of more scientific farming operations, such as the dusting of crops to fight insects, requires that weather information be as accurate as possible.

Mr. Bill Grange, the secretary-manager of the Twin Falls Chamber of Commerce, who has put forth considerable effort to make their weather needs known to the Congress, reported to me, for example, that one cherry grower lost approximately 50 tons of his crop in 1960 due to his dependence on the Boise area forecast. A frost loss of 10 to 20 percent in the bean crop last year can be attributed to the same inaccurate weather information.

What adequate weather service can mean to farmers is dramatically pointed out in the Weather Bureau report issued early last year on the agricultural weather service operating in Mississippi's delta area.

This report states:

A survey of delta farmers conducted in October 1959 by the Mississippi Agricultural Extension Service county agents indicated that delta farmers saved nearly \$3 million in wasted production costs as a direct result of the new State-Federal agricultural weather service. This saving was effected at a cost of less than \$60,000—a dollar return of 50 to 1.

Idaho is currently faced with one of the most serious droughts in its history and there is little evidence that this situation is going to change for the next several years.

This dire situation makes even more urgent the need for having available accurate weather information which could assist in the more efficient use of the limited water supply. Many farmers would hold off using their precious supply of stored water for irrigation when they know, for example, that a heavy rainfall is expected around the same time as their water turn is scheduled.

Advance weather warnings would also aid our firefighting crews to take steps which would prevent many blazes caused by the drought from starting and would aid in their determining the best location of firefighting equipment in areas where fires are most likely.

While agricultural needs are certainly our most urgent, there are a number of other factors prompting me to urge the approval of this conference report which includes weather funds for Idaho. The most significant of these is the location in the Magic Valley area of one of the most outstanding winter sports areas in the country.

This sports area includes Sun Valley, Magic Mountain, Soldier Mountain, and Mount Harrison ski areas. I am advised that the airport in this area handles 100 aircraft movements per day, with commercial passenger boardings in excess of 1,200 per month and a slightly higher number of passengers leaving commercial planes at the airport. This great activity results largely from the winter sports enthusiasts coming into the area.

To handle this amount of traffic safely, much more accurate weather information is needed. The Twin Falls community is so anxious to have this service that facilities at the airport have been offered for the establishment of a weather bureau.

A tentative plan for providing 24-hour, full-time agricultural and public weather service to the Magic Valley area and adjacent farming areas which would meet the needs I have outlined has been developed by the Weather Bureau and could be put into operation very shortly for just the cost of establishing one new full-time weather bureau serving only a local area, and yet this plan would aid some 400,000 people.

The plan, a joint effort, would cost \$92,500, with the Federal share \$63,500,

the State, \$6,000 and the local share, \$18,000. It would:

Add two agricultural weather forecasters to the staff of the Boise weather airport station.

Establish seven agricultural weather observation stations at State agricultural experiment branches in the area to provide daily weather reports during the crop season.

Establish a joint weather bureau experiment station at Twin Falls, staffed by an advisory agricultural meteorologist and clerical assistant and equipped with weather facsimile receiver.

Establish a public and agricultural weather teletypewriter circuit with send-receive outlets at weather bureau facilities at Boise, Pocatello, and Twin Falls and make information available to mass disseminators at Blackfoot, Boise, Burley, Caldwell, Idaho Falls, Jerome, Payette, Pocatello, Preston, Rexburg, Rupert, Soda Springs, Twin Falls, and Weiser.

Several radio stations have indicated their desire to participate, including KEEP at Twin Falls and KRXX at Rexburg. There is great community interest generally in aiding in every way to get this plan into operation.

I urge the House to approve this conference report.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion that has been offered. To be perfectly frank, this is known as the Grace amendment. Now, the same amendment was offered during consideration of the cruise bill by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries; it was debated and evidence was offered and witnesses were permitted to testify with respect to this particular matter. It was voted down in the committee. Now, these cruise ships do not interfere with the regular trade routes of cruise passenger vessels. These are round trip cruises. They cannot take on a passenger at an intermediate port nor can they discharge a passenger unless the passenger just walks off and leaves the ship. It is a round trip ticket. They cannot carry cargo.

The British and many foreign ships, as the gentleman from Washington, [Mr. TOLLERSON], has so ably pointed out, have come into this field. Passenger cruises are becoming very lucrative. They would return dollars that, if we get into it, we can get, where the American dollars today are going abroad with these Caribbean and South American cruises. This does not only apply to the Caribbean; it applies to other ports. In our report we set forth that in the opinion of our committee the proposal is not practical, and if inequities exist, it is a matter of review and correction by the Maritime Board. Moreover, in any proposed cruise touching the port or ports regularly served by a subsidy operator, who would be damaged, the board should take that fact into account in considering the cruise application. So, before such a cruise, even though generally authorized, can be initiated, the Maritime Board has to look into all these phases and give the operating company a per-

mit to cruise in that area after weighing the effect of such operations on the operations of other American operators.

In our considerations in the committee we have tried to be fair and proper with all operators.

Mr. Speaker, there is another matter in connection with this, as long as we have pointed out the particular operator. We withdrew the Panama Line from the freight operation of two ships at the request of the Grace Line. Grace substantially showed, in my opinion, that here was a Government operation that was being carried on in which they as a private operator could function and save the Government money. So we reduced one ship. That was on the basis of an application by Grace, who urged that Government steamship operations were hurting private shipping operations.

But here come applications from other large American passenger vessels to get into a field that is lucrative. In my honest opinion it will not hurt Grace one bit whatsoever. If I thought so I would be one of the first here to say so; and I would never have brought the bill to the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Appropriations Committee will insist upon its position in the Senate, and I know if it insists, the Senate will recede.

This matter has been thoroughly threshed out before the legislative bill authorizing these cruise ships was brought to the floor of the House. I do not think this is fair. I do not think it is right, and I do not think it is an honorable way to transact business in the Congress.

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

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. In order to straighten out the parliamentary situation, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] as chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, is against the preferential motion to recede and concur, and is in favor of the committee's position to insist on the House position in this matter.

Mr. BONNER. That is right.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman's remarks were perfectly plain, but I simply wanted to get the parliamentary situation straight.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I do not think the gentleman that offers the motion, had he heard the hearing in the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House, would feel as he does. I know he is a conscientious, honest, able Member of this House. There is much controversy in this shipping business. But the fact is that this is the wrong way to handle a matter of this kind. The cruise bill should have been defeated if it is not a proper bill. I say it is a proper bill.

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

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SIKES. With all due respect to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, let me assure him that I do not know

the Grace Line from Adam's old fox, and could not care less.

May I ask the distinguished gentleman why it is that all ships that are allowed to operate in the Caribbean are not given a uniform subsidy, a 57-percent subsidy, rather than to saddle the American taxpayer with an additional 15 percent, when certain ships from other lines are allowed to move in seasonally. Why cannot the subsidy be the same? Why is it necessary for one line to be given an opportunity for a higher profit? I do not care how many passengers the line carries. I want to save a dollar or two for the American taxpayer, if I can. Will the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] explain why all of these ships should not be given the same 57-percent subsidy when they are operating side by side in the same area?

Mr. BONNER. On the face of the gentleman's question and statement he does bring a logical matter to the attention of the House and it would be debatable were we not familiar with the fact that the Congress does not set these rates. The Maritime Board sets the rate of subsidy, up or down. In our report we pointed out if the subsidy of Grace in the area which they operate is not sufficient, then their recourse is to the Maritime Board.

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

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

Mr. MAILLIARD. I think in reply to the question of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] the point has already been made that when these ships are permitted to go under this cruise legislation they cannot carry any cargo. They cannot carry anything but round trip passengers. They are operating on a cruise system, and not on a regular run. It is not a fair comparison between the two.

Mr. BONNER. They may not touch any port served by another operator at all, or they might touch only one port. If they are going to that port, then, as the authorizing legislation finally passed, their subsidy would be reduced for the time spent in that port. But there would be no savings at all, because by complicating the bookkeeping it will take up the amount you save.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I think we are all interested in saving the taxpayers' money. I assure you that you are not going to save the taxpayers' money unless you reject this proposed conference report, because here is an opportunity for American-flag ships to participate in a \$50 million a year business that is being denied them. The more money American-flag ships make the nearer they come to that place where they share the profit with Uncle Sam, and the more money they make and the more money they can show they make, the lower we can fix their subsidy. So if you want to save money, reject this conference report.

If you want to make it look as if there is a saving of public money by comparing the percentages of two subsidies—you may do so but it is based on a false premise—these subsidies are fixed by the Maritime Commission, and if they

are not correct they can be challenged—but if you want actually to save money, vote down this Senate amendment. Let us reject it and send the bill back to conference.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I think it is demonstrated here that this is a controversial and highly technical matter. For that reason, the conferees felt we should insist that the Senate amendment be eliminated.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS] moves that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 15. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] makes the preferential motion that the

House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, this bill appropriates funds for the Executive Office of the President, the Department of Commerce and sundry agencies for the fiscal year 1962. The bill as agreed to in conference provides total appropriations of \$641,135,800 which is \$14,177,800 over the House bill, \$9,302,400 below the Senate bill, and \$25,142,200 below the budget estimates. The major increases are for the construction of a replacement Coast and Geodetic Survey vessel, additional funds for the construction of facilities program of the National Bureau of Standards, and a number of new projects for the Weather Bureau. At this point in the RECORD I will insert a summary table showing in comparative form the budget estimates, House, Senate, and conference actions on the bill:

Summary of general government matters, Department of Commerce and related agencies appropriation bill, 1962 (H.R. 7577)

Title	Budget estimates (revised)	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		Senate
					Budget estimates	House	
Title I—Executive Office of the President and Funds Appropriated to the President.....	\$12,911,000	\$12,614,000	\$12,762,000	\$12,708,000	-\$203,000	+\$94,000	-\$54,000
Title II—Department of Commerce.....	597,562,000	559,059,000	582,101,200	573,052,800	-24,509,200	+13,993,800	-9,048,400
Title III—The Panama Canal.....	23,230,000	23,100,000	23,100,000	23,100,000	-130,000		
Title IV—Independent Agencies.....	32,575,000	32,185,000	32,475,000	32,275,000	-300,000	+90,000	-200,000
Grand total.....	666,278,000	626,958,000	650,438,200	641,135,800	-25,142,200	+14,177,800	-9,302,400

NOTE.—Excludes amounts relating to the "Highway trust fund."

There is only one amendment brought back in actual disagreement and that is No. 15 relating to limitations on subsidy rates applicable to passenger vessels engaged in cruises. This matter has been brought back with the recommendation that the House insist on its disagreement inasmuch as consideration was given to the subject in the recently enacted Public Law 87-45 and constitutes legislation both in intent and effect.

The bill includes appropriations for the Bureau of the Budget. One of the major responsibilities of the Bureau is to coordinate the many and varied activities of the Government. There is one area that should be given more attention and that is the exercise of a stricter control limiting the use of Government owned and leased passenger cars to official purposes only. There are repeated instances being called to the attention of the committee of the use of Government vehicles for obviously private purposes such as transporting certain officials to and from their homes and offices. I would hope that the Bureau would step up its efforts to curtail such practices.

TERRITORIAL AND INSULAR AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Territorial and Insular Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may meet during general debate this afternoon.

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

There was no objection.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 7—REORGANIZATION OF MARITIME FUNCTIONS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GROSS moves to discharge the Committee on Government Operations from further consideration of House Resolution 336, introduced by Mr. MONAGAN, disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 7, transmitted to Congress by the President on June 12, 1961.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Iowa in favor of the resolution?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] is recognized for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, the House has under consideration at the moment the Reorganization Plan No. 7 which seeks to reorganize the Maritime Administration. The proposal seeks to do two things. First, it seeks to separate the regulatory functions of the present Maritime Board from the promotional and administrative functions of the Board. It is proposed to do this by creating a five-man bipartisan Maritime Commission. This Maritime Commission would handle only the regulatory matters heretofore performed by the Maritime Board. Many of us have no particular quarrel with this part of the reorganization plan because of hearings

before our committee over the past 2 or 3 years, and largely because of hearings before the Committee on the Judiciary over the same period of time, hearings involving investigations of the operations of the maritime industry. These hearings revealed some practices which were of considerable concern principally to the House Committee on the Judiciary. The plan comes about largely as the result of a letter written by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary to the President early this year calling the attention of the President to a number of alleged violations by the American and foreign operators who are operating in our so-called conference system. The chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary recommended that there be created a three-man regulatory bipartisan board within the Department of Commerce to take care of the regulatory matters heretofore taken care of by the present Maritime Board. It was apparent throughout our considerations, which had to do not with this reorganization plan, but with the conference dual-rate system, that the present Maritime Board was hampered largely by lack of staff and over the years, for the past 30 or 40 years probably, had not devoted sufficient attention to its regulatory obligations. So most of us have felt, perhaps, in the interest of better administration, it would be advisable to have the regulatory functions separated from the promotional and administrative functions of the present Maritime Board and vest it either in a three-man bipartisan Board, as recommended by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, or in a five-man bipartisan commission, as recommended by the Presi-

dent in this proposal. So there has not been much quarrel over this portion of the President's reorganization plan except to the extent that this particular portion of the plan was defective, and I shall touch upon that presently. But in the meantime, I want to call attention to the other part of the reorganization plan which seeks to abolish the present Maritime Board and to place the remaining authorities and obligations not in a bipartisan Board but in the hands of the Secretary himself.

A single person, then, would have all the authority, promotional and administrative, that the present Maritime Board has had. I think this is a bad mistake. I would like to say to my friends who are presently inclined to support the reorganization plan, I know there are political aspects whenever a reorganization plan comes down, and it is only natural that the President's party membership in the House and the Senate would vote to support it if it is reasonable. I think in this particular instance somebody gave the President some very bad advice. I do not believe that he or the people who drafted the proposal realized what they were proposing to the Congress of the United States. I can understand your wanting to support the President's proposal, but let me say this to you. As sure as I am standing here, had this same proposal been made by a Republican President to a Republican Congress the vast majority of you people on the other side of the aisle would have risen up and fought it tooth and toenail not because it was submitted by a Republican President but because the plan itself is defective.

As I said to our own committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, if this plan is adopted it will rise up to plague you, because amongst the powers vested in the Secretary under this proposal is authority to allocate, if I may use that word, the ship construction subsidy fund and the ship operating subsidy fund which run from \$250 million to \$300 million a year. It is just too much to expect one man to be able to carry out this responsibility. I have the highest regard for the present Secretary of Commerce; I have known him now for several years. I know he is a man of very high caliber and very great stature, but I know also he will not always be in that office. The day will come when somebody will succeed him. I do not know who that individual may be. It might be a Republican, and certainly you people on that side of the aisle would not want to vest in a Republican Secretary of Commerce the authority to allocate subsidy funds totalling \$250 million or \$300 million a year.

A reorganization proposal was submitted to the Congress about 10 years ago by a distinguished President of the United States, Mr. Truman. Mr. Truman in his reorganization recommendation proposed that the authority to grant subsidy funds should not be placed in the hands of one individual but in a bipartisan board, and he recommended the present three-man Maritime Board.

In testimony before our committee—and our committee informally discussed

this reorganization plan—we had some 3 days of hearings and the committee finally voted 14 to 11 in opposition to it, mostly along party lines.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I am sure he does not mean in opposition. The committee voted for it.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I thank the gentleman for correcting me. The vote was 14 to 11 in support of the President's plan; that is true.

Among the witnesses was the Secretary of Commerce himself. When we questioned him about what he planned to do if he got this authority he told us he did not intend to take individual responsibility of allocating the funds but would attempt to administer this provision in conjunction with the Maritime Administrator and the latter's assistant. Then the Secretary of Commerce would choose some third person in the department, and these three would constitute some sort of committee. He had no name for it. This group would allocate the subsidy fund. However, the Secretary did say under questioning that his would be the final authority.

If he felt, and if you feel, that a three-man group or five-man group appointed by the Secretary of Commerce is the answer to the arguments that I have made, then why do you not go a step further and agree to a bipartisan board rather than to a three-man board answerable to the Secretary of Commerce, all of whom would be political appointees?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, the proposal of the Secretary of Commerce to satisfy those of us who opposed the idea of one individual having the authority to administer all of these funds and to allocate them would be much like a proposal coming from one of you to the effect that on every issue coming before the House of Representatives he will turn that decision over to three people in his office and they will tell him how to vote. How ridiculous that would be. That is tantamount to the proposal coming from the Secretary of Commerce. He is the one who is going to say to company A, "You get so much," and to company B, "You get so much." On construction subsidy he will say to company A that he will fix the subsidy in its case and it will amount to \$4 or \$5 million. It is not beyond the realm of conjecture to foresee a possible situation arising such as company A having supported a successful candidate for the Presidency, and seeing to it that considerable sums of money were raised for his campaign. Company B supported the opposing candidate for President in exactly the same manner. Now, when company A comes up before the Secretary of Commerce and asks for an operating subsidy or a construction subsidy, would it not be logical to believe that the Secretary of Commerce may be more friendly to company A than to company B?

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

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

Mr. CELLER. I am very much interested in the statement of the gentleman casting a bit of doubt on the Secretary of Commerce's right or ability to function as a dispenser of funds for these subsidies. Is it not true that the Secretary of Commerce in connection with the Bureau of Public Roads now dispenses over a billion dollars a year for public highways?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. That is correct, but these are two entirely different situations, as I see them. The Maritime Board and the Maritime Administrator have jurisdiction over a form of transportation. This is not true with the Bureau of Public Roads. The Bureau has jurisdiction over the roads, and not over the form of transportation using them.

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

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

Mr. ZELENKO. The gentleman mentioned company A supporting a presidential candidate and company B as another company supporting another candidate. Does the gentleman contend that companies or corporations are permitted to contribute to political campaigns?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. The gentleman from New York has been around here maybe not quite as long as I have, but I know he is not naive and he knows there are more ways than one to support a candidate.

Mr. ZELENKO. Is it not a fact that in effect up to the present time the Secretary of Commerce has had the final word on the granting of subsidies? I am talking practically, regardless of whether or not under the law it was to be allocated by the Board. It was under his supervision and in the same department.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. No.

Mr. ZELENKO. Can the gentleman point out one instance where the Board awards a subsidy contrary to the wishes of the Secretary of Commerce?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Putting it the other way, can the gentleman from New York point out one instance where an award was made by the Board that the Secretary of Commerce was able to change? Under the law the decision of the Maritime Board with respect to allocation of subsidies to individual companies cannot be changed or challenged by the Secretary of Commerce. As long as I have been a Member of Congress I have not heard of one case where the Secretary of Commerce has changed a decision of the Board.

Mr. ZELENKO. The gentleman states that perhaps my not being in this House as long as he has not eliminated my naivete in regard to the question I asked regarding companies contributing to campaigns. I know that the Department of Justice and the gentleman and myself would be happy to have the names of any corporation having contributed to anyone's campaign.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. May I say to the gentleman that that is aside from the merits of the bill. But if I wanted to, I could tell the names of companies or

individuals who have supported presidential candidates.

Mr. ZELENKO. I would suggest that he furnish those names to the Department of Justice.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I have taken up too much time perhaps on the political aspects of this proposal. I would like to go back now to the proposal for a five-man commission. This in itself, irrespective of the other aspects of the bill, should be sufficient for the House to turn the proposal down. The administrative division of the Maritime Law Association of the United States submitted testimony to our committee and also submitted a letter or statement to the Committee on Government Operations to the effect that the plan with respect to the five-man commission was structurally defective and would result in such confusion from a technical, legal standpoint that in all likelihood there would be years of litigation following the enactment of the proposal simply because of the deficiencies in the law.

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

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. You were referring to Mr. Ewers' testimony.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I was.

Mr. BONNER. Did I not send the gentleman a copy of the letter from the Maritime Law Association stating that Mr. Ewers did not represent them; that he represented a subdivision?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. That is correct.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Ewers' testimony bothered me. I had research made. There has been a case on it, and the courts have decided against the testimony that Mr. Ewers offered.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Well, I do not agree with the gentleman. The gentleman and I have served together for 15 years. There is no finer Member of the Congress than the chairman of our committee. I have been proud to serve with him. We have gotten along wonderfully well and rarely have I disagreed with him, but I disagree with him completely on this reorganization plan and I disagree with him in respect to the testimony of Mr. Ewers who came before our committee and specifically said he was expressing the views not of the Maritime Law Association but of the administrative division thereof and of himself. So, it is perfectly clear. And, the letter that came from the president was for the purpose of clarifying a news item that Mr. Ewers did not issue, and the news item quite evidently was erroneous.

Mr. BONNER. I have a high regard for Mr. Ewers, and I was surprised to get the letter. I merely wanted to point out that the committee did receive the letter, so I am not trying to castigate or throw any aspersions on Mr. Ewers at all. I have a high regard for him.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Irrespective of the letter from the president of the associa-

tion itself, Mr. Ewers' testimony was accurate testimony, and I am only sorry that the Members of the House, every one of them, could not have read his statement or read the letter of the division which went to the Committee on Government Operations. We are not quarreling with the idea of separating the regulatory functions from the promotional functions. The wording of the President's proposal is such that we will have such confusion in the administration of the maritime law, if this plan is adopted, that it will be harmful to the American merchant marine and will stop some of its functions. There is no savings clause and no provision for disposition of unfinished cases pending before the Maritime Board at the time it goes out of existence. The reorganization of the Maritime Administration should be done by legislation, such as proposed by a measure I introduced the other day which would create a five-man bipartisan regulatory commission but would continue in existence the present board to administer its remaining functions.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO].

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on the special order I have for today paying tribute to the 25th anniversary of Spain, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to extend my remarks at that time and that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks following my own and that other Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM BALANCE OF THIS WEEK
AND FOR THE WEEK OF JULY 24

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to inquire of the majority leader if he will advise us concerning the program for the remainder of this week and for next week.

Mr. MCCORMACK. If the reorganization plan presently before the House is disposed of, as well as plan No. 6, that completes the business for this week and I shall ask unanimous consent to go over until Monday.

Monday is District Day, but there is no business; the Committee on the District of Columbia has no bills to present. So there is no legislation programmed for Monday.

For Tuesday there is the military construction appropriation bill for 1962.

Also H.R. 4998, the Community Health Services and Facilities Act of 1961. If that can be reached on Tuesday it will be the next order of business after the appropriations bill.

For Wednesday and the balance of the week the program is as follows:

On Wednesday the Prime Minister of Nigeria will address the House.

Then we will have House Concurrent Resolution 351, to which I referred yes-

terday. Unanimous consent will be asked to take that up. That is in connection with the Berlin situation. As I said yesterday, there will be a rollcall on that, if unanimous consent to take it up is granted, as I assume it will be.

Following that will be the bill H.R. 8230, the general farm bill for 1961, if a rule is reported.

There is the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time, and any further program will be announced later.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I have had the honor and pleasure to serve on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives for 20 years or more. During the past 6 years, prior to this session of Congress, I have had the honor to be chairman of that committee, and have served with pleasure and strong collaboration with regard to all matters coming before the committee with the gentleman who has just preceded me, the Honorable THOR TOLLEFSON of the State of Washington. I do not know a Member of this body and certainly I do not know any member of our committee who has served more faithfully, who has applied himself more diligently, nor for whom I have a higher regard.

This is the first occasion on which Mr. TOLLEFSON and I have strongly disagreed. I admire his position. I am sure he respects mine.

Mr. Speaker, when this plan was sent to Congress, naturally it was sent to the Committee on Government Operations. But, nevertheless, I felt that it was the responsibility of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to be informed as to the effect of the plan on the administration of our maritime policy and on the shipping industry. Therefore I advised the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON], that with his approval, we would hold hearings on the plan. We held hearings for 3 days. We gave everybody an opportunity to appear before the committee and testify either for or against the plan. I am very proud to say that the present Secretary of the Department of Commerce, the Honorable Luther Hodges, former Governor of the State of North Carolina, made a great impression on the committee. I think he impressed the left side of the committee as well as he did the right side. I think he instilled confidence in the full membership of the committee that if he were delegated the power to exercise these important maritime functions, they would be in good hands, and would be carried out in a manner that the gentleman himself would be proud of, and that the Congress of the United States would approve.

There is no argument about part 1 of the plan. All sides agree that the supervision of regulations and enforcement of the Shipping Act of 1916 and the Inter-

coastal Shipping Act of 1933 should be strengthened from the manner in which it has been handled in the past.

I do not want to say anything derogatory about the administration of the Maritime Board in the past. I know, and I think my colleagues on the committee know, that there are too many responsibilities and duties in this field for one man to be Administrator of maritime affairs and at the same time Chairman of the Board, responsible for the execution of both regulatory and promotional functions. I think that is where the Board got into trouble with respect to regulatory matters, and it has drifted along.

So much did the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON] and I think about this that we had the Board before us and called it to their attention that they should give more attention to the 1916 act and the regulatory provisions of the other acts under their supervision. So they began to plant field officers around the country, and they strengthened the regulatory features of their responsibility. So we are all more or less agreed that section 1 is proper and should be a Board separate and distinct from the administration of promotional and operating functions, including the basic construction and operating subsidy program.

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

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I think perhaps I should make it clear that while I agree with the philosophy of separating the functions, with the regulatory functions going into the new Commission and the promotion and administrative functions remaining where they are, I do not agree with the specifics of the proposal.

Mr. BONNER. I understand the gentleman well.

My good friend, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON], has spoken about putting this grave responsibility in the Secretary. I had a lot of respect for Mr. Weeks. He came down to my office many times to discuss with me, along with members of the Maritime Board, legislation pending before the committee and administrative matters on which he had to make a decision. So it cannot be said here that this Board has the sole authority. The Secretary of Commerce has had influence over the Board and has had in many cases final decision.

We might just as well be men and understand that where a board is under an agency and is responsible to the head of that agency with respect to its budgetary matters, it is going to have a great deal of influence coming down through the Secretary, through the Under Secretary for Transportation, and so forth. So in the past 3 years the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and the Committee on the Judiciary have held extensive hearings on various shortcomings in the administration of the laws governing our American merchant marine and the regulation of our waterborne foreign commerce.

Testimony before these committees has made it abundantly clear that the pres-

ent three-man Board charged with both regulatory and development activities is unworkable, and no serious question has been raised with respect to the desirability of establishing a separate and independent party charged with the regulation of the industry.

A serious question, I think, arises with respect to the development function presently handled by the Federal Maritime Administration and the Maritime Board. I am convinced, as are most people concerned with the defense of our country, that a thriving American merchant marine is an essential element.

The problem confronting us is the best means of assuring the well-being of that aspect of our seapower. The present three-man Board which functions partly as an independent body and partly under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce—and I repeat that—partly under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce, has been less than completely effective in achieving our aims. It is my feeling that the responsibility for the promotion and development of the merchant marine should be vested in a single individual, and that in order to discharge his responsibility properly, he must have full authority. We have that authority with respect to the military. Full authority is vested in the Secretary of National Defense. We have that authority in other Government agencies, and, I believe, this cannot be achieved under the present hybrid Board which is responsible to the Secretary of Commerce under certain circumstances but which is solely a free agent under other circumstances.

Now, that cannot be denied; it just cannot be denied. It is my sincere belief that the best way to assure the future of a healthy merchant marine is to place the sole and whole responsibility for its well-being in the hands of the Secretary of Commerce. Obviously, with the breadth of his responsibility, he will not seek to handle the matter without competent assistance, and to that end the plan provides for the appointment by the President of a Maritime Administrator who will have the direct responsibility under the Secretary of Commerce for the promotional activities of the American merchant marine. That is what we want. The promotional functions relating to the American merchant marine are the matters at stake in part II of the plan. To the extent that the Administrator requires assistance in matters involving hearings, such as subsidy matters, that can be handled through the selection of two competent Deputies who will sit with him as an administrative board and perform all the functions of the present Board—subject, of course, to the overall responsibility of the Secretary of Commerce.

In other words, the Secretary of Commerce, as he proposes to do under this plan, will get the advice and guidance of a high level board of three competent, highly qualified members—one, the Maritime Administrator, appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate—another, the Deputy Administrator—and the third, another high

ranking civil service employee who will be selected either as Deputy or Assistant Administrator. Then that board will determine the differential operating subsidies and construction subsidies and be responsible for such promotional aspects of the American merchant marine, under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce. It is a big field and it needs a strong, vital head. I am convinced that the plan offers the best means of assuring the future of our American merchant marine, and to that end I heartily urge my colleagues to support the plan.

Now with respect to the motion here to discharge the committee. I have great confidence in the Committee on Government Operations. I had the honor to serve on that committee under the present distinguished chairman. I always found him fair, I always found him diligent, I always found him a man who conscientiously did the right thing.

This committee has decided for the present to table this plan, keep it in the committee. Here comes the motion to discharge.

I have spoken of the plan itself, and it has been recorded here that the Merchant Marine Committee of the House, your committee which gave 3 days of hearings to all parties, voted on this matter 14 to 11. There were probably several members of the committee unavoidably absent, but that is a pretty strong decision; and as I said in the beginning, our committee has not been political. If it had been political, I, in the position I have held as chairman of the committee, could have done many, many things throughout the past 6 years to have caused the former Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Weeks, an awful lot of trouble in his administrative bills that he sent down to the Congress and the Maritime Board Chairman who was a Presidential appointee, an awful lot of trouble in decisions he may have made, or did make, which probably I did not agree with, and I have the authority and the opportunity to give him a lot of trouble by setting up things to do this, that, and the other, which I did not do. And again, I have never in that committee programed or arranged hearings, and so forth, without first calling the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON]. When decisions had to be made in the committee, I always consulted with the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON], as well as my distinguished colleagues on the Democratic side. So I say, there is nothing political about the matter. It is a matter to expedite the business of the American merchant marine and to perfect a better working system for the promotion of the American merchant marine.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, if ever an agency of Government needed reorganization, the Federal Maritime Board does. Based on a 3-year investigation by the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am chairman, I can state unequivocally that in my 39 years in the House I have never seen a record of regulatory neglect

by any Government agency that even approaches that of the Federal Maritime Board and its predecessor agencies. This record is due in large measure to the fact that the Board has been charged with two completely different and basically conflicting responsibilities—subsidy awarding and other promotional functions with respect to the U.S.-flag merchant fleet on the one hand and regulatory and supervisory functions over waterborne foreign and offshore commerce of the United States on the other.

Reorganization Plan No. 7 would accomplish what has long been vitally needed in the maritime field—separation of regulatory and promotional functions over the waterborne foreign and offshore commerce of the United States and the assignment of these functions to two distinct agencies.

Under existing maritime laws the present Federal Maritime Board is charged with an almost hopeless task. The Board and its personnel are responsible not only for regulating carriers engaged in the foreign and offshore commerce of the United States, but also for the allocation of vast sums of money for construction and operating differential subsidies to American-flag carriers and for numerous other promotional activities in behalf of the U.S. merchant fleet.

More particularly, in the regulatory area, the Board's responsibilities include the regulation of services, practices, and agreements of common carriers by water; the formulation of rules and regulations affecting shipping in the foreign trade in order to adjust or meet conditions unfavorable to such shipping; the investigation of discriminatory practices in foreign trade; and the control of rates of offshore common carriers. In the promotional area, the Board's responsibilities include such duties as determining, awarding, and terminating construction and operating differential subsidies; and investigating and determining first, the relative cost of construction of comparable vessels of the United States and foreign countries; second, the relative cost of operating vessels under the registry of the United States and under foreign registry; and third, the nature of subsidies granted by foreign governments to their merchant marines.

With this multiplicity of functions, I emphasize multiplicity, the Board members and personnel devote by far the preponderance of their working time to promotional and subsidy programs, relegating the vital task of regulation to subordinate status. Furthermore, while the Board has nearly 3,000 employees, about 80 are assigned to the regulation area.

In addition, there is a complete lack of separation between the Federal Maritime Board and the Maritime Administration of the Department of Commerce, which latter agency has responsibility for carrying out the subsidy agreements made by the Board and for administering various operating and promotional programs. The Maritime Administration and the Board do not have separate staffs. As a consequence, the Administration utilizes jointly with the Federal

Maritime Board the services of Board employees. This extends even to its Administrator, who is also Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board, and to its General Counsel who serves as chief legal adviser to both agencies.

As a result of this commingling, Board personnel are engaged in diametrically different and sometimes conflicting types of activities and functions. On the one hand, they are entrusted with the task of managing and fostering the American merchant fleet; on the other, they have statutory responsibility for regulation of international and offshore shipping in which that fleet is engaged.

Experience has shown that with this administrative organization and with such diverse responsibilities the Board has been completely unable to discharge effectively its regulatory responsibilities. What prompts my earnest interest? The Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am chairman, has devoted almost 3 years to exploring antitrust problems and competitive practices in the shipping industry. Our results may be found in five volumes of hearings held in the 1st session of the 86th Congress, running upward of 5,600 pages of testimony; two volumes of hearings held in the 2d session of the 86th Congress, totaling nearly 2,500 pages; and an as yet undeterminable number of volumes of testimony arising out of hearings held during the 87th Congress. It was a searching inquiry. There had been no comprehensive investigation since 1912 of the maritime industry. Based on the evidence in the record, it is clear that the Federal Maritime Board has been guilty of incredible neglect in carrying out the responsibilities delegated to it by the Congress under the Shipping Act of 1916. Throughout our inquiry there was ample evidence of apathy, indifference, casualness and cavalier disregard of responsibilities. The regulated became the regulators. The industry had become master, the FMB servant. The shipping lines have had a heyday of misrule. There has been no resistance by the Board to their whim and caprice. It is a shocking condition. It cannot continue.

For example, at our shipping hearings held in 1959, 1960, and during the month of March of this year, the subcommittee, on the basis of examining the records of only a small number of steamship lines, discovered more than 240 apparent violations of Federal statutory provisions—violations which have caused the Attorney General to embark on a sweeping grand jury investigation of steamship industry practices, and have caused the Federal Maritime Board to institute a number of investigative and rulemaking proceedings. Of even greater concern, this wholesale disregard of statutory requirements by steamship carriers, coupled with Federal Maritime Board indifference, has injured the foreign commerce of the United States; has made it necessary for American consumers to pay more for imported goods; and has been gravely detrimental to American manufacturers and exporters. The evidence of some of these practices was so

compelling and the activities so clearly illegal that officials of several steamship lines had no choice but to admit guilt to the subcommittee.

Thus, when confronted with evidence unearthed by our subcommittee, tending to show that his company was guilty of fraud, the present president of one of the largest of U.S. steamship lines stated:

I am personally extremely ashamed of it. I am frank to admit it.

Another top steamship company executive, when faced with similar evidence of fraud, told the subcommittee:

It was wrong, our people were wrong. Ethically, morally and every other way.

I could go on at length with example after example of willfully illegal activity and of Federal Maritime Board neglect.

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

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. The gentleman made reference to alleged violations or apparent violations by the steamship operators, and I understood him to say they admitted their guilt to the gentleman's committee. Have there been any convictions or findings of guilt by any court or by the Maritime Board in any particular case?

Mr. CELLER. The Department of Justice has impaneled two grand juries, one in San Francisco and one in the District of Columbia. The Federal Maritime Board, as a result of our inquiry and the revelations made therein, has instituted a number of proceedings based upon the evidence that we unearthed. Because of procedural delays only a few have been completed. In one case involving a fraudulent bill of lading, the Board found the parties guilty. I have also made inquiry at the Department of Justice as to the progress that has been made by the grand juries. I was advised that because of limitations of personnel they have been unable to present those charges with as much diligence as they wished, but that from now on, they would carry out their responsibilities in this regard more expeditiously. Up to this point there has been no court conviction.

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

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. My information may be incorrect; I have not checked on it, but I understood that one or two or more cases, shall I say, have been brought by the Federal Maritime Board under its legislative jurisdiction, and in the cases that they have actually heard and have reached conclusions upon they have found, shall I say, the operators not guilty; is that not true?

Mr. CELLER. That may be true except for the case and law mentioned. I have no specific information about the specific cases you adverted to. I shall, however, in view of what the gentleman has said, make an examination in that regard.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. It is my further understanding that out of some 200 apparent violations only 55 remain. All

others have been disposed of in one way or another without any finding of guilt against any operator; is that not correct?

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman may be correct, but in view of what the gentleman has said, I shall check on that likewise.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I did not mean to make the statement as being true. I simply say I heard that, and I wonder whether the gentleman had heard it.

Mr. CELLER. I have no knowledge of that.

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

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. I wonder if the gentleman would explain this: Would not the regulatory features under the reorganization plan remain the same?

Mr. CELLER. No. The regulatory functions would be split off.

Mr. PELLY. Yes, but the actual cases which you have been citing would still remain under the three-man Board.

Mr. CELLER. The regulatory functions would come under the jurisdiction of the so-called Federal Maritime Commission beyond question.

Mr. PELLY. Then, it would still be under the vigilance of a committee, like the gentleman has stated, to require that there be audits and investigations?

Mr. CELLER. Well, if the gentleman will be patient, I will cover that a little later.

In any event, it is clear that the need for regulatory vigor over this industry is now greater than ever. Some of the members of this industry have learned very little from the hearings of the past 3 years. Indeed, one representative of this maritime industry in testifying before the House Merchant Marine Committee last week in opposition to this reorganization plan boasted that the violations of law brought forth during the course of our 3-year study meant very little. He stated that the record of fraud and deceit was one to which "you should point with pride." Such arrogance and blatant disregard for the public interest cannot go unnoticed.

Reorganization Plan No. 7, which, in effect, is before the House, would help remedy that regulatory neglect by establishing a new independent five-man Federal Maritime Commission which will have the sole function of regulating this industry and supervising its use of the antitrust exemption that is granted by the Shipping Act of 1916. The promotional and subsidy-awarding functions will be placed in the Maritime Administration, which remains, as it is now, in the Department of Commerce, subject to the overall policy guidance and administrative supervision of the Secretary of Commerce. For administrative reasons I understand that while the plan structurally places these promotional functions in the Secretary of Commerce with power in him to delegate those functions to subordinates, it is understood that the Secretary will delegate those functions to the Maritime Administration which is also specifically provided for in this plan.

The new regulatory agency called Federal Maritime Commission will have jurisdiction over a broad range of activities. Not only will it include regulation of services and practices of all common carriers engaged in the foreign commerce of the United States as I have indicated before, but it will be required to regulate firms providing forwarding, wharfage, docking, warehouse, and other terminal facilities, and the regulation of various conference agreements and other arrangements and understandings between common carriers and other persons subject to the Shipping Act. Moreover, the Commission will have comprehensive and penetrating regulatory and rate-making responsibilities over offshore commerce between continental United States and the States of Alaska and Hawaii, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and other island possessions.

The task of regulating the foreign and offshore commerce of the United States is a vital one. The functions of this proposed Commission are at least as important in the public interest as those of other independent Federal regulatory agencies. They must therefore be housed in a separate independent regulatory commission as the President proposes. I strongly believe that the interests of our merchant marine and of the public at large require that this reorganization plan be approved speedily in order that there may be effective and vigorous regulation of this industry as soon as possible.

There is widespread agreement that the Federal Maritime Board's long-time failure to regulate the shipping industry can no longer be countenanced. The reorganization plan proposed would not be a panacea. But it would lay the essential groundwork for accomplishing that which Congress intended—fair, impartial, and vigorous enforcement of the regulatory provisions of the shipping laws.

When Members of the House hear that there is opposition to this reorganization plan from the industry that will be affected by it, I hope they will remember that the nonsubsidized segments of the U.S.-flag maritime industry, representing more than half of the deadweight tonnage operating in the foreign commerce of the United States, support this plan. In addition, there are portions of the maritime industry that are not registered under the United States-flag but are United States owned. This part of the industry also supports the President's plan.

Finally, of the 15 subsidized United States-flag lines which together represent less than half of the United States owned maritime tonnage in U.S. foreign commerce, 5 or 6 subsidized lines did not join the others in opposing this plan. Hence, the opposition to the President's plan comes from only a part of the subsidized segment of the steamship industry. This opposition by only a small part of the total industry is based upon an unarticulated fear that their \$300 million per year subsidy from the United States might in some undefined way be jeopardized by this plan.

I will say to the gentleman who addressed a question to me before that the function of handling subsidies would be turned over to the Department of Commerce, and the Secretary of Commerce has indicated that he would in turn turn over that function to a three-man group in the Maritime Administration.

But the point is that you cannot mix promotional and regulatory functions together and get proper and efficient exercise of responsibility.

The handling of subsidies and promotional activities must be separated from regulation. If we do that, then I think we will have effective regulation, and will not have the industrywide excesses and wrongdoing that has been possible under the Federal Maritime Board.

For 45 years the maritime industry has been a government unto itself. It has governed itself unwisely and selfishly, without concern for consumers, importers, and shippers. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that as we consider the pending motion the real question before the House is whether present regulatory abdication should be permitted to continue or whether the Congress should require effective regulation of this industry as Congress sought to do 45 years ago. Therefore, I urge the House to vote "nay" and support the President's plan.

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

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

Mr. McCORMACK. This plan is very simple, very effective, and sound. The opposition emanates from outside Congress. One of the most powerful lobbies against this plan has been conducted. We all know and have known for many years that within the steamship industry they have a powerful lobby. That is a well-known fact. If the American people only knew some of the lobbying that goes on against legislation, they would rise in their indignation. They little realize what is going on, and the pressure upon Members of Congress. The opposition to this is outside, from a lobby that has been operating, as we know around here, for the past several weeks.

Mr. CELLER. I thank the gentleman.

I do think, however, that the congressional inquiries have had a salutary effect on the members of the industry. I think that there are members in the industry who want to do the right thing. I hope, and I am quite sure, that that will be the case in the future.

Mr. Speaker, we all want to support the American merchant marine. It is essential to our defense. It is material to our economy. If the industry acts in a responsible manner and in accordance with statutory requirements, I am sure every Member of this House will support their cause.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. There is one point in the gentleman's discussion which might be clarified at this point in the record, since it came up. That is with respect to the alleged violations.

On page 46 of the transcript of the hearings before our committee, in the testimony of Vice Admiral Wilson—on pages 46 and 47, he stated that it can be determined that of the 200-plus alleged violations, 82 or more have been disposed of in one fashion or another, either under the statute of limitations or otherwise, and 118 still remain for action.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I am a little disturbed that the majority leader made reference to lobbying by the merchant marine industry with respect to this plan. I will say for my own part that no one from the merchant marine has lobbied me, and if he is going to talk about lobbyists and their effect upon reorganization plans, he might better have addressed his remarks to Reorganization Plan No. 2 which was overwhelmingly defeated by this House.

In fairness to the people of the country who are considering outside pressure on what we do here in this body, let us not overlook the very powerful lobby from the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

Mr. Speaker, I approach this plan from two different activities.

First is, as a member of an Antitrust Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee headed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], I participated I believe in almost every one of the very numerous and very exhaustive hearings conducted by his subcommittee both here in Washington and in the city of New York.

Second, I am a member of the Government Operations Committee, which held hearings on Reorganization Plan No. 7 with respect to maritime functions.

I must say that I myself was amazed that although we had a Shipping Act on the books since 1916, yet, as I believe, our records showed that not one single penalty had ever been assessed against anyone under that act in some 45 years of its operation.

Whatever may be the outcome of any individual cases of possible violation of the 1916 act or other Federal laws either in grand jury proceedings or in matters before the Federal Maritime Board itself, let me say I believe I must concur with Mr. CELLER in his statement that the record of negligence and inactivity in enforcing the provisions of the maritime laws has been a bad one as far as the Federal Maritime Board and its predecessors are concerned.

However, I am not sure this reorganization plan is going to be any more successful than the two other attempts to shake up this organization by reorganization plans, both of which were advanced in the name of efficiency and economy. I do not think anyone, so far as I know, disagrees with the proposition that the subsidy function, the development, promotional, and operating functions of the maritime agency, whatever you want to call it, and the regulatory functions should be separated, because they are different in nature. To that extent this plan is good.

As a matter of fact, Reorganization Plan No. 21 of 1950, which is the most recent reorganization plan with respect to maritime functions, seemed to have that purpose in mind. However, because of the importance of the subsidy function and, I suppose, in view of the possibility of its being abused, the function, it was thought, should be in the hands of more than one person. The President in transmitting that plan expressed exactly that thought in his message accompanying the plan.

In fact, after the hearings of the Antitrust Subcommittee I was so impressed that this separation of functions was necessary that I explored the possibility of introducing a bill myself on this subject. I thought perhaps it could be done by simply repealing Reorganization Plan No. 21 of 1950. I found when I made my study that technically it just could not be done that way and be made workable.

I might say that I think the complicated nature of this plan as compared with others, although it does retain the unpalatable feature of delegation of powers from a board or commission to subordinate employees, indicates that this is a problem which probably should be handled in the ordinary fashion by legislation, where errors can be corrected either by the committee or on the floor.

I call the attention of my colleagues to a letter on page 78 of the hearings, a letter from Mr. John Mason, president of the Maritime Law Association of the United States, who raises some very serious questions of a technical nature about this plan.

According to his letter, no adequate provision is made for pending cases, cases in the process of decision. Somewhere along the line the Federal Maritime Board is abolished, but nothing is said as to what is to happen to the business that is in process. If that is a defect, and would be likely to give rise to extensive litigation before it is settled, it is something we should correct. But because of the fact that a plan may not be amended by the Congress, only voted up or down, it is impossible to correct even technical defects.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, my interest in this particular matter arises, I should say at the outset, from the fact that I was a member of the Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations which conducted the hearings and heard some testimony with respect to this particular plan, plan No. 7. As I recall it, we were in hearings on this particular plan less than 1 day. One of the witnesses who appeared before our committee on the day we held those hearings and whose testimony I awaited with great expectation by virtue of his position as chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of this House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] appeared before that committee and testified with respect to

the plan. I quote from page 17 of the record of the hearings, which we conducted. I quote Mr. BONNER as follows:

Mr. BONNER. Because of my concern for the execution and administration of our merchant marine policy and those features of part 2 of the plan which would vest subsidy and other promotional matters of an adjudicatory nature in the Secretary in lieu of an independent, quasi-judicial board, I recently informed the chairman of my desire to hold hearings on the substance of the plan before it was called up on the floor. He assured me that he would be agreeable to allowing us a reasonable time to make an independent inquiry into this matter in order to arrive at a position which we as the cognizant legislative committee could present to you gentlemen for consideration.

Then he went on and said that he preferred not to express an opinion either for or against the resolution of disapproval on plan No. 7.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding, after listening to the statement of the gentleman from North Carolina here on the floor today, that something like 3 days of hearings were held, but they were concluded the day before yesterday and by a very close vote the plan was approved. Now, to my knowledge, no report has been filed—that is, no published hearings have been filed and made available to the members of the committee or to the Members of the House as to the hearings that were held before the cognizant legislative committee. I think that is regrettable. I think when you consider that fact in conjunction with the fact that less than 1 day of hearings were held by the subcommittee of which I am a member; that we are voting this afternoon with only a very small proportion of the membership of the House even interested enough to remain on the floor and listen, we are voting on a fairly fundamental and important basic reorganization plan without all of the facts we should have.

There seems to be pretty general agreement even by those like myself who oppose the plan that there are parts of this plan that are good—that part which would divorce the regulatory from the promotional and subsidy functions is good. The regrettable thing, as I think the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] pointed out is that we are obliged to vote these plans up or down, and that we do not have a chance to offer any amendments and simply have to either take them or leave them. I listened as carefully and as conscientiously as I could in the day of hearings which I attended. There are some very substantial and some very good reasons why we should not entrust to the executive branch—and why we should not entrust to even as honorable a gentleman as the present Secretary of Commerce what the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has referred to as adjudicatory matters—matters which are adjudicatory in nature.

I think somebody mentioned in connection with their remarks on the floor here this afternoon that former President Truman sent up a reorganization plan in 1950, plan No. 21, which abol-

ished the U.S. Maritime Commission. Today this plan abolishes the Federal Maritime Board and establishes a new commission. Maybe that is some indication, albeit somewhat small, that these reorganization plans are not always what they are cracked up to be, are not always a panacea, are not always the solution envisaged by their proponents.

I think it is also interesting and it would be helpful for us to note that one of the purposes of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, was to allow the President to submit plans that would permit the more efficient and more economical operation of executive agencies within the executive branch of the Government. Today I think the President has been notably frank in his transmittal message to the Congress in pointing out that this particular reorganization plan is going to cost more money. As a matter of fact, the Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget in appearing before our subcommittee said it would cost at least \$173,000 in additional salaries for the 13 new positions which include a Maritime Administrator and an enlarged Maritime Board.

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Certainly.

Mr. ZELENKO. As I understood the gentleman in one part of his discussion just now, he stated that the hearings, in his opinion, were insufficient. If I understand correctly, there is a motion before us to discharge the committee and for the House to take up the reorganization plan. My question is this: If the committee had not had sufficient time to conduct hearings is not that a reason to vote against the motion before us?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I do not think so. The reason that we are here by virtue of this procedure today, this motion to discharge, is that we had a vote in the Committee on Government Operations tabling any action on the resolution of disapproval. There were some, like myself, in the Committee on Government Operations who voted against the motion to table because we wanted the opportunity of further consideration. Let me point out one or two things. As I say, we do not have available any published hearings before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. A number of things were brought out in testimony before the Committee on Government Operations. I call attention to a statement that was given by Admiral Will who appeared before our committee and I quote very briefly from what he said:

The proposed delegation to the Secretary of Commerce of functions now vested in the Federal Maritime Board by basic statutes, by section 105 of Reorganization Plan No. 21, represents a sweeping change in basic law. In effect Reorganization Plan No. 7 would completely alter basic law by transferring from a statutory board appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate to the Secretary of Commerce all of the functions now vested in the Board by basic law.

I had a brief colloquy during the appearance before the subcommittee of the distinguished Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Hodges, on this matter of delegating to him the determination and the award of subsidies, operating differential subsidies, and construction differential subsidies, and I think it is interesting to point out what his position was. This will be found on page 27 of the record of hearings before our committee:

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Secretary, I gather from your support of this plan and the implications of your testimony, particularly as brought out on page 4, that you do go along with the idea that this business of subsidy awards is an executive function which should be given to the executive?

Secretary HODGES. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANDERSON. It seems to me though, as I examine your proposal on page 7 for a proposed departmental order, that you are just setting up another quasi-judicial body or commission which would, in effect, be exercising something in the nature of a quasi-judicial rather than purely executive authority in determining this matter of awarding subsidy contracts.

In effect he testified that he would further delegate power which would be delegated to him by this reorganization plan, further delegate it to the Maritime Administrator and to other assistants of the Maritime Administrator.

I refer again to a statement that was made and which I think I neglected to mention. I digressed when I started to mention it. I refer to a statement made by former President Truman when he sent down a reorganization plan with respect to the same agency in 1950:

The impact of the award of subsidies on the shipping industry and on individual operators is such as to make desirable the deliberations and the combined judgment of a board.

That was his decision when he sent down a plan with respect to this agency in 1950. That statement is true today, and we ought to reject this plan for that reason, and many other reasons that I think have been brought out here in the discussion today.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ZELENKO].

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pending motion, and in support of the reorganization plan. I do not think there are many Members of the House who in the past have been more critical of the operation of the Maritime Administration and the Maritime Board than the present speaker. The record will show that.

Throughout the years I have come to the conclusion that one of the reasons that the old setup has failed up to the present time has been the fact that the combining of the responsibilities of promotion and regulation has been too much for one board to handle, both physically and legally. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary [Mr. CLEGG] submitted the proof to you. He has come to the same conclusion, and so has his committee, that there must be a separation of the powers of regulation and those of promotion.

On the question in the plan of the separation of the regulatory powers, we do not have much in the way of controversy. I believe that the Board will have an opportunity to devote its time to regulatory activities.

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

Mr. ZELENKO. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. The gentleman from New York is a distinguished member of our committee, and he is a very astute lawyer. I wonder if he has given consideration to the letter written to the Committee on Government Operations by the president of the Division of Administrative Law of the Maritime Law Association of the United States, in which the president called attention to what he called structural defects in part I of the President's reorganization proposal. In effect he says there is no saving clause, there is no provision in the plan for disposing of pending cases as of the date when the old Board goes out of existence.

Would the gentleman comment on that? What happens to a case, if I may be more specific, that has been heard by the Maritime Board but no decision has as yet been reached at the time when the Board goes out of existence? Who renders the decision then?

Mr. ZELENKO. First, I did give consideration to the letter. It is my understanding that the president of that law association disclaimed the position taken by the writer of the letter.

Secondly, may I say to the gentleman from Washington it is to the benefit of those members of the industry who oppose the plan and their attorneys to keep matters in status quo.

I would suggest to the gentleman from Washington that those people will oppose any plan of reorganization for the reason that in the present cluttered up condition of the regulation calendar it is to their advantage to have their matters remain in status quo.

I suggest, sir, that they do not desire to rectify the inequities and the calendar delays. I would say, therefore, I did give consideration to the letter which was later disowned by the president of the association of which the writer is a member.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Will the gentleman yield right there? The gentleman and I are talking about a different letter.

Mr. ZELENKO. I am talking about the letter the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. No. If the gentleman will yield for a clarification, on page 78 of the hearings before the Committee on Government Operations, there is a letter written by John Mason, president, Division of Administrative Law of the Maritime Law Association of the United States. That is the letter I had reference to. I think the gentleman who has the floor was talking about a letter written by the president of the law association itself.

Mr. ZELENKO. May I say that regardless of which letter it is, my argument applies to both of them. The writers are advocates at the bar. They

want this maritime board to remain in status quo. They will oppose any plan, however perfect, for they do not want their matters to be regulated expeditiously. Most of the time they are appearing for the defendants in regulatory matters. Anyone appearing for defendants does not wish to expedite matters. Delay in administration always favors a defendant. Secondly, as to the powers of the Secretary under the new plan; in effect the Secretary has always had the final voice, albeit a silent one on the actions of the Maritime Board in their promotional activities up to the present time. I have rarely heard of the Secretary expressing an opinion in regard to the awarding of subsidy, whether it be a formal opinion or an informal one, which was not followed by the Board. Further, we have a more important benefit in this new plan, a benefit to all of our people, and that is, under this new plan we will pinpoint the responsibility of the awarding of a subsidy. Up to the present time, with the combination of regulation and promotion, the responsibility, the fairness, and the accuracy of the decision has not always been a clear, distinct, or discernible one; under plan No. 7, the Secretary, with the advice and counsel of the experts in his Department, will be held responsible. Should there be defects developing in the plan, it will be easy to point out the responsibility. This has not been so up to now. Should the plan work properly, as I think it will, with undivided responsibility and in the hands of a dedicated American, a member of the President's Cabinet—and I would say the same for any member of any President's Cabinet—the benefits to the American merchant marine will be apparent almost upon its adoption. This House will be wise to support the reorganization plan and vote down the motion to discharge the committee.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I think the gentleman has failed to answer one question, and that is what happens to the cases that are pending when the Maritime Board ceases to function? What is happening to the cases it heard but not yet reached a decision on?

Mr. ZELENKO. The cases, under the specifics of the plan and legal precedent, will follow the Board over to its regulatory hearing room. Those unfinished cases under the plan will go to the Maritime Board in its capacity as a regulatory agency.

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

Mr. ZELENKO. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. I agree with the gentleman. It is obvious, as a matter of law, that if you transfer functions, you transfer responsibility.

Mr. ZELENKO. The gentleman has answered the question more ably than I have.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. The plan does not make that provision.

Mr. ZELENKO. Well, that is inherent in the law.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that failure to reject Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1961, providing for reorganization of maritime functions, would represent a weakening of the legislative responsibility and transfer to the executive branch of functions which heretofore have been administered by quasi-judicial tribunals under supervision of Congress.

Subsidies on account of the differential between foreign and American ship construction and operation costs under plan No. 7 would no longer be assured an independent determination but the power of such determination would be transferred to the Secretary of Commerce. The result would invite criticism which could be valid that contracts and benefits were decided on the basis of political favoritism.

The part of the plan which would set up an independent regulatory Federal Maritime Commission has encountered no objection. But the transfer of promotional and subsidy functions has met with strong objection. Admiral Wilson, former Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board, said:

I am opposed to Reorganization Plan No. 7 because I am convinced that it includes more disadvantages than advantages to the public interest.

Admiral Wilson said to avoid undue political pressures on subsidy rates and allocation of construction subsidy contracts, there should be a statutory, impartial board.

As for myself, I can foresee an administration—not this administration necessarily—maybe a Republican administration—seeking to put pressure on Members of Congress—maybe to support a foreign aid program—maybe to enlarge or “pack” a Rules Committee—maybe even to support such a reorganization proposal as this one, maybe by telephone calls from some future Secretary of Commerce to influence a legislator. I am not saying that Secretary Hodges would do this.

But, anyway, that is a possibility under this program. Beneficiaries under subsidies, for example, might respond with an extra sensitiveness, perhaps, to the call to buy \$100-a-plate dinner tickets. Not maybe with the present Secretary or administration, but under any administration. Also we might see more fancy pastel mink coats, or vicuna coats in Washington, D.C.

If we fail to reject plan No. 7 that could follow. Would not a bipartisan board offer more in the way of a safeguard?

Finally, we see that here in essence is another example of transfer of legislative power and responsibility to the executive branch.

Who says this is and will continue to be the greatest legislative body in the world?

What with back-door spending and reorganization plans we are indeed moving,

as a Member of the other political party said in this Chamber yesterday, toward making a mockery of this legislative body.

We are headed for one-man White House rule in this country. That is why Reorganization Plan No. 7 should be rejected.

Now let me discuss another matter. The majority leader referred to the powerful lobby of the steamship companies. I am a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. I never heard from any members of the industry with regard to this Reorganization Plan No. 7 except as they appeared before the committee. Mr. Gibbons, the chairman of the finance committee of the U.S. Lines appeared as a member of the executive committee of the Committee on American Steamship Lines. He said that the American Merchant Marine Institute and the Pacific American Steamship Association joined him in opposition. That is the testimony and that is the extent of the pressure of this powerful lobby.

Mr. Speaker, I think there is an answer to this matter. I think possibly, as the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary has indicated, there has been an inattentiveness to its regulatory duties by the Federal Maritime Board.

But, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion there is a remedy. The defects or weaknesses in the present Board are obvious. I agree that its duties and functions should be split. My colleague from the State of Washington has introduced a bill which would accomplish this. His bill would set up the functions and powers that under this plan would go to the Secretary of Commerce, to be put under a separate independent bipartisan board and I should hope that the Members of the House would reject plan No. 7 and then give the Committee on Merchant Marine an opportunity to study legislation such as has been introduced by the gentleman from Washington, Mr. TOLLEFSON. I believe any defects that have been referred to can be cured in a proper way without abdication to the executive branch of responsibilities and powers of the legislative branch.

I hope the House will reject Reorganization Plan No. 7.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MAILLIARD].

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, most of the points I wished to get on the record have been made by other speakers. I do not want to delay the House unduly. However, there are a couple of things that have been said during this debate that I think require some clarification.

The distinguished gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, said that only some of the subsidized lines found this plan objectionable. All I can say is that the record of the Committee on Merchant Marine and the Committee on Government Operations showed that Castle, which represents all 15 of the subsidized lines, came in and made a

very effective presentation against the plan.

The gentleman also said that the non-subsidized portion of our American merchant marine was for the plan. I asked several witnesses before our committee representing the non-subsidized portions whether their support of the plan rested on their approval of part 1 alone or whether they had considered the implications of part 2. Without exception they replied that part 2 did not affect them so they had not taken it into consideration. So this was only support of the part of the plan that was least controversial, because that is the only thing that affected them.

I would object to both part 1 and part 2 of this plan on the fundamental basis that the distinguished Speaker of the House raised in the debate on Reorganization Plan No. 2. The distinguished chairman of the legislative committee, whom I see across the aisle here, raised the same objection, that is, that we have impaired the individual rights of American citizens under both sections of this plan. Under part 1 because of the unusual authority to delegate the absolute right of an interested party to review by a statutory board is lost. Under part 2 the same right is lost. As a matter of fact, now there is no right under any circumstances to go to a board, only the right to have the decision made by the Secretary of Commerce.

I should like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Florida if he will answer a question or two for me. On page 79, the last paragraph of the letter from Mr. John Mason, contains these sentences:

These questions are in some degree technical but that does not diminish their importance. Unless they are answered by the plan itself, rather than by the slow and costly process of legal trial and error, the Government's entire maritime program may be seriously retarded and some of its activities may be brought virtually to a standstill.

This is from John Mason, president of the Division of Administrative Law of the Maritime Law Association of the United States.

The gentleman previously stated that one of his objections was taken care of in basic law. I am not a lawyer, and his title is pretty impressive to me, so I feel pretty concerned when a reputable man in the legal field makes such a statement.

Mr. FASCELL. I can appreciate the gentleman's concern, and am very happy he has asked the question. While I will state it is an elementary rule of law, I will also be glad to give the gentleman a citation on the case in which this issue has long been settled. It is *Chairman of the U.S. Maritime Commission v. California Eastern Lines, Inc.*, 204 F. 2d 398. The point of that decision basically is that administrative proceedings are not subject to the common law rules of abatement and that a statute should not be so interpreted unless the legislative intent clearly so requires.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Of course I am not a lawyer, so I am at a disadvantage. I

know very good lawyers cite cases on both sides of questions.

Mr. FASCELL. I understand that, but the gentleman did not cite any cases.

Mr. MAILLIARD. No, that is true. Citing cases does not impress me. I am in the position of having to believe one or the other of two learned gentlemen, and this is a good reason, it seems to me, why this type of plan should come to the legislative committee so that it can be amended and not by way of a reorganization act. Now would the gentleman answer one other question for me? Was it ever explained in the gentleman's committee as to why in these reorganization plans the maritime industry is the only transportation industry that is so treated? You just had a CAB reorganization plan. The airlines are still kept under the jurisdiction of a quasi-judicial independent agency. The same thing is true of the railroad and trucking industry, which is still under the ICC. Why is it that we take these functions and put them in the Department of Commerce?

There is no other transportation agency like this, and I do not see why this should be.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman be willing to ask the gentleman from Florida if he would answer what I think is a rather important question as to why this transportation industry is treated differently?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield for that purpose.

Mr. FASCELL. I will be happy to answer the question. The answer is that you have not changed the regulatory functions. They are now and will still be in an independent body. The promotional and subsidy aspects of this thing, which are purely administrative basically and fundamentally although they have some adjudicatory aspects, are in the Board now but will not be in the new Commission.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Yes; but no other transportation agency where we have either loans or subsidies or whatnot is treated this way. They are all handled through the agency that is set up for that particular transportation industry. I do not get the distinction.

Mr. FASCELL. The distinction is by way of long precedent.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, when the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] spoke earlier this afternoon, he referred to the appearance of Secretary of Commerce Hodges, former Governor of the State of North Carolina, before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. I was there when he appeared. I am sure he is an estimable gentleman and that he is competent, but I am unwilling by implication or otherwise to assume that he is going to be the only Secretary of Commerce who is going to administer that Department from here on out under this reorganization plan. No matter who the Secretary of Commerce may be today,

I do not know who is going to be there tomorrow or 3 or 4 years from now so I am not about to buy this reorganization plan on the basis of any one particular individual. I am opposed to this plan for the reason, among others, that I have been opposed to the other reorganization plans submitted by the Kennedy administration because of the naked and unholy delegation of power to the chairman of a commission, which makes of that official a virtual dictator to run the affairs of the commission. I will be opposed to any reorganization plan that contains such a provision. I repeat, it is an unwarranted, naked, and unholy delegation of power.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the leader of our party, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, just to keep the record straight a little something should be said about the way this plan came before the House.

On June 12 the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN]—I take it he is a member of the majority party, and that he acted with the approval of that party leadership—introduced a resolution which stated the "House does not favor the Reorganization Plan Numbered 7." I would assume from that, that the majority party was then against plan No. 7 which is now the subject of the pending motion. Then along comes the Government Operations Committee controlled by the majority party and votes to table that resolution. That leaves Members a little bit confused as to just what the majority party supports or opposes. But evidently what it now wants is to strengthen the political hands of the administration on every possible occasion. And much might be said on that subject.

Now, it is Thursday, and I know almost everyone wants to go home tomorrow, wants to finish up tonight. I have been advised that the leadership, majority, minority, and third party, is of that desire, and I have no intention of filibustering as the gentleman from Florida so ably did yesterday when he set a pattern for the other body. It was very interesting and very instructive.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes. Do you accept the intended compliment I tendered?

Mr. FASCELL. I want to assure the gentleman from Michigan that I was not filibustering yesterday in the consideration of another reorganization plan, but I did take ample time completely and fully to lay on the record my position with respect to that plan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman did it very, very well. It is regrettable perhaps, but I do not think the gentleman's constituents will pay too much attention to the action of the House rejecting the gentleman's argument and thinking. I am sure they will not for he did a magnificent job.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY], said everything I think I could say on this about the delegation of power. Do I hear someone suggest: Why keep on? Well, if someone will ask me, I will say that I accept and adopt the remarks of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] as my own. I think the same statement was made by another gentleman on this side a few moments ago.

What I cannot understand is the reaction of Congressmen. I am reminded of a Congressman in the old days who lived at a hotel down here, I think it was the Continental. He looked over the hotel register when he came down in the morning, and if there was a man from his State he would ask the clerk to point out the individual a little later in the day. Every time the clerk complied and he frequently did, the Congressman would go to the man, stick out his hand, and say, "I am Congressman Blank. Would you like to meet me?" And, of course, the poor citizen who was nothing but a taxpayer, said, "Why, of course, I would be very happy to meet you, a Congressman." People do that even though they may be mistaken as to our ability or qualifications for office.

The point I am driving at is that we should assume our responsibilities, have pride in the office we hold, we should recapture the power to legislate, which we have surrendered to the Executive. It seems to me we should reevaluate our position here and remember our oath of office. Refuse to turn over to the executive department authority, shirk our duty.

Now, out of consideration for your wish to get through, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we are considering here and have pending before us a motion to discharge the Committee on Government Operations.

I rise in opposition to that motion and trust that it will be defeated.

Mr. Speaker, agreement is almost universal that the Board is not performing its functions adequately. Its important duty to regulate the maritime industry has been neglected under the press of other duties involving promotion of the same industry.

There is also nearly universal agreement about the main causes of this situation.

First, the Board's two types of responsibilities are mutually inconsistent, if not contradictory. On the one hand, the Board must regulate the rates and practices of the maritime industry. On the other, it must sustain and promote that industry by determining and awarding huge subsidies. For fiscal year 1961, operating-differential subsidies are estimated to total \$156.9 million, and obligational authority granted for construction-differential subsidies amounted to \$106 million.

Second, the Board and the Maritime Administration, notwithstanding their separate and often divergent responsibilities, are headed by the same individual and are served by the same unified staff. As with the Board itself, most of the time of the joint staff is consumed

in promotional, rather than regulatory activity.

In the situation which prevails, we observe a case of administrative schizophrenia. Under existing law, the Maritime Administrator, as head of the Maritime Administration, has the duty to promote the growth of the merchant marine. Yet this Administrator is also the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board, which regulates operations of the very same merchant marine.

Regulation usually involves restrictions. Thus, failure to allow a rate increase—a regulating function—could tend to inhibit the growth of the maritime industry, and growth is an objective of the promotional function.

As Board Chairman Thomas E. Stakem testified before the Committee on Government Operations:

The possibility that an agency acting in a regulatory capacity may be influenced in its decisions by the fact that the same agency wearing a promotional hat has promotional functions with respect to the same matter, is, of course, the strongest argument why regulatory and promotional functions should be divorced. This is not to say that a regulatory body should not consider nonregulatory but interrelated statutes. In such instances, however, the promotional agency should bring its facts and arguments before the regulatory agency.

I should like to enumerate the intermixed and interlocking relationships in the present organizational structure. Between the Federal Maritime Board and the Maritime Administration there are: First, intermixture of the two basic functions, regulation and promotion; second, intermixture of agency heads, in that the Chairman of the Board is the same person as the Maritime Administrator; and third, intermixture of operating personnel, since a joint staff serves both agencies.

Furthermore, this intermixture extends to the relationships between the Federal Maritime Board and the Secretary of Commerce:

First. In its subsidy award functions, the Board is under the policy guidance of the Secretary, although individual awards by the Board are final.

Second. The Board is included within the Department of Commerce and uses the administrative services of the Department.

It is not surprising that in numerous instances of their actual operations, the Board and the Administration have maintained no separate, distinguishable identities.

Reorganization Plan No. 7 would correct these organizational defects. In transmitting the plan to Congress, the President declared:

Existing organizational arrangements have not proved to be satisfactory. The development and maintenance of a sound maritime industry require that the Federal Government carry out its dual responsibilities for regulation and promotion with equal vigor and effectiveness. Intermingling of regulatory and promotional functions has tended in this instance to dilute responsibilities and has led to serious inadequacies, particularly in the administration of regulatory functions. Recent findings by committees of the Congress disclose serious violations of maritime laws and point to the urgent need

for a reorganization to vest in completely separate agencies responsibility for (1) regulatory functions and (2) promotional and operating functions.

Testimony before the Committee on Government Operations fully sustains the findings of the President on which he based Reorganization Plan No. 7. In his well-reasoned and effective presentation, the Chairman of the Board supported the plan for reasons very similar to those stated in the message. He ended his statement by declaring:

Based on 18 years' experience in Government maritime agencies, I am convinced of the need to allow plan No. 7 to become effective. There is an immediate necessity of improving regulatory efficiency in the public interest. Plan No. 7 will accomplish this objective.

I should like to add that in considering the disapproval resolution on plan No. 7, the Committee on Government Operations took note of the following:

First. Almost everyone agrees that a separate and independent agency should be set up to perform solely regulatory functions under the U.S. shipping laws.

Second. The Secretary of Commerce has declared that the subsidy-award function, which under plan No. 7 would be divorced from the regulatory agency and transferred to him, would not be exercised by one man. This function would be delegated to the top three officials of the Maritime Administration, to be exercised by them jointly.

Third. The provision of plan No. 7 authorizing the new Commission to delegate any of its functions is virtually identical in language and purpose to Reorganization Plans Nos. 1, 3, and 4, which were thoroughly considered and endorsed by both the committee and the House.

Fourth. All the procedural safeguards with which Congress has surrounded the performance of maritime functions by existing agencies would survive and be preserved under plan No. 7.

In light of this, the majority of the Committee on Government Operations concluded that the plan should be allowed to go into effect.

It has been made abundantly evident that the matter to which the motion is directed has been fully considered by the Committee on Government Operations. As expressed by their chairmen, testimony taken by the legislative committee and the testimony before the Committee on the Judiciary are clear as to the need for this plan.

It is even admitted by the opponents that a great many parts of the plan should be put into operation. In this connection, I should like to refer to the testimony of Vice Adm. Ralph E. Wilson before the Committee on Government Operations. Admiral Wilson is a member of the Board. He was Chairman of the Board and Maritime Administrator under the previous political administration. Admiral Wilson opposed the plan. Yet, he conceded that the Board has left much to be desired in the area of regulation. He conceded that the Board should be enabled to spend more time on regulation. He conceded that it was difficult for the overloaded

Chairman and Administrator to give positive, day-to-day direction to the Board. Finally, and let me emphasize this point, Admiral Wilson expressed himself in favor of that section of the plan which provides for delegation of functions by the proposed Commission. That provision, he stated, is sound and should serve to expedite matters before the Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the situation has been amply discussed. In view of the need as expressed by the chairmen of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and the action taken by the Committee on Government Operations, the plan should be allowed to go into effect and the motion to discharge the Committee on Government Operations should be defeated.

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

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

Mr. HARRIS. The parliamentary situation is about like this: "Is it not true if this motion were to be agreed to then the House would resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the purpose of then considering the plan itself, with general debate up to 10 hours?"

Mr. FASCELL. I would not want to assume the functions of a parliamentarian or render a dissertation on the law. I am not sure that the matter would be exactly as the gentleman states it.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, is it not true if the motion is agreed to the House would then resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the first place, a motion could be made that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the resolution and, under the law, 10 hours of debate are permitted.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, the effect would be if this motion is adopted to discharge the committee, then I would move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole for the consideration of the disapproving resolution. In that event, I would be agreeable to dispensing with all debate. We have had a full debate on the resolution as of now and it should require no time whatever, I may say to the gentleman from Arkansas.

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

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

Mr. HARRIS. Of course that would not be possible except by agreement on both sides.

Mr. GROSS. If you wanted to filibuster or carry this debate on for 10 hours, certainly you could do it.

Mr. HARRIS. But you could have up to 10 hours of general debate?

Mr. GROSS. Oh, yes. We could have had that on the previous resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the House for taking this additional time in view of the time I have taken previously, but I do so because in good conscience I must respond to some of the statements made in connection with alleged violations on the part of steamship operators. In the months ahead most of these so-called violations will prove not to be violations. According to the testimony before our committee, out of some 200 alleged violations something like 55 remain now without yet a single conviction or verdict of guilty having been returned. I do not mean to say that some will not be returned, but I only want to point out from the standpoint of numbers only about 55 individual cases remain.

These violations are not such terrible things as the House may have been led to believe. What do they consist of? Most of them are failure to file agreements between shippers and between carriers and shippers and between carriers and transshippers. In many cases the Maritime Board itself, as well as the carriers, felt that certain types of agreements should not have to be filed at all; nobody knew they had to be filed, yet the assertion is now made that they should have been filed and because they were not, they were violations.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, made reference to a case where he says the Government was charged \$305,000 in excess freight rates. Now, that is only part of the story. On the face of it and on the basis of the testimony before his committee, I can see where he would arrive at that conclusion. And, I do not mean to indicate in any case that the gentleman has not revealed the full story of the evidence appearing before his committee, but this is the situation which actually existed.

In the first place, the Government was not overcharged in this case; not one penny. The rates were fixed by the Department of Agriculture itself. Furthermore, the rates were below the rate established by the Maritime Administration which has the authority, in connection with shipments of grain, to establish a fair and reasonable rate. And, this particular rate paid by the Government in this particular instance was less than the rate fixed by the Maritime Administration itself. So, the Government did not pay in excess freight one penny. It did pay more than the commercial shipper on the same line.

Here is what happened. When the carrier enters into his agreement with the Department of Agriculture, which set the rate itself, he still did not have a full ship. So, along comes a commercial shipper and says, "Look, I have some grain. I have some barley or corn going over to Germany, along with the Government grain. Can you take it for me? I can get it shipped on a foreign tramp ship for 50 percent of the Government rate on your vessel. Will you take it?" And the man says, "Sure I will take it." The only way he can get it is to compete with the foreign tramp ship, and that is

exactly what happened, and it has been the practice of the trade over the years, yes, over the centuries. The carriers want to carry a full load, and they will take additional cargo at a lesser rate than they normally would. But in this case the rate was fixed by the Department of Agriculture itself and was below the rate set by the Maritime Administration, so the violation was not as terrible as you were led to believe.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support Reorganization Plan No. 7 and I do so after having heard the testimony on the plan presented before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of which I am a member.

I wish to emphasize my position in support of Reorganization Plan No. 7 because I intend to vote for the motion before us. I want to make clear the procedural issue we will be voting upon, as distinct from the substantive issue of whether or not the reorganization plan should be adopted.

Under the procedure for considering reorganization plans, as we all know, a reorganization plan automatically takes effect unless either body of the Congress disapproves the plan within 60 days after it has been submitted. As I understand it, there are only two ways for a reorganization plan to come to the floor of the House. First, and the most usual way, is for the legislative committee considering the plan to send a disapproving resolution to the House. If this resolution is voted down, the House in effect has registered its approval. Two negatives make a positive.

If the legislative committee fails to take the necessary action to send a disapproving resolution to the floor, any Member may move to discharge the committee. If the motion carries, there is an opportunity for the House to consider fully the merits of the reorganization plan. If the motion is voted down, the House has no such opportunity. I believe that this body is entitled to pass upon the merits of plan No. 7 and since approval of the motion before us is the only means of accomplishing this I will vote for it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss the background of plan No. 7.

The American merchant marine and the foreign commerce of the United States which is conducted over water are primarily regulated by two acts and the amendments to these acts which have been made over the course of the last 35 years. Known as the Shipping Act of 1916 and the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, these two laws dealing with different subject matter, arose out of different circumstances, and seek to accomplish vastly different objectives.

The Shipping Act of 1916, the object of which was to protect the American public against certain predatory economic practices of the shipping companies, was enacted as a result of a series of hearings before the Alexander committee of the House, which uncovered widespread economic conspiracies, violations of the antitrust laws, and collusive practices, all in flagrant violation of both the spirit and the letter of the

laws of our free enterprise system. Under the Shipping Act, certain kinds of agreements were made illegal, and many other agreements were to be permitted—presumably because of the demands of international competition—only when they had been filed and approved by a newly established regulatory agency, the U.S. Shipping Board.

During the First World War, however, and in the economic expansion which followed the war, it became clear that the domestic shipping industry was not able, even when protected by governmentally permitted anticompetitive agreements, to provide adequate service to the country. Congress realized that something else had to be done to promote the industry, and a series of stopgap measures were enacted from 1920 through 1933 which finally culminated in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, the object of which was to promote the merchant marine by establishing Federal subsidies for the construction and operation of American vessels.

By the end of the Second World War, it had again become apparent that even these laws were inadequate. The administration of a huge subsidy program combined with the other strenuous efforts being made by the Maritime Commission to insure the continued existence of a healthy domestic industry had resulted in a situation in which virtually no time, attention, or money was being spent on the vitally important regulatory activities ordered by the Shipping Act of 1916. The Commission had become merely the handmaiden of the industry, faithfully administering the promotional legislation of 1936 while the regulatory 1916 legislation was allowed to literally wither on the vine.

It was with this situation in mind that President Truman recommended the reorganization of 1950, which, in recognition of the need for a separation between regulatory and promotional bodies, brought about the system which prevails today: a Federal Maritime Board charged with making subsidy contracts and regulating the industry, and a Maritime Administration charged with administering the subsidy contracts.

It cannot be denied that the separation of functions which President Truman sought to accomplish was highly desirable. It has become clear, however, in the 3-year study conducted by the Celler subcommittee, that President Truman's plan did not fully accomplish its goal. Under the reorganization plan which has now been submitted by President Kennedy, this separation will be accomplished.

The gist of Reorganization Plan No. 7 is that the Shipping Act of 1916 and the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 will each be administered by a different agency: The Maritime Administration will be responsible for the latter and a newly created Federal Maritime Commission for the former. Under the proposal, the Federal Maritime Commission will regulate, and the Maritime Administration will promote.

The need for effective regulation of the industry—and the virtual impossibility of achieving this regulation under

the present organizational setup—was dramatically demonstrated over and over again in the hearings before the Celler subcommittee. The subcommittee uncovered cases in which American lines have conspired with foreign shippers to violate laws of foreign governments; cases in which American companies have charged our Government 50 percent more than they charge private individuals for the same services; and vast plots, involving secret meetings, burned correspondence, and foreign agents, designed to evidence a "blood-thirsty price war" and thereby trick the U.S. Supreme Court into a favorable decision on a pending case; all for the first time discovered by the Celler subcommittee, instead of having been uprooted in the normal course of affairs by the properly designated regulatory body. The 10,000 pages of hearings set forth hundreds of examples of this kind of conspiracy, all of which are against our laws and most of which have been completely neglected by the forces of authority which should be responsible for regulation.

Under the President's proposal, the Federal Maritime Commission would have no other responsibility than the enforcement of the laws which prohibit illegal and conspiratorial agreements such as those I just described. The granting of subsidy contracts, which alone with regulatory authority is now in the hands of the Maritime Board, would be turned over to the Maritime Administration, which would thereby become responsible for all aspects of the subsidy program, instead of merely the administrative aspects, as is now the case. The splitting of functions and conflicts of responsibility which have characterized the administration of the maritime law since 1936 would finally be brought to a halt.

Neither the President, the Merchant Marine Committee, nor the Antitrust Subcommittee believe that this change is a panacea which will eliminate all the problems of the merchant marine. Problems will undoubtedly remain, and it may be a long time before the regulatory functions of the Maritime Commission will be conducted with diligence and dispatch. One thing is sure, however, and that is that this plan will be a long step in the direction of insuring that an industry vital to our national welfare will be regulated in a manner consistent with the best interests of the American people.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the motion to discharge the committee from further consideration of the resolution.

The question was taken, and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 184, nays 218, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 118]

YEAS—184

Abbitt	Durno	Minshall
Adair	Dwyer	Moore
Andersen,	Ellsworth	Moorehead,
Minn.	Fenton	Ohio
Anderson, Ill.	Findley	Morse
Arends	Flynt	Norblad
Ashbrook	Ford	Nygaard
Ashley	Forrester	O'Konski
Auchincloss	Frelinghuysen	Osmers
Avery	Fulton	Ostertag
Ayres	Garland	Pelly
Baker	Gavin	Pilcher
Baldwin	Glenn	Pillion
Barry	Goodell	Pirnie
Bass, N.H.	Gooding	Poff
Bates	Griffin	Quie
Battin	Gross	Ray
Becker	Gubser	Reece
Beermann	Hagan, Ga.	Reifel
Belcher	Haley	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bell	Hall	Riehlman
Bennett, Mich.	Halleck	Riley
Berry	Halpern	Robison
Betts	Harrison, Wyo.	Rogers, Tex.
Blitch	Harsha	Rousselot
Boggs	Harvey, Ind.	St. George
Bolton	Harvey, Mich.	Schadeberg
Bray	Hiestand	Schenck
Bromwell	Hoeven	Scherer
Broomfield	Hoffman, Ill.	Schneebell
Brown	Hoffman, Mich.	Schwicker
Broyhill	Horan	Scranton
Bruce	Hosmer	Seely-Brown
Byrnes, Wis.	Jensen	Short
Cahill	Johansen	Shriver
Cederberg	Jonas	Sibal
Chamberlain	Judd	Siler
Chelf	Kearns	Smith, Calif.
Chenoweth	Keith	Smith, Va.
Chlperfield	King, N.Y.	Springer
Church	Kitchin	Stafford
Clancy	Knox	Stephens
Collier	Kunkel	Taber
Colmer	Kyl	Teague, Calif.
Conte	Laird	Thomson, Wis.
Corbett	Landrum	Tollefson
Cramer	Langen	Tuck
Cunningham	Latta	Utt
Curtin	Lennon	Van Pelt
Curtis, Mass.	Lindsay	Van Zandt
Curtis, Mo.	Lipscomb	Wallhauser
Dague	McCulloch	Weaver
Davis,	McDonough	Westland
James C.	McIntire	Whalley
Davis, John W.	McVey	Wharton
Derouian	Mailliard	Whitten
Derwinski	Martin, Nebr.	Whitall
Devine	Mathias	Wilson, Calif.
Dole	May	Wilson, Ind.
Dominick	Meador	Winstead
Dooley	Michel	Younger
Dorn	Miller, N.Y.	
Dowdy	Milliken	

NAYS—218

Abernethy	Cohelan	Gary
Addabbo	Cook	Gathings
Addonizio	Cooley	Gialmo
Albert	Corman	Gilbert
Alexander	Daddario	Granahan
Andrews	Daniels	Grant
Anfuso	Davis, Tenn.	Gray
Ashmore	Dawson	Griffiths
Aspinall	Dent	Hagen, Calif.
Baring	Denton	Hansen
Barrett	Diggs	Harding
Beckworth	Dingell	Hardy
Bennett, Fla.	Donohue	Harris
Blatnik	Downing	Harrison, Va.
Boland	Doyle	Hays
Bolling	Dulski	Healey
Bonner	Edmondson	Hechler
Boykin	Elliott	Hemphill
Brademas	Everett	Henderson
Breeding	Ewins	Holland
Brewster	Fallon	Holtzman
Brooks, La.	Farbstein	Huddleston
Brooks, Tex.	Fascell	Hull
Buckley	Feighan	Ichord, Mo.
Burke, Ky.	Finnegan	Ikard, Tex.
Burke, Mass.	Fisher	Inouye
Burleson	Flood	Jarman
Byrne, Pa.	Fogarty	Jennings
Carey	Fountain	Joelson
Casey	Frazier	Johnson, Calif.
Celler	Friedel	Johnson, Md.
Clark	Gallagher	Johnson, Wis.
Coad	Garmatz	Jones, Ala.

Jones, Mo.	Morgan	Rostenkowski
Karsten	Morris	Roush
Karsh	Morrison	Rutherford
Kastenmeier	Moss	Ryan
Kelly	Moulder	St. Germain
Keogh	Multer	Saund
Kilday	Murphy	Saylor
Kilgore	Murray	Schwengel
King, Calif.	Natcher	Selden
King, Utah	Nix	Sheppard
Kirwan	Norrell	Shipley
Kluczynski	O'Brien, Ill.	Sikes
Kornegay	O'Brien, N.Y.	Sisk
Kowalski	O'Hara, Ill.	Slack
Lane	O'Hara, Mich.	Smith, Iowa
Lankford	Olsen	Smith, Miss.
Lesinski	O'Neill	Spence
Libonati	Passman	Staggers
Loser	Patman	Steed
McCormack	Perkins	Stratton
McDowell	Peterson	Stubblefield
McFall	Pfost	Sullivan
McSween	Philbin	Taylor
Macdonald	Pike	Thomas
Machrowicz	Poage	Thompson, Tex.
Mack	Powell	Thornberry
Madden	Price	Toll
Magnuson	Pucinski	Trimble
Mahon	Rabaut	Udall, Morris K.
Marshall	Rains	Ullman
Matthews	Randall	Vanik
Merrow	Reuss	Vinson
Miller, Clem	Rhodes, Pa.	Watts
Miller,	Rivers, Alaska	Whitener
George P.	Rivers, S.C.	Wickersham
Mills	Rodino	Willis
Moeller	Rogers, Colo.	Yates
Monagan	Rogers, Fla.	Young
Montoya	Rooney	Zablocki
Moorhead, Pa.	Roosevelt	Zelenko

NOT VOTING—35

Alford	Hollifield	Santangelo
Alger	Kee	Scott
Bailey	Kilburn	Shelley
Bass, Tenn.	McMillan	Teague, Tex.
Bow	MacGregor	Thompson, La.
Cannon	Martin, Mass.	Thompson, N.J.
Delaney	Mason	Tupper
Fino	Mosher	Walter
Green, Oreg.	Nelsen	Weis
Green, Pa.	Roberts	Williams
Hébert	Roudebush	Wright
Herlong		

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Santangelo against.

Mr. Alford for, with Mr. Hollifield against.

Mr. Williams for, with Mr. Shelley against.

Mr. Bow for, with Mr. Delaney against.

Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Thompson of New Jersey against.

Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Bailey against.

Mr. Herlong for, with Mrs. Kee against.

Mr. Scott for, with Mr. Walter against.

Mr. Martin of Massachusetts for, with Mrs. Green of Oregon against.

Mr. Mosher for, with Mr. Green of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Roudebush for, with Mr. Roberts against.

Mr. MacGregor for, with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Wright with Mrs. Weis.

Mr. McMillan with Mr. Tupper.

Mr. Cannon with Mr. Nelson.

Mr. Bass of Tennessee with Mr. Alger.

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may be permitted to extend their remarks in the body of the RECORD on the motion just acted on prior to the vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills, a joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1182. An act to create the Wyandotte National Wildlife Refuge;

H.R. 1336. An act for the relief of Anna Catania Puglisi;

H.R. 1379. An act for the relief of the dependents or estate of Carroll O. Switzer;

H.R. 1383. An act for the relief of Hyacinth Louise Miller;

H.R. 1390. An act for the relief of Jung Ngon Woon;

H.R. 1391. An act for the relief of Mrs. Wong Lau Sau Kam;

H.R. 1486. An act for the relief of Mrs. Vicenta A. Messer;

H.R. 1499. An act for the relief of Manuel Nido;

H.R. 1699. An act for the relief of Nick George Boudoures;

H.R. 1704. An act for the relief of Lee Shee Woon;

H.R. 1706. An act for the relief of Adela Michiko Flores;

H.R. 1891. An act for the relief of Engineer First Class William J. Stevens;

H.R. 1903. An act for the relief of Mrs. Amina Youssif Cosino (nee Simaan);

H.R. 2354. An act for the relief of Mr. Louis Fischer, Feger Seafoods, and Mr. and Mrs. Thomas R. Stuart;

H.R. 2674. An act for the relief of Eva Nowik;

H.R. 2750. An act to provide for the relief of certain enlisted members of the Air Force;

H.R. 7454. An act consenting to the amendment of the compact between the States of Pennsylvania and Ohio relating to Pymatuning Lake;

H.J. Res. 463. Joint resolution to extend through June 30, 1962, the life of the U.S. Citizens Commission on North Atlantic Treaty Organization; and

H. Con. Res. 353. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Clerk of the House to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 6874.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6874) entitled "An act to authorize the appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction of facilities, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY, JULY 24

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I promised yesterday that Reorganization Plans 6 and 7 would be brought up today; but apparently plan No. 6 is not coming up.

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

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY NEXT WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON SPECIAL PROJECTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCRANTON], is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SCRANTON. Mr. Speaker, this is the first of a series of discussions on unemployment in the dynamic American economy, a project of the House Republican Policy Committee's Special Committee on Special Projects. This special committee is under the leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], and the eminent gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES]. The discussion this afternoon lays out for consideration by the House of Representatives community efforts in meeting the problem of unemployment. There are so many different phases of this aspect of this great and grave problem of unemployment, and they revolve around so many different difficulties that almost every community with unemployment in the United States has a special problem.

Specifically, there are the problems of finance, of sites, of public utilities, of skilled labor, of housing, of recreation facilities, of labor and management relationships, of education, of transportation and many others, of course. It is possible to point out many varied types of communities throughout the United States which have handled problems of this sort or which are handling them under circumstances of specific cases of unemployment. For example, there were a number of different localities which sent representatives to the Banking and Currency Committee this spring to testify on the types of work that they are doing.

In southern Illinois a number of small towns have set up community organizations to help finance and bring in new industry. In West Virginia, the hardest struck of all the States of the Union with the problems of unemployment, the city of Huntington has done a remarkable job and is doing so with a retraining program for those who are out of work.

Mr. Speaker, likewise the city of Wheeling has done an astounding job, both financial and from other aspects, and it was our honor and privilege to have had the cooperation of Prof. Bruno Hartung, of Wheeling College, who has presented a paper on the subject of what that community has done in this respect.

In the State of Pennsylvania there are innumerable communities where the

people have fostered special community organizations for financing projects which have brought new industries to these areas, and thereby ridding the areas of certain amounts of unemployment.

We all remember not many years ago the establishment in Toledo of a labor-management relations committee which did so much to solve their industrial problems.

The small towns are not left out of this very interesting procedure that is taking place all over the United States on a community basis. The small town of Tupelo, Miss., for example, has done an extraordinary job by citizens getting together and helping to eradicate an unfavorable economic condition.

Specifically, today it is my honor to present to this House the job that is being done in my own county of Lackawanna, Pa. This is an outstanding one and, incidentally, the first that was devised after World War II.

This community has a mining background and, of course, we have a tremendous loss of employment as either the anthracite coal has been depleted or the market for it has deteriorated. As a result, there have been many decades of decline in this industry, which has resulted in a situation where, when once as many as 45,000 people were employed in the anthracite mining business, now only about 1,000 are working in the mines.

The citizens of that area, as did so many other communities around the Nation as a whole, particularly after World War II, gathered together and formed community industrial development associations. These have recently been combined into one such organization in Lackawanna County—LIFE. This is done as it is in other places primarily by three resources: First, and foremost, by the people themselves getting together and forming such an organization. Second, by the use of these people of under their own power going out and doing a job of raising money. Altogether in that small area a little over \$5.5 million has been raised for this purpose. Then with this money they are able to organize internally. They take the money and use it and bring to that area new industries to take care of the constant decline in unemployment in the anthracite industry.

The result of this remarkable experiment over some 15 years has been that with this money, a little over \$5.5 million, some 33 industrial buildings have been built, costing approximately \$20 million. There has been help, of course, from the local banks and other organizations who are interested in such community development. Some 10,000 people in these 33 plants are now at work who otherwise would have no jobs.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks a statement and a number of charts and tables indicating some of the work that has been done in this area.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

THE STORY OF LACKAWANNA COUNTY

I. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF AREA ECONOMY

Early economic trends

Economic growth in Lackawanna County, as in all of the northeastern Pennsylvania anthracite region of which it is a part, was from the very early years of its development largely dependent upon the mining of hard coal. Anthracite production enjoyed a tremendous boom between 1890 and 1917, when it reached the rate of 100 million tons yearly in the five-county hard coal region. In those 27 years over 2 billion tons of coal were mined and the population of the region mushroomed as the result of a high birth rate and an influx of migrants seeking jobs.

The boom begins to fade

Since 1917, however, except for the World War II period, the production of hard coal in the region has declined almost steadily. Present output is less than 25 percent of what it was at the 1917 peak. For many decades the mining industry was the single biggest employer in Lackawanna County. Mine employment reached its peak in 1930 with about 39,000 workers employed in the industry. This dropped to about 12,200 in 1950 and to about 1,200 in 1961. The decrease in mine employment in Lackawanna County was sharper than in other sections of the anthracite region because of the earlier depletion of the Lackawanna coal reserves which were in thicker, more easily mined veins than in some other parts of the region where mining developed at a later date.

Hard times hit Lackawanna County

The greatest decline in the county's mining industry occurred during the depression years of the 1930's when some 24,000 miners lost their jobs. These losses, plus the general depressed condition of business, coincided with entrance into the labor force of about 8,000 new workers who were born during the high birth rate period of 1910-20.

As a result, by 1940 nearly one out of every three members of the county work force was out of a job.

The community fights back

As World War II drew to a close, clear-thinking leaders of the community realized that it would be futile for the community to indulge in fools' gold hopes that coal mining would ever again be able to support the area economy. Rapid diversification of industry was needed to keep communities in Lackawanna County from becoming a series of ghost towns. The world-famous Scranton plan and other industrial development corporations were born to pull the area up by its bootstraps.

These industrial development plans, financed by funds contributed by area residents and bolstered by mortgage financing provided by a credit pool of local banks, offered industry 100 percent financing for new plants. The community built the plants and offered them to industry on attractive lease-purchase terms.

Between 1940 and 1953, resident industrial employment in Lackawanna County more than doubled, increasing by an estimated 16,600 persons. This more than offset the loss of some 10,000 resident jobs in the mining industry. About 81 percent of the industrial expansion took place between 1940 and 1950 mainly in the textile and metal industries.

However, since 1953, after the Korean war buildup ceased, manufacturing employment fell off from 32,300 to 29,700 jobs in 1958. Combined with the continued decrease in mining employment, this resulted in a net decrease of some 9,300 jobs in this 5-year period.

In the two decades from 1940 to 1960, manufacturing employment increased from 18,000 in 1940 to 29,900 in 1960, or an average yearly gain of 595 jobs. In the same period, mining jobs decreased from 17,900 in 1940 to 2,800 in 1960, or an average yearly decline of 755 jobs.

II. DEVELOPMENT OF LOCAL EFFORT

The Scranton-Lackawanna effort to achieve industrial diversification was born in 1945 under what is collectively known as the Scranton plan, a program involving three corporations separate in organization but alike in dedication—to bring new payrolls to the area. The Scranton Chamber of Commerce is the promotional agency and administrator of the collective effort.

The Scranton Plan Corp. and Scranton Lackawanna Industrial Building Co. (Slibco) were formed in 1945. The former raised \$1,200,000 through the sale to area residents and enterprises of first mortgage bonds to buy a Government-built war plant for the Murray Corp. of America. In the same year, Slibco sold \$1,900,000 of 4-percent debenture bonds to the public and currently holds title to, and is the building agency of all plants erected under the development program.

Lackawanna Industrial Fund Enterprises (Life), a nonprofit corporation, was formed in 1950 and has, in two fund drives, received approximately \$2,500,000 in outright donations from approximately 50,000 individuals, firms, and industries in Lackawanna County. This company has supplied Slibco with the capital needed in its building operations. A merger between Life and Slibco with Life as the surviving corporation has just been completed. This results in Life being the only countywide community industrial development corporation in Lackawanna County.

The area's industrial building program is financed in the following manner: First, an acceptable industry tenant is secured and a lease or agreement to lease is signed. Life-Slibco provides 20 percent of the construction cost, the Scranton Bank Credit Pool provides 50 percent, and the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority the remaining 30 percent. The continuity and the success of the Scranton plan may be found in the willingness of local banks to work hand in hand with the community industrial development agencies.

As evidence of the capital resources available to these industrial development agencies, a consolidated statement of Life and Slibco and the Scranton plan is submitted. The statement shows that a substantial amount of funds are presently invoiced in Life-Slibco buildings. None of the funds have ever been given away as inducements to industrial firms to locate in the area, with the result that the return from interest received in investments in community-built plants from 1945 to 1960 has been added to the original fund for further reinvestment in new plants.

The sound financial condition of these industrial development agencies is a tribute to the leadership personnel. The membership in Life, consisting of approximately 100 individuals, is a cross section of all phases of community life. Included are bankers, labor leaders, commercial and industrial executives, and representatives of government, the professions, and the clergy. Among the board of directors of Slibco and Life, are representatives of business, labor, and the professions.

III. SUMMARY

Whereas various governmental bodies and agencies, State and Federal, are in a position to assist local communities to meet the problem of unemployment, nevertheless, the

ultimate effort to put the unemployed back to work is primarily a local or community one. Whatever the particular need of the community may be, e.g., finance, sites, public utilities, skilled labor, housing, recreation or cultural facilities, labor-management relations, education, transportation—no matter how much assistance comes from government, without local effort and participation, and a community eagerness to solve the problem, the need is not fulfilled.

Leaders of industry have stated over and over again that an essential for new plant location is a favorable community spirit or atmosphere. Community efforts of the types described here, carried forward with vigor and imagination, are the final answer to frictional and structural unemployment.

In essence, this community effort is based on individuals joining together, dedicated to

stamp out unemployment. This can be done through community development corporations, supported by every segment of the community.

Mr. George McLean of Tupelo, Miss., testified before the Banking and Currency Committee with reference to the Area Development Act. His testimony pinpoints another community effort to eradicate unemployment, this time a small community in the South, and asserts the basic need of local effort to solve the problem. I quote from his testimony:

"In the 13 years from 1948 through 1960 we have spent more than a quarter of a million dollars in industrial development trying to increase the employment of our people. We have floated bonds for over \$2½ million under Mississippi balance-with-industry plan. We have invested more than

a quarter of a million dollars in rural development and general community development. In addition, we have bought stock and debentures to help local enterprises, and to provide working capital for new and existing enterprises. Nearly \$4 million has been invested by local people in these enterprises.

"We firmly believe that the starting point for any program of this type is people as the basic ingredient. We do not stress projects, programs, professional leadership, nor organization—we put our trust in people.

"We say to our people that there is no Santa Claus. There is no Santa Claus at Washington, at the State capital, at the State college, or at the local county seat, who can hand the good life to them. The people who live in the community and love it must assume their own responsibilities and take advantage of their God-given opportunities."

New industries, community financed

Plant	Date	Size (square feet)	Construction cost	Employment	Plant	Date	Size (square feet)	Construction cost	Employment
Scranton plan:					LIFE-Slibco—Continued				
Murray Corp. (Eljer).....	1946	550,000	\$4,340,380	950	Poloron Products, Inc.....	1950	135,500	\$575,691	1,510
Warehouse.....	1947	100,000	389,000		Dearborn Glass Co.....	1951	55,000	276,835	260
Slibco:					W. L. Maxson Corp. No. 1.....	1952	100,000	549,759	1,553
C. & D. Sportswear.....	1946	21,000	99,700	134	Daystrom Instrument Corp.....	1953	350,000	3,881,000	1,540
Royal Miss (manufacturers sportswear).....	1946	40,000	122,102	135	W. L. Maxson Corp. No. 2.....	1953	50,000	287,961	
Walitt & Bond, Inc.....	1947	50,000	425,327	528	Anemostat Corp. of America.....	1961	163,000	1,200,000	300
LIFE-Slibco:					El-Tronics Co. (now Piasecki Aircraft Corp.).....	1954	67,000	386,213	100
Golo of Dunmore.....	1946	50,000	205,700	276	Luce Luggage Co., Inc.....	1955	94,000	507,571	70
Billig Shoe Co., Inc.....	1947	55,000	283,125	427	Consolidated Molded Products.....	1956	71,000	445,142	125
Parker Textile Co.....	1947	32,600	138,632	98	Chrysler Corp.....	1957	200,000	1,052,835	415
The Crown Corp.....	1947	26,000	72,353	248	Precision Engineering.....	1956	15,000	202,136	10
Harris Hub Bed & Spring Co. (Now Suckle Electronics Co.).....	1947	125,000	420,000	107	Fab-Weld Corp.....	1957	100,000	165,554	160
Scranton Battery Corp.....	1947	49,000	197,924	75	Associated Transport, Inc.....	1959	60,000	550,000	400
Superior Fireproof Door & Sash Co.....	1947	75,000	411,485	250	Roovers-Lotsch, Old Forge.....	1959	28,900	183,000	100
Douglas Shoe Co. (now Prudential Insurance Co.).....	1947	61,000	251,519	90	Eastern Wood Products.....	1960	57,510	338,000	125
The Trane Co.....	1948	192,600	902,320	465	Continental Cigar.....	1961	45,300	375,000	150
Mayflower Shoe Case Co.....	1949	48,200	205,322	169	Shell No. 18.....	1959	92,000	550,000	250
Sturdi-Wear, Inc.....	1950	48,000	180,000	200					
					Total.....		3,209,610	20,171,586	10,220

¹ At high point.

² Estimate.

Slibco-LIFE-Scranton plan consolidated balance sheet as of Apr. 30, 1961

	Slibco	LIFE	Scranton plan	Eliminations	Consolidated		Slibco	LIFE	Scranton plan	Eliminations	Consolidated
Assets:						Liabilities—Continued					
Current assets:						Current liabilities—Con.					
Cash, in bank.....	\$59,988	\$234,773	\$5,544		\$300,305	Accrued real estate taxes.....	\$13,682				\$13,682
Bond redemption.....	31		8,413		8,444	Total, current liabilities.....	24,993	\$2,212			27,205
U.S. Treasury bills.....		296,114	54,251		350,365	Fixed liabilities:					
Accounts receivable.....	15,728	2,212			17,940	Notes payable, LIFE.....	1,467,000			\$1,467,000	
Notes receivable.....		1,467,000		\$1,467,000		Mortgages payable:					
Rents receivable.....	24,984				24,984	Banks.....	1,233,050				1,233,050
Total, current assets.....	100,731	2,000,099	68,208		702,038	Insurance companies.....	580,091				580,091
Fixed assets:						SBA.....	32,924				32,924
Buildings, net of deposits.....	5,663,911				5,633,911	PIDA.....	727,020				727,020
Land.....	327,033				327,033	1st mortgage bonds.....			\$8,400		8,400
Total, fixed assets.....	5,990,944				5,990,944	Debenture bonds.....	831,600			240,800	590,800
Other assets:						Total, fixed liabilities.....	4,871,685		8,400		3,172,285
Mortgage receivable.....	73,566				73,566	Other liabilities: Subscriptions to bonds.....	117,000				117,000
Subscriptions receivable.....	107,732				107,732	Total, other liabilities.....	117,000				117,000
Pledges receivable, net Slibco bonds.....		552,678	1,000	240,800	552,678	Deferred credits: Interest income on construction.....	26,324				26,324
Securities.....		200			200	Total, deferred credits.....	26,324				26,324
Total, other assets.....	181,298	792,678	1,000		734,176	Total, liabilities.....	5,040,002	2,212	8,400		3,342,814
Deferred and prepaid assets:						Capital and surplus:					
Real-estate tax escrow.....	13,459		1,200		14,958	Residue against sale of assets.....	842,231				842,231
Insurance escrow.....	8,056				8,056	Pledges receivable 1959 net.....		552,678			552,678
Prepaid real-estate taxes.....	19,447				19,447	Capital stock.....	1,004		1,000		2,004
Total, deferred and prepaid assets.....	40,962		1,200		42,162	Capital and donated surplus.....	33,532	2,134,340			2,167,872
Total, assets.....	6,313,935	2,792,777	70,408	1,707,800	7,460,320	Earned surplus.....	397,166	103,547	61,008		561,721
Liabilities:						Total, capital and surplus.....	1,273,933	2,790,565	62,008		4,126,506
Current liabilities:						Total, liabilities and capital.....	6,313,935	2,792,777	70,408	1,707,800	7,460,320
Accounts payable.....	3,548	2,212			5,761						
Deferred interests, Clideo.....	2,066				2,066						
Accrued interest on bonds.....	5,696				5,696						

Mr. SCRANTON. Accordingly, the point I want to make this afternoon specifically is this: It is perfectly possible, in fact it is essential, in order to eradicate unemployment throughout the Nation where it exists in a dynamic economy, for the local people to join together to develop community organizations, to eradicate these particular sore points that are causing difficulty and the unemployment that goes with it, because with such development there comes a spirit within the community which is itself an enticement to new industry and new jobs. Community efforts of the type I have briefly outlined this afternoon, carried forward with vigor and enthusiasm, are the final answers to both frictional and structural unemployment.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRANTON. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I want to compliment the gentleman on the work he has done in this area. I think it would be appropriate to call the attention of the House and particularly those who will read these studies that the gentleman is putting in the *Record*, the one regarding Wheeling, W. Va., and, of course, the work done in Lackawanna County, in Scranton, to the fact that I know the gentleman himself has played a great part in the work done in Scranton, Pa., and Lackawanna.

The point I should like to ask the gentleman to develop is this: Here we are at the Federal level. In what area has the Federal Government assisted in the work done in Lackawanna County, and where, in the gentleman's judgment, would further help have been meaningful in the work that was done in Scranton and possibly these other areas? Would the gentleman develop that a little bit?

Mr. SCRANTON. In the course of the development of these community organizations and their work there has been assistance from both the State and the Federal Governments in these respects.

Both the Department of Commerce and the Department of Labor have done certain work which has been very helpful from two or three standpoints. In the first place, they have clearly made statistics available on unemployment and on the problems of unemployment, and also on what is needed to offset such difficulties. There has never been, to the best of my knowledge, any direct assistance in the form of financial help or otherwise. From the standpoint of the State of Pennsylvania, that is not true. Primarily emanating from the work that was done in our area, a bill which passed the State legislature allows for part of the mortgage money that is used to build these buildings to come from a State organization. But the National Government, except from the standpoint of statistical effort and a considerable amount of sympathy, has rendered comparatively little help so far. With the Area Development Act, it is hoped, and I think it will eventually materialize, there is a possibility of obtaining more financial help which is needed

now that the local community has done so much.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRANTON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I call attention to the studies of the Holland subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor which was recently completed in the area of retraining. One of the points I was hoping would be developed in that subcommittee was the work that the Department of Labor could be doing and possibly has to some degree in simply gathering together what information exists throughout the country as to what is being done such as in Scranton, Pa., and being a clearinghouse of that information so that it would be available to other communities. I was wondering if in your work in Scranton, Pa., you had utilized the Department of Labor in that fashion.

Mr. SCRANTON. The Department of Labor has given us the usual type of statistical information which they give to all communities with regard to the status of unemployment. We have recently requested of them information which would help us to get vital statistics on labor management problems, because this is a problem in our area as well. So far we have received some information but not enough to make it thoroughly useful. There is no doubt in my mind, and I am sure there is none in the minds of people who have been in the forefront on this in our area, that both the Department of Labor and the Department of Commerce can be and could be of great assistance, particularly from an informational standpoint because this is something that we can use. I am hopeful that this will occur and we are making efforts to obtain such information.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Returning to the area of the Department of Education, which has the jurisdiction over vocational education and Federal aid, did the Department of Education serve of value in the area of Federal assistance to vocational education in the work done in Scranton?

Mr. SCRANTON. The Department of Education in Washington was not of any material assistance in this. The Department of Labor and Industry of the State of Pennsylvania has done a good job in setting up a vocational retraining program.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, at this point in my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to include a letter from the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Goldberg, dated May 12, 1961, addressed to Mr. Donald H. Ackerman, Jr., staff director of the Republican policy committee and staff director of this study on employment that we are conducting. This letter sets forth some of the areas in which the Department of Labor has been gathering statistics and what information is being developed in the States on certain communities. I think it is a basic document that will be very helpful in these studies that we are conducting.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The letter is as follows:

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
Washington, May 12, 1961.

Mr. DONALD H. ACKERMAN, JR.,
Staff Director, Republican Policy Committee,
U. S. House of Representatives, Wash-
ington, D. C.

DEAR Mr. ACKERMAN: This is in further reply to your inquiry of April 18 requesting information relating to geographical skill surpluses and shortages for use in your long-range study on employment. As previously noted, the Bureau of Employment Security and its affiliated State agencies develop considerable occupational information on manpower requirements and labor supply. These products of the employment security system, geared primarily to meeting community manpower problems and the operating needs of local public employment offices, furnish significant current and long-range data on available skills and the types of workers in demand in specific labor market areas and the Nation.

Some 45 State employment security agencies, with the technical assistance of this Bureau, are engaged in a program of collecting, analyzing, and publishing State and local job opportunities information. Area skills surveys, providing information on the occupational composition of current employment, anticipated requirements, labor supply and related data, are completed or in progress in more than 40 States. These surveys, relating local manpower resources to current and anticipated employment opportunities (generally including needs 2 and 5 years hence), usually include studies of demand and supply in skilled, professional, and other key occupations in the community. In most instances, the consideration of demand and supply in selected occupations has included an evaluation of the output of qualified manpower from area training facilities, including colleges and technical institutes, as well as apprenticeship and other in-plant program. Area skill surveys are particularly useful to a community in providing needed information for directing local educational and training objectives. Copies of the San Diego, Dallas, and Tucson skill surveys, as well as a listing of such studies prepared, in progress or planned, are being forwarded under separate cover.

In addition, 33 State employment security agencies have published or are preparing guides for separate occupations or occupational fields, aided, in many instances, by information made available through the area skill survey program. These guides contain basic information on the job content, employment outlook and other economic factors associated with the occupation.

Industry manpower surveys present analyses of labor market developments, the current employment situation and job outlook for the next 6 months in selected industries. They are based primarily upon establishment manpower reports collected by local offices of the State employment security agencies, supplemented by information from other government, industry, and related sources. These surveys include information on occupational shortages and other manpower recruitment problems.

Three other reports prepared in this Bureau provide additional significant information on occupational labor needs.

CURRENT LABOR MARKET CONDITIONS IN ENGINEERING, SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL OCCUPATIONS

This report was initiated at the request of the National Science Foundation and the President's Committee on Scientists and Engineers. The report has been based prima-

rily on special bimonthly analyses of current conditions in the 30 largest major labor market areas and on statewide statistics on job openings for these occupations which have been placed in interarea clearance by public employment offices. Information has also been developed from other sources, such as departments of the Federal Government, university placement services, and professional societies.

AREA LABOR MARKET TRENDS

This Bureau's bimonthly Area Labor Market Trends" bulletin regularly contains a national roundup of area labor market developments and short-term employment prospects, including the current occupational demand-supply situation. The local labor market reports on which this survey is based provide a manpower demand and supply analysis, including considerable occupational detail regarding job openings and the composition of the unemployed, for the Nation's principal industrial centers and many smaller areas of substantial labor surplus.

QUARTERLY SURVEY OF LOCAL OCCUPATIONAL SHORTAGES

This quarterly analysis is based on inventories of job openings which are published every 2 weeks by all State employment security agencies. The openings listed in these inventories represent a compilation of jobs for which there is not an adequate supply of local workers and employers are willing to recruit out-of-area applicants. While all local occupational shortages are not reflected in these figures, the inventory listings of these openings placed in clearance (a process of matching workers in one area with jobs in other areas), nevertheless, provide a good indication of the relative volume, trend, and types of occupational shortages.

Yours sincerely,

ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG,
Secretary of Labor.

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

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

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania is making a very definite contribution here to the efforts of those of us who are confronted with a tremendously high unemployment situation at the present time.

I would like to share with you an experience we enjoyed just last week, the answer partially at least to the question: What is being done on the Federal level? Seven or eight counties in my district have been labeled depressed areas qualified for assistance under the Area Redevelopment Act. We have had excellent cooperation from the Commerce Department, from the Agriculture Department, and also from HEW, in efforts to pinpoint the problems in all these communities. We spent a solid day in each county. These men were able to see the problems. They met then with the community leaders and offered their advice and assistance in helping them arrive at some solution.

I think there has been excellent cooperation on the part of various governmental agencies. The gentleman, however, made one statement that should be emphasized, and that is that every community must face up to and recognize that it is community leadership and effort on the part of the community to solve their problems that counts. Without that leadership, Gov-

ernment assistance is going to be of no avail.

Mr. SCRANTON. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. SCRANTON. I yield.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I believe it might be helpful to the gentleman in clarifying the situation to point out that the gentleman from Pennsylvania used his home area, Lackawanna County, as an example. I am sure the experience of the Chicago Heights, Ill., area in my district will be of interest, where a local group did an effective job of combating unemployment. It was a repetition of the Wheeling story. In each case we found a significant difference as well as a significant common situation, the difference being that there is definitely a different type of unemployable persons, the geographical conditions, the history, the traditions, and all those problems that go into any community district. Then there are individual problems that enter into the picture.

The greatest factors, however, are the desire, the imagination, and the leadership exercised on the part of local community leaders, that is, the public officials, the businessmen's committee, the labor union leaders, and all those groups which work together. This coordinated efficiency, this dedicated type of local community spirit has done the job which we emphasize here needs to be done in many, many communities throughout the United States.

Mr. SCRANTON. There is no doubt about it. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

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

Mr. SCRANTON. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOORE. I should like very much to acknowledge the very fair way in which the gentleman from Pennsylvania has analyzed the problem in this own particular area. It is likewise applicable to many other areas of the country. What can be done in a given situation depends to a very large extent on local government, local industry, and the desire of the people in the community to help solve their own problems. All that is contained in the survey. A part of this survey was made in the largest metropolitan area in my Congressional District, Wheeling, W. Va., and I think those who have the opportunity to read the insertion made in the Record of the work of Dr. Hartung of Wheeling College in the city of Wheeling, W. Va., realize what can be done by local development organizations, listing the aid of both Federal and local governments since 1931, and what has been done in the matter of bringing life and industry to the community. They have dwelt upon local initiative in an attempt to arrive at a suitable answer to a problem over a long number of years.

It is difficult for me to perceive, if I may ask the gentleman to yield further, where we as a community will receive a great deal of benefit from recently enacted legislation in the field of

area redevelopment, because that legislation itself attempts to give to local development organizations an initiative along with a push from the Federal Government, a giant push in some respects. Whereas we have been treating this on a local level, on a local basis, for a number of years, the undertaking has not always spelled success; but the Ohio Valley Development Corp. and the participation of local communities in an endeavor to meet the unemployment situation in my community thus far has been a successful undertaking.

I take this opportunity to applaud the local governments and local initiative in the area of Wheeling, W. Va. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SCRANTON. I thank the gentleman. We are deeply indebted to Dr. Hartung and the fine job he has done concerning the city of Wheeling. I compliment the gentleman from West Virginia himself and the leadership he has taken there.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRANTON. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his very fine presentation and for the very effective work which he has done in preparing this analysis.

Also I wish to thank the other Member participating, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI]. Also may I express my own personal appreciation to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS]. The gentleman from Missouri is not only a member of the great Committee on Ways and Means but he is also a member of the Joint Economic Committee and is, in my opinion, the foremost expert on the economics of the United States in the House of Representatives today. We are most fortunate in having his services in leading this particular discussion on reports by Republican Members, and we appreciate his efforts.

Also, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his participation.

We certainly have no desire to make this a show on one side of the aisle, and we welcome the participation of our colleagues on the Democratic side, because unemployment and the economics of the country are problems that cut across party lines, and any time a Member on the other side of the aisle desires to participate, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Missouri, I am sure, will join with me in welcoming that Member.

Mr. SCRANTON. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Speaker, the point of this entire presentation is to bring to the attention of the Members of the House and the country as a whole that community efforts are basic and essential. We are indebted to not only Dr. Hartung and the two gentlemen who are distinguished leaders of this group, but all the participants today, especially the gentleman from Ohio, the gentleman from Illinois, and the gentleman from West Virginia.

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

Mr. SCRANTON. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MATHIAS. I would like to second particularly the sentiments expressed by the gentleman from Arizona that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is doing a service to the country as a whole. The problems we are discussing today require the best brains, the best thinking, and the best efforts of all of us. As one who represents a congressional district that has two areas which are classified as areas of persistent and substantial unemployment, I have a direct interest in this matter. We have been working hard within the district, but I believe it is the thinking that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has been presenting today that will help us solve some of the common problems so that we can reach a common conclusion, and I thank the gentleman for his efforts.

Mr. SCRANTON. I thank the gentleman.

The point we are trying to make is that there are many efforts going on all over the country on a self-help community basis.

A great many of them can learn, one from the other. As a matter of fact, we have had delegations from almost every State of the union and many foreign countries to my own community to see the type of work that has been done there. An outstanding example is the very successful plan in the city of Lawrence, Mass., a city which once had the highest percentage of unemployment of any city in the Nation and which today is no longer in any of the categories set down by the Department of Labor as having unemployment of any sizable amount.

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

Mr. SCRANTON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI. It was a pleasure for me to work with the gentleman from Pennsylvania on this project. As the gentleman has explained to the House, this is the first in a series that we on this side of the aisle will present to the House entitled "Operation Employment." We have found in dealing, as we have, with numerous communities throughout the country that community effort can be extremely vital and efficient, as the gentleman has pointed out. In discussing my home area, the specific area of Chicago Heights, which we used in our studies, I would just like to review for the benefit of the Members that in approximately 7½ years this community, through a civic program, completely local in nature, attracted 23 new industries, expanded 12 existing plants, and created over 6,000 new jobs, and all of this as the result of inspired local effort. And, I am sure if the gentleman from Pennsylvania and I, with our adviser and counsel, Professor Hartung, had had the time to delve into numerous communities all over the country, we could have produced examples that often exceeded those that we present to you this afternoon. And, it is my hope that not only this afternoon but in the days to follow,

when our colleagues will participate in Operation Employment, that they do receive the attention of the Members of the House. This problem is certainly one of bipartisanship. It is certainly one that has its repercussions throughout the country and certainly one that deserves our constant attention.

Mr. SCRANTON. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I want to compliment my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCRANTON]. I know by my experience with him on the Committee on Banking and Currency that he and many of the people in his area have come to grips with this problem of unemployment. These people have done it on their own without coming to the Federal Government crying for more and more money, when they realize that this does not really solve the problem of unemployment. I think that during the period of over 15 years that our colleague [Mr. SCRANTON] has served in the local area on hard-working committees that have genuinely come to grips with this problem. Mr. SCRANTON has been instrumental in solving it and has proven that it is not necessary to have all problems of unemployment solved at the Federal level. I think he is to be complimented and I think the examples he and Mr. DERWINSKI have given here today should serve as a strong reminder to the whole country that the real problem of unemployment can best be solved at the local level. Federal money just does not hold all the answers to unemployment.

Mr. SCRANTON. I thank the gentleman very kindly.

I wish I could agree that we have completely solved the problem in our community. We have not. But, we have reached the point where unemployment from the coal industry can go no higher, because the coal industry is at its nadir in our area, and without this type of community effort, it would have been impossible to have saved some 10,000 jobs. We are hopeful of saving many more when the community effort is being made.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD at this point an article entitled "The Wheeling Story" prepared by Prof. Bruno J. Hartung of Wheeling College, Wheeling, W. Va., in which he tells in a most thorough, practical, and dramatic manner, the story of the community efforts in Wheeling, W. Va., which is one of the outstanding examples of local accomplishments in solving community problems involving chronic unemployment:

THE WHEELING STORY

In this chronicle the writer hopes to present a panorama of events depicting how

the community of Wheeling, W. Va., through civic minded groups and individuals has attempted to solve its most pressing economic and social problems. While far from complete in realizing its objectives, it nevertheless should be apparent, to even the most casual observer, that the community has made tremendous strides toward realizing its stated aims. Tragically, the pace is too slow for many as witnessed by the heavy egress of population from this area to other more economically fortunate areas in recent years. It is the writer's hope that this tragic cycle of historical events may be in the nature of a warning to other areas and that they may benefit from our experience.

Historically the community of Wheeling has benefited very early from its location at the head of deepwater navigation on the Ohio River. The location of early manufacturing plants was dependent not only on water power but also on transportation facilities. Until overland routes opened up, settlers for the most part kept to the rivers, and it was on these rivers that the first small manufacturing plants were to be found. As the westward movement gained momentum chiefly through the construction of overland routes, key cities on the route such as Wheeling were given a start toward industrial life.

Largely at the insistence of Albert Gallatin, in his famous report on internal improvements—the Congress authorized (on Mar. 29, 1806), the building of a road known as the Cumberland Road or National Road. It was completed to Wheeling, W. Va., in 1818. Basically it was a portage trail from the Potomac River at Cumberland through southwest Pennsylvania to Wheeling traversing a distance of 130 miles. At Wheeling much of the freight took to flatboats and continued down the Ohio River. The road was later completed to Vandalia, Ill., and its 834 miles provided the chief route for the settlers going west. This double advantage of being at the head of deepwater and being at the terminus of the National Pike provided unparalleled economic advantages for the location of infant industries. By 1832 a thriving industrial economy was in the making. Pottery, calico, glass, rope making, as well as tobacco products, particularly the lower priced cigars called "stogies" for "conestogas" were some of the industries which thrived. Earlier coal and limestone deposits were discovered which set the stage for the development of the iron industry and which eventually made it internationally famous as the "Nail City" and later the "Steel City."

By 1900 Wheeling was a thriving old established industrial community. During the period from 1900 to 1926 were sown the seeds of a slow economic erosion possibly because existing economic interests did not want competition or because the rich had become complacent and possibly lacked many of the more sterling qualities of their forebears. By 1926 the eastern Ohio coalfields were depleted. As a result, it has been estimated that this caused payrolls to fall from \$60 million to \$15 million. It readily became apparent that something had to be done to help the distressed community. The plea was heard when a group of civic minded merchants formed the Ohio Valley Industrial Corp., and by 1931 raised \$500,000 for the purpose of buying industrial land sites and helping distressed industries. In 1934, at the depth of the depression, the industrial development program came to an abrupt end.

During the war years the city did not attract large scale war factories and by 1947 it was again apparent that efforts were necessary to revive the economy. In 1948 the Ohio Valley Industrial Corp. was reactivated with one-half of the organizational expenses being borne by the Wheeling Steel Corp., the dominant employer in the area.

Mr. Robert Rownd was the executive director, and under his leadership an energetic campaign was launched to attract new industrial plants; however, new plants needed vast acres of land—something Wheeling did not have to offer. Ohio County's density figure—669.8—is the highest in the State of West Virginia. Thus the viewpoint developed that area development must encompass the entire metropolitan area and not only the city of Wheeling. Over a period of time, Rownd and the OVIC were able to attract several sizable plants to the immediate valley area and one new industrial plant located in the city itself.

In the post World War II years it readily became apparent that efforts had to be launched to develop civic pride which had sunk to a distressingly low point. However, the time was not yet ripe for a concerted drive on such major problems as smoke control, housing, planning, parking, and slum clearance. Not until 1950 was the necessary drive and energy forthcoming to launch an assault on these community sore spots. It was at that time that the Wheeling Civitan Club sponsored a 6-month series of programs delving into all phases of the city's problems. From these discussions evolved an idea later developed by the Wheeling Civic Clubs Association—an organization of representatives of all existing civic and service clubs in town.

These representatives met monthly to discuss and develop current community projects and problems. From these discussions evolved the Wheeling Area Conference on Community Development, whose organizational structure was patterned after the Allegheny Conference on Community Development which sparked so dramatically Pittsburgh's spectacular renaissance.

Quickly \$80,000 was raised for organizational purposes. Monthly luncheons were held at which time current and pressing problems were discussed. Expert opinion was solicited and field trips to other cities having similar problems were conducted.

Standing committees included: arterial highways, cooperation with civic organizations, cooperation with governmental units, community improvement, finance, housing and development, legal advisory, parking and traffic, public relations, schools and education, and ways and means.

The first major project on the agenda of the conference was that of smoke control, and this project resulted in a model air pollution control ordinance passed by city council in February of 1955.

Shortly after its founding the realization was forthcoming that a plan prepared by experts was necessary for long-range planning and growth.

In the year 1956, through a contribution of \$40,000, the Wheeling Area Conference hired a private consultant, Mr. Francis Dodd McHugh, to submit portions of a comprehensive community plan to the city. Mr. McHugh prepared and submitted for consideration to city officials, two plans: Land use and thoroughfare; two studies: Land utilization and natural resources and economic population; and two regulatory measures: Zoning and subdivision regulations. These plans submitted by Mr. McHugh were never adopted by city council, but have since served as a foundation and guideline that has promoted the efforts of the Wheeling Planning Commission toward a better community.

Wheeling has a nonpartisan city manager-city council form of government. Councilmen are elected at large from 11 city wards. A mayor is selected from this group of councilmen and he presides at council meetings. The mayor has no administrative powers. City council appoints a city manager who directs the administrative end of city government. Council is a legislative body.

Because of the area conference activity in the field of city planning, Wheeling's Planning Commission was revived and became an active, functioning body. For the first time it was provided with a regular annual budget and a staff to carry on the work as initiated by the McHugh studies.

Utilizing Mr. McHugh's material as a basis to start with, the planning commission undertook the job of revising his plans in order to give the city a comprehensive community plan that entails four basic plans and two regulatory measures, which are:

Plans: Land use, thoroughfare, community facilities, and public improvements.
Regulatory measures: Zoning and subdivision.

The planning commission has since completed and city council adopted the land use plan of 1980 and subdivision regulations as well as the community facilities plan and the public improvement plan. Also before council for their consideration is the thoroughfare plan adopted by the planning commission on February 15, 1961.

At present, the planning commission is working toward the revision of the present zoning ordinance, soon to be submitted to council for their consideration.

To give a clearer understanding of the basic elements of a comprehensive community plan, the following explanations are offered:

PLANS

Land use

The land use plan is the most basic and important part of the comprehensive community plan due to the fact that the remaining section of the comprehensive plan will be directed toward the accomplishment of the land use plan by the year 1980. This plan determines to a degree, based on area districts, where people will live, work, shop, and play, by designating residential, industrial, commercial, and recreational areas. It is important to remember, however, as population counts are taken and the actual land use changes, this plan may be revised to meet changes, thus avoiding uneconomical and unbalanced development.

Thoroughfare plan

The thoroughfare plan is a general plan intended as a guide for the planning and construction of highways and proper development of the street circulation pattern.

Community facilities

The community facilities plan is a plan which is designed to accomplish two things: (1) To show existing facilities in the community; and (2) to revise and project these facilities in order that they may serve their intended purpose to the fullest extent.

Public improvement plan

This plan is intended to show where and how the community will acquire the financial means for any public improvement, and to construct a priority schedule for these improvements.

REGULATORY MEASURES

Zoning

Basically, zoning is the legal tool that enables a community to set up its various districts and is also the legal tool that nudges communities into proper planning. Zoning must be reasonably calculated to project the health, welfare, and safety of the public while leading to the betterment of the community. This regulatory measure is also the means and tool for accomplishment of the land-use plan.

Subdivision regulations

Subdivision regulations are necessary to promote the public safety, health and general welfare, to provide for suitable residential neighborhoods with adequate streets and utilities and appropriate building sites,

to stifle unnecessary expenditures of public funds by reserving space for public lands and buildings and proper land records for the convenience of the public, and for better identification and permanent location of real estate boundaries.

Thus far, I have discussed the comprehensive community plan, and how this plan, with its elements, offers a pattern that will guide a community toward better economic development. Yet, this plan, important as it may be, is just one of seven parts of Wheeling's workable program prepared by McHugh.

To elaborate, the Housing Act of 1954 called upon all local communities to attack their urban problems by developing a local workable program. Briefly, the workable program is a community's own long-range practical guide to achieve civic facelifting, to rid itself of blighted neighborhoods, to prevent reoccurrence of urban decay, improve building and housing standards, and prepare for orderly municipal growth.

In addition, such a community blueprint, submitted and approved by the HHFA administrator in accordance with the Housing Act of 1954 and its subsequent amendments, qualifies a municipality to apply for certain major Federal assistance programs.

Under the workable program, a community agrees to work toward the attainment, within a reasonable time, of the following seven objectives:

1. Codes and ordinances.
2. A comprehensive community plan.
3. Neighborhood analysis.
4. Administrative organization.
5. Financing.
6. Housing for displaced persons.
7. Citizen participation.

Wheeling, realizing the advantages of receiving Federal aid, submitted its application to the HHFA, and in 1957 became certified as having a workable program and each year since has been recertified. It is important to note that once a community has become certified, this certification is good for 1 year only. Each year thereafter, the community must apply for recertification showing the progress they have made on the attainment of the seven elements. If the HHFA after examination of the application for recertification feels the community has not substantially progressed toward the attainment of the seven elements, the community is then no longer eligible for Federal assistance.

Earlier in 1954 a committee of the Wheeling Area Conference known as the community improvement committee and headed by Robert L. Levenson, saw the need for slum clearance in Wheeling. At the urging of this committee, city council created an urban redevelopment authority. Four members of the area conference committee were appointed to serve on this authority.

With no funds from any source the authority began the task of preparing a survey and planning application for a redevelopment project in what is known as Center Wheeling. After months of labor the application was filed with the Housing and Home Finance Agency under title I of the Housing Act of 1949.

Shortly after, the HHFA approved the application and \$75,000 in planning funds. A capital grant reservation for nearly a half million dollars was reserved at that time by the Federal Government for the Wheeling project. This was the first such application in the United States prepared by nonprofessional, private citizens, which won approval of the HHFA.

In 1954 the 1949 act was amended by Congress to bring forth the new idea of urban renewal. The Wheeling authority prepared necessary State legislation and followed it through the West Virginia State Legislature.

When planning was completed on the Center Wheeling project it was determined that this particular blighted area be redeveloped for use as a light industrial park to aid the city's economic base. The HHFA approved the plans in 1957 and reserved a new capital grant totaling nearly a million dollars.

In order to raise the city's share of the project cost—a half million dollars—a 3-year special levy was proposed. Twice the levy was presented to the voters but each time the referendum failed.

It was because of the work of this authority in pressing for urban renewal that the city gained other benefits. The planning commission was revived. A master plan was drawn by professional planners with the cost borne by the area conference. Numerous new codes relating to housing conservation were adopted and a workable program prepared for the city.

After the two levy defeats, members of the authority resigned so that city council would have a free hand in determining a new course of action. New members were appointed to the authority and the planning commission staff aided in revising the original Center Wheeling project.

The downtown Wheeling associates inspired by the administrative lead and after consulting with the new authority, requested council to raise the gross sales tax a sufficient amount to raise \$180,000 for urban renewal. The \$180,000 plus the city's noncash grants-in-aid provided the necessary financing for the project.

At present, the part I application has been approved, the public hearing is scheduled for May 1961 (no voting by the public will be necessary) and part II loan and grant is being developed. The acquisition and clearance of property is expected to be underway this summer.

Traffic and parking conditions in the city of Wheeling have been improved as a direct result of studies made by a committee of the Wheeling Area Conference. The Wharf Parking Garage is an outstanding example of activity by this committee.

Industrial development is a comparatively recent venture of the Wheeling Area Conference—with a committee established to perform this important phase of overall area development. The preparation of the voluminous data necessary to the success of this activity is a continuing one performed by the conference staff.

In February of 1960, the Ohio Valley Board of Trade was absorbed into the Wheeling Area Conference and the normal chamber of commerce type functions are now performed under the aegis of the trade and commerce committee of the conference.

I would be remiss in my duties as a reporter if I did not cite the many organizations and their consequent contributions toward improving the moral, economic, social, and cultural climate.

CIVITAN CLUB

I have already mentioned the heroic efforts of the Wheeling Civitan Club in sparking the Wheeling Area Conference on Community Development. Many Civitans served on the sponsoring committee of this new organization and on the working committees playing a leading role in pushing through conference projects.

At least three members of the Civitan Club were cited as "Citizens of the Month" individually by the junior chamber of commerce for work on behalf of the community.

Several years ago the club sponsored a downtown improvement award designed to stimulate the rebuilding of downtown properties. Since that time a total of 37 business firms in the central business district have received the cherished award.

In the early postwar period the club sponsored several meetings with State officials

which resulted in the construction of the new four-lane Fort Henry Bridge spanning the Ohio River at Wheeling.

Other projects participated in by the Civitan Club include support of a revised city charter, a hearing testing program for all students in Ohio County schools and for many years an annual Christmas party for the area's needy children.

WHEELING COLLEGE

This city's educational picture was enhanced greatly when the new Wheeling College opened its doors for the first time in the fall of 1955. This multimillion dollar coeducational college is operated by the Jesuit Fathers. It is the only college operating within the city limits. Since that time the college has made a lasting imprint on the social, educational, and economic fabric of the community. In 1957, the college sponsored a highly successful 2-month long seminar on community planning problems. In 1959 and in 1960, the conferences were repeated for planning commissioners, municipal officials, and interested citizens.

Currently the senior research seminar for economics majors at Wheeling College is devoted to problems of area research. Students typically choose a subject from a list of suggested topics offered by the Small Business Administration or by interested Wheeling area groups. In addition, each student enjoys some measure of direction by an expert located in the community.

The department of chemistry has undertaken a program to upgrade science teaching in the upper Ohio Valley culminating in a National Science Foundation Workshop. The department has also sponsored a "Chemistry for Industry" series of lectures this past year.

Several members of the faculty have participated in management-development seminars held over the years and one member is serving as a public member on a labor arbitration board.

Over the years the college has been a meeting place for the Ohio Valley Air Pollution Council which itself is served by two members of the faculty.

BETHANY COLLEGE

Under a grant from the Upper Ohio Valley Development Council, Inc., senior economics students have conducted a survey of the reasons for ingress and egress of plants in the upper Ohio Valley.

Bethany College, in cooperation with the Ford Fund for Adult Education, has carried out a community leadership development program.

WHEELING JAYCEES

This organization has attempted to remedy the acute juvenile delinquency problem by promoting projects geared to the youth of the area—mostly in the nature of sports competition.

They were instrumental in changing the name of the city from that of the Power City to the one selected, the Friendly City. They are currently engaged in promoting and managing a city-county "Cleanup campaign." They also contemplate the printing of a monthly tourist guide for distribution by gas stations, hotels, restaurants, and motels. Also in the planning stage is a proposal for tax reform for the city and State. In order to enhance citizen-participation in civic matters, they have sponsored a "Citizen of the Month" program. At the end of each year a banquet is held in honor of these 12 citizens and 1 is selected as the most outstanding of the year.

The Jaycees have furthermore offered their assistance in raising the necessary funds in order to achieve fire safety in the area schools. They also have membership on the committee checking the feasibility of a consolidated high school for the community.

WEST VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

The local office of the West Virginia Department of Employment Security in Wheeling is one of five local offices in West Virginia participating in the more than 100-office network for professional clearance services. Inventories from 50 States are received every 2 weeks, listing all the job openings for professional and clerical workers from outside their local area.

Recently students have been selected by the local office for the area vocational training program. This training program was made available by the passage of house bill 7 by the State legislature early in 1960. Mr. Roy Potter, principal, McKinley Vocational High School, is the coordinator for the area vocational training program. The purpose of this program is to assist individuals, who are not gainfully employed, in acquiring the essential skills and related information necessary for entrance into a recognized occupation, to provide training and retraining programs for all adults who need the essential skills and related information necessary for entrance or advancement in a recognized occupation, and to provide a reservoir of trained individuals to satisfy the community or area employment needs. The first class, which trained workers for pressers in the drycleaning industry, was completed in March 1961. A class training electric appliance servicemen will be completed in June 1961, and another class will soon begin. Classes will be held soon for welders, machine operators (machine shop), cooks, and garment alteration.

Display windows in the local office have been used to advantage by local industries to display locally manufactured products. Arrangements for these displays have recently become a project of the local chapter of the Industrial Management Club of the Ohio Valley. Representing some 23 firms, the club is first giving space to member firms and will arrange for displays of other interested firms throughout the Ohio Valley.

Information is furnished regularly to the Wheeling Area Conference on Community Development regarding the skills of applicants registered at the local office. The office also furnishes information to the planning commission for the city of Wheeling and has worked with the save-a-plant committee.

Publications, pertaining to the area, are a central office function. The Labor Market Digest is a bimonthly release pertaining to employment and unemployment for the area comprised of Ohio and Marshall Counties in West Virginia and Belmont County in Ohio. With cooperation from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, it presents statistics on the size of the labor force by industry, the average hours worked, average earnings of production workers and the outlook on employment.

Money was made available in 1958 for a study of the area which, at the time, was known as the Wheeling, W. Va.-Steubenville, Ohio, metropolitan area, comprised of four counties in West Virginia (Ohio, Marshall, Brooke, and Hancock) and two counties in Ohio (Belmont and Jefferson). Released early in 1959 under the title of "Manpower Requirements and Training Needs Survey," it projected the needs, by occupations, for both expansion and replacement to 1960 and 1963. The study included all occupations that required at least 1 year of special education, or formal training, or the equivalent in planned on-the-job training. The study was designed to stimulate local action and provide factual data for setting up inplant training programs, vocational guidance, curriculum planning in school systems, apprenticeship programs and improved methods of worker selection. Distribution was made to all participating firms, schools and interested groups. There has

been no way to measure just how much the survey has been used.

THE UPPER OHIO VALLEY DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL, INC.

The purpose of this organization which lies adjacent to the Wheeling-Bridgeport metropolitan area is to promote and advance the economic, industrial, and transportation interests of the upper Ohio Valley. Although this organization's activities are not primarily concerned with the Wheeling area, there is nevertheless an appreciable degree of economic interdependence, as well as mutual competition for new plants.

Probably the greatest contribution this organization made to the upper Ohio Valley area was engaging the Batelle Memorial Institute of Columbus, Ohio, to study the economic potentialities of this general region.

The council further assisted in having a branch of Ohio University established at Martins Ferry, as well as assisting in establishing at Ohio University a department for regional and community development guidance.

Although the council was successful in locating several medium-sized plants in its own area, it is doubtful if these actions precipitated immediate economic gains to the Wheeling area. Very little, if any, integration presently exists between the two planning groups; however, both organizations may, in the future, provide a measure of cooperation for overall regional planning.

MINISTERIAL ASSOCIATION OF WHEELING

In 1959-60 a group from the Ministerial Association of Wheeling comprised of a number of prominent Protestant clergymen waged a relentless battle against encroaching vice and gambling in the city and its environs. Although not purposefully planned in line with the aims of area development, the campaign nevertheless highlighted the fact that a community cannot hope to attract industry to an area steeped in vice. At this date it is difficult to determine the measure of success achieved by the campaign.

DOWNTOWN WHEELING ASSOCIATES, INC.

Historically, the downtown Wheeling business community had felt the absence of an organization responsive to its own needs—able to solve common problems—capable of bringing more business downtown.

In October 1959, the organization was founded and its membership includes all the major downtown retailers, many small retailers, banks, utilities—nearly everyone who has a stake in downtown Wheeling.

It aims to accelerate the growth of downtown Wheeling as the shopping center of the Wheeling region. In line with this stated aim, the organization has gone down on record as favoring urban renewal, the replacement of the antiquated Market Auditorium, by backing the referendum of "liquor by the drink."

The special events committee of the DWA has engaged in such community services as bringing to the people "Main Street U.S.A.," organizing Fourth of July fireworks, and most recently promoting Wheeling's 125th anniversary.

Although the board of directors is the controlling and guiding force of DWA, a great deal of work is performed through the following committees:

Beautification committee: Recent action in the State, county, and city cleanup campaign.

Executive committee: Acts as a steering committee for the board of directors.

Sales events committee: Organizes and supervises the four sales events each year.

Special events committee: Promotes and supervises civic and community events.

Traffic committee: Promotes improvements in traffic, parking conditions, etc.

Christmas decoration committee: Supervises and plans downtown Christmas decoration.

Finance committee: Financial advisement. **Membership committee:** Procure new members, contacts present members.

Civic auditorium committee: Studies feasibility and plans for a civic auditorium.

Communication committee: Contacts all members via newsletter, telephone, etc.

Probably the greatest service rendered by the DWA to the city was their activity in regard to urban renewal. Ever since the voters of Wheeling, for the second time, turned down a special 3-year urban renewal levy, city authorities have been casting about for ways and means of salvaging the Center Wheeling project and the million-dollar Federal grant earmarked for it in the original plan.

The grant had been kept alive on a conditional basis pending the exploration here of other means of financing the local share. The final determination was that, through a combination of money and services, Wheeling could qualify by raising approximately \$60,000 a year over a 3-year span.

But raising the money remained the stumbling block. Beset with many other demands, city council could not absorb this amount in the regular budget and still meet essential service requirements without raising the public tax bill, a step which council hesitated to take in view of the voter rejection of a special levy. So with the deadline for action approaching, it appeared that Wheeling had lost its final opportunity to win an important improvement for the city.

It was into this branch that the merchants stepped. Speaking through their organization, the Downtown Wheeling Associates, they formally petitioned council to increase the gross sales tax, to which they are major contributors, by an amount sufficient to raise the urban renewal funds.

DWA has sought to locate so-called ghost owners of run-down buildings and urged them to make repairs to the community eye sores. Furthermore, the DWA has striven toward the total removing of these buildings which have outlived their usefulness. In this they have been aided through a revived municipal building enforcement agency. DWA has given full support and cooperation to highway officials in pushing through to completion Interstate 70, a new State Route 2 through the northern panhandle, and all other highways that provide for ingress to and egress out of the heart of the city. The DWA is also studying an old proposal for a convention hall and a sports arena for the city.

VOLUNTEERS FOR BETTER SCHOOLS

In May 1959, a bond issue for a new high school was defeated by the electorate of Ohio County. In May 1960, the electorate defeated a special levy for the correction of fire hazards existing in the public schools. Faced with the threat that some schools would be closed if these conditions were not corrected, a small group of citizens met early in June to discuss what they felt was now a critical situation. After a few meetings, the group realized that in addition to the fire hazards, many problems confronted the school system. A larger group, more widely representative of the county and the Greater Wheeling area, was soon called together to organize under the name of "Volunteers for Better Schools."

The organization had six programs during this first year, dealing with background material necessary for the basic orientation of the VBS.

To date, three reports have been accepted by the organization and sent to the proper officials with recommendations that they be most thoughtfully considered. The first was the report on fire hazards. Copies of the report on merit rating were sent to the superintendent of schools and to the board of

education with the recommendation that such a plan be considered whenever feasible. Copies of the report on secondary curriculum and consolidation of the five county high schools were sent to the board of education, the superintendent of schools and the citizens advisory committee, a group recently appointed by the board of education for the purpose of studying the feasibility of high school consolidation.

The group plans to look into such subjects as school financing and administration and to encourage qualified citizens to run for the school board. It intends to present programs to service groups and others interested in the public school system and is considering sponsoring public meetings with speakers of prominence in various fields of education. The organization realizes that this is a continuing program, but also that an informed citizenry means a progressive community.

The membership at present numbers 80 citizens whose contracts reach into every segment of the county population. It seemed significant that many members of VBS are not native West Virginians and have not been in the Wheeling area very long. It is typical of these young professionals and business men to bring to a community an objectivity and vitality that creates a more progressive spirit. When these people joined with the intelligent, forward-looking members from all walks of the permanent county population, VBS had every reason to believe that its potential could overcome the general public apathy.

SANITARY BOARD

In line with the eight State compact calling for the States bordering the Ohio River to eradicate stream pollution, city council established the sanitary board. Beginning in 1954, four bond issues were floated totaling \$7½ million—the proceeds of which established a new filtration plant. The plant, just recently completed, utilizes the new Zimmerman process which completely eliminates sludge, and thus provides the city with the most modern method for the elimination of sewage and yet at the same time contributes to stream purification.

PUBLIC FACILITY PROJECTS

Recently a new city-county building rose in the heart of the downtown business district, as a result of an approval of a special levy by the citizenry. The building was long overdue in that the old city-county building, which twice served as the State capitol was beyond repair. A 1940 bond issue provided for \$720,099.99 but this was hardly enough and taxpayers approved a 3-year levy to raise additional funds to insure construction.

During the past several years an extensive building program has been in process at famed Oglebay Park, one of the city's two municipal parks. Here in this beautiful 1,000 acre park one may enjoy such facilities as an 18-hole golf course, tennis courts, swimming pool, and a lake for boating and fishing. In addition Oglebay Institute maintains a cultural and educational programs. The building program provides for the construction of a four-unit park lodge. Unit one provided for a 57-unit sleeping wing; unit two includes a lobby, general dining room, offices and kitchen. Unit three now under construction will be a multiple use auditorium for conventions, banquets, plays, and other community events. Unit 4 now complete provides an additional sleeping wing of 47 rooms.

Recently the Wheeling Electric Co. removed its overhead powerlines in the downtown business district and placed them underground at a cost of \$1,800,000.

The Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. of West Virginia recently spent millions of dollars in converting to the dial system.

Probably the most significant demonstration of civic alertness and responsibility was demonstrated in 1954 when the directors of the Ohio Valley General Hospital in Wheeling launched a drive to expand facilities.

The Hill-Burton Act provided Federal funds to finance a portion of the planned expansion but additional money was needed.

A call went out for citywide help. Thousands of volunteer campaign workers responded, eagerly ringing doorbells and making speeches. Within 3 months' time the goal had been topped. Subscriptions totaled \$1,911,638.27. An additional 150 beds have been added to the hospital while the total project, costing \$6 million, includes a new south building with facilities for chronic, maternity, and psychiatric patient care and a new east wing for pathology, radiology, and surgery. The old building was remodeled giving additional facilities for medical and surgical patients.

UNION-MANAGEMENT COOPERATION

Labor leaders in the area generally feel that they have not been assigned the place in economic redevelopment which should rightfully be theirs. They feel that they have been frozen out of the picture. It is true that they were invited to participate as individual citizens—to this invitation they responded, but they were disappointed when no labor leader was appointed to any meaningful committee. Furthermore, there is a great deal of sentiment on their part for the formation of a labor subcommittee within the framework of one of the existing committees, or in some new organization which would avail itself of their potential.

The above statements do not infer that labor organizations did not take an active interest in the developments of the last several years. Quite the contrary—urban renewal, for instance, received the endorsement of the Ohio Valley labor assembly. Labor, furthermore, worked very closely with Rownd and the old Ohio Valley Industrial Corporation.

Labor leaders generally feel that labor's image in the valley is not what they would like it to be, but they hastily point out that a great deal of misinformation and misquotation, and careless reporting have been spoon-fed to the general public. A particular case in point was the Sav-a-Plant movement which originated after the Wheeling Steel Corp. decided to sell its Ackermann Steel plant. The general public was led to believe that high wage rates were the reason for the shutdown. A study by the union's national research staff showed that wages were actually lower here than in its present location and that freight rates were the prohibiting factor toward further location in this area.

The charge has also been made that Wheeling has historically been a "strike happy" town. Union leaders point to the fact that only three major strikes occurred (in basic industry) in the last 10 years, and that the steel union has had contracts with many employers in the valley characterized by the fact that there has never been a day lost because of strikes.

The concept of poor labor relations is further weakened when one realizes that the National Planning Association in its monumental study, "The Causes of Industrial Peace Under Collective Bargaining," had originally chosen one of Wheeling's industries for a case study depicting an industry wherein good labor relations exist.

As a further example of union cooperation, the steel union has at times permitted distressed industries to pay wages below the basic wage formula in the hopes that the industry would eventually reach a competitive position.

One large craft union even goes so far as to solve all problems that have reached an

impasse (including wage negotiation) to an arbitration committee.

CITIZENS' VOLUNTARY ACTION COMMITTEE

This organization, the latest to arrive on the scene, is now in its organizational stage. The group holds that Wheeling is losing its factories and its payrolls because the factories are out of date, obsolete, high cost, which prevent a company from making an adequate profit in today's competitive industrial world.

The CVAC is being formed by local businessmen who will attempt to raise money through its "buck a month" campaign. Each member asks his employees to contribute a dollar a month to a fund for the purpose of attracting new industries and new payrolls. The employer in turn agrees to match this money dollar for dollar.

Specifically, the money would be used to erect "shell plants" suitable for any industry; to acquire the land; to seek out new employers; to encourage new plants; even including "home grown" industries. Here we have the beginning of a development credit corporation so successful in other areas. A valuable byproduct is the opportunity it gives people in the community to participate in plant financing. In other successful areas this has been interpreted by industry as a favorable community attitude toward industry.

CONCLUSIONS

Without a doubt the community has made great strides in realizing some of its objectives; however, a great deal yet remains to be accomplished before eventual success materializes—that of persuading plants to locate in the area. The community has attempted to get the facts—surveys of areas where improvement is needed have been made, and steps have been taken toward remedial action; an inventory of the resources in materials and people has been made, and means of arousing public interest have been explored. There are certain areas, however, that might bear further scrutiny by the community's leaders and these are listed below.

With industrial landsites in such short supply, every effort should be made to extend planning to and beyond the perimeter of the city with options taken on all available industrial landsites. It would be regrettable for private individuals rather than society to realize sizable amounts of economic rent in the years ahead.

Serious thought and study should be given to the passage of a local wage and income tax to gain revenue in order to provide more services. Low taxes have actually, in the past, been a deterrent to ingress of plants. In the final analysis it is not only taxes but services which are important.

Every effort must be exerted to improve the image of good labor-management relations. Labor must be given the opportunity to participate in more planning and to have generally a louder voice in the deliberations affecting the economic well-being of the community.

Perhaps too little attention has been given to the teachers at all levels in the community—a business-education day devoted to industrial plant tours and basic orientation to community problems might be a step in the right direction.

Perhaps greater study devoted to such meaningful areas as product diversification, skill survey of the unemployed, buyers of finished products, sellers of raw materials to our industrial complex, the concept of an industrial park, growth industries, etc.

But what is most urgently needed to cure the disease is skill and leadership. This is a case for the professionals—for the private organizations and trained personnel who are versed in the economics of location. If

existing private organizations are not sufficiently resourceful to do the job they should be supplemented by experts.

Equally important is the ability to communicate, to explain, and to consult. Care must be taken to inform the public of every step and provide opportunities for everyone to share in the planning and work. Community spirit will be alive only when educators, welfare agencies, religious leaders, and service clubs discuss the area's needs with one another.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as I discuss this subject this afternoon, I have no knowledge whatever as to the political philosophy of Professor Hartung. For all I know, he may be a militant member of the Democratic Party. My purpose in calling this to your attention is to emphasize the nonpolitical approach that we Republican Members of the House are developing in the presentation of Operation Employment.

My associate in this project, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, has told you the story of Lackawanna County, his home area. As I have just indicated, Professor Hartung has given us the story of Wheeling, W. Va. In my remarks to you, I use a fine community in my district—Chicago Heights, Ill.—as an example of effective community effort in meeting this challenge of unemployment.

In each instance of unemployment, you will find that a community's problems, its program, and its degree of success, vary. This is natural, and in fact, it is our desire to emphasize the tremendous flexibility and imagination that must be used by local communities in solving their unemployment problems since conditions obviously change throughout the country, affected as they are by local geographic conditions, type of population, size of the community, and the other factors which become readily apparent.

We feel it is our obligation to repeatedly call to your attention the need to emphasize various approaches for the creation of jobs in our free enterprise economy. Others who will participate in this program will literally cover the waterfront in pointing out failures, as well as accomplishments; the pitfalls as well as the tremendous future, of our dynamic American economy.

I personally feel that in addition to the detailed statistics, analyses, and constructive suggestions and criticisms that we and other congressional teams in this Republican operation are providing, there are two main ingredients necessary for our Nation to achieve the greatest possible success which is capable in our free enterprise system.

These ingredients are confidence in and appreciation of the virtues of our way of life.

Confidence is absolutely necessary to provide the inspiration and vigor needed to overcome temporary roadblocks and difficulties, and to bolster us under conditions of great frustration or temporary disappointment.

Appreciation for the historic fact that under our system, we have achieved the highest economic standard of any nation known to man, and our living standards

have been developed under a system of government which has placed maximum emphasis on freedom and the rights of the individual, in contrast to the restrictions that are placed on individuals under socialistic and communistic forms of government.

Mr. Speaker, now may I specifically direct my comments to the city of Chicago Heights, Ill., located in the southernmost section of Cook County, 10 miles from the Chicago city limits, and 25 miles from the center of Chicago.

I will relate the accomplishments whereby a tremendous increase in employment, thousands of new residents, stimulation to the homebuilding industry—all resulted from this effective community effort.

In 1953, a small but determined group of Chicago Heights industrialists, business, and financial men and a newspaper publisher held a number of meetings with the thought of establishing an organization to promote the industrial and commercial development of the Chicago Heights area. As a result of this effort the Committee for Chicago Heights was organized at a meeting on January 12, 1954. The purpose of the organization as stated in its charter is "To promote, foster, and encourage the industrial, commercial, civic, educational, and cultural betterment and improvement of the city of Chicago Heights; to create and maintain a compact, representative, and centralized agency for concerted action upon all matters affecting the betterment of conditions and the general welfare of Chicago Heights."

Early emphasis was put on industrial development in an effort to balance the growing commercial and residential growth of the community.

It soon developed that it was not a one organization job so the cooperation of the local governmental bodies was solicited and secured, including city administration, planning commission, board of zoning appeals, sanitary district, elementary and high school, district boards of education, and park district.

Cooperation was also obtained from local nongovernmental organizations including board of realtors, manufacturer's association of Chicago Heights, and newspaper, and radio stations.

Later it developed that help would be needed from organizations outside of Chicago Heights and cooperation was obtained from the industrial development department of railroads serving Chicago Heights, especially the Chicago & Eastern Illinois Railroad who owned considerable of the land in the area which was desirable for industrial development; the industrial development departments of the electric, gas, and telephone utilities serving Chicago Heights; Industrial Development Division of The Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry; and Chicago Chapter of the Society of Industrial Realtors.

All information on industrial development available was secured from Office of Area Development, U.S. Department of Commerce; Illinois Division of Industrial Planning and Development; Ameri-

can Industrial Development Council; Great Lakes States Industrial Development Council.

In 1956, a brochure listing all available industrial buildings and/or land in the Chicago Heights area was prepared and placed in the hands of the industrial development departments of the railroads and utilities serving the area, industrial realtors, factory locating services, and so forth. This industrial brochure was completely revised in 1960 and is kept up to date as buildings and/or land are sold or rented and new buildings and land come on the market.

Some of the work of the committee has, of necessity, been defensive. Soon after the committee was organized in 1954 a building material supply company optioned a tract of land just east of Chicago Heights for a stone quarry.

The committee felt that this development would not only ruin the site but the area for industrial development and initiated a campaign that resulted in the company abandoning the project. Today the Ford Motor Co. Stamping Plant stands on the site originally proposed for the stone quarry and gives employment to 3,500 to 4,000 people with a yearly payroll of approximately \$25 million.

In 1959 the committee in cooperation with their local manufacturers association appeared before many hearings of the Cook County Zoning Board of Appeals during the rezoning of the unincorporated areas of Cook County to assure that the proper amount of land was zoned for industrial development to protect it from commercial and residential encroachment and to insure performance standards for industry that were workable and livable.

Early in the work of the committee it developed that industrialists in the Chicago area seeking new plant locations looked on Chicago Heights as a good place to work but not a good place to live. New plants were being located in the area west and northwest of Chicago primarily so that the executives could live along the north shore and drive to their plant in 10 to 15 minutes. In an effort to show that Chicago Heights was a good place to live and play, as well as work, the committee initiated a program to sell what they called gracious living which culminated in "Culturama," a 2-month program in May and June 1958 to highlight the cultural side of the community.

The committee has followed the policy from the beginning of telling industrial prospects facts about the community and not hopes and false promises. No gimmicks have been offered any prospect in the way of tax abatements, free land, or subsidization of any kind.

As a corollary to their work on industrial development, the committee has worked to improve the civic, commercial, educational, and cultural development of Chicago Heights in order to have a better product to offer industry interested in new plant locations or relocations. The committee has worked constantly to improve the industrial climate of Chicago Heights and while it is not perfect and probably never will be, it feels that it can demonstrate that it is good.

All of the work and results of the committee's activities have been accomplished with funds subscribed by industry, business, and the professional men of the community. Not one cent of subsidy from Federal, State, or local sources has been solicited or received.

What are the results of the community's effort to secure new industry, spearheaded by the Committee for Chicago Heights? In round figures, in 7½ years the 23 new industries and the 12 expansions of existing plants have created 6,000 new jobs and added \$30 million in additional annual payroll and close to \$1 million in new tax income to the taxing bodies in the area. The resulting benefits to the economy of Chicago Heights is self-evident.

Mr. Speaker, certainly this story of Chicago Heights reminds us of an old adage that "success is 10 percent inspiration and 90 percent perspiration." The community leaders and the people of Chicago Heights proved that they can expand, improve, and advance their own community to the benefit of all its segments, and are an outstanding example that other communities, not only in Illinois but throughout the Nation, might well follow.

Many unemployment problems can effectively be solved by local community actions, primarily since local civic leaders have the awareness of the community's needs, its potential, the skill of its employable members, and the inspiration and dedication to maintain the individual areas in which they work and live.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRANTON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. One point I would like to make. In the determination of this one aspect of this study, which is primarily at this point demonstrating what specifically has been done at the local level, an article appeared in Fortune magazine this month, the title of which I like very much—"The Hard Realities of Retraining." In even identifying the problem that exists in this area of unemployment the emphasis is affirmative, because technological advancement creates more jobs than it creates obsolete skills and jobs, and the obvious answer is to match the obsolete skills and the people who have those skills with the jobs that have been newly created.

But identifying a problem is only the very beginning of the job. Hard realities are involved in this problem of technological growth. We shall send to all Members a list of how we have scheduled these talks and these papers that we shall put in the Record. They will cover various aspects of this problem, and as soon as this list is firmed up a little more we shall put it in the Record so that Members may follow it.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania on this kickoff of this discussion on the very many facets of this problem of employment in our dynamic economy.

Mr. SCRANTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who participated in this discussion have permission to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture have until midnight Saturday to file reports on H.R. 8230 and S. 2197.

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

There was no objection.

STAND FIRM IN BERLIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Sisk). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Cook] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, World War II, the greatest catastrophe in history, was brought about through the aggressive tactics of a Nazi dictator. This holocaust cost the lives of many of the finest men in this Nation and other nations. In addition to the military casualties, thousands upon thousands of civilians were killed and maimed in most of the leading countries of the world. Fortunately, we in the United States were spared an attack on our homeland.

I do not need to dwell on the horrors of World War II, on the slaughter of men, women, and children, on the destruction of billions of dollars' worth of property, and the like. I recall it only to ask, What have we learned from World War II?

Those of us in our forties or older can remember when Franklin Delano Roosevelt warned that Japan should be quarantined after it invaded the Asian mainland in the thirties, but he was then termed a "warmonger." We recall the futile efforts of the League of Nations to slap the wrist of Mussolini when he brought his Fascist black shirts in to spread gas and terror in primitive Ethiopia. We can recall, perhaps even more vividly, that there were people who thought that Hitler himself could be placated when he marched into the Rhineland, or when he absorbed Austria and Czechoslovakia.

But these power-mad nations were not satisfied; their thirst was unquenchable.

Now, today, are there any among us who really believed that Premier Khrushchev will ever be appeased unless communism engulfs the world?

Have you ever wondered, as I have, what the world history books will say about the 1950's and 1960's, in, say, 10, 20, or 30 years? They cannot help but record the strains and crises that have taken place between the Soviet Union and the United States and its allies ever since the end of World War II.

Recent developments cited would include the U-2 incident and the resulting Powers trial, the Communist gains in

Laos, and, within recent weeks, the pact between the Soviet Union and North Korea, and the announcement by Khrushchev of his determination to sign a separate peace treaty with East Germany which, presumably, will precipitate a Berlin crisis.

Despite the fact that Khrushchev followed up on this by announcing that Soviet military forces are now not going to be reduced any further, nations within gunshot—France and Britain—have announced through their strong leaders, President de Gaulle and Prime Minister Macmillan, that the allies will stand firm in West Berlin. West German Chancellor Adenauer and West Berlin Mayor Brandt have also called for firmness.

There are few subjects on which Americans are so nearly unanimous—the need for standing firm is shared by almost every thinking person. To be honest, some of them, perhaps, have not fully evaluated the consequences of a nuclear war. Others have made this evaluation and say that even if it does increase the risk of world war III and all that this implies, they are willing to take the risk.

My position is this: I think by making it clear that we will stand firm in Berlin it will reduce—not increase—the dangers of all-out nuclear war. I feel that this is comparable in fact to the possibilities that slipped away from us to stop World War II before it began by taking a firm stand on the early aggressions of Japan, Italy, and Germany.

Some may argue that this is not "early aggression" on the part of the Soviets; that it is, instead, one of a long series of aggressive actions. That certainly is true; there have been more examples of aggression than we like to think about.

But, remember, we have stopped Communist aggression in various places by taking affirmative action.

I am convinced that the success of our Marshall plan and our point 4 programs after World War II saved many countries, including Italy and France, from falling under the Communists. We need an intelligent foreign-aid program today for similar reasons.

While no American is completely satisfied with the outcome of the Korean conflict, we did succeed in accomplishing what we started out to do. We drove the Communist invaders out of South Korea.

In other places we did not act.

When the Hungarian debacle occurred we were invited to assist the Hungarians but we did not respond. More recently we witnessed a sad spectacle just off our own shoreline—we saw the vicious Fascist dictatorship in Cuba fall only to be replaced by a Communist police state.

In these cases we did practically nothing. We let events follow the course guided by the Communists who never just sit back and wait to see how things are going to work out.

Certainly there are many other good and bad examples that can be cited to show our successes and our failures. I have no intent here to compete with the coming white paper on the subject being prepared by the administration.

But I will briefly mention Laos. The situation here is admittedly difficult and

we have been given reason to doubt whether the Laotians themselves, are really willing to fight. I have heard an explanation that except for those under hard Communist discipline, the Laotians are such a nice, pleasant, kind people that they just don't want to fight and hurt anyone.

But there is no doubt of what the people want in West Berlin. They want to be part of the free, democratic Western World. While this is true of all West Germany today, this is especially true of West Berlin.

There have been few places in the world where such a side-by-side test has been made of freedom and slavery in action. According to all reports, today West Berlin is bright, throbbing, energetic. When you pass through the Brandenburg Gate into East Berlin, it is like going into another world—it is going into another world. There is not even a traffic cop on the West Berlin side of the gate. On the eastern side there is a squad of armed soldiers; visitors are subjected to a propaganda lecture and must be prepared to produce identifying papers or passports.

There are few cars on the streets, the homes and stores are dark and dingy. Whereas West Berlin is almost completely rebuilt from the devastation of World War II, block after block of East Berlin is still in rubble, more than 15 years after the end of the European war.

But the biggest difference is the people. It is not only a matter of the citizens of West Berlin being better fed and better clothed, they have a sparkle in their eyes, a briskness in their walk, and an effervescent spirit that is utterly lacking in East Berlin. They have tasted freedom, enjoy it, and intend to keep it.

East Berliners, by startling contrast, have a glum, down-in-the-mouth, hang-dog look. What better evidence of their feeling is there than the fact that they daily defy Soviet authorities and flee into West Berlin? And this is only part of the story. Berlin is the hole in the Iron Curtain that provides an escape route into the West for all East Germany and Eastern Europe. This is the bone in Khrushchev's throat. Since he made his provocative statements, the flights to freedom have been stepped up. Naturally West Berlin cannot absorb them all and they are being flown to other parts of West Germany.

Of course we cannot control the action taken by Khrushchev. If he chooses, he can sign what he may call a peace treaty with East Germany—really with himself—and he can turn real control of the Communist section of Berlin over to East German stooges. Apparently at least part of his idea is that the United States would be forced to give the Soviet German puppet some de facto status by having to deal with it to arrange access routes, and so forth.

It is suggested that the access routes may be choked with redtape by East Germany and that if the United States forces its way through, the Soviet Union will defend the aggrieved German puppet.

As our President has indicated, things are apt to get much worse before they

get better. However, I do not doubt for a moment that the United States will be able to cope with any and all physical and psychological roadblocks imposed by the Soviets themselves, or by their East German puppets.

Death and taxes may be inevitable, but I am not yet convinced that war with the Soviet Union is inevitable. Certainly it is possible, some say even probable, but I say not inevitable.

My contention is that it is possible to avert war only by taking a firm stand. We are in Berlin, we have a right to be there, and the people there want us to stay. Where a prospective clash with Communist China in the days of the Korean conflict was described as the wrong war, in the wrong place, at the wrong time, with the wrong foe, I say that Berlin is the right place and this is the right time to make it clear that we are not going to back down.

I believe the Soviets are not ready for war, but every precaution should be taken. If the Commander in Chief deems it necessary to call out the Reserves, to have practice defense alerts, to evacuate cities, I am prepared to support him. These actions would have the double value of letting the Soviet Union know that we are serious and it would better prepare us for war, if war should come.

But, as I have asserted, I think that a serious show of firmness will lessen the chances of war.

Every American knows that America will, at some point, fight for its freedom. The Soviets may doubt this. If we should back down now on Berlin, we would give them all the evidence they need to be absolutely convinced that the United States of America will give up its own freedom and the freedom of the world without firing a shot. They would push and push and push. Under such conditions, war would indeed be inevitable.

It has taken the world many years to achieve the freedom and independence that now exists in so many places. We cannot, we will not, allow the Soviets to change the course of history and put out the lamps of freedom that so many noble men have strived so hard and so long to light.

SPAIN'S 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF ITS CIVIL WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, we are gathered here today in this great Chamber to pay a deserving tribute to Spain on the 25th anniversary of the unity of its people following the outbreak of its civil war which began on July 18, 1936. I want to take this opportunity to salute the people of Spain who, under the capable leadership of Gen. Francisco Franco, succeeded in throwing out the forces of communism from their country after a bloody and costly civil war.

Spain today is a staunch and devoted ally of the United States. They are strongly opposed to Communist domina-

tion of their country. Their opposition is based on ideological differences, on political grounds, and on personal experiences which have left deep wounds in the hearts of the Spanish people. There may have been certain misconceptions regarding Spain during the civil war struggle. Many of us had strong reservations about its government at that time.

The situation, however, has vastly changed since then. Today we are faced with a global struggle in which our Communist adversary threatens to enslave us, to eradicate everything that civilization has achieved over these many centuries. Spain is now on our side in this great struggle to help us muster the military potential needed for the security of the free world.

Let us also recognize that General Franco has given Spain over the past quarter of a century a stable government, as well as a certain degree of economic stability. General Franco has also allowed the United States to establish important naval and air bases on its territory which, due to Spain's strategic location, enable the free world to obtain a significant military advantage in its defense effort.

I believe the time has come for us to take the sensible and the very practical step; namely, to admit Spain into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization—NATO—as a full-fledged and rightful member of the Atlantic nations. Spain could provide needed manpower to augment the forces of NATO, which are so badly outnumbered now by the Communist forces in Europe. Spain is a member of the United Nations and of other international bodies, and deserves a seat in NATO.

As we pay tribute to Spain on this historic day, let us remember that the struggle in which she first became involved 25 years ago has spread to all corners of the earth and is now our struggle as well. If we are to succeed in emerging victorious, we must have all the resources in men and materials, all the support that nations everywhere can give us. This is a must, and Spain today understands it just as we do.

On this occasion, I extend best wishes to the people of Spain and to General Franco for their successful crusade to drive communism from their country—a feat which not many nations have been able to accomplish so well and so thoroughly.

I wish to extend my congratulations also to the Spanish Ambassador in Washington, His Excellency Mariano de Yturralde, who is noted as a distinguished diplomat and statesman and is a true friend of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the Record regarding the anniversary of Spain's Civil War.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with my distinguished colleagues in congratulating the Spanish nation on its efforts in combating the drive of the international Communist movement to establish a beachhead on the Iberian Peninsula.

At this critical time when the entire free world is threatened by Communist designs for world domination, it is important that we know where other nations stand in the struggle between freedom and communism. We should have no doubt where Spain stands in this respect. In the past 25 years, communism has found a determined foe in the Spanish nation. And we, on the other hand, have found a friend willing to cooperate with us in the interest of the collective security of the free world. Even though Spain was not a member of NATO, we have had for a number of years important arrangements with that country—arrangements which enabled us to build some vital bases within 750 miles of the Soviet Union and which contribute greatly to the strength and defense of the free world and of the NATO area. We have had other relations with Spain, serving the best interests and the security of the American people and of the Spanish nation. We should not forget these facts.

There are, however, bonds other than the overriding issue of survival which have existed between our people and the people of Spain for many, many years. From the time when the Spaniards made their first discoveries in the New World, to this very day, these cultural, historical and traditional bonds have contributed to the enrichment of our own heritage.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my profound hope and wish that, through the years to come, the people of Spain may increasingly enjoy the opportunity for their own full development and material advancement. The tact, patience, and understanding shown by the Spanish Ambassador, His Excellency Mariano Yturralde Orbegoso, in matters relating to United States-Spanish relations, is contributing to this goal. I am confident that the efforts which the people of Spain are making to the cause of freedom, and the greatness which they have demonstrated in the past, will aid them in attaining the full flowering of the blessings and the heritage of free institutions.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, today I join with my colleagues in the House in observing the 25th anniversary of Spain's gallant and successful fight against communism. The observance this year is particularly appropriate when we think about the Soviet campaign presently being waged against West Berlin, and it is a pleasure for me to extend to the people of Spain my congratulations on their great firmness and strength in resisting the brutality and ruthlessness which we have come to associate with the Kremlin.

Since the signing of the United States-Spanish defense treaties of 1953, the United States has invested more than \$400 million in modernizing Spain's armed forces. Industrial output is rising and Spain today is recovering at an accelerating pace from the ravages of their civil war, plus the isolation endured during and after World War II.

Twenty-five years ago the Spanish people embarked upon a determined program to resist Communist aggression.

They have a shining record of achievement and their country now serves as a challenging example that communism can be halted.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on this anniversary occasion I would remark on the strong bond of friendship that unites the people of the United States with the people of Spain. This is a friendship that has for its source that time long ago when a woman in Spain, Queen Isabella, gave aid to Christopher Columbus, without whose voyage of discovery to American shores there might never have been a United States of America.

It is a sentiment of friendship that has grown during the years when men and women of Spanish blood have come to and become a part of our great American melting pot. It is a sentiment of friendship that is expressed in the warm hospitality of the Spanish people to Americans journeying to Spain and who on their return are rapturous in their acclaim of Spain itself and of the men and women and children of Spain.

In this troubled world in which we live, Spain has furnished us with bases most essential to our security. In the fight against the threat and spread of an ideology that would destroy our way of life and everything that we regard as precious, Spain has stood steadfast.

Mr. Speaker, I speak on this anniversary with a keen sense of the grief that is universal in the United States and in Spain over the recent tragical death of a daughter of Spain who became an American wife and an American mother and was admired and beloved by everyone who knew her in the home of her adoption.

Mrs. Angier Biddle Duke was of the high nobility of Spain. She represented the finest traditions of the womanhood of Spain. Her family was among the many impoverished by the devastating civil war that ended 25 years ago, and when order finally was restored and Spain started to rebuild from the wreckage she was a girl early in her teens. Her marriage to State Department's present Chief of Protocol came when Mr. Duke was Ambassador to the Central American Republic of El Salvador.

No one ever loved and served America better and more deeply than this fine daughter of Spain. When the news of the crashing of the plane in which she was riding reached us in the Congress it brought to us all who had known her a deep sense of personal grief. Her life as an American wife and an American mother, altogether too brief, added immeasurably to the bonds that unite Spain and the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I would not wish to close without extending to the new Ambassador of Spain, His Excellency Mariano Yturralde Orbegoso, the warmest greetings of the Congress and of the people of the United States.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, it is now 25 years since Spain successfully repelled the yoke of communism and in these years the Spanish people have demonstrated in countless ways their friendship with us.

The history of Spain's devastating civil war was written by a people who fought for causes in which they believed. The scars of this terrible war remain, and the brave Spaniards still struggle to rise above them.

Spain's friendship toward us was shown during World War II when, as a neutral nation, it kept our enemy from crossing the Pyrenees Mountains, separating Spain from then-occupied France, and reaching the Mediterranean.

Today, we have important naval and air bases on Spanish soil. Because of its strategic position in Europe, this cooperation with us and this sharing of our cause is of inestimable value.

Spain has sent to the United States, as Ambassador, his Excellency Mariano Yturralde Orbegoso, who has by his every action demonstrated the friendship of his country and a sympathetic understanding of the efforts of the free world to strengthen its stand against communism.

In these last few years, during his term as American Ambassador to Spain, the Honorable John Davis Lodge contributed enormously to the relationship between our two countries as we know it today and as we face, together, the challenge of communism.

Very recently, Ambassador Lodge issued this statement: "The present excellent relations between the United States and Spain constitute one of the foundation stones of our foreign policy. Spain and the United States not only share common traditions and aspirations but are bound together in a common cause. Together we confront the relentless challenge of Communist aggression. Spain, the third largest national land area in Europe, occupies a vital strategic position south of the Pyrenees and at the gateway of the Mediterranean. Particularly as a result of the bloody and tragic Spanish Civil War, the Spanish people are firmly anti-Communist. Spain has wholeheartedly joined with the United States during the past few years in developing air and naval bases and other military facilities which are an important bastion in a dangerous world.

"The continuation of fruitful and friendly Hispano-American collaboration is of great importance to the achievement of a just and durable peace."

It is my hope that friendly relations with Spain will continue to be fruitful and I congratulate the Spanish people on this 25th anniversary of their successful crusade against communism.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to congratulate the distinguished Chief of State of Spain, General Francisco Franco, on the 25th anniversary of his leadership of a great people and a great country. We must never forget that General Franco and his valiant forces repelled the communistic scourge from within its borders at the supreme sacrifice of a million lives, thus bringing down upon them the never ending hatred of Moscow. I say the free world owes a continuing debt of gratitude to General Franco and the good people of Spain. Again I extend

my felicitations to a great general—General Franco—a great people—a country we are proud to have as a loyal, faithful and reliable ally.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO] for calling attention to this day the 25th anniversary of the commemoration of General Franco's expulsion of the Communists from Spain.

Several years ago I had the opportunity of visiting San Pedro near Madrid where the SAC airbase is located. I was briefed and inspected the base there. It is a revelation to one to see the great service and strength that Spain has given the NATO cause of freedom in Europe.

After all in entering a protectionary mutual agreement pact with the United States Spain abandoned her neutrality. She had remained neutral in World War II, for which we were grateful.

Spain had dealt in a significant fashion with communism and we dread to think what would have happened to Europe if Spain had become a member of the Communist bloc.

The assistance programs have not only helped to support the economy at a time of critical need but has also had a direct benefit upon the populace in increasing the availability and reliability of electric power, by irrigation, land consolidation, and other help to farmers, and by gifts of food to over 4 million needy children and adults through *cantas*. We must continue to help Spain in the future with adequate aid.

Spain is active in the international economic organization of nations. We expect Spain to further increase her benefits through economic development.

We Americans must never forget the role that Spain has played in taking over part of our responsibility to protect the liberty loving nations of the world.

The Russians reserve a special hatred for Spain. Each new day brings forth a continuous outpouring of invectives via radio, television, and the press contra Spain and its people. But the Spaniard has only to remember the vicious and bloody encounter during the civil war against communism, to know that only those who are really alert survive.

The Spanish nation is fortunate for having as its Ambassador to the United States the distinguished and popular, His Excellency Mariano Yturralde Orbegoso. The estimable gentleman enjoys a powerful position among persons of influence. He is a genial and popular personage socially. Spain should be proud of his high heritage and skilled abilities in his efforts to advance the prestige of Spanish influence here.

There is a different feeling in America toward Generalissimo Bahamonde Franco since he commenced the military campaign to rid Spain of the communistic scourge—that is that the cold war brings into focus the true value of General Franco's victory in its contribution to the protection afforded the nations of Europe from communistic overthrow.

It was brought to my attention, as you have stated in your analysis, what the locations of the ports and the airfields mean in military advantages en-

joyed by the United States of America. And this is a control not only in a military sense, but a control of all of Europe in view of the fact that the Continent at that point sets back in the Atlantic and commands all of the areas including Russia which is only 750 miles from San Pedro. We realize now why Russia is so anxious to have the airdromes and the airbases demilitarized. Certainly, San Pedro stands as a spear at the throbbing throat of Russian activity and at the vitals of the Russian manufacturing and production centers. The gentleman from New York is to be congratulated because of the fact that very few people have ever analyzed the civil war as you have done—to consider all of its consistencies as well as its inconsistencies. Very few have made such a keen study of the alinement of political parties and patriots in Spain. The gentleman, of course, realizes the negative effect of our ordering our ships and sealing them off against the ports of Spain for 10 years which added to their misery and to their poverty. The Communist leaders fled from Spain after the civil war and during the civil war and absconded with some \$550 million in gold. They brought that gold to Russia. The wonderful women of Spain by public subscription sent their jewels to the Government for the purpose of establishing a treasury so that Spain could carry on its international commerce. Now this great spirit has been inculcated in these fine and wonderful people with a deep sense of religious belief and a strong spiritual attitude. Now we see the benefit we are getting as a result of the establishment of bases that were to control our destiny and the destiny of Europe and the freedom-loving nations. What great losses we would have suffered if the situation were otherwise. I congratulate the President of the United States and our late Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles—God bless his soul—for their comments relative to the strength contributed by Spain to the common cause of liberty-loving nations. I congratulate the gentleman from New York on this day for the thorough study he has made of the problems confronting Spain. I am sure each American as this information is disseminated throughout the country will know that Spain is truly our friend. They will know the great sacrifices she has made for us and that she has forgiven us for the outrageous acts committed against her and the lack of support to her up to 1953.

I am glad that the United States has been able to give real help to Spain in the last 5 years. There have been advances made for the development of capital equipment to industry, agriculture and transportation. We helped to meet consumer goods needs during the period of inflation and shrinking foreign exchange reserves. Recently we helped underwrite the financial success of the stabilization plan through helping to furnish food stuffs, raw materials, and capital projects. The United States has provided in different forms over \$1 billion of economic assistance to Spain—defense support grants—Export-Import Bank and Development Fund loans,

grants, and long-term economic development loans from proceeds of the sales of U.S. farm products for pesetas and technical assistance in many fields.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to take this opportunity to note the present status in domestic and international affairs of the great Spanish nation.

Although Spain within a quarter of a century struggled agonizingly through a great fratricidal conflict, today this historic country stands at a peak of economic recovery that cannot but give satisfaction to those of us who admire the Spanish character and revere Iberian culture.

Like the American Civil War, the Spanish revolution in which families were torn apart and brother fought against brother, left physical and spiritual wounds which have been slow to heal and which have left substantial scars.

Yet Spain today has achieved an economic and social recovery which would have seemed impossible 15 or 20 years ago.

True much of this has been accomplished with American aid, yet the fact remains that the Spanish Government has taken substantial measures of self-help and has instituted programs of land development, of irrigation, and of fiscal reform which have contributed markedly to this recovery.

In addition, from a purely national point of view, Spain has provided the United States with invaluable naval and air bases which form a vital and irreplaceable link in the chain of our world defense against Communist aggression.

Of course, much remains to be done. But under the direction of Francisco Franco who is accepted by the Spanish people as the sole bulwark against disintegration, we can discuss marked progress toward permanent stability.

And may I add a word of tribute here for the excellent work the Spanish Ambassador to the United States, Mariano Yturralde, is doing in advancing the understanding of his country in the United States and improving relations between our two nations.

Of course, as friends of the great Spanish people, we would hope for greater progress. We would hope to see the gradual spread of economic well-being, the rise of living standards, the broadening of individual liberties and the ultimate emergence of this Nation from isolation to a position of equality with our other allied nations in the free world.

But all of this takes time and, most importantly, the sympathetic understanding of nations like ourselves who are greatly dependent upon Spain's cooperation.

Therefore, on this 25th anniversary of the Franco government, I prefer to look upon the progress that has been made, to express appreciation for the support that we have had, to have confidence that economic well-being will bring political maturity and to assist as best we can, without rancor, to return this great country to the position of eminence in the world community which its historic tradition so richly warrants.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I desire very much to join with my colleagues and with the American people in offering my felicitations to the Government of Spain and to the Spanish people for the great strides that have been made in the past 25 years.

Having visited Spain on a number of occasions and traveled over the country, as well as having had discussions with His Excellency Generalissimo Francisco Franco. I have had the very good feeling that Spain and the United States are and will continue to be great friends. This is advantageous to both of our countries.

Spain has been most cooperative in permitting the establishment of great airbases and a great naval base. I am further happy over the fact that I know the cause for which we are all struggling has been furthered by our mutual friendship. I sincerely hope that the future will hold greater things in store in the next 25 years for the people of Spain and that our friendly relationship will continue and grow.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, today I join with my other colleagues and free-loving people throughout the world in sending felicitations to our near neighbor, Spain, upon the anniversary of her gallant fight for freedom from communism.

This is the 25th anniversary of the outbreak which marked the beginning of Spain's Civil War. Despite its industrial difficulties and near financial collapse, the people of Spain carried on under the heroic leadership of General Franco and with the utmost faith in God.

On the several visits I have made to Spain, I was deeply impressed with the devotion of the women and children—dressed in mourning—tramping the streets, with rosary tightly grasped in their hand. They were on their way to mass to devotedly pray for their loved ones who had given their life's blood for the cause of freedom and their right to worship.

The people of Spain are friendly. They are a great ally for us. We can count on them to be in our corner should the chips be down. They will continue to fight for their rightful place amongst the freedom-loving nations of the world.

When we look back upon the history of our own country, we must not overlook the fact that it was the people of Spain who financed and manned the ship and sent on his way the great explorer who discovered America. And after our discovery—they helped in every possible manner to make America the greatest Nation on earth.

I wish to most heartily salute the generous, God-fearing, and loving people of Spain and rejoice with them and their leader, Generalissimo Franco, upon their triumphant success. May God bless them and keep them always in His divine care.

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I send greetings on the 25th anniversary of the liberation of Spain, at which time I want to take this opportunity, while the House

is discussing our relationships with Spain, to call attention to the fact that one of our most outstanding Pennsylvanians, the Honorable Anthony J. Drexel Biddle, was selected by President Kennedy to serve our Nation in the important post of Ambassador to Spain.

Ambassador Biddle had a remarkable diplomatic career during World War II in a role which played an enormous part toward the success of the forces of freedom. He has most recently been adjutant general of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania under Governor David L. Lawrence, prior to his appointment by the President to the post in Spain.

It is, of course, a mark of the importance with which the President regards the Madrid post in the furtherance of his foreign policy that he would select for it a man of such recognized ability and stature. In return, we are pleased that the Spanish Government, in designating His Excellency Mariano Yturralde Orbegoso as Ambassador to the United States, has similarly sent us a highly regarded diplomat.

I have never had the pleasure of visiting Spain, but many of my constituents in the Second Congressional District of Pennsylvania, in Philadelphia, who have been lucky enough to travel through Europe on business or pleasure, have told me in glowing terms of the wonderful time they have enjoyed in Madrid and elsewhere in Spain. Travel is indeed a fine way of improving person-to-person relationships between the peoples of different Nations. I am pleased that we are taking steps now to make America more attractive as a tourist mecca and I hope many in Spain will come to visit us.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, it is most appropriate that we pause here to recognize and salute the great nation of Spain on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of her liberation.

All of us very well realize that the culture of Spain and her contributions to the development of our hemisphere have long been a part of our common heritage.

We also appreciate that long ago they demonstrated they clearly understood what it has taken us and so many other parts of the world a long time to recognize, that communism is evil in its very nature. They very early understood that the determined objective of communism is eventual enslavement and domination of the world by the Soviet Union.

We have long enjoyed a mutually friendly relationship with Spain and her people and they have demonstrated their friendship by cooperating with us in the establishment and operation of airbases there, vitally important to the defense of ourselves and the free world against attempted Communist expansion by force.

The vital import of these defense bases and the cooperation of Spain in our mutual objective of maintaining liberty and freedom in the world has been commended by former President Eisenhower and the later and revered Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles.

Let us, then, today extend our congratulations and best wishes to Spain,

her courageous leaders and all the Spanish people for the enjoyment of continued honorable peace and increased economic blessings. Let us renew our expressions of mutual confidence and trust as we move on together in our joined determination that freedom and liberty will not perish from the earth by the plague of Communist tyranny or any other uncivilized terror.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in paying tribute to Spain on this 25th anniversary of the start of their civil war. Little did we realize at the time of that war just how vital to our own welfare the outcome of it would be. Fortunately for us and for the rest of the free world the Spanish people recognized the dangers of communism, when we were hardly aware of its existence, and were brave enough to risk their lives and their fortunes for the cause of freedom and independence.

In addition to being indebted to Spain for the discovery of this continent, and its fight against communism a quarter of a century ago, we must realize that their neutrality during World War II was one of the greatest contributing factors to our victory and the defeat of our enemies. Had they joined forces with either side, the outcome could have been far different.

One need but study briefly the location of Spain to realize its strategic importance to Europe and the rest of the free world. We are fortunate, indeed, to have been able to reach such satisfactory agreement with Spain, which permits our use of their soil for air and naval bases on the Atlantic and Mediterranean. This agreement put them squarely on the side of the free world and makes them a prime target for Communist forces, in the event of open conflict. Thus we have another example of their love of liberty and their willingness to risk war, if necessary, to preserve it.

It is therefore a privilege to join with the people of Spain in observing this anniversary of their struggle for freedom, and to rejoice with them in their victory. We wish for them continued improvement in their economic conditions and with us, many years of peace and freedom, to enjoy their hard-won freedom.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, it is most appropriate that Spain of all countries should be recognized on her anniversary as one of the most important bulwarks of the entire free world.

Within the confines of Spain are some of the most valuable strategic defenses of the free world, and without the sincere and loyal cooperation of this great nation, all this would have been impossible.

Spain has suffered over a million dead and countless thousands of casualties, and with her beautiful cities bombed and destroyed and a large part of her country devastated, has seen destruction everywhere.

The war which brought Spain's victory over communism was a long, tragic, and bloody one. She further triumphed over the intrigues and pressures of the Axis Powers in World War II, and today

she stands as one of our great monuments of freedom for the free world. We should never forget that during World War II General Franco kept his country neutral despite tremendous pressure from the Axis Powers.

All in all, over the years, and at this time more than 21 years since her victory over communism, Spain has courageously demonstrated her ability to move ahead with both patience and understanding for the other freedom-loving nations of the world. I think that every freedom-loving American should be most grateful for Spain's contribution to the cause of freedom and for her extreme cooperation and kindness toward the United States. I believe that Spain has justly demonstrated that there will never be a time the United States should fail to put forth every possible effort to aid, help, and thereby keep, the friendship of this great nation.

I wish to take this opportunity to pay special tribute to the Ambassadors and representatives that have been sent to the United States to represent this great nation. They have all been remarkable, able, and outstanding men, and certainly have demonstrated by their unusual and exceptional statesmanship that they are the highest caliber of representatives that any nation could send to our country.

So I am happy, Mr. Speaker, to be able to express my feelings today for the great good fortune that this country has realized as a result of the mutual feeling of friendship between Spain and our Nation, and it is my wish and hope that Spain shall continue to go forward and prosper, and be a symbol as a great bulwark of strength for all freedom-loving peoples of the world.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Spain—the symbol of opposition to the Kremlin.

Mr. Speaker, for a quarter of a century we have enjoyed the friendship of the Spanish people. Today we have an alliance with these proud people that is the most meaningful of any nation in the Western World. Spain asks for nothing but friendship and the right to fight the ideology of communism.

Some years ago, we made a military alliance with General Franco. Under this pact, Spain permitted our Nation to construct military bases on her soil. We paid nothing for the land—only the cost of construction—other nations made us pay through the nose for every inch of real estate we obtained—not Spain.

Today those bases are built and are the most important we have on earth. At Rota alone we have a base worth many others in Europe.

When our Nation landed at Beirut, General Franco was asked what Spain would do if we got in a war with Russia as a consequence. Would Spain allow us to use the bases? Franco is supposed to have said, "That is why they were built." These words illustrate our friends in Spain. I think we have no more loyal—anywhere on earth.

Spain has always sent her finest representatives to America. I have known them all. The present one is a classic

example of such fine Spaniards, His Excellency Mariano Yturralde Orbegoso.

Mr. Speaker on this 25th anniversary all Americans should salute our friendship. No better exists anywhere on earth.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, once again I want to take the opportunity of placing before our colleagues the remarks made on the floor of this House on January 24, 1950.

Since 1950, it has been my good fortune to meet and get to know each of Spain's diplomatic representatives to the United States and to the United Nations. They have committed Spain to being our ally in the all-out struggle against communism. Spain has never once faltered in her pledges to us and has not in the slightest deviated from the highest principles of international law.

It has been my happy privilege to get to know the new Spanish Ambassador, His Excellency Mariano Yturralde Orbegoso. He impresses me as an able career diplomat who will distinguish himself on the American scene, strengthening the ties of friendship and continuing to improve the relations between our countries.

The most recent evidence of the humaneness of the Spanish regime was its action which was announced on June 22, 1961, in relinquishing its right to demand the return to Spain from the United States of two Spanish naval deserters. This voluntary action by the Spanish Government came after our State Department and our American courts had recognized the validity of article XXIV of the Treaty of Friendship and General Relations between the two countries which established the international obligation of the United States to return the seamen at the request of the Spanish Government.

It is conduct of that kind which creates better relations between governments and their people.

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE JEWS IN SPAIN
(Speech of Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, of New York, in the House of Representatives, Tuesday, January 24, 1950)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this time to tell the House about the Jews in Spain.

This is not a plea for resumption of diplomatic relations with Spain. Whatever our course of conduct with any country, it should be based upon principle and upon truth.

LOVE OF DEMOCRACY

I love freedom and democracy. I will never embrace any form of totalitarianism. I, therefore, despise every type of dictatorship, political or religious, vicious or benevolent. But the type of government of any nation is not to be decided by outside sources. One of the fundamental features of the United Nations Charter is the right of each country to determine for itself how it shall be governed. My thoughts and feelings on this subject have been openly and freely declared and publicized.

Accordingly, I had never had any desire to visit Spain. In fact, I felt that my vigorous, if not violent, denunciation of Franco would, to say the least, make me unwelcome there. More than a year ago I had been told that my antagonism against the Spanish Government was engendered by misinformation and that the Jew in Spain

was accorded the same privileges as any other Spaniard. I made no effort to hide my disbelief. In fact I said that if that were true, the Jews would be the first to proclaim it. Why not, said I, have one or more of the leaders of Spanish Jewry come to the United States and tell it to us. The response was that such procedure would be derided in the American press as paid propaganda.

I continued to believe the newspaper and magazine articles about the terribly oppressive conditions under which Jews lived in Spain, confined in ghettos, denied the right of religious worship, and the pursuit of the traditional rites of practicing Jews.

When my wife and I planned a trip to the European Continent and the Middle East last year, Spain was not on our itinerary. It was not even once considered as a place we cared to see. My mind was closed on Spain and on the possibility of any good coming out of it. Incidentally, even though I planned and did devote much time on that trip to matters of official interest to me as a Member of Congress, I bore the full expense thereof personally.

WHY I WENT TO SPAIN

On the start of our journey, aboard the *Queen Mary*, I heard much talk from apparently responsible sources directly at variance with my beliefs about Spain. In London and Paris I heard more of the same tenor. I continued to hold to my own ideas on the subject.

In Paris we attended the Rosh Hashana—Jewish New Year—services in the famous Rothschild Synagogue. It overflowed with worshippers. There was standing room only. During the portion of the services devoted to meditation I thought of the fact that here were thousands of free men and women praying according to their ancient tradition in a place but so recently occupied by Hitler's Nazis. Through my mind ran the places where freedom of worship was still proscribed. Communist Russia and her satellites came to mind, some Arab countries, and then Spain. An inspiration struck me. At least some of my colleagues were going to Spain and might be misled by false propaganda into bringing tales to the United States that all was well there with the Jew. I could scotch such tales if I could go there and bring home firsthand knowledge of the true situation.

Fearful that my request for a visa would be denied, I did not present myself at the Spanish Embassy in Paris. Instead I asked the American Embassy in Paris to obtain our Spanish visas. In due course our passports came back with the visas affixed.

From France we proceeded to Spain instead of going to Italy as originally planned. Obviously I had no interest in Generalissimo Franco. I had no desire to see him and I did not see him.

NO DISCRIMINATION, NO GHETTOS

We spent most of our time with the members of the Jewish communities. We conversed in English, Yiddish, and German. We were in their places of business, in their homes, and in their synagogues. We were shown around Barcelona by native Jews who were as proud of their city as any Brooklynite is of his Brooklyn—than whom there is no prouder native son. I know it will sound incredible to the average American but here is the truth and I will document it for you.

There is no discrimination against the Jew in business or in employment in Spain. The Jewish employee and the Jewish employer have the same privileges and the same rights as any Spaniard. No one asks him his religion. It is the only place in the Eastern Hemisphere, outside of Israel, where I observed Jews proudly wearing in their lapels the gold Mogen David, the shield of David,

colloquially referred to as the Jewish star. The Jews are engaged in business as merchants, exporters, importers and manufacturers.

They live wherever they can afford to rent or buy a home. There is no ghetto. No one asks their religion before they rent or sell a home to a Jew.

They make no attempt to hide their Judaism. They are not afraid of persecution because they happen to be Jews.

FREEDOM OF ACTION

I had been told that they were not permitted to acquire Torahs—Holy Bibles, handwritten in Hebrew upon parchment scrolls. Here is a photostatic copy of an original certificate by the Spanish authorities permitting Mr. D. Salomon Romano, as secretary of the Jewish community of Barcelona, to import a Torah, free of duty or other payment.

Shortly after our arrival in Barcelona the local Jewish community tendered a testimonial dinner to me at the Ritz Hotel. Not only was the dinner publicized but the printed menu cards—I hold an autographed copy of one in my hand—said in Spanish that it was tendered by the Jewish community of Barcelona. The placecards carried the names of every person in attendance. Pictures were taken by a commercial photographer. I have several of them here. That is certainly not the conduct of a minority group of people which is faced with persecution or is fearful of oppression.

Congressman EUGENE J. KEOGH, of New York, made an inspiring talk at this dinner, which was gratefully acknowledged by those in attendance. I visited their synagogue which is used for daily prayer. Here are the photographs of the interior of that synagogue. One of these shows the rabbi in the pulpit. I worshiped with them at their Sabbath services.

Any Christian entering that place of worship will see at a glance that it is not a Catholic church. Any Jew will observe at once that it is a synagogue.

As in most Jewish communities, the synagogue customarily used for daily prayer is not large enough to accommodate the large number of worshippers on the high holy days. In Barcelona, they solved their high holy day problem by renting a theater which they equipped for use as a synagogue during those holidays. I was there between New Year's Day—Rosh Hashana—and the day of atonement—Yom Kippur. Here are the pictures of the interior of that building as it was prepared for use as a synagogue. Note please that the names of the pew holders appear on every seat.

SPAIN'S ROLE IN RESCUING JEWS

It was in Barcelona that I first learned of the thousands of Jews that were rescued with the aid of Spain from the Nazis. That was told to me by a Jew who had been interned in a concentration camp and who was not only rescued by Franco's men but was given the very job he holds today by one of them.

I later had the fact confirmed to me by a representative of the American Joint Distribution Committee that, during the height of Hitler's blood baths, upward of 60,000 Jews had been saved through the generosity of Spanish authorities who permitted them to enter into Spain and then helped them proceed to places of safe refuge.

Upon my return to this country I contacted the World Jewish Congress and received from its representative a copy of the resolution it adopted in November 1944 in Atlantic City, N.J. Let me quote this sentence to you from that resolution:

"The War Emergency Conference extends its gratitude to the Holy See and to the Governments of Sweden, Switzerland, and Spain and to the International Committee of the

Red Cross for the protection they offered under difficult conditions to the persecuted Jews in Hungary. It is confident that this protection will be continued and its scope enlarged in accordance with the contingency of the situation."

From Barcelona we flew to Madrid. Again we devoted ourselves to the Jewish community. There are only about 500 Jews in Madrid and about 3,500 in Barcelona. I since learned that there are also two very small communities in Valencia and Seville. The total population of Spain is 28 million, of whom between 4,000 and 5,000 are Jews.

In Madrid we attended the Yom Kippur services in their synagogue. I participated in the prayer service, wherein we used Torahs which in 1939 had been secreted for safekeeping in a Catholic monastery and later returned by a Catholic bishop to Dr. Ignacio Bauer, as president of the Jewish community in Madrid. Dr. Bauer is a lawyer and a professor of law at the University of Madrid. A teacher of English in a Catholic high school there assured us that the school authorities have known from the day they hired her that she was an orthodox Jewess.

RELIGIOUS RESTRICTIONS

I inquired in both cities about restrictions against the practice of traditional Jewish rites. I was assured that there was no restriction against kosher slaughtering of fowl and cattle.

The Jews are required to obtain permits to maintain their synagogues. The same is true, however, of all non-Catholic places of worship. Having in mind that Spain, like certain other European countries, has a state religion; I thought this was an unfair requirement imposed for the benefit of the Catholic Church. England and the Scandinavian countries have state religions, but no such requirement.

Italy, which has no state religion, does have such a requirement. The reason given for the requirement in Spain and in Italy was that the Government desired to be in a position of assuring itself that no religious institution would be used as a cover for revolutionary or antigovernment activity.

While understanding the reason I do not approve the regulation. I think both Italy and Spain stand to gain more in the eyes of the free world by abolishing such regulations.

What bothered me greatly, however, was the fact that although both the Barcelona and the Madrid Jewish communities had been assured by authorities that their applications for permits were in order and that they could function, no written permits had been issued by the authorities. I also learned that in Barcelona the Jews were not permitted to bury their dead, but were required to seal the bodies in vaults in a wall maintained at one side of the civil cemetery. This condition did not prevail in Madrid, where the civil cemetery was divided by a wall into what became two cemeteries, one for Jews and one for the Protestants.

I was assured by Mr. Enrique Benarroya, president of the Jewish community in Barcelona, and by Dr. Ignacio Bauer, president of the Jewish community in Madrid, as well as by many others in both cities, that they were quite happy with their lot in life, that the Spanish authorities extended every cooperation to them and their coreligionists, and that they suffered no discrimination at the hands of the authorities or of private citizens.

INTERCESSION ON BEHALF OF JEWS

Before leaving Madrid I called on the Foreign Minister. I told him of the things I had learned about the Jews in Barcelona and Madrid. I told him how very glad I was about some of the things I had learned. I also told him about the things I did not like.

I emphasized particularly that, while I did not approve of the regulations requiring

permits to maintain places of worship, at least the written permits should be issued if governmental requirements were met. I also said that the cemetery situation was not only intolerable but irreligious.

I was most agreeably surprised to find that the Foreign Minister was in accord with my thinking on both subjects. While he knew that both Jewish communities were maintaining synagogues, he professed not to know that written permits had not been issued by the local authorities. He assured me he would inquire into the matter and see that they were promptly issued. He was disturbed to learn about the cemetery situation, and promised me that if my facts were correct those regulations would be rescinded at once.

After discussing these matters with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH], he suggested that we discuss them with the Spanish Ambassador at Large, José F. de Lequerica. Upon our return to Washington, D.C., we did just that, and the Ambassador offered to follow the matter with his Government to a satisfactory conclusion.

RESTRICTIONS ABOLISHED

I am happy to announce today that I have before me confirmation of the fact that formal permits have been issued by the proper Spanish authorities for the maintenance of the Jewish synagogues, and for the burial of Jewish dead in accordance with orthodox religious requirements.

This confirmation comes to me from many sources. Ambassador de Lequerica has so advised me orally and in writing. An American friend in Spain, who has nothing to fear from any source, has so advised me in writing. The World Jewish Congress and the American Joint Distribution Committee have likewise confirmed those facts.

The World Jewish Congress wrote me:

"We received direct confirmation from our friends in Spain that the Barcelona community was granted official recognition, and that the communities of Barcelona and Seville were given permission to maintain their cemetery."

Dr. Bauer wrote me from Madrid:

"I am certain you are already aware of your great personal success. Thanks to your intervention, the Barcelona community is already officially recognized, and we hope that the Madrid community will also be approved shortly. I consider this as being really a great feat."

The American Joint Distribution Committee wrote me under date of January 12, 1950:

"The efforts you made while in Madrid apparently have borne early and productive fruit."

Mr. Benarroya wrote me from Barcelona, as follows:

"Since your visit things have been happening very fast and in our favor. On the part of the civil governor and in accordance with instructions from Madrid, we have obtained official recognition for our community, which puts us in the same situation as all other communities in other countries. We are under the impression that this was due to the influence of the United States of America, and knowing that you, my dear Mr. MULTER, had something to do with this, we send you our thanks, and ask that you send same along to the other people who intervened."

I take this occasion to extend such thanks publicly to all those who lent their good offices to the excellent results obtained and especial thanks to my good friend and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH].

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, permit me to commend my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] for his typically intelligent address. He has been overly generous in his treatment of

me for which, of course, I am grateful. My knowledge of the matters about which he has spoken leads me to observe that he has rendered our country a great and courageous service, in addition to which he has been an important factor in further removing some of the real or fancied differences that have tended to separate us from the people of Spain—a separation which, if removed, would better serve the interests of all peaceful and freedom-loving people. You have listened to a well-documented report from one of our most energetic and capable Members from New York. The longtime effect of his conscientious and successful efforts to improve the situation of the Jews in Spain will become the greater as time goes on. He has well served the cause of peace and has well served the Spaniards of Jewish faith.

On February 24, 1955, I inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an item, as follows:

COMMUNITY HEAD STATES SPAIN NOT ANTI-SEMITIC

(Extension of remarks of Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, of New York, in the House of Representatives, Thursday, February 24, 1955)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following news item which appeared in the Jewish Advocate newspaper in Boston, Mass., on February 10, 1955:

"COMMUNITY HEAD STATES SPAIN NOT ANTI-SEMITIC

"MANILA.—Newspaper accusations in the United States and Britain that Spain has been intolerant of Jews and anti-Semitic were denied here this week by Daniel F. Baroukh, president of the Jewish community of Madrid, who is currently in the Philippines.

"In a statement to the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, Sr. Baroukh noted that 2 years ago he was granted an audience by the Spanish Chief of State, the first such interview granted a Jew in Spain in 450 years. He said he came away from the meeting impressed with General Franco's words and message to the people of Israel.

"Sr. Baroukh recalled that 2 years ago the Spanish Government gave its permission for the holding of public high holiday services in a Madrid hotel and that a Spanish Government representative attended the services, as did leading Spanish Catholics, representatives of the American Embassy, and American Jews. In a reference to the refusal to grant a permit to hold similar services in a Madrid hotel this past Rosh Hashana, Sr. Baroukh said a mistake was committed by his secretary in Sr. Baroukh's absence.

"The head of the Spanish Jewish community stressed that during the Nazi regime many Jews were saved by being admitted to Spain. He listed various other gestures by the Spanish Government toward the facilitating of religious services and instruction, and acknowledged its presentation of a magnificent collection of books for the projected Sephardic Library in Jerusalem. Sr. Baroukh said that there are now 35,000 Jews in Spain."

It has been my happy privilege to become rather well acquainted with the former Spanish Ambassador to the United States and present chief of the Spanish mission to the United Nations, His Excellency José Felix de Lequerica and his successor as the Ambassador to our country, His Excellency José Maria de Areilza. They are both able and distinguished diplomats and truly great statesmen. They have improved relations between our countries, while at all times working for world peace.

I hope that the people of our two countries can continue to work and live together in harmony.

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, currently there is being commemorated in many parts of the world the 25th anniversary of the Spanish Government which was inaugurated on July 18, 1936, following a bloody but unavoidable civil war.

Ever since Benjamin Franklin, our first diplomatic representative to Spain, served our Nation in that historic land, there have been strong ties of friendship between the United States and Spain. Only once in our history have we resolved our difficulties by hostile force, but that was in days long gone and the events of that period have faded into the realm of forgetfulness.

Today, under the leadership of Generalissimo Francisco Franco, Spain has risen to a position of power where it stands as a bulwark against the forces of communism.

The Spanish people are represented in this country by an Ambassador of extreme skill, charm, and ability, namely, His Excellency Mariano de Yturralde, who is a statesman of the highest rank. He has helped cement the relationships between our countries and has given to America a broader understanding of the ideology, the norms, and customs of the Spanish people.

At the present time the United States is dependent upon Spain for the conduct and administration of the joint Spanish-American air bases, naval bases, the 485-mile-long pipeline, and other important military installations built at a cost of some \$350 million as a bastion of strength against the inroads of Communist aggression. These bases, far-flung facilities that they are, function effectively under joint Spanish-American operation and they constitute a warning to those who would destroy us that we have the means and the will not only to defend ourselves but to strike a lethal blow at our attackers. In this enterprise of defense are bonds that bind us both close to each other. And in addition, there is a constant exchange of cultural activity including the Fulbright program and the exchange of art, artists, writers, and students.

Of late, thousands of American tourists are discovering the superb art treasures, the ancient monuments, the invigorating air, the majestic landscape, the nostalgic steeples, and the magnificent people of Spain and the magic of this ancient land.

The folklore of Spain goes back centuries beyond recall and the entire country is marked with beautiful alabaster visions.

Under Generalissimo Franco, stability has come to this land that has sometimes been torn with strife. Economic conditions have improved despite hard experiences with inflation, loss of foreign exchange reserves and at time the declining value of the peseta in international markets.

However, the country has become free from the shortages and scarcity of essential goods which were common a decade ago. One thing is certain: other countries will rise and fall, appear and

disappear, but the durability of the Spaniards is axiomatic and Spain has the capacity to flourish even when other nations have disappeared by reason of having lost the economic or military struggle.

Although Spain is a member of the United Nations, by some quirk of world politics it has been denied membership in NATO. This is a tragic situation, for Spain alone on the European Continent stands perpetually opposed to the Communist ideology and in the event of a showdown would stand by the United States in close consonance with our objectives.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, on this the 25th anniversary of the liberation of Spain, I take this opportunity to salute the Spanish people as friends and allies in the great struggle of our time, resistance to communism. Spain has become a valuable partner of the West in its struggle against the Communist East. Some of our most important airbases are located in Spain and their very existence aids in keeping the peace. The deterrent of an effective strategic Air Force has long prevented the Communist world from indulging in new adventures.

It is significant that on this the 25th anniversary of Spain's liberation that she is embarked on an economic revitalization which will enable her to break out of her post-World War II isolation and embark on a program of worldwide economic activity.

Nowhere can be found people who are more genuinely receptive to Americans than the Spanish people. They displayed true friendship and a real desire to welcome visiting Americans. On my visits to Spain, I have always come away with the feeling that I would like to return and this can be attributed to the wonderful qualities of the Spanish people.

They are not only imbued with a strong desire for friendship with this country but they have always displayed a fierce resistance to godless communism.

They long ago clearly saw what we, and the rest of the world, had to painfully recognize through the light of experience that communism is evil by its very nature, and that communism was but a cause to veil the plans for world domination by the Soviet Union.

So, today, let us wish Spain and the Spanish people well. As they celebrate the 25th anniversary of their liberation let us wish them continued peace and real prosperity. The culture of Spain and their contributions to the development of our hemisphere were long part of our common heritage. We renew that feeling of mutual destiny as we join thanks in our mutual determination that the world will not be engulfed by Soviet communism.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the Spanish civil war, I am happy to join with my colleagues in saluting the people of Spain and in paying tribute to the role now being played by Spain in our overall defense against communism in Western Europe.

It was my privilege a little more than a year ago, Mr. Speaker, both as a mem-

ber of the Naval Reserves and a member of the Committee on Armed Services of this House, to make my first visit to Spain. Of course I had read about Spain and the trials and travails that the people of Spain endured during the long years of its civil war. But this was my first opportunity to visit that country in person.

Although my visit was brief, I want to say that I came away very much impressed not only by the physical beauty of the Spanish landscape but also by the amazing development that has occurred in this country in the years that have elapsed since the civil war came to a close.

Let me say too that I had a chance personally to visit the memorial erected outside of Madrid to those who lost their lives in the Spanish civil war, the Valley of the Fallen, a great cathedral fashioned out of the solid rock of the Guadarama Mountains. This is one of the most impressive memorials I have ever seen, and stands as a fitting symbol to a decisive victory over communism on the part of the Spanish people.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that Spain is a part of our North Atlantic defense community. I had a chance to see our major airbase at Torrejon, outside of Madrid. I satisfied myself of the vital importance of our new naval base at Rota. If the Soviets should ever strike against Western Europe, a factor we must always keep in mind as the crisis in Berlin heightens, Spain alone in Western Europe will provide us with a foothold from which to strike back and as a sanctuary in which to recoup our forces. And, Mr. Speaker, with the whittling away at American air and naval bases in north Africa that has been underway now for some years, our air and naval bases in Spain become absolutely essential to our defense.

Mr. Speaker, the fight against communism requires a broad and solid base. We in America can be glad that communism has gained no foothold in Spain and that the Spanish Government has pledged its support to us in this way in the vital fight against the Communist menace we wage together.

For this reason, I am glad to salute our Spanish ally at this critical and decisive moment in world history.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this month the people of Spain are celebrating the 25th anniversary of the beginning of a glorious victory over the dreaded communistic scourge.

It is only fitting and proper that we salute the leader of those victorious forces, the great soldier-statesman, Gen. Francisco Franco.

There is a traditional close relationship between the people of Spain and the people of the United States. The people of Spain and the Government of Spain are strong in their deep faith and their love of God and love of neighbor, and whenever we find the people of any nation who are possessed of such deep faith, we know that in the world of today, they are also bitterly opposed to godless and atheistic communism. The current history of Spain is one of strong

opposition to the international conspiracy. I have always been a strong advocate of friendly and close relationship between the Government of the United States and the Government of Spain, and particularly between the people of both countries.

In the face of the threat to the entire world of atheistic and international communism, it is necessary for those who believe in and love God to unite together in the common cause of preserving the spiritual truths and ideals in which we all believe.

It gives me great pleasure to congratulate and felicitate the great and noble people of Spain who are inextricably a part of our own culture and history, as well as their distinguished Ambassador Mariano de Yturralde who combines the highest qualities of a successful career diplomat.

SPAIN FREED FROM COMMUNISM

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, a quarter of a century ago the threat of Communist totalitarianism, which later was to become worldwide, had its overt manifestations, including the now familiar aim of suppressing all religious activity, in Spain, where religion is such an intimate part of the way of life. When these suppressions became intolerable to the good people of that country their struggle for liberation from that yoke was begun on July 18, 1936. After a devastating and heartbreaking war the foreign domination was finally eradicated. Thus the Soviet hold in a strategic part of Western Europe was eliminated and perhaps the course of history was changed. We now know, from bitter experience, how that hold—if permitted to remain—would have sought to spread to other parts of the Continent with, perhaps, disastrous consequences to the United States and the rest of the free world.

We would be deprived of the strategic naval and air bases which we have set up with the consent of the Spanish Government and a most vital area for the defense of Europe would be in unfriendly hands.

At the present time the United States enjoys warm and cordial relations with the friendly Spanish Government, particularly through its eminent and able Ambassador, His Excellency Mariano de Yturralde, who has devoted himself to the furthering of those relations, and who is so capably carrying on in the efficient tradition of his immediate predecessor, Ambassador José Felix de Lequerica.

Mr. Speaker, on this anniversary of the commencement of that great and historic struggle by the people of Spain, I wish to extend to them my sincere congratulations and express the hope that our friendly alliance will continue and flourish. I should like to see an increase in cultural and political relations between our two countries. There are many cherished vestiges in the United States, especially in the West and Southwest, of the Spanish culture and background.

BERLIN AND GERMANY AND MIDDLE EUROPE: WE SHOULD ARM AND PARLEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, last Monday the United States, Great Britain, and France sent notes to Moscow setting forth our clear determination to maintain the freedom of the 2.2 million people of West Berlin. This House will overwhelmingly endorse, I am sure, the resolution just reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, recognizing this moral obligation.

The notes also told of the West's readiness to consider a freely negotiated settlement of the unresolved problems of Germany. And Western foreign ministers will meet in Paris on August 5-6 to consider a Western position for negotiation.

Certainly the West needs a position. As it is necessary to remain firm in our determination not to be pushed out of Berlin, it is equally necessary that we have a set of goals for the future of Germany and of middle Europe.

THE KREMLIN'S MOTIVES

The chances that the Kremlin will accept a sensible Western negotiating proposal are bleak indeed. But we certainly should not be inhibited from setting forth what we believe to be right because the Russians may not like it.

Before considering a set of goals for the West to adopt, let us ask ourselves what is the Kremlin's motive in demanding that West Berlin be made a free city, ending the four-power occupation, and in threatening to sign a separate peace treaty with East Germany, which would then control access routes to West Berlin.

It seems to me that there are two main possible theories of Kremlin action:

First. The maximum theory, that the Kremlin is presently engaged upon an all-out campaign for the destruction of the Western alliance on all continents, and that it aims at Berlin as a symbol, just as the Turks in the 17th century aimed at Vienna as the symbol of Christian Europe. As evidence of the maximum theory, you can look at the Moscow statement of Communist leaders from 81 countries in November 1960, and Khrushchev's January 6, 1961, speech.

Second. The minimum theory, that the Kremlin is uncertain of its European flank, and wants a German treaty pinned down and a status quo clearly established before West Germany gets the atomic bomb.

WHAT KHRUSHCHEV SAID

Walter Lippmann's report—Howard K. Smith, CBS, June 15, 1961—on what Khrushchev told him in his recent interview well delineates the minimum view:

All I can tell you is that Khrushchev says he wants to negotiate. And my own view is, that the thing he wants more than anything else, and I'd like to tell you why he wants it, I think—he wants to give legal status to the East German State.

Why does he want to have this? I asked him why he was in such a hurry. The answer was: "I am in a hurry because I want the frontiers of Germany, and the status of Berlin and the demarcation line between the two Germanys settled in a treaty before West Germany gets the atomic bomb. They've (the West Germans) already got it—being trained how to use it. They haven't got the warheads, but they are going to get it and they surely will get it in 4 or 5 years—and if that comes then the great danger for Europe exists, because either by their attacking East Germany and overrunning East Berlin—or the other way around, that the East Germans rise and they go to their defense—either way, there'll be nothing to stop it, nobody will have any agreements.

You won't intervene—and there we'll be with a very dangerous war at our hands. So we must have a treaty first. And that is what I am pressing for. But I want to get those frontiers fixed so that if either Germany moves, in a military sense, in the next 4 or 5 years, it will be the aggressor.

I doubt whether anyone outside the Kremlin really knows which of these two theories is correct—or whether neither is, or both are. I shall not engage in Kremlin astrology.

But there is only one way to force our opponent to discuss his thoughts and plans. This is to confront him with a rational and logical concept that would make it difficult for him in the eyes of the world to elude discussion. This sort of probing, exploratory negotiation by the West is a sign of strength, not of weakness. It should be undertaken for its own sake, rather than merely in response to Khrushchev's Berlin threats.

If the maximum theory is correct, there is no hope of successful negotiation. Even so, the West needs a clearly formulated position, lest the uncommitted world be taken in by Khrushchev's demands for nice-sounding things like a "free city" for Berlin, and a "peace treaty" for East Germany.

If the minimum theory has something to it, however, exploratory negotiations have a point. If what Khrushchev really fears is aggression by the West Germans, or a situation in East Germany which might trigger a conflict he has something we can talk about. It should be within the reach of statesmanship to prepare a set of goals which at the least would put the onus of refusing to discuss reasonable proposals on Russia's back.

SOME ELEMENTS OF A PROPOSAL

The outlines of such a proposal have been advanced by myself and by some of my colleagues on this side of the House on many occasions in the past—on March 16, 1955; in December 1956; on March 27, 1957; on November 22, 1957; on December 12, 1957; on January 27, 1958; on April 16, 1958; on March 26, 1959.

Here are some elements to consider in a possible position for the West:

First. The problem of Berlin can be solved not as an isolated problem, but only within the larger framework of Germany, middle Europe, and a security system which embraces East and West.

Second. In middle Europe—where twice in this century world wars have erupted and where a third explosion is

possible—a zone of reduced military tension may be possible. It could involve withdrawal of Russian troops back to her historic borders, and of British, United States, and French troops back to the west bank of the Rhine, or perhaps out of Germany. These withdrawals would not affect the strategic military power of either side in Europe.

In the area between the Rhine and Russia, there would need to be freely agreed and self-imposed limitations on armaments. Nuclear weapons would be banned from this middle European zone. The conventional arms allowed would be sufficient for self-defense, but not for aggressive war.

In the case of Western Germany, the present number of divisions, or a somewhat higher number to compensate for the withdrawal of NATO troops to the West, could be envisaged.

The phasing out from middle Europe of Russian and Western troops, and the limitations on remaining armaments, would have to be supervised by an international control commission, perhaps under the U.N. In addition, both East and West would guarantee the area of middle Europe against outside attack.

True, a zone of arms control confined to middle Europe may seem to "discriminate" against that area. But as an announced first step in a broader program of arms control, it is no more "discriminatory" than, say, a nuclear test ban which only affects nuclear powers.

Third. Politically, the key for middle Europe has to be the protection of human rights. It will inevitably take some time before free elections can be held in the countries of Eastern Europe, and for East and West Germany to be ready for reunification. Meanwhile, the U.N. could be involved as a supranational protector of human rights in the area. Just as Western Europe, under the leadership of France and West Germany, has moved away from traditional ideas of sovereignty, and toward a supranational arrangement, surely the countries of middle Europe could accept some international guarantees that their governments will respect human rights.

THE PROBLEM OF "REENTRY"

Fourth. As in outer space, middle Europe has a reentry problem. The human mind, which recently proved itself capable of devising a system for reentry from outer space, should be equally capable of devising a system to prevent the reentry of Russian troops into middle Europe once they have retired.

Russian reentry, of course, would be subject to the full retaliatory power of the West.

But equally important is an arrangement whereby there would be as little reason for the Soviet Union to reenter as possible. We should insist that the Soviet Union withdraw her oppressive control over middle Europe; but the Soviet Union justly needs guarantees that the countries of Europe would not become anti-Soviet, Fascist, heavily armed states that would once again menace her. There are two ways of forestalling such an evolution, and by

so doing minimizing the danger of Russian reentry:

(a) International control of armaments in the region would make it very difficult for any regime to build up military strength which could menace Russia.

(b) A U.N. commitment to protect human rights in the area would exclude Fascist regimes.

Fifth. If Russia undertakes to sign a separate peace treaty with East Germany, the West may have to deal for some purposes with East Germany—just as West Germany now deals with it for purposes of trade. But this does not mean that the West accepts the permanent partition of Germany. In the context of the broad arrangements here described, we could look with some confidence toward the progressive liberalization of East Germany, leading to the ultimate reunification in freedom which is our goal. Since reunification of Germany cannot be brought about by military force, we ought to let the forces of depolarization work in the direction of reunification.

THE ODER-NEISSE PROBLEM

Sixth. A viable arrangement for middle Europe is not possible unless it includes a basis for settling the Oder-Neisse territorial question between Germany and Poland. Until the border question is settled, Poland will quite likely feel that it needs the protection of the Red army. I believe that the Oder-Neisse boundary problem can be settled only in a middle Europe in which the old excessive nationalism, the old economic separatism, and the old political totalitarianism have given way to a middle Europe characterized by political federation, economic integration, humane governments, and internationally limited armaments. In such a framework, the Oder-Neisse question will lose most of its bitterness.

Seventh. It is not necessary to ask Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and the other countries of middle Europe to adopt a concept of neutrality like that of Switzerland or Austria. Let the military striking power of these countries be internationally limited; let the human rights of their peoples be internationally safeguarded; and they may safely maintain close economic, political, and cultural ties with either the East or the West, or with both. Germany I should certainly expect to stay with the West, and with such organizations as the Coal and Steel Community, Euratom, the Council of Europe, and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. It would enjoy a full NATO guarantee.

Will Russia entertain such a proposal? If there is anything to the minimum theory I have mentioned, she just might. Khrushchev says his great fears are a resurgent Germany armed with the bomb, and the satellites in ferment. The proposals contain workable guarantees against both of these.

ARE THE SATELLITES A BURDEN?

There is considerable evidence that the satellites, which used to be a great

source of loot for the Soviet Union, are today an economic burden, as well as a potential military liability. As Louis Fischer, author of "Russia, America, and the World," and a faculty member of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton University, reports in the July 15, 1961, issue of the Saturday Review:

Stalin robbed Poland of her coal shipments, dismantled East German industry, exploited all the satellites through trade at Moscow-made prices without aid. The East German uprising of July 16-17, 1953, was a warning to Stalin's heirs. The Polish and Hungarian revolutions of 1956 called a halt. Now Russia is paying in goods, grants, and loans for the might and prestige which empire supposedly brings. This is reverse imperialism: the colonies submit politically to the "motherland" and exploit her economically. Fine for the power-lusting Soviet dictatorship; bad for the impatient Soviet people who foot the bill. Someday an "Attlee" may arise in the Kremlin who will liberate "India," a Malenkov who will free Russia of the satellites and make Russians free. For the Soviet individual pays not only with clothes, homes, and foods; he pays also with his freedom.

But before we can probe Russia's reaction to such proposals, they must be approved not just by ourselves but by Britain, France, and West Germany.

MR. GERSTENMAIER'S SPEECH

West Germany is the key to the proposals. Most people would say that Chancellor Adenauer is not likely to relish them. I do not know. I do know that a leading member of Chancellor Adenauer's Christian Democratic Union, Bundestag President Eugen Gerstenmaier had some wise and reasonable things to say in his formal address to the German Parliament on June 30:

Within the next few days, it will be 20 years since World War II entered upon its decisive phase with the German attack on Soviet Russia. I fully understand that the Russian people will remember that event with bitterness. There is certainly no one present in this House who does not look back with sorrow on that catastrophe which Hitler's war brought upon the peoples to the east of Germany. I am speaking for all reasonable people when I say that we are ready to do our utmost in conformity with the dictates of justice to remedy the consequences of that war.

We thank God that after so much blood and tears we are living, not simply in a state of peaceful relations with France and other nations of the free world, but in an atmosphere of friendship and reconciliation.

We should like to have similar relations with our neighbors in the east and southeast.

Indeed, we Germans have nothing against peaceful coexistence. But as long as we have to fear that this concept is used merely to camouflage world-revolutionary aggressive maneuvers, there is nothing to be gained by it.

After all that has happened since the capitulation of the German Reich in May 1945, we consider it not only justified but absolutely necessary that the whole German people should be guaranteed a secure existence and freedom.

We have been, and we are, ready to give every reasonable guarantee that the German people, once they are peacefully united through a fair settlement that regards their vital requirements, will be a reliable partner

for all their neighbors in the west and the east, the north and the south.

And the Chancellor's Social Democratic opponent in the September Bundestag elections, Mayor Willy Brandt, of West Berlin, in a press conference at Bonn on July 6, called for a peace conference on Germany which would discuss, among other things, a zone in middle Europe free of atomic weapons.

THE GERMAN SITUATION

A note in the July 15 Economist discusses the current German situation:

While the Western Powers have been answering Mr. Khrushchev's proposals on Berlin in notes to the Russian Government, Dr. Adenauer and Herr Brandt have been publicly duelling on the subject in a fairly surprising way. On July 7 Herr Brandt proposed that the West should try and get away from the cold war by producing proposals on the German question as a whole. The West should be prepared to discuss the political and military status of a reunited Germany. It should propose a peace conference of 52 governments; representatives of the two German states could be consulted beforehand.

Holes can obviously be picked in this proposal. Except as a way of buying time, a peace conference of 52 states hardly looks a practical way of making progress over Germany. But in general outline Herr Brandt's idea has much to be said for it. For the West the only way of getting off the Berlin hook in the long run must lie through a serious discussion of the German question as a whole. And if such a discussion is to be fruitful, it will necessarily cover not only the character of a future German Government, but the reunited Germany's alliances, armaments and frontiers.

Dr. Adenauer's reaction, however, has been brusque and bitter: "Mr. Khrushchev is anxious to hear just this sort of thing." If Herr Brandt became Chancellor, the best thing to do would be to emigrate to the United States, he told a rally of Christian Democratic women. Thus Herr Brandt's suggestions, like most suggestions concerning the German question, are branded as dangerous appeasement.

Some of the reasons for Dr. Adenauer's attack are understandable in electoral terms. It is extremely irritating for him that Herr Brandt has been able to quote in support the suggestions for a German peace treaty made 2 weeks ago by Herr Gerstenmaier, the Christian Democratic President of the Bonn Parliament. For once it is the Christian Democrats, more than their opponents, who look divided about foreign policy.

MAYOR BRANDT'S PROPOSAL

Terrance Prittie, in the July 24, 1961, New Republic, reports from Bonn, Germany:

On July 6 Willy Brandt, the Social Democratic candidate for the Chancellorship in this autumn's West German elections, proposed the holding of an international peace conference attended by the 52 nations which fought Nazi Germany. The ostensible purpose would be to discuss a German peace treaty. But its more immediate purpose would be to mobilize world opinion against Nikita Khrushchev and Walter Ulbricht, who have been paving the way with almost maniacal preoccupation for a Berlin crisis at the end of this year. Brandt is aware that the Berlin issue, more than any other, could lead to war.

Brandt points out that the Communist leaders have been talking about the need to

liquidate the leftovers of Hitler's war. And they have gone on to say that a peace treaty should be based on the "natural consequences" of that war—chief among them the division of Germany into two separate states. This hypothesis is then used by the Communists to justify the threat that—falling peace treaties with both German states—the Communist bloc will sign one with the East German Republic alone.

Brandt has offered excellent arguments in favor of his super peace conference. He believes it would show the Soviet Union that world opinion is strongly on the side of a fair solution of the German problem—for he is sure that a big majority of the 52 nations would reject any Soviet proposal which could lead to increased tension in and over Berlin. It would show, too, that the West is ready to discuss the German question as a whole—which would compromise the Soviet allegation that the West wishes to avoid, even sabotage, negotiations. The super peace conference might deflect, if not derail Khrushchev's present intention to sign a separate peace treaty, achieve full East German sovereignty, transfer shared control over Berlin's communications from the Soviet to East German hands, and thereafter wage a war of nerves against the 2½ million inhabitants of West Berlin and the Western Powers who are responsible for their freedom and independence.

Willy Brandt is not an outstandingly clever man, but he is eminently sensible. And commonsense rather than cleverness will be more useful in countering Communist pressure in Germany which—unless countered—will lead to crisis and, possibly, to world war. In his commonsense way, Brandt, perhaps not entirely intentionally, has pointed to one essential failure in Western diplomacy—the failure to evolve a negotiating basis for the recapture of diplomatic initiative. The West has so far blankly turned down a whole string of Communist proposals—for a zone of limited armaments in central Europe, for a confederation of two German states, for the signing of German peace treaties, for all-German talks at one table. There has been an almost wearisome repetitive assertion that the West will not desert West Berlin, or recognize the East German Republic or allow East German supervision of those of Berlin's communications for which the Soviet Union has hitherto been responsible. The attitude of the West may have been firm; it has not been constructive.

This has been recognized by a great many critics, but the critics have themselves fallen into error. Some have assumed that the way to avert disaster is by working out some deal which the Russians might possibly accept. One school of thought wants recognition of the East German Republic or of the Oder-Neisse line traded for firm Soviet guarantees for the maintenance of a free West Berlin. Another school of thought would denude West Berlin of allied troops in return for the same guarantees. Yet another would agree to the permanent division of Germany (which the Soviet Union wants anyway) if the 17 million East Germans were allowed to elect their own Government freely. Proposals of deals of this kind merely suggest to Khrushchev and his advisers that there may possibly be more chance than before of wringing concessions out of the West.

There has also been a shocking failure by the West Germans to explain to the outside world just what a foreign-installed, Communist tyranny in Eastern Germany amounts to. There has been an equally bad failure by the West German Government to develop or support ideas for breaking the diplomatic deadlock (one such idea was the so-called "Macmillan plan" for a zone

of equalized armaments in Germany, which Dr. Adenauer rejected out of hand). There has, in short, been extreme mental laziness; and the Soviet leaders have taken full advantage of it.

It is a misfortune that Western Germany is now in the throes of a Federal election campaign. Already the Federal Minister of Defense, Franz-Josef Strauss, has denounced Brandt's plan—either out of sheer stupidity but more probably for electioneering purposes. West German parliamentarians have gone on holiday, or departed from Bonn for their constituencies. Dr. Adenauer's mind is given up to the problem of how to win on September 17. And the odds are all on Khrushchev beginning to implement his plans for Berlin and Germany only a month after that.

The West has probably 3 months in which to act, and if it does not act its very inaction will increase the chances of the Communist bloc committing itself to terribly dangerous steps in Berlin. There is a great deal that can be done. The West can elaborate Willy Brandt's proposal of a super peace conference—which should be held in Berlin, where the nations of the world can get a firsthand picture of the Berlin problem. The West can jolt the West Germans into informing world opinion more fully about the East German Republic; for the counterpart to a free, prosperous and generally respected West German Republic is an Eastern Germany which is ruled by an alien tyranny, which is losing 200,000 citizens a year, which is in the throes of economic crisis and which is the worst possible shopwindow for the Communist world. The West should consider putting the plight of the East German refugees before the United Nations. And it should place the illegal rearmament in East Berlin, the Communist kidnappings of West German citizens, the persecution of the Christian churches in Eastern Germany and the continued incarceration of 10,000 political prisoners before the bar of world opinion.

One thing is certain. The government which emerges from the German elections in September will surely be in a position to take a fresh look at the whole problem of Western Europe's security.

THE "WESTERN PEACE PROPOSAL" OF MAY 14, 1959

It is sometimes said that strong elements in both Great Britain and France oppose German unification. But far better than guessing what they may do is for us to come up with a recommendation to them of what we think the West ought to do. We should remember that Britain, France, and the United States all agreed on the "Western Peace Proposal" of May 14, 1959, with its proposals for controlled disarmament in middle Europe.

Developing a constructive set of goals for the West in middle Europe is particularly important because of its effect on the smaller nations in the U.N. Frank Aiken, Ireland's Minister for External Affairs, in a speech on June 5, 1961, talked about the desirability of establishing areas of law in places such as middle Europe:

In order to foster the evolution of world law and to improve the chance of keeping the peace in zones of international tension, we have suggested the establishment of groups of states which I have variously described as "areas of peace," "areas of law," "disarmed areas of law," and "carpets of peace between the great powers." As we envisage them such areas would be composed

of groups of states which would agree to limit their armaments to police level, to settle their differences peacefully, to exclude foreign troops from their territories, and to accept international supervision over the fulfillment of the agreement. The possibility of establishing such areas depends not only on agreement between groups of smaller states but on the forbearance and enlightened self-interest of the great powers who would be required to support the United Nations in guaranteeing the agreement and the inviolability of the countries concerned.

So let us arm ourselves against the Soviet threat to Berlin. But, as Churchill said "We are to parley." The West must equally prepare a set of proposals for the kind of middle Europe it would like to see when the nightmare is over. And if we do, the problem of Berlin will shrink in size.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 5 AND THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN] may extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I am voting against the resolution (S. Res. 158) to disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 5, because I believe that the plan should become effective, as provided in the Reorganization Act of 1949, on July 24, 1961.

The position I am taking is that the benefits to prompt and orderly labor-management procedures which are to be derived from the reorganization of the daily operations of the National Labor Relations Board overbalance the valid points which have been raised against the Reorganization Plan No. 5.

The Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959—the Landrum-Griffin Act—like all major legislative products, was not the perfect document that those who voted for it would like to have had it. There were some things about it that needed amendment. It was amended.

One amendment which the Congress did adopt in 1959 without controversy specifically authorized the National Labor Relations Board to delegate its powers in representation cases to its regional directors.

Pursuant to this provision of the law, the Board on April 27, 1961, issued an order, which became effective on May 15, delegating its powers in election cases to its 28 regional directors, subject to the discretionary review of the Board itself. Such actions, now being decided by the regional directors, include decisions as to whether a question concerning representation exists, determination of the appropriate bargaining unit, the direction of elections to determine whether the employees wish to be represented, and rulings on supplemental matters

such as challenged ballots and objections to an election.

By this order, as authorized by Congress, the Board has cleared from the workbaskets of its members about 75 percent of all the cases in the shop, which now will be decided by the regional directors. However, it is estimated that a review by the Board will be requested in about half of the cases adjudicated by the regional directors.

This Reorganization Plan No. 5, unless disapproved by Congress, conveys to the National Labor Relations Board "the authority to delegate, by published order or rule, any of its functions to a division of the Board, an individual Board member, a hearing examiner, or an employee or employee board, including functions with respect to hearing, determining, ordering, certifying, reporting or otherwise acting as to any work, business or matter," provided any or all of these things are done within the requirements of section 7(a) of the Administrative Procedure Act—60 Stat. 241—as amended.

Under this reorganization plan, the trial examiners, of whom the Board last year had 49 who worked the entire fiscal year, will hear the cases pertaining to charges of unfair labor practices, just as they are doing now. The difference will be that the findings by the trial examiners will not have to be reviewed by the Board, unless at least two of the five members of the Board decide that they should be.

The plan does not relieve the members of the Board of any of their responsibilities for the proper operation of the Board or for the proper administration of the act which they are charged with enforcing. It does not change the right of interested parties to seek and secure review in the courts of a decision by the Board or its representatives, nor does it change the standards applicable to such judicial review. It does seek to reduce the tremendous backlog of cases now pending in the Board and to improve the quality of its work.

During the fiscal year just closed, more than 18,000 cases were filed with the National Labor Relations Board. The previous 2 years 21,000 cases were filed each year. It is estimated that the total will be 23,000 cases in the year just begun. It now takes more than 400 days from the time a charge is filed until the Board's mandatory reexamination of all the facts is completed and its ruling issued. Under the Reorganization Plan No. 5, it is expected that this timelag can be cut in half.

The Board's members, Republican as well as Democratic appointees, are unanimous in believing that it would be a gain for timely justice if the decisions of the trial examiners could become final except in cases where a real basis for a challenge exists.

There are a number of objections that have been raised to Reorganization Plan No. 5. I think that I am familiar with all of them. With a number of them, I have no difficulty in being in agreement.

Practically all of these objections, however, were just as valid when the delegation of the Board's powers to the regional directors in representation cases was being considered in 1959. If they were stated, however, they were not heeded by Congress, which proceeded to convey in part the delegation of authority which now it is proposed to carry one step further in Reorganization Plan No. 5.

It is a delegation of authority, but it is not a delegation of power. The Board surrenders none of the power given it in the Labor-Management Reporting Act. Its litigants surrender or are deprived of none of their rights.

Unless the complaints and the claims which are brought to the National Labor Relations Board can be considered fairly and seriously, and decided promptly, the very safeguards provided for all concerned in the Landrum-Griffin Act are destroyed.

The Reorganization Plan No. 5 is intended to obtain for every litigant fair consideration and a prompt decision. It thus becomes an important instrument of progress in the relations between management and labor throughout business and industry.

MR. SALINGER PAYS THE AIR FORCE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI], who has a special order, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, this morning I received the following letter, dated July 18, 1961, from Pierre E. G. Salinger, Press Secretary to the President:

Your speech in the House of Representatives today has been brought to my attention. In fairness to me I think it would be helpful if you would insert in the RECORD that on July 5, 1961, the day I returned from Europe, I reimbursed the Air Force for my daughter's trip.

In fairness to Mr. Salinger, I am glad to accommodate him, but in fairness to the taxpayers it might have been helpful had Mr. Salinger told me the amount of his reimbursement to the Air Force.

Was it the regular commercial first-class jet fare for a child under 12 years of age from Washington to Europe, which I am advised is \$270, plus tax? Or could it have been only \$153.45, as I have been informed?

In fairness to the taxpayers, it might also have been helpful if Mr. Salinger had reported that the commercial first-class jet fare for an adult from Washington to Europe is approximately \$540, plus tax. Mr. Salinger, it will be recalled, accompanied his daughter to Europe, and there has been no reimbursement to the Air Force for his own pleasure jaunt.

In fairness to Mr. Salinger and the taxpayers, I am glad to be helpful.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we are in the midst of commemorating Captive Nations Week, in accordance with the intent of Congress that this observance be continued on an annual basis and in conformance with the proclamation issued by President Kennedy.

On many previous occasions this year, numerous Members of the House have discussed the specific operation of Captive Nations Week, and much emphasis has been placed on the creation of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations. I will discuss that particular point in some detail this afternoon.

But first, I ask leave to incorporate with my remarks an address by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, national chairman of the Captive Nations Committee, Inc., which was delivered this last Sunday afternoon, July 16, at a huge captive nations rally held in Chicago's Grant Park.

This ringing address packs all the dynamic vigor of its title, "A Policy of Emancipation and Liberation of Khrushchev's Captives":

A POLICY OF EMANCIPATION AND LIBERATION OF KHRUSHCHEV'S CAPTIVES

(An address by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, Chicago Captive Nations Day, July 16, 1961, Grant Park, Chicago, Ill.)

This magnificent city of Chicago, its illustrious mayor, Richard J. Daley, and you, its freedom-loving citizens, command the profound gratitude and respect of all Americans for your leadership and forward-pushing courage in annually observing Captive Nations Week. Last year you led the Nation in giving forceful expression to the cause of dynamic and expansive freedom; and this year your inspiration is felt in New York, Buffalo, Washington, and numerous other cities and towns where friends of freedom are joining with you in this second anniversary observance. In all humility it is a privileged honor for me to join with you in this observance, my friends of freedom.

From time to time many people ask, "Why do we need a Captive Nations Week?" "What is the meaning and significance of it?" "What do you hope to achieve and accomplish?" You've heard these questions, and I'm sure that in many ways the answers you've given are even better than those I hope to supply today. Complete answers to these recurring questions require, it seems to me, (1) a fixed conviction about the nature and independence of our own Nation, (2) an appreciation of the impact of our history upon Eastern Europe and Asia, (3) an understanding of the ideas of Captive Nations Week, and (4) a restless will seeking the translation of our ideas and convictions into concrete, imaginative, and fearless action.

THE REVOLUTIONARY SYMBOL OF AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE

If you will reread the clauses of the Captive Nations Week resolution, which is now Public Law 86-90, you will again be impressed by its initial emphasis on the revolutionary symbol of American independence. Based on this resolution and law, President

Eisenhower issued proclamations, both in 1959 and 1960, giving eloquent expression to this symbol. And this year, we cannot but express our most grateful thanks to President Kennedy for his stirring proclamation. The revolutionary symbol of American independence cannot be anything but a living and dynamic symbol, signifying strong motivation to action and action itself. We were soundly advised early this year, "Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country." Some time ago you and I asked ourselves this question, and our answer is in part given in this annual observance.

Our answer to this bestirring question is founded on a fixed conviction about the nature and independence of our Nation. Two weeks ago we celebrated our Independence Day, and we looked inward, reexamining our souls and consciences as a free and responsible people. Today we look outward and with our blessings give thought to the millions who have actually lost their independence and freedom in the past 42 years.

Calvin Coolidge once said, "Whether one traces his Americanism back three centuries to the Mayflower or 3 years to the steerage is not half so important as whether his Americanism of today is real and genuine." Whether some of you today are products of the Hungarian revolution, the free voices of a conquered Poland, the escapees of a Russian-genocided Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, past fighters of a Ukrainian or White Ruthenian underground, or past victims of tyranny and oppression in Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, East Germany, Yugoslavia, or in the Caucasus and Asia—or indeed, freedom-loving Russians who have found a haven here—your Americanism is no less than that of those born and reared here. Together we share a common conviction about the nature and independence of our Nation.

Our Day of Independence symbolizes for us, under God, our national freedom, the untampered will of a sovereign people, our firm determination to meet any enemy who would attempt to destroy our independence. It symbolizes, too, the spiritual and moral power of our great tradition, the just institutions of our country, and the warm humanism of its laws. Often different peoples throughout the world see the meaning and essence of this Nation more objectively and even more appreciatively than many of us do.

As the Captive Nations Week resolution indicates, our Nation, built on the free and creative energies of people drawn from every quarter of the globe, is a unique historical experiment—in short, the great experiment of mankind. Our Nation is a living revolution that moves the hearts and minds of freedom rather than just peace-loving peoples everywhere, particularly those in captive Eurasia. Placed against this revolution, the so-called Communist revolution is but a dressed-up phantom shielding the most reactionary, barbaric, and feudal forces of all time. Our society, to be sure, is not perfect. But, by all evidence, it is unquestionably one that has given so much in so many ways to so many within a short span in the history of man.

Contrary to some false notions, we do possess an ideology which inspires our continued growth as a morally leading nation and remarkably equips us to contend successfully with the present threat of imperialist Red totalitarianism. This ideology is plainly and precisely spelled out in our Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights. It is vitally important for us to reflect continually upon the moral and political principles embodied in these historic documents. Nuclear weapons, missiles, luniks, and the whole array of new technological innovations—which by nature are

only instruments and means—cannot possibly reshape or antique these natural norms of civilized human existence.

But at this time even more important is the conscious application of the perennial principles of national independence and personal liberty to other Nations and peoples. For, not only is the living application of these principles crucial to the further growth and development of our Nation, but it is also indispensable to the existence and survival of the nontotalitarian free world. A persistent application by every conceivable medium of communication and contact would dwarf the inflated accomplishments and pretensions of Moscow and its colonial puppets.

AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE AND EASTERN EUROPE AND ASIA

This conviction about our own Nation and about the revolutionary symbol of American independence is not enough. It is a base that in these times demands a structure of appreciation, understanding and a will to act in the community of mankind. The captive peoples of Eastern Europe and Asia form a major and, in the cold war sense, a primary part of this community.

With our shared conviction we must convey among our fellow Americans a vivid appreciation of the profound impact of our history upon Eastern Europe and Asia. What a moving and powerful force our Declaration of Independence was on the various nations which were subjugated in the empires of the last century and a half. Nations in the Russian, Austro-Hungarian, and Ottoman Empires soon rose at the beginning of this century to declare their independence with a will to pursue an independent national existence similar to ours. But, in significant part, this was short lived as the unchecked surge of totalitarian Russian imperialism since 1918 once again reduced the many non-Russian nations of Eastern Europe and Asia to servility.

To me it is vitally significant that the first major counterattack against the ravenous forces of Soviet Russian imperialism was staged by the Polish-Ukrainian alliance between Pilsudski and Petlura. Had this alliance destroyed Trotsky's Red army completely and decisively, the course of world developments would surely have been different. The myths of communism and Marxism-Leninism would have only been a peep in the arena of human history. As it was, this alliance gave Europe and other parts of the world a breather of some 20 years before the Soviet Russian scourge began to spread again.

Today, we ourselves are seriously threatened by this barbaric peril, which, as in past centuries, poses as the wave of the future, as the third Rome of mankind, as the Slav center of culture, power and might. Worst of all, in our confusion, generated in the greatest degree by the unsurpassed propaganda skill of the enemy, we aren't even aware of the tremendous opportunities we have to defeat this menace in the cold war and thus stave off an otherwise inevitable hot global war. The prime and chief forces of patriotic nationalism in central Europe, in the Soviet Union itself, in central Asia and east Asia are our paramount ally. We haven't even begun to tap the enormous potential of non-Russian nationalism within the Soviet Union. The insecurity of Moscow's imperialist and colonial domination over the captive non-Russian nations from the Danube to the Pacific would be permanently sealed and intensified once we seriously begin to direct the words of the President to the peoples of these over 20 captive nations: "Fellow citizens of the world, ask not what America will do for you,

but what together we can do for the freedom of man."

THE IDEAS OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

This necessary togetherness for freedom is best expressed in the Captive Nations Week resolution. This observance gives a crystallized expression to the necessity for working together for freedom, especially in the one area of the world that thirsts for it. Above everything else Khrushchev craves to have his captive world undisturbed and neglected by the free world. But we must never allow him to consolidate his farflung empire; we must never forget that his growing insecurity about the captive nations is our great weapon in the cold war, not to speak of a hot one; nor must we ever forget that the field of the cold war is also Eastern Europe and Asia, not only between imperialist Moscow and the free world but also between the captive peoples and the colonial puppets imposed on them. "They must never," as Mayor Daley so well declared, "be permitted to believe we have deserted them."

Captive Nations Week means all this and more. And an understanding of the ideas of Captive Nations Week must be transmitted to all Americans. What Public Law 86-90 calls for is, in essence, a universalized declaration of independence. It is based on the knowledge that the captive peoples of central and southern Europe—the Poles, Hungarians, Slovaks, Czechs, East Germans, Rumanians, Bulgarians, Serbs, Croats, Slovenes, Montenegrins, Macedonians, and Albanians—have a common bond for freedom with the captive peoples in the Soviet Union and Asia. For the first time, our Government recognized the fundamental fact that the Soviet Union itself is an empire, in which the majority of people constitute captive non-Russian nations.

We all recall how in 1959 the self-confident, blustering and cocky Khrushchev reacted violently against the resolution. At every turn he harried Vice President Nixon with the question: "Are these captives?" Isn't it strange that this colonial and imperialist ruler of a vast empire, forever boasting about his missiles, sputniks, aircraft, steel—and even donning an ill-fitting military uniform to press his points—should be alarmed and explosive over a mere congressional resolution? Ask yourselves what, except for the U-2 incident, has stirred Khrushchev more to this explosive point of fear and anxiety than the ideas contained in the resolution. The fact is that we have focused the spotlight of imperialism and colonialism on the only important center where it today belongs—Moscow.

As in Poland, Hungary and elsewhere, there is a serious colonial problem within the Soviet Union. And if this is emphasized more and more in the forum of world opinion and attention, the proper characterization of Russian Moscow as the last major colonial and imperialist power in the world would be devastating to its propaganda and cold war efforts. Khrushchev well understood this and ranted endlessly; many in this country remained puzzled and bewildered. We muffed our opportunities then and since.

The hour of decision is rapidly approaching, and you and I are convinced that only a policy of emancipation and liberation of Khrushchev's captives is the decision for freedom-loving men. I have always held that a policy of liberation is inescapable for victory in the cold war. And the horrors of a nuclear war only reinforce this position. Our opportunity, I am convinced, will come once we realize the following: (1) that the issues of colonialism and imperialism in Moscow's empire are prime targets for our national concern and effort, (2) that the

Soviet Union, which poses as an equal to the United States, is an empire in itself, holding in bondage the captive nations of Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Turkestan, Cossackia, North Caucasia, and Idel-Ural, (3) that the only types of warfare that Moscow can wage with success are propaganda and guerrilla warfare, (4) that the cold war will be as permanent as the colonial imperium maintained by Moscow from the Danube to the Pacific, and (5) that the universalization of our Declaration of Independence is the most formidable weapon in this type of war. Initiative, positive action, imaginative ideas can be ours with these fixed and new dimensions of thought.

Although it is said that "the fool's treasure is in his tongue," Khrushchev has never uttered a more complete truth when he recently said his tongue is his chief weapon. The typical Russian Potemkin village tactics practiced by him, whether in economic, military, space, cultural or other fields, should frighten no one. In each of these areas a persistent, continuous, and popular concentration and study by us would easily reveal the breadth and depth of the Russian con game. For instance, the economic boasts of Khrushchev could be easily exploded by revelations of the rampant economic imperialism and colonialism within the U.S.S.R. itself. The Gagarin space story will in time become the Russian gangrene story of the cold war. The greatest lies are half truths.

FROM IDEAS AND CONVICTIONS TO ACTION

It is often said by some that the American people haven't the will to prepare for and do the tasks that must be done. You and I don't believe this. The Captive Nations Week observances demonstrate in themselves a restless will in many sections of our country, seeking the translation of these ideas and convictions into concrete, imaginative, and fearless action. Our best defense in the cold war is the offense. There are many things that are required for the successful development of a cold war strategy. In this year's observance we are concentrating on the following:

1. A firm stand without any compromise on West Berlin: The issue of West Berlin is part of the issue of a free reunited Germany, and this is an integral part of the general issue of the captive nations.

2. A determined opposition to the admission of Red China to the United Nations: Mainland China is the largest of all captive nations. Its hope of eventual freedom is in Taiwan. There is nothing inevitable about Peiping being in the U.N. Here, too, no compromise; here, too, no illusions about any mutual suicide pact between Peiping and Moscow.

3. The passage of House Resolution 211 and similar resolutions proposing the creation of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations: The necessity for such a committee has been ably set forth in congressional discussion. There is no agency in Government or private life that continually and persistently studies and investigates all of the captive nations. We need such a body, and this meeting should go on record for the establishment of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations.

4. The passage of the Freedom Academy bill in this Congress: We shall surely continue to lose the cold war until we decide to develop a cold war strategy and apparatus. The Captive Nations Resolution is the basis for such a strategy; the establishment of a Freedom Academy is an essential of the apparatus.

5. The activation of the Kersten amendment to the Mutual Security Act with reference to Cuba: What we failed to do 10 years

ago with regard to the captive nations, we must do now with regard to Cuba. The fact of a near-captive nation existing at our doorstep should awaken us to the need of forming units of free Cuba, prepared for guerrilla warfare and the process of liberating Cuba.

6. The expansion and improvement of the Voice of America broadcasts to the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R.: It is strange, indeed, that the enemy in effect determines the shifts in Voice of America frequencies as, for example, in Africa and Latin America, while we virtually leave his vulnerable areas untouched, e.g., Turkestan and the Caucasus. There are over 30 million Moslems in the U.S.S.R. who deserve our closest attention and whose significance for the entire Islamic world is immense.

7. The restoration and extension of the Champion of Liberty Stamp series: The good-will impact of these stamps has been well demonstrated. The action of our postal authorities to downgrade the series is mystifying and even irrational, especially when many fighters of freedom among the captive nations should be appropriately honored.

8. The creation of an Executive Agency on the Self-Determination of the Captive Nations: Such an agency would steadily focus world attention on the captive nations of Europe and Asia and, by deed, attest to our policy of never acquiescing to their permanent captivity. By all evidence such an agency is more important than a disarmament agency.

Your fervent support of these and other issues should be forcefully expressed. You will be working in the best interests of our Nation, for the survival of freedom, and for the avoidance of a cataclysmic hot global war. Colonial Moscow knows best from decades of experience and evidence that it cannot trust its own armed forces. This was shown in World War I, World War II, and in Hungary. The momentous conflict of our day will not be resolved by military arms but, instead, by nonmilitary means, particularly in the field of propaganda. But we seek to propagate a diplomacy of truth, the dynamics of freedom, and the certainty of victory in the most essential area of the cold war—the area of Moscow's colonial empire. And the greatest contribution we could make to the independence and freedom of the 100 million Russian people is to work for the independence and freedom of all the captive non-Russian nations now under the heel of imperialist Moscow.

President Theodore Roosevelt was entirely right when he advised, "Speak softly and carry a big stick." But let us, for the sake of world freedom, speak—continuously, persistently, truthfully; and as he also said, "Fear God and take your own part"—for the freedom of the captive nations, for, in reality, our own freedom.

Mr. Speaker, the rally at which Dr. Dobriansky delivered this inspiring message was held under the auspices of the city of Chicago, and drew into its impressive fold all the organized ethnic groups, identifiable with the captive peoples of the European and Asian satellite nations, as well as the captive peoples within the Soviet Union proper.

The master of ceremonies was our distinguished colleague, the Honorable DAN E. ROSTENKOWSKI, and the cofeatured speaker with Dr. Dobriansky, was our colleague from Indiana, the Honorable RAY J. MADDEN, whose inspiring address was truly appreciated by the assembled audience.

It is especially appropriate to note that Congressman MADDEN is a member

of the House Rules Committee, which has before it for consideration numerous resolutions to create a Special House Committee on Captive Nations. His support of this special committee is evidence of his thorough knowledge and grasp of the tremendous potential of our counteroffensive against false Soviet ideology through the vehicle of exposing to the world the imperialism and colonialism now being practiced by the Soviet Union.

Next week the House Rules Committee will once again study the creation of this committee. Therefore, I deem it most appropriate that the Members of the House study the address of Dr. Dobriansky that I have inserted into my remarks, for its clear, concise, vivid explanation of many points in this picture.

There is no doubt that the Soviet Government will continue to muddy the waters of international diplomacy in an attempt to achieve its avowed goal of worldwide communism. We can effectively spike much of their hypocritical material through the vehicle of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations supporting, as it will, the President and the State Department in these times of grave international problems.

It will be truly fitting and proper that following the nationwide Captive Nations Week observances, the House move rapidly to finally organize this committee.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that the Members of the House have a multitude of issues before them and are hard pressed to keep abreast of the tremendous burden of detail. But certainly, we all see the importance of developing an effective coordination with our State Department in these times, and in this way emphasize to all the world the effectiveness of our legislative branch of Government as it, in a spirit of bipartisanship, marches shoulder to shoulder with our executive branch, in representing not only the honest position of the American public but the just aspirations of all peoples throughout the world.

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

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

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the gentleman from Illinois on his constant devotion to this particular cause. I know personally the Member from Illinois has been very interested in this matter for many, many years, and has talked about it both on and off the floor from the start of this session. I am glad to see him take the floor of the House at this time to bring it before the American public.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I thank the gentleman for his support.

EQUAL RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. FROST], is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mrs. FROST. Mr. Speaker it gives me great pleasure to join my colleagues in commemorating this day which is so historically important to the fight of

women for equal rights with men. I am happy, especially, that a number of men in the Congress have joined in sponsoring the equal rights amendment.

It was on a July 20th like this, just 113 years ago, that Susan B. Anthony presided over a meeting at Seneca Falls, N.Y., to discuss the social, civil, and religious condition and rights of women.

That meeting, participated in by a group of 68 dedicated women leaders and 32 men, laid the basis for the passage of the 19th amendment to the Constitution in 1920, which for the first time gave women the right to vote.

Women in the intervening years have made great strides toward equality with men. This has not been accomplished through legislation benefiting women, but rather through the untiring, ceaseless and dedicated service by American women.

I am well aware, as a Member of Congress from the West, that the early pioneer could hardly have succeeded in settling the West were it not for the brave woman by his side who shared the dangers of the frontier. In this environment women were raised to their true stature. They met the challenges of the times—the Indian wars, the disease and hardships—and it instilled in them a passion for freedom and equality.

Out of this came the movement for the right to vote which first took hold in Wyoming and spread to other States helping to lay the foundation for the subsequent amendment to the Constitution.

Names like Amelia Earhart, Madam Curie, and many others are also a reminder that women have written a proud chapter in history. They are not to be denied and I think the time has come for the Congress to recognize the writing on the wall and vote approval of the equal rights legislation, of which I am a sponsor.

Mr. Speaker, a number of points should be kept in mind in regard to this amendment.

First of all the proposal would in no way abrogate or interfere with existing protective laws for special segments of our society. Moreover, it would not interfere with States rights to legislate regarding health, welfare, and civil rights. The amendment would simply provide a guarantee to insure that such laws would apply equally to all citizens regardless of sex.

Secondly, the proposal would require ratification by 36 State legislatures after its passage by Congress before it could become law. This would give an opportunity to the various States to have their say on the question. While many States at this time do have special laws in effect safeguarding the rights of women, some States do not. The national amendment to the Constitution is needed to guarantee that existing inequalities and discrimination against women will be eliminated by all States.

In America today, more than 50 percent of our population are women. The Labor Department estimates that there are some 23 million women in our working force, and this total is climbing

steadily. Women thus continue to take an increasingly important role in our society.

As a member of the Business and Professional Women's Club of Nampa, Idaho, I am aware that the national organization has long been one of the spearheads in the struggle for equal rights, and I urge the Congress to give serious consideration to this amendment.

It is not enough, as the common expression goes, to say that "behind every great man there is a woman." Rather, it should say that "alongside every great man there is a woman." In other words, in the motto of Susan B. Anthony: "Men their rights and nothing more; women their rights and nothing less." This is the intent and purpose of the equal rights legislation.

It gives me pride to note the spirit of that Seneca Falls convention of 113 years ago is prevalent in many Members of Congress, including an even 100 of my colleagues who joined with me in introducing the joint resolution on equal rights.

On this historic day for women, let us act accordingly.

HIGH MORTGAGE INTEREST RATES IN THE SOUTH AND IN THE WEST

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a tabulation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the RECORD of July 10, at page 12219, I called attention to the fact that people in the South and the West pay much higher interest rates for short-term business loans than people in the East, particularly in New York City. I think this is a serious situation and one that should be corrected.

The prevalence of high interest rates in the South and the West is even more striking in mortgage loan rates. The National Association of Real Estate Boards made a survey of mortgage loan rates in various sections of the country. The response to this survey shows that conventional mortgage loan rates for both new houses and existing houses in good neighborhoods are substantially higher in the South and in the West than in the northeastern part of the country.

The accompanying tabulation summarizes the results of the survey:

Mortgage loan rates in various sections of the country, spring 1961 (percentage distribution)

CONVENTIONAL LOANS—NEW HOUSES

Region	5½ per cent or less	6 per cent	6¼ per cent	6½ per cent	Over 6½ per cent
Northeast.....	46	54	—	—	—
North Central.....	12	71	6	8	3
South.....	26	68	—	6	—
West.....	—	33	21	29	17

CONVENTIONAL LOANS—EXISTING HOUSES IN
GOOD NEIGHBORHOODS

Northeast.....	40	60			
North Central.....	7	70	5	13	5
South.....	16	60	5	14	5
West.....		21	29	29	21

Source: National Association of Real Estate Boards. Mortgage market, spring 1961, pp. 8-19.

In the Northeast, nearly half of the respondents reported mortgage interest rates for new houses were 5½ percent or less and 6 percent was the highest prevailing rate reported.

In sharp contrast, in the South, in a number of cases the rate was 6½ percent, and over two-thirds of the respondents placed the prevailing mortgage at 6 percent. Only about one-fourth of the reports in the South placed prevailing mortgage rates at 5¾ percent or less.

In the West, no prevailing mortgage rates were below 6 percent. One-third were 6 percent, one-fifth were at 6¼ percent, 29 percent were at 6½ percent, and 17 percent were above 6½ percent.

As is to be expected, conventional loan rates for existing houses in good neighborhoods are at a higher level throughout the country than the rates for new houses. However, in this category also there is a sharp discrepancy—the South and West pay very much higher rates than prevail in the Northeast and North Central regions. In the Northeast, again 6 percent is the highest prevailing rate. Forty percent of the respondents report that mortgages carry an interest charge of 5¾ percent or less; 60 percent report 6 percent.

In the South, however, nearly a fifth of the respondents place mortgage rates in their areas at 6½ percent or more. In the West, where the rates are the highest, no rates are below 6 percent, half the respondents place prevailing mortgage rates at 6½ percent or more, and nearly 80 percent report mortgage rates at 6¾ percent or more.

Financing costs are recognized as the second largest and sometimes the largest single component in housing costs. In fact, when a mortgage is spread over an extensive period of years, the cost of interest will often exceed the price of the house itself.

The high cost of money in the South and the West defies logical justification. As I pointed out in my discussion of the banking rates on short-term business loans, if we had a completely free market for funds, you would think that these rates would tend to equalize—that money would flow into the South and the West and bring about a better balance in interest rates.

I am afraid there is widespread complacency about this situation. Little effort is made to explain it, much less to correct it.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. Bow (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), until July 24, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legis-

lative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. REUSS, for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mrs. FROST (at the request of Mr. COOK), for 20 minutes, today, to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. COOK), for 30 minutes, on Monday next, July 24, 1961.

Mr. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mr. DEVINE), for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona (at the request of Mr. DEVINE), for 1 hour, on Tuesday, July 25.

Mr. GRIFFIN (at the request of Mr. DEVINE), for 1 hour, on Tuesday, July 25.

Mr. AYRES (at the request of Mr. DEVINE), for 1 hour, on Wednesday, July 26.

Mr. GOODELL (at the request of Mr. DEVINE), for 1 hour, on Wednesday, July 26.

Mr. ALGER (at the request of Mr. DEVINE), for 1 hour, on Thursday, July 27.

Mr. SPRINGER (at the request of Mr. DEVINE), for 2 hours, on Tuesday, August 1.

Mr. MCINTIRE (at the request of Mr. DEVINE), for 1 hour, on Tuesday, August 1.

Mr. CAHILL (at the request of Mr. DEVINE), for 1 hour, on Wednesday, August 2.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI (at the request of Mr. DEVINE), for 1 hour, on Wednesday, August 2.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BOYKIN (at the request of Mr. COOK) and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$270.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DEVINE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FINO.
Mr. MICHEL.
Mr. WEAVER.
Mr. FINDLEY.
Mr. VAN ZANDT.
Mr. McCULLOUGH.
Mr. SCHADEBERG.
Mr. MORSE.
Mr. WILSON of Indiana.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. COOK) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. EVINS.
Mr. WHITENER.
Mr. BREWSTER.
Mr. STRATTON.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLERSON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 6874. A act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space

Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction of facilities, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 7444. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 331. An act for the relief of Mrs. Kazuko (Wm. R.) Zittle;

S. 438. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria Giovanna Hopkins; and

S. 1644. An act to provide for the indexing and microfilming of certain records of the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church in Alaska in the collections of the Library of Congress.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 24, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

JULY 12, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John J. Heimburger.....	Counsel.....	\$8,772.00
Francis M. LeMay.....	Staff consultant.....	8,051.46
Christine S. Gallagher.....	Clerk.....	7,685.21
Hyde H. Murray.....	Assistant clerk.....	7,172.76
Lydia Vacin.....	Staff assistant.....	4,727.28
Betty M. Prezioso.....	do.....	4,727.28
Pauline E. Graves.....	do.....	4,712.67
Gladys N. Ondareho.....	do.....	3,998.22
Peggy Jean Lamm.....	do.....	3,981.33
Jane C. Wojcik.....	do.....	3,404.72
Subcommittee on equipment, supplies, and manpower:		
John Malcolm Smith.....	General counsel.....	5,250.02
Martha S. Hannah.....	Staff assistant.....	2,061.96
Haywood Taylor.....	do.....	1,217.82

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$50,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1961..... 15,579.02

Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1961..... 15,579.02

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1961. 34,420.98

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Table with 3 columns: Name of employee, Profession, Total gross salary during 6-month period. Lists employees like Kenneth Sprankle, Paul M. Wilson, etc.

Amount of expenditures previously reported \$225,571.33
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1961 212,045.66
Total amount expended from July 1, 1960, to June 30, 1961 437,616.99

CLARENCE CANNON, Chairman.

JULY 15, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS (INVESTIGATIONS STAFF)

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of

the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Table with 3 columns: Name of employee, Profession, Total gross salary during 6-month period. Lists employees like Joseph K. Ponder, Kenneth T. Delavigne, etc.

REIMBURSEMENTS TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Table with 3 columns: Agency/Department, Name of employee, Profession, Total gross salary during 6-month period. Lists agencies like Agriculture, Army, Atomic Energy Commission, etc.

REIMBURSEMENTS TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES—Continued

Table with 3 columns: Name of employee, Profession, Total gross salary during 6-month period. Lists Navy Department employees like Goode, S. O., Williams, Ben M., etc.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures \$600,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported 300,482.30

Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1961 223,256.02

Total amount expended from July 1, 1960, to June 30, 1961 523,738.32

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1961 76,261.68

CLARENCE CANNON, Chairman.

JULY 6, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Table with 3 columns: Name of employee, Profession, Total gross salary during 6-month period. Lists employees like Robert W. Smart, John R. Blandford, etc.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures \$150,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported 0

Amount expended from Jan. 1 to July 1, 1961 27,722.70

Total amount expended from January 1961 to July 1961 27,722.70

Balance unexpended as of July 1, 1961 122,277.30

CARL VINSON, Chairman.

JULY 1, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of

the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert L. Cardon	Clerk and general counsel	\$8,824.74
John E. Barriere	Majority staff member	8,824.74
Orman S. Fink	Minority staff member	8,824.74
Robert R. Poston	Counsel	8,824.74
Helen L. Rogers	Deputy clerk	5,204.16
Mary W. Layton	Assistant clerk	5,204.16
Marguerite Bean	Secretary to chairman	6,030.36
Aliecia F. Shoemaker	Secretary to minority	4,838.70
Roger J. Brown	Editor	6,004.02

EMPLOYEES PURSUANT TO H. RES. 143, SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Kenneth W. Burrows	Housing economist	\$8,241.61
John L. Fitzgerald	Attorney (EOD 3-15-61)	2,835.08
Eleanor N. Hamilton	Research assistant	3,547.56
John J. McEwan, Jr.	Deputy staff director	8,824.74
Grady Perry, Jr.	Clerk	5,702.24
Margaret E. Tucker	Secretary	4,307.04
Frances M. Yeakle	do	3,491.78

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$105,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	0
Amount expended from January through June	38,858.10
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 through June 30, 1961	38,858.10
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1961	66,141.90

BRENT SPENCE,
Chairman.

JULY 1, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from December 31, 1960, to June 30, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
W. N. McLeod	Clerk	\$8,754.48
Hayden S. Garber	Counsel	8,051.46
Leonard O. Hilder	Investigator	5,942.52
Dixon D. Davis	Assistant clerk (Jan. 1 to May 31)	2,947.85
Clayton D. Gasque	Assistant clerk (June 1)	899.58
Donald J. Tubridy	Minority clerk	5,397.48
Ruth Butterworth	Assistant clerk	4,767.78
Ann L. Puryear	do	4,099.50
Lillian B. Hamilton	do	3,390.60
Ellen M. Coxeter	Stenographer-clerk	3,590.60
Patricia Ann Dempsey	Stenographer (Apr. 1)	1,290.27

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$10,000
Amount of expenditures previously reported	None

Balance unexpended as of..... 10,000
NOTE.—Nothing has been spent out of H. Res. 189, \$10,000.

JOHN L. McMILLAN,
Chairman.
JULY 5, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Boyd Crawford	Staff administrator	\$8,824.74
Roy J. Bullock	Senior staff consultant	8,723.70
Albert C. F. Westphal	Staff consultant	8,723.70
Franklin J. Schupp	do	8,644.62
Harry C. Cromer	Investigator-consultant	7,361.32
Henry E. Billingsley	Consultant	1,433.44
June Nigh	Senior staff assistant	6,294.00
Winifred G. Osborne	Staff assistant	5,942.52
Helen M. Mattas	do	5,527.98
Myrtle M. Melvin	do	5,397.48
Helen L. Hashagen	do	5,397.48
Ann L. Clark	do	3,990.35
Robert J. Bowen	Clerical assistant	3,937.44

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$150,000.00
---	--------------

Amount of expenditures previously reported	None
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1961	21,406.05

Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1961	21,406.05
--	-----------

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1961	128,593.95
--	------------

¹ Month of January 1961 only.

THOMAS E. MORGAN,
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR (STANDING COMMITTEE)

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Louise M. Dargans	Chief clerk	\$8,726.69
Russell C. Derrickson	Staff director	8,726.69
Wray Smith	Education chief	5,883.16
Howard G. Gamser	Chief counsel for labor-management	8,726.69
Livingston L. Wingate	Associate counsel for labor-management	7,418.92

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Teresa Calabrese	Administrative assistant to the chairman	\$4,945.14
Richard T. Burress	Minority clerk	7,339.30
Melvin W. Sneed	Minority staff assistant	8,292.48
Louise M. Wright	Administrative assistant	3,855.11
Cabell Waller Berge	do	2,041.73
Anne K. Fernbach	Administrative assistant (to Mar. 22, 1961)	1,208.37
Charles E. Wilson	Staff assistant (Feb. 1-28, 1961)	1,470.79
John H. Young III	Administrative assistant (to Jan. 31, 1961)	1,372.74
J. Noble Richards	Administrative assistant to the minority (Jan. 4-31, 1961)	806.72
Jeanne E. Thomson	Administrative assistant for the minority (to Jan. 31, 1961)	652.87
Charles T. Lane	Assistant clerk (to Jan. 2, 1961)	97.47
Charles M. Ryan	General counsel (to Jan. 2, 1961)	97.47
Ida S. Miller	Assistant clerk (to Jan. 2, 1961)	43.52
Levi K. Alderman	Clerk (to Jan. 2, 1961)	97.47
Kathryn Kivett	Assistant clerk (to Jan. 2, 1961)	43.52
Melvin W. Sneed	Minority clerk (to Jan. 2, 1961)	97.47
Russell C. Derrickson	Chief investigator (to Jan. 2, 1961)	97.47
Gladys M. Rafter	Assistant clerk (to Jan. 2, 1961)	43.52
James B. Wells	do	56.96

Amount of expenditures previously reported	None
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1961	\$72,142.27

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR (INVESTIGATING STAFF)

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
General Subcommittee on Education (Representative CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, chairman)		
Reva Beck Bosone	Legal counsel (to Mar. 15, 1961)	\$2,166.94
Ruth P. Ebersole	Assistant subcommittee clerk	2,930.77
Robert E. McCord	Subcommittee clerk	7,377.24
General Subcommittee on Labor (Representative CARL D. PERKINS, chairman)		
Peggy Lia Amburgey	Secretary	250.46
Joe Lee	Counsel (to May 31, 1961)	3,033.58
Hartwell Duvall	Counsel	683.51
Jeanne F. White	Secretary (to Mar. 31, 1961)	350.09
Marian Ruth Wyman	Secretary (to May 31, 1961)	455.56

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Special Subcommittee on Education (Representative EDITH GREEN, chairman):		
Betty R. Pryor	Subcommittee clerk	\$3,501.64
Nicholas H. Zumas	Counsel	3,501.64
Special Subcommittee on Labor (Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, chairman):		
Doris G. Smith	Secretary	2,751.68
W. Wilson Young	Counsel	7,377.24
Select Subcommittee on Labor (Representative HERBERT ZELENKO, chairman):		
Harvey B. Cohen	do	833.45
Mollie D. Cohen	Administrative assistant	3,168.40
Joseph I. Paper	Counsel (to May 31, 1961)	3,751.14
Select Subcommittee on Education (Representative FRANK THOMPSON, chairman):		
Mary E. Corbin	Secretary	2,237.40
William P. Gerberding	Counsel	4,500.64
Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Unemployment and the Impact of Automation (Representative ELMER HOLLAND, chairman):		
Walter Buckingham	Director of automation study	2,744.55
Olive M. Gibbons	Secretary	1,983.85
Ad Hoc Subcommittee on the Impact of Imports and Exports on American Employment (Representative JOHN H. DENT, chairman):		
Barbara Dash	do	1,983.85
Stanley D. Metzger	Subcommittee counsel	2,500.76
Ad Hoc Subcommittee on the National Labor Relations Board (Representative ROMAN PUCINSKI, chairman):		
James McConnell	Counsel	5,001.52
Laurine Pemberton	Secretary	1,500.39
Full committee staff:		
Donald F. Berens	Administrative assistant	2,333.61
Patricia Bergman	Secretary	1,350.86
Cabell Waller Berge	Administrative assistant	233.39
Adrienne Fields	Receptionist	1,400.90
Mary Sue Leonard	Secretary (to Jan. 31, 1961)	484.29
Mary D. Pinkard	Administrative assistant	2,448.34
Charles E. Wilson	Assistant education chief	3,157.75
Anne K. Fernbach	Administrative assistant (to Mar. 22, 1961)	458.35
Investigative task force:		
James E. Branigan	Counsel	4,375.02
Helen Tena Bushman	Clerk-receptionist (to June 30, 1961)	1,116.96
Oiga Cano	Administrative assistant (to June 30, 1961)	1,875.06
Odell Clark	Assistant chief investigator	4,167.25
Marvin R. Fullmer	Chief investigator	4,751.44
Ann I. Jordan	Secretary	1,500.39
Waldo E. Parrish	Administrative assistant	1,500.39
Jose Lumen Roman	Investigator	3,333.80
Ludwig Teller	Consultant	3,751.14
Minority staff:		
Walter P. Kennedy	Clerk (to Mar. 31, 1961)	201.26
Beverly Pearson	Minority secretary	2,741.15
Jeanne E. Thomson	do	3,585.00
Travel and miscellaneous expense		13,033.41

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$633,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	-----
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1961	122,306.06
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1961	510,693.94

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman.

JULY 1, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 4 to June 30, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Expenses, Jan. 4-June 30, 1961:	
Full committee	\$943.71
Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee	42,128.14
Military Operations Subcommittee	38,181.02
Government Activities Subcommittee	21,640.56
Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee	22,908.93
Foreign Operations and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee	32,252.87
Special Donable Property Subcommittee	15,609.20
Special Government Information Subcommittee	33,582.89
Special Subcommittee on Assigned Power and Land Problems	16,034.88
Total	228,282.20

Salaries, full committee, Jan. 1-June 30, 1961:	
Christine Ray Davis, staff director	8,824.74
Orville S. Poland, general counsel	8,234.74
James A. Lanigan, associate general counsel	8,824.74
Earle J. Wade, staff member	5,620.59
J. Robert Brown, staff member	6,733.38
Dolores Fel'Dotto, staff member	4,727.28
Ann E. McLachlan, staff member	4,281.72
Patricia Maheux, staff member	3,988.22
Helen M. Boyer, minority professional staff	8,051.46
J. P. Carlson, minority counsel	7,401.18
Expenses, Jan. 4-June 30, 1961:	
Full committee, travel, publications, telephone, stationery supplies, etc.	943.71

Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee, Hon. WILLIAM L. DAWSON, chairman:	
Elmer W. Henderson, counsel	7,768.62
Phineas Indritz, counsel (Jan. 4-Mar. 31, 1961)	3,742.89
Orville J. Montgomery, associate counsel	6,979.76
Arthur Perlman, investigator	6,979.76
Miles Q. Romney, counsel (Apr. 1-June 30, 1961)	3,322.74
David Glick, associate counsel	5,757.04
Lawrence P. Redmond, clerical staff (Jan. 4-Mar. 27, 1961)	2,479.93
Irene Manning, clerk-stenographer	3,583.07
Veronica B. Johnson, clerical staff (May 1-June 30, 1961)	1,250.04
Expenses	264.29
Total	42,128.14

Military Operations Subcommittee, Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman:	
Herbert Roback, staff administrator	8,677.66
Earl J. Morgan, investigator (Jan. 3-June 30, 1961)	6,658.56
John Paul Ridgely, investigator	5,670.67
Douglas G. Dahlin, staff attorney	4,628.61
Robert J. McElroy, investigator	4,429.42
Mollie Jo Hughes, clerk-stenographer	3,931.58
Catherine L. Koerberlein, clerk-stenographer	3,931.58
Expenses	252.94
Total	38,181.02

Government Activities Subcommittee, Hon. JACK BROOKS, chairman:	
Edward C. Brooks, Jr., staff administrator	7,571.65
John E. Moore, investigator	5,817.58
L. Russell Harding II, investigator	4,494.15
Irma Reel, clerk	3,488.43
Expenses	268.75
Total	21,640.56

Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, Hon. L. H. FOUNTAIN, chairman:	
James R. Naughton, counsel	\$7,614.84
Delphis C. Goldberg, professional staff member	7,614.84
Eileen M. Anderson, clerk-stenographer	3,931.58
Bebe B. Terry, clerk-stenographer	3,533.27
Expenses	214.40
Total	22,908.93

Foreign Operations and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, Hon. PORTER HARDY, Jr., chairman:	
John T. M. Reddan, chief counsel	7,800.00
Richard P. Bray, Jr., counsel	7,269.21
Miles Q. Romney, counsel (Jan. 4-Mar. 31, 1961)	3,042.10
Walton Woods, investigator	6,534.72
Phyllis Seymour, clerk	3,931.58
Yvonne J. Kurtak, stenographer	3,334.09
Expenses	341.17
Total	32,252.87

Special Donable Property Subcommittee, Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, chairman:	
Ray Ward, staff administrator	7,917.27
Margaret B. O'Connor, clerk-stenographer	3,533.27
Clara Katherine Armstrong, clerical staff	3,548.20
Herbert Lee Goldblatt, clerical staff (June 15-30, 1961)	160.08
Expenses	450.38
Total	15,609.20

Special Subcommittee on Government Information, Hon. JOHN E. MOSS, chairman:	
Samuel J. Archibald, staff administrator	7,917.27
Jacob Seher, counsel (Jan. 4-Mar. 15, 1961)	1,560.79
Phineas Indritz, counsel (Apr. 1-June 30, 1961)	4,025.73
Harry S. Weidberg, assistant counsel	5,554.02
Jack Howard, professional staff member	6,116.32
Helen Beasley, stenographer	3,931.58
Catherine L. Hartke, stenographer	3,931.58
Expenses	545.60
Total	33,582.89

Special Subcommittee on Assigned Power and Land Problems, Hon. JOHN E. MOSS, chairman:	
Sidney McClellan, professional staff member	6,344.62
Adriene C. Masterson, clerical staff	4,674.75
Francis J. Schwoerer, staff member	4,917.36
Expenses	98.15
Total	16,034.88

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	640,000.00
Amount expended from Jan. 4 to June 30, 1961	223,282.20
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1961	416,717.80

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman.

JUNE 30, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Julian P. Langston	Chief clerk	\$8,824.74
Marjorie Savage	Assistant clerk	7,612.03
John F. Haley	do	3,846.33
Mary F. Stolle	do	2,273.21

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$20,000.00
---	-------------

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....
 Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1961..... \$12,320.40

Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1961..... 12,320.40

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1961. 7,679.60

OMAR BURLESON,
Chairman.

JULY 7, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS
To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Professional staff:		
Sidney L. McFarland.	Professional staff director and engineering consultant.	\$8,359.02
T. Richard Witmer.	Counsel.	8,051.46
John L. Taylor.	Consultant on territorial and Indian affairs.	8,051.46
Karl S. Landstrom.	Consultant on mining, minerals, and lands (to Jan. 20, 1961).	894.61
Milton A. Pearl.	Consultant on mining, minerals, and lands (from Feb. 1, 1961).	6,270.20
Clerical staff:		
Nancy J. Arnold.	Chief clerk.	7,172.76
Laura Ann Moran.	Assistant chief clerk.	4,808.28
Dixie S. Duncan.	Clerk.	3,998.22
Penelope P. Harvison.	do.	3,863.18
Virginia E. Bedsole.	do.	3,795.66
Patricia B. Freeman.	Clerk (from Feb. 1, 1961).	2,589.26
Marjorie Lee Smith.	Clerk (Jan. 3-31, 1961).	464.43

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$60,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....
 Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1961..... 9,472.87

Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1961..... 9,472.87

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1961. 50,527.13

¹ Includes payment of \$3,150 to Paul D. Shriver, special consultant on territories, under contract approved Mar. 1, 1961.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman.

JULY 7, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Clerical staff:		
W. E. Williamson.	Clerk.	\$8,801.32
Kenneth J. Painter.	1st assistant clerk.	7,322.11
Marcella Fencil.	Assistant clerk.	4,575.40
Glenn L. Johnson.	Printing editor.	6,206.12
Joanne Neuland.	Clerical assistant.	3,643.77
Mildred H. Lang.	do.	3,643.77
Mary Ryan.	do.	3,643.77
Roy P. Wilkinson.	Assistant clerk.	3,593.14
Professional staff:		
Andrew Stevenson.	Expert.	8,807.16
Kurt Borchardt.	Legal counsel.	8,807.16
Sam G. Spal.	Research specialist.	8,807.16
Martin W. Cunningham.	Aviation consultant.	8,807.16
Additional temporary employees under H. Res. 108 and H. Res. 165:		
Gladys Johnson.	Clerical assistant.	3,643.77
Margaret J. Robinson.	Staff assistant.	7,796.63
Elsie M. Karpowich.	Clerical assistant.	3,643.77
Thomas A. Craig.	Messenger (Mar. 1 to Mar. 31, 1961).	362.58
Donald Wayne Cash.	Messenger (May 1 to May 31, 1961).	362.58
William J. Smead.	Messenger (June 1 to June 30, 1961).	362.58
Subcommittee on Regulatory Agencies:		
Robert W. Lishman.	Consultant (to Mar. 31, 1961).	4,239.80
Oliver Eastland.	Attorney (to Feb. 28, 1961).	2,553.81
Charles P. Howze, Jr.	Attorney (chief counsel from Apr. 1, 1961).	7,065.19
George W. Perry.	Attorney (associate counsel from Apr. 1, 1961).	6,331.17
Herman Clay Beasley.	Assistant clerk.	7,044.54
Rex Sparger.	Special assistant.	5,022.38
Lurlene Wilbert.	Clerical assistant.	4,364.70
Stuart C. Ross.	Consultant (from May 1, 1961).	2,688.22

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$435,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....

Amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1961..... 59,653.18

Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1961..... 59,653.18

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1961..... 375,346.82

OREN HARRIS,
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Bess E. Dick.	Staff director.	\$8,824.74
William R. Foley.	General counsel.	8,824.74
Walter M. Besterman.	Legislative assistant.	8,824.74

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Murray Drabkin.	Counsel.	\$7,099.53
Herbert N. Maletz.	do.	8,578.68
William H. Crabtree.	Associate counsel.	7,612.08
Carrie Lou Allen.	Clerical staff.	3,863.18
Anne J. Berger.	do.	5,631.98
Jane Caldwell.	do.	3,964.48
Frances F. Christy.	do.	5,204.16
Garner J. Cline.	Assistant Counsel.	5,702.24
Helen Goldsmith.	Clerical staff.	4,909.56
Velma Smedley.	do.	5,397.48

FUNDS FOR PREPARATION OF UNITED STATES CODE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE, AND REVISION OF THE LAWS

A. Preparation of new edition of United States Code (no year):
 Unexpended balance Dec. 31, 1960..... \$61,610.21
 Expended Jan. 1-June 30, 1961..... 21,519.02

Balance June 30, 1961..... 40,091.19

B. Preparation of new edition of District of Columbia Code (no year):
 Unexpended balance Dec. 31, 1960..... 76,695.91
 Expended Jan. 1-June 30, 1961..... 8,751.91

Balance June 30, 1961..... 67,944.00

C. Revision of the laws 1961:
 Unexpended balance Dec. 31, 1960..... 9,276.76
 Expended Jan. 1-June 30, 1961..... 8,939.74

Balance June 30, 1961..... 337.02

SALARIES PAID JANUARY 4 THROUGH JUNE 30, 1961, PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 56 AND HOUSE RESOLUTION 68, 87TH CONGRESS

Employee	Profession	Salary
Appel, Leonard.	Assistant counsel.	\$6,837.16
Beland, Lorraine W.	Clerical staff.	2,935.84
Burak, Gertrude C.	do.	4,529.02
Eisenberg, Roberta E.	do.	3,851.99
Finger, Alexander E.	Assistant counsel.	6,275.54
Fuchs, Herbert.	do.	7,053.21
Gary, Leon.	Clerical staff (as of June 7, 1961).	440.61
Greenwald, Andrew E.	Clerical staff (as of June 23, 1961).	80.04
Haardt, Alma B.	Clerical staff (as of Feb. 13, 1961).	2,056.02
Jett, R. Frederick.	Assistant counsel.	6,534.72
Kelemonick, Michael.	Clerical staff.	3,533.27
Meekins, Elizabeth G.	do.	3,851.99
Peet, Richard C.	Assistant counsel.	6,275.54
Shea, Mary Pat.	Clerical staff (to June 15, 1961).	2,869.28
Simms, Regina H.	Clerical staff (as of May 1, 1961).	1,130.20
Singman, Julian H.	Associate chief counsel, antitrust.	7,571.65
Sky, Theodore.	Assistant counsel.	4,329.89
Walden, Jerrold.	Associate counsel (as of June 12, 1961).	803.50
Williams, Stephen L.	Messenger.	2,437.94

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$200,000.00

Amount expended from Jan. 4 through June 30, 1961..... 76,277.11

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1961..... 123,722.89

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON STATE TAXATION OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE, PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 204, 87TH CONGRESS

Employee	Profession	Salary
Bankester, Claude E.	Counsel (as of June 8, 1961).	\$703.26
Breslow, Jerome W.	Assistant counsel (as of Apr. 17, 1961).	1,352.30
Greess, Constance.	Clerical staff (as of June 21, 1961).	180.77
Hall, Patricia J.	Clerical staff (as of June 26, 1961).	86.17
Meek, Joseph P.	Economist (as of June 19, 1961).	242.58
Melville, Robert F.	Senior economist (as of June 5, 1961).	938.96
Zelfman, Jerome M.	Counsel (as of June 15, 1961).	444.51

Funds authorized or appropriated for special subcommittee expenditures.....	\$150,000.00
Amount expended from Mar. 15 through June 30, 1961.....	5,586.85
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1961.....	144,413.15

EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman.

JULY 1, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John M. Drewry.....	Chief counsel.....	\$8,798.37
Bernard J. Zincke.....	Counsel.....	8,227.20
Robert H. Cowen.....	do.....	8,525.97
William B. Winfield.....	Chief clerk.....	7,612.08
Frances P. Still.....	Assistant clerk.....	5,030.16
E. M. Tollefson.....	Clerk to the minority.....	4,808.28
Edith W. Gordon.....	Secretary.....	3,998.22
Ruth E. Brookshire.....	Assistant clerk.....	3,998.22
Vera A. Barker.....	Secretary.....	3,998.22

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$75,000.00
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1961.....	9,994.49

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1961.....	65,005.51
---	-----------

HERBERT C. BONNER,
Chairman.

JULY 12, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Frederick C. Belen.....	Chief counsel (resignation effective Mar. 2, 1961).....	\$2,990.61
Charles E. Johnson.....	Staff director.....	8,698.80
George M. Moore.....	Counsel (effective Mar. 16, 1961).....	5,147.76
B. Benton Bray.....	Professional staff member.....	7,970.92
John H. Martiny.....	do.....	7,685.32
William A. Irvine.....	Assistant clerk (effective Mar. 1, 1961).....	4,942.92
Lillian L. Hopkins.....	Assistant clerk.....	4,909.56
John B. Friece.....	do.....	4,504.50
Lucy K. Daley.....	do.....	4,403.24
Elsie E. Thornton.....	Secretary.....	3,930.70
Blanche M. Simons.....	do.....	3,542.52

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$100,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	

Amount expended from Feb. 28 to June 30, 1961.....	\$19,652.03
--	-------------

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1961.....	80,347.97
---	-----------

TOM MURRAY,
Chairman.

JULY 14, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee:		
Margaret R. Beiter.....	Staff director.....	\$8,824.74
Richard J. Sullivan.....	Chief counsel.....	8,824.74
Robert F. McConnell.....	Minority counsel (retired Jan. 31, 1961).....	1,462.00
Clifton W. Enfield.....	Minority counsel (appointed Feb. 19, 1961).....	6,236.30
Joseph R. Brennan.....	Engineer-consultant.....	8,824.74
Stephen V. Feeley.....	Subcommittee clerk.....	6,294.00
Helen A. Dooley.....	Staff assistant.....	7,172.76
Helen A. Thompson.....	do.....	5,854.62
Dorothy A. Beam.....	do.....	5,204.16
S. Philip Cohen.....	do.....	4,504.50
Ester M. Saunders.....	Clerk-messenger.....	2,783.04
Investigating staff:		
Durward G. Evans.....	Subcommittee clerk.....	4,909.56
John A. O'Connor, Jr.....	do.....	4,909.56
William B. Short, Jr.....	do.....	4,909.56
Jerome N. Sonosky.....	Subcommittee clerk (resigned May 7, 1961).....	3,902.19
Peter M. Gentilini.....	Subcommittee clerk (appointed May 16, 1961).....	1,349.37
Agnes M. GaNun.....	Staff assistant.....	3,572.88
Mary C. Porter.....	Minority staff assistant.....	4,396.47
Murray S. Pashkoff.....	Investigator (appointed Mar. 1, 1961).....	2,668.84
Nicholas Capozzoli, Jr.....	Minority clerical assistant (Feb. 1 through Apr. 30, 1961).....	1,044.60
Flavil Q. Van Dyke, Jr.....	Minority clerical assistant (appointed June 12, 1961).....	347.21
Sterlyn B. Carroll.....	Clerk-messenger.....	2,783.04
Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway program:		
Walter R. May.....	Chief counsel.....	8,824.74
Robert E. Maunel.....	Minority counsel.....	7,809.84
John P. Constandy.....	Assistant chief counsel.....	7,807.62
James J. Fitzpatrick.....	Associate counsel.....	6,996.96
Robert A. McElhrott.....	do.....	6,996.96
Robert E. Vaughan.....	Associate counsel (resigned Mar. 13, 1961).....	2,445.65
George M. Kopecky.....	Chief investigator.....	7,537.18
George M. Martin.....	Administrative assistant.....	7,293.57
Baron I. Shacklette.....	Investigator.....	6,996.96
James P. Kelly.....	do.....	6,469.74
John N. Dinsmore.....	do.....	6,474.15
Sherman S. Willse.....	do.....	6,581.79
Charles A. Gannon.....	Investigator (appointed Apr. 6, 1961).....	3,069.69
Kathryn M. Keeney.....	Chief clerk.....	3,876.66
Mildred E. Rupert.....	Staff assistant.....	3,491.88
Jean N. Cameron.....	Staff assistant (resigned June 23, 1961).....	3,356.08
Erla S. Youmans.....	Minority staff assistant.....	3,339.96

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Special, etc.—Con. Sara L. Vollett.....	Clerical assistant.....	\$2,909.63
Michael J. McInerney.....	Research assistant (resigned Feb. 28, 1961).....	900.68
Clifton A. Woodrum.....	Research assistant (appointed June 16, 1961).....	190.15

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$950,000.00
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1961.....	163,437.45
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1961.....	786,562.55

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
Chairman.

JULY 17, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
T. M. Carruthers.....	Clerk, standing committee.....	\$5,733.38
Mary S. Forrest.....	Assistant clerk.....	4,200.72
D. E. Lukens.....	Minority clerk (Jan. 3, 1961, to June 30, 1961, inclusive).....	4,554.70

HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman.

JULY 10, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 4 to June 30, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Charles F. Ducander.....	Executive director and chief counsel.....	\$8,824.74
Charles S. Sheldon II.....	Technical director.....	8,824.74
Philip B. Yeager.....	Special consultant.....	8,824.74
Spencer M. Beresford.....	Special counsel.....	8,824.74
John A. Carstarphen, Jr.....	Chief clerk.....	8,293.14
Emily Dodson.....	Secretary.....	3,658.98
Eva F. Lopez.....	do.....	3,658.98
Jane J. Zetty.....	do.....	3,650.54
Mary Ann Robert.....	do.....	3,419.32
Mary L. Myron.....	do.....	3,210.04

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Investigations subcommittee:		
Raymond Wilcove	Staff consultant	\$8,293.14
C. Otis Finch	Assistant clerk	4,570.32
Richard P. Hines	Staff consultant	7,163.94
Frank R. Hammill, Jr.	Counsel	7,269.42
Mary Ann Temple	Secretary	3,199.69
Eunice A. Walker	do	3,253.92
Mabel McLaughlin	Stenographer	355.92
Joseph Felton	Publications clerk	830.25

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures \$300,000.00
 Amount expended from Feb. 28 to June 30, 1961 45,692.94

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1961 254,307.06

OVERTON BROOKS,
Chairman.

JULY 12, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3 to June 30, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
STANDING COMMITTEE		
Donald T. Appell	Investigator	\$7,260.60
Juliette P. Joray	Recording clerk	5,678.88
Thelma S. Michalowski	Secretary to investigators	4,686.78
Gwendolyn L. Lewis	Administrative assistant (appointed Jan. 4, 1961)	5,584.23
Isabel B. Nagel	Secretary to counsel	3,896.94
Rosella A. Purdy	Secretary to director	4,686.78
Frank S. Tavenner, Jr.	Director	8,824.74
Anne D. Turner	Chief of reference section	5,722.80
Lorraine N. Veley	Secretary	3,694.44
William A. Wheeler	Investigator	7,084.86

INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE

Beatrice P. Baldwin	Clerk-typist	2,681.76
Daniel Butler	do	2,175.48
Charlotte B. Carlson	Research analyst	3,466.56
Regina Marie Crissy	Clerk-typist (appointed June 1, 1961)	362.58
Kathleen Fritz	Clerk-typist (appointed Mar. 7, 1961)	1,268.36
Raymond T. Collins	Investigator	5,010.84
Annie Cunningham	Information analyst	3,719.71
Rosalyn B. DuVal	do	2,691.84
Oliver Eastland	Consultant (Mar. 1 to 12, inclusive)	394.41
Elizabeth L. Edinger	Editor	3,694.44
Emily R. Francis	Information analyst	2,479.26
Helen M. Gittings	Research analyst	4,605.78
Robert Henry Goldsborough	Investigator	3,238.74
Betty Ann Gredecky	Clerk-stenographer (appointed Mar. 1, 1961)	1,652.84
Kathleen L. Hagenburch	Clerk-stenographer	3,593.16
Walter B. Huber	Consultant	7,172.76
Mastra Patricia Kelly	Research analyst	2,965.32
Olive M. King	Editor	4,453.86

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE—continued		
Evelyn M. Kocis	Clerk-stenographer (appointed Apr. 1, 1961)	\$1,376.34
Fulton Lewis III	Research analyst (Jan. 1-12)	208.15
Gwendolyn L. Lewis	Administrative assistant (transferred to standing committee)	94.65
Francis J. McNamara	Research director	6,557.64
William Margetich	Investigator	3,562.80
Vincent J. Messina	Research analyst	2,377.98
David E. Muffley, Jr.	Clerk-typist (appointed Jan. 5, 1961)	2,151.38
Jane S. Muller	Information analyst	2,702.04
Alfred M. Nittle	Counsel	7,001.40
Maureen Phillips	Information analyst	3,026.09
Ontrich	do	do
Alma T. Pfaff	Research clerk	2,479.26
Katherine Phillips	Switchboard operator	2,555.22
Josephine S. Randolph	Research clerk	2,884.32
Barbara E. Rettew	Editor	3,188.09
Louis J. Russell	Investigator	5,854.62
Olga Seastrom	Clerk-typist (appointed June 16, 1961)	181.29
Hilda C. Schoenek	Clerk-stenographer (terminated Apr. 30, 1961)	1,040.85
Doris P. Shaw	Information analyst	2,702.04
Lela Mae Stiles	do	3,026.09
Consuelo S. Thompson	Clerk-stenographer (resigned May 15, 1961)	2,098.66
Joseph T. Timony	Clerk-typist (resigned June 15, 1961)	2,133.39
Geraldine M. Unangst	Clerk-stenographer	2,175.48
Mary Myers Valente	do	3,140.84
John C. Walsh	Cocounsel	5,378.16
Vera L. Watts	Clerk-stenographer	3,431.09
Neil E. Wetterman	Investigator	4,403.28
Billie Wheeler	Clerk-stenographer	1,984.26
Regina McCall Wilt	Clerk-typist	2,175.48
John A. Yohe	Staff member (appointed Jan. 4, 1961)	4,840.28

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures \$331,000.00
 Amount of expenditures previously reported None
 Amount expended from Jan. 4 to July 1, 1961 123,256.64

Balance unexpended as of July 1, 1961 207,743.36

FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman.

JULY 14, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Full committee:		
Oliver E. Meadows	Staff director (P)	\$8,824.74
Edwin B. Patterson	Counsel (P)	8,824.74
J. Buford Jenkins	Professional aid (P)	7,699.98
Jack Z. Anderson	Professional aid for minority (P)	6,373.42
George W. Fisher	Clerk (C)	8,824.74
Paul K. Jones	Assistant clerk (C)	6,294.00
Helen A. Biondi	do	5,160.22

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Full committee—Con.		
George J. Turner	Assistant clerk (C)	\$4,302.00
Alice V. Matthews	Clerk-stenographer (C)	4,302.00
Helen J. Peterson	Clerk-stenographer for minority (C)	2,375.66
Investigative staff:		
Adin M. Downer	Staff member	6,720.18
Joanne Doyle	Clerk-stenographer	3,496.98
Jean Johnson	do	2,914.15
Billy E. Kirby	Investigator	131.48
Paul H. Smiley	do	66.35
John Billie Smith	do	989.54
Kay N. Small	Clerk-stenographer	1,481.66
William T. McDonald	Clerk-typist	343.49

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures \$50,000.00
 Amount of expenditures previously reported
 Amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1961 16,918.32

Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1961 16,918.32

Balance unexpended as of July 1, 1961 33,081.68

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman.

JULY 10, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Leo H. Irwin	Chief counsel (C)	\$8,824.74
John M. Martin, Jr.	Assistant chief counsel (P)	8,666.58
Thomas A. Martin	Minority counsel (P)	8,824.74
Gerard M. Brannon	Professional assistant (P)	8,666.58
Raymond F. Conkling	do	7,928.46
Alfred R. McCauley	do	7,787.82
William E. Wells	Attorney (from Jan. 4, 1961) (P)	3,705.09
Virginia Baker	Staff assistant (C)	4,276.68
Virginia Butler	do	4,383.00
Frances E. Donovan	do	4,276.68
Grace Kagan	do	4,383.00
June Kendall	do	4,453.86
Margaretta G. Pestell	do	3,375.42
Elizabeth L. Ruth	do	4,150.08
Eileen Sonnett	Staff assistant (C) (from Jan. 4, 1961)	3,234.57
Susan Taylor	Staff assistant (C)	5,300.82
Irene Wade	do	4,383.00
Hughlon Greene	Document clerk	2,894.40
Walter B. Little	do	2,894.40

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures \$25,000.00
 Amount of expenditures previously reported None
 Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1961 844.38

Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1961 844.38

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1961 24,155.62

WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman.

JULY 1, 1961.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

TO THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 4 to June 30, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Charles S. Beller	Assistant counsel	\$2,166.84
Katherine C. Blackburn	Research analyst	3,981.38
John Bryan	Business analyst	1,871.28
Dorothy F. Council	Secretary-stenographer	3,956.48
Frances F. Crane	do	3,174.79
Victor P. Dalmás	Adviser to minority members	7,917.27
Dean B. Dittmer	Research analyst	3,368.92
Jane M. Deem	Administrative assistant	2,970.19
Jean W. Fender	Secretary-stenographer	2,950.77
Justinus Gould	Counsel	7,485.21
Martha S. Hannah	Secretary-stenographer	1,040.33
Bessie C. Harding	do	3,612.92
Bryan H. Jaques	Staff director	8,608.57
Win. Summers Johnson	Chief economist	1,945.44
Carolyn A. Fatimer	Research analyst	3,981.38
Barbara Wright McConnell	Secretary-stenographer	3,533.27
Alfonso Everette MacIntyre	General counsel	8,608.57
Irving Maness	Assistant counsel-investigator	2,236.52
Willard F. Mueller	Chief economist	5,367.64
Margaret Fallon Palmer	Research analyst	3,525.19
J. Brooks A. Robertson	Analyst	5,623.76
Lois B. Shupe	Administrative assistant	583.35
J. Allan Sherier	Counsel	4,025.73
Margaret C. Staleup	Secretary-stenographer	200.05
Frederick A. Spinell	Assistant counsel	3,869.92
Marie M. Stewart	Clerk	4,344.82
Annette F. Vollmer	Secretary-stenographer	1,775.73

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$580,000.00
Total amount expended from Jan. 4 to June 30, 1961	107,128.63
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1961	472,871.37

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1148. A letter from the consultant for research and development, Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report on Department of the Army research and development contracts awarded during the period July 1 through December 31, 1960, pursuant to Public Law 557, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1149. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the loan guarantee and direct loan programs of the Veterans' Administration (VA) for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1150. A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill authorizing a celebration of the American patent system"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1151. A letter from the treasurer, Jewish War Veterans, U.S.A., National Memorial, Inc.; transmitting a copy of the audit report of the Jewish War Veterans, U.S.A., National Memorial, Inc., for the fiscal year April 1, 1960, to March 31, 1961, pursuant to Public Law 85-903; 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. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 378. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 30, a bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the northeastern water and related land resources compact; without amendment (Rept. No. 745). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 614. An act to authorize the use of Commodity Credit Corporation-owned surplus grain by the States for emergency use in the feeding of resident game birds and other resident wildlife; to authorize the use of such surplus grain by the Secretary of the Interior for emergency use in the feeding of migratory birds, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 746). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Science and Astronautics. H.R. 8095. A bill to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 747). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McCULLOCH: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8140. A bill to strengthen the criminal laws relating to bribery, graft, and conflicts of interest, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 748). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 8033. A bill to amend section 17 of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to authorize the delegation of certain duties to employee boards; without amendment (Rept. No. 750). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 763. An act to authorize annual appropriation to reimburse Commodity Credit Corporation for net realized losses sustained during any fiscal year in lieu of annual appropriations to restore capital impairment based on annual Treasury appraisals, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 751). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

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. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1378. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an exchange of certain land in

Madera County, Calif., with Mary Saunders Moses; without amendment (Rept. No. 749). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming:

H.R. 8271. A bill to amend the act granting the consent of Congress to the negotiation of certain compacts by the States of Nebraska, Wyoming, and South Dakota in order to extend the time for such negotiation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H.R. 8272. A bill to extend for 2 years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, relating to the construction, maintenance, and operation of schools in federally impacted areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 8273. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended, and the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to prohibit the subsidized export of any agricultural commodity to Communist nations and to prohibit sales by the Commodity Credit Corporation of surplus agricultural commodities to such nations at prices less than those prices available to American consumers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LOSER:

H.R. 8274. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ST. GERMAIN:

H.R. 8275. A bill to amend titles I, X, and XIV of the Social Security Act to make individuals suffering from tuberculosis or mental illness eligible thereunder for public assistance payments (and medical assistance) on the same basis as individuals suffering from other types of illness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWENGLER:

H.R. 8276. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to improve and promote the development of a sound U.S. economy through the establishment of a program of advisory services to small business and other concerns; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H.R. 8277. A bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act to simplify and improve the election and appointment of directors of the Federal home loan banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 8278. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended, and the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to prohibit the subsidized export of any agricultural commodity to Communist nations and to prohibit sales by the Commodity Credit Corporation of any agricultural commodities to such nations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ZELENSKO:

H.R. 8279. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend the child labor provisions thereof to certain children employed in agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 8280. A bill to extend for 3 years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, and to make certain changes in such laws; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 8281. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended, and the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to prohibit the subsidized export of any agricultural commodity to Communist nations and to prohibit sales by the Commodity Credit Corporation of any agricultural commodities to such nations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 8282. A bill to amend section 3203(d) of title 38, United States Code, to provide that there shall be no reduction of pension otherwise payable during hospitalization of certain veterans with a wife or child; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H.R. 8283. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act relating to relief work programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 8284. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended, and the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to prohibit the subsidized export of any agricultural commodity to Communist nations and to prohibit sales by the Commodity Credit Corporation of any agricultural commodities to such nations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 8285. A bill to extend for 2 years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, relating to Federal assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 8286. A bill to provide for research into and development of practical means for utilization of solar energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 8287. A bill to extend for 1 year the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, which relate to Federal assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 8288. A bill to extend for 3 years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, and to make certain changes in such laws; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 8289. A bill to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 8290. A bill to provide an exemption from participation in the Federal old-age and survivors insurance program for individuals who are members of a church whose doctrines forbid participation in such program on grounds of religious belief; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 8291. A bill to amend the act of July 14, 1960, enabling the United States to participate in the resettlement of certain refugees; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.J. Res. 491. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.J. Res. 492. Joint resolution establishing a temporary loan guarantee program under the direction of the Secretary of State in connection with the 1962 world sport parachuting championship to be held at Orange, Mass.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.J. Res. 493. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.J. Res. 494. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H. Res. 379. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BARING:

H. Res. 380. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the administration by the Secretary of Commerce of the Federal-aid highway program; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. Res. 381. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MORSE:

H. Res. 382. Resolution to establish a House Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to create a Territorial Deputy from Guam to the House of Representatives, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 8292. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Jack Galin for disability retirement as an officer of the Army of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 8293. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mirosława Kulesza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 8294. A bill for the relief of Annie Gabbay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 8295. A bill for the relief of Dr. Asu Ram Jha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 8296. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kokila Fadla and her minor daughter, Kalpana Fadla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 8297. A bill for the relief of Gregory Waskul; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8298. A bill for the relief of Henry Gamero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8299. A bill for the relief of Vladimir Tsvetanov Trifonov (Vladimir Itsov Toshev); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUSSELOT:

H.R. 8300. A bill for the relief of Teh Wen Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 8301. A bill for the relief of Teresa Mikucki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Dignity of Being American—Statement by George M. Mardikian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 20, 1961

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, this country is enriched by many citizens who have come here from other lands, and whose pride in their rights and responsibilities of American citizenship is a never-ending one.

One such distinguished American citizen is George M. Mardikian, of San

Francisco, Calif., born in Armenia, a devoted American by choice.

In the June 11 issue of This Week magazine appeared an inspiring statement entitled "The Dignity of Being American." The statement was written by Mr. Mardikian, a prominent and highly successful restaurateur in San Francisco and a public-spirited patriot. I highly commend my fellow Californian for the moving words with which he has portrayed the dignity of holding high our heads, and calling ourselves Americans. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of Mr. Mardikian's statement be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks just now made by the distinguished Senator from California.

As a matter of fact, only 2 weeks ago it was my great honor and privilege to be invited to address the Armenian Youth Group of the United States of America, which met in convention in my own beloved city of Providence; and at that time I took occasion to mention the great accomplishments of Mr. Mardikian. I think he is an inspiration to all young Americans; and I am very happy that the Senator from California has brought his statement to the attention of the Senate and the country.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I am grateful to my friend, the distinguished