

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 25, 1962:

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

Noel P. Fox, of Michigan, to be U.S. district judge for the western district for Michigan.

U.S. ATTORNEY

Donald A. Wine, of Iowa, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Iowa for the term of 4 years.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate July 25, 1962:

U.S. MARSHAL

John L. Di Benedetto, of New York, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of New York, vice Thomas J. Lunney, term expired, sent to the Senate March 20, 1962.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JULY 25, 1962

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

Psalm 29: *The Lord will give strength unto His people. He will bless them with peace.*

O Thou God of all grace and goodness, may nations everywhere abandon their sordid scramble for prestige and power and gain a new vision which is radiant with the promise and assurance of justice and righteousness, of freedom and fraternity.

Inspire us to give authentic and enthusiastic expression to the mind of the Prince of Peace for we know that there can be no security and blessedness for mankind until we follow His ways of mutual welfare.

Grant that as partners in a great and glorious enterprise we may feel constrained to put forth a more heroic effort in behalf of a nobler issue of personal character and a finer social order.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE MONTH OF AUGUST

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order tomorrow to take up for consideration a House joint resolution to provide continuing appropriations for the month of August.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers

on the part of the House have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on H.R. 11289, the Department of Defense appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1963.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 10904) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

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

Mr. LAIRD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, may I state that the Senate has added a considerable amount of money to several sections of this bill over and above President Kennedy's budget request. It is my hope that we can bring back those Senate amendments which add funds to this bill in disagreement. In this way we can have separate votes on these increases here on the floor of the House. Many Members of the House have contacted me hoping that they would have an opportunity to have a separate vote on increases of the other body. Certainly, if I am appointed as one of the conferees, I shall try to give the House the opportunity to have such a vote and work its will.

Mr. Speaker, I assure this House that if appointed to this conference committee, I will do everything in my power to uphold the appropriation level established in the House-passed bill.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the views just expressed by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], relative to bringing back to the House in disagreement any items in the appropriations for the National Institutes of Health which the Senate conferees insist upon increasing above the amounts approved by the House. I take this position because the Committee on Government Operations, in a unanimous report issued last month—House Report No. 1958—found serious deficiencies in the management of the National Institutes of Health. The committee has made an

intensive study during the past 3 years of the administration of the NIH grant programs. Although serious management weaknesses were brought to the agency's attention in April 1961—House Report No. 321—relatively little effective action has yet been taken by NIH to correct these shortcomings which it has acknowledged.

I would remind my colleagues of the tremendous growth of appropriations for the National Institutes of Health in recent years. Between 1950 and 1962, appropriations for NIH have increased by approximately 15 times, from a level of around \$50 million in 1950, to well over \$700 million last year. Appropriations for research and training grants to non-governmental scientists alone have increased by more than 26 times. Few public programs have grown at such a rapid rate. It is not surprising, therefore, that officials of the agency have experienced organizational and management problems in administering these programs.

The investigation made by the Committee on Government Operations has demonstrated that the NIH grant programs are not being administered in an efficient and economical manner. To increase the appropriation for these programs in the absence of effective management can only result in greater waste and inefficiency. It is my belief that the funds which are now spent unnecessarily as a result of inadequate review procedures would go a long way toward financing those new projects which are found to merit support during 1963. Surely, with the additional \$60.4 million already voted by the House, there will be more than enough money available for support of all meritorious health research and training. I can see no possible justification for increasing the NIH appropriation still another \$60 million as proposed by the other body.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it would be a serious mistake, and a disservice to the cause of medical research and to the taxpaying public, if appropriations for the National Institutes of Health were increased beyond the House amount before the agency has strengthened its capability for administering these programs efficiently. I intend to bring to the attention of the House in more detail the reasons why the House conferees should not agree to increasing these appropriations above the \$840,800,000—plus \$50 million for health research facilities—already authorized by the House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman tell us when this bill passed the House of Representatives, how long ago?

Mr. FOGARTY. It passed in the month of March. I do not have the exact date.

Mr. GROSS. The month of March, 4 or 5 months ago?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes, it was just passed in the other body last week.

Mr. GROSS. Maybe my memory is failing me, but it was so long ago I could

not remember how long the Senate has been sitting on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island? The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. FOGARTY, DENTON, CANNON, LAIRD, and TABER.

PUERTO RICO'S BIRTHDAY: COMMONWEALTH DAY

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago today, July 25, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was proclaimed in effect. This was one of the most significant dates in man's entire colonial history. Without the slightest violence and with the fondest expressions of esteem for the parent country, the Puerto Rican people became virtually autonomous in local affairs, while happily accepting control from Washington in foreign affairs as well as in certain national objectives. It was not so much a revolution as a coming of age. The Federal Government and the Puerto Rican people agreed that the latter were well able to take care of themselves.

The results of this friendliest of associations have been sensational. Puerto Rico truly is a showcase for democracy, and has inspired oppressed and impoverished peoples the world over.

The Puerto Rican people who live in the States take pride in the accomplishments of their island brethren; but they can also point to contributions and at tributes of their own. Distinguished mainland Puerto Ricans are found in many and diverse fields. Rita Moreno, Jose Ferrer, and Juano Hernandez have long been among the more noted film and stage stars. Graciela Rivera has charmed Metropolitan Opera audiences. Vic Power and Jim Rivera, among others, have been major league baseball stars. Puerto Ricans have risen to important business and professional positions; and have occupied posts in various branches of National, State, and local government.

The Puerto Ricans who have settled in my home city of Springfield, Mass., brought with them the Latin customs of their island, their strong family ties and strong religious feelings that have made Puerto Ricans a stable, industrious and productive people. Every summer the Springfield Puerto Rican community sponsors a San Juan Festival of music, gaiety, and native dances largely attended and greatly appreciated by their neighbors and public officials. During the festival the Puerto Ricans demonstrate to us that they are wholesome, fun loving and gay people, justifiably proud of their past island traditions now blended into the mores of the mainland.

Mr. Speaker, an editorial entitled "Puerto Rico's Birthday," from today's New York Times, follows:

PUERTO RICO'S BIRTHDAY

A generation ago Puerto Rico was one of the problem children of the Caribbean, although its problem was not violence or revolutionary tendencies but poverty. If the island had not been so poor, we would not have so many Puerto Ricans in the city of New York. We are having fewer such migrants now and presumably will have fewer still, for the little country is not so poor as it used to be. When it became a commonwealth 10 years ago, its per capita income in current dollars was about \$318. Today it is about \$621.

A great part of this progress can be traced to the work of Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marin, who has been continuously Governor since 1948. Governor Muñoz-Marin, who got his higher education in New York City, strikes those who know him as almost an old-fashioned American Progressive. He has drawn around him some of the most gifted young people in his island and set them to work in developing new housing, new industries, better sanitation and a higher level of education. The tragedy of tyranny has never afflicted Puerto Rico as it has at various times Cuba, the Dominican Republic and Haiti. There is no island in the Caribbean that has a seemingly more prosperous future, no island flag that flies more proudly than the Lone Star of the Puerto Rican Commonwealth.

As a political device the Commonwealth experiment has worked out smoothly. The Puerto Ricans are citizens of the United States, although they do not vote for President unless they migrate to the mainland; they rely on us for their protection, and their citizens serve in our armed forces. On this, the birthday of the Commonwealth, we hopefully wish the island and its people well.

TREASURY, POST OFFICE, EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF PRESIDENT, AND CERTAIN INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1963

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 10526) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, 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 Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2028)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10526) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, 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 9, 16, and 18.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 15, and 19, 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 "\$4,510,000"; 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 matter proposed by said amendment insert "sixty"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "fifty"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "fifty"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$64,775,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$33,330,000"; 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 "\$32,350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "one hundred"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$12,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$486,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "eighty-one"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree

to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$5,475,000"; 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 "\$594,500,000"; 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 "\$5,650,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

J. VAUGHAN GARY,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN R. PILLION,

Managers on the Part of the House.

A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
MIKE MONRONEY,
ALAN BIBLE,
CARL HAYDEN,
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
GORDON ALLOTT,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
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. 10526) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, 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—TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Office of the Secretary

Amendment No. 1—Appropriates \$4,510,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$4,480,000 as proposed by the House and \$4,540,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Customs

Amendments Nos. 2, 3, and 4—Allow purchase of 60 passenger motor vehicles of which 50 shall be for replacement, including 50 police type.

Amendment No. 5—Appropriates \$64,775,000 for salaries and expenses, instead of \$64,600,000 as proposed by the House and \$65,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Coast Guard

Amendment No. 6—Appropriates \$220,000,000 for operating expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$217,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 7—Appropriates \$33,330,000 for acquisition, construction, and improvements instead of \$25,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$39,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House allowance provides for replacement of one patrol craft at \$4,250,000, replacement of one coastal tender at \$3,000,000, and replacement of three harbor tugs at a total of \$1,080,000.

Amendment No. 8—Appropriates \$32,350,000 for retired pay instead of \$32,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$32,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Internal Revenue Service

Amendments Nos. 9 and 10—Allow purchase of 200 vehicles for replacement only, of which 100 may be for police-type use.

CVIII—928

Amendment No. 11—Provides \$12,300,000 for temporary employment instead of \$12,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$12,600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12—Appropriates \$486,000,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$480,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$492,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

U.S. Secret Service

Amendment No. 13—Allows 81 vehicles instead of 74 as proposed by the House and 89 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14—Appropriates \$5,475,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$5,300,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,650,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE II—POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Research, development, and engineering

Amendment No. 15—Appropriates \$12,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$10,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Operations

Amendment No. 16—Appropriates \$3,535,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$3,548,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Transportation

Amendment No. 17—Appropriates \$594,500,000 instead of \$590,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$599,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Facilities

Amendment No. 18—Appropriates \$167,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$173,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Plant and equipment

Amendment No. 19—Appropriates \$120,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$116,000,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE III—EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Bureau of the Budget

Amendment No. 20—Appropriates \$5,650,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$5,600,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,677,000 as proposed by the Senate.

J. VAUGHAN GARY,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN R. PILLION,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, this is the first regular appropriation bill to be reported out of conference since the little altercation we have had with Members of the other body. I will report to the House that by unanimous request the chairman of the House conferees presided over the conference. It was a very harmonious session and everybody was in a good humor. We arrived at a very fair and satisfactory settlement of the differences between the two bodies.

The total amount agreed upon in conference was \$5,489,781,000. When the bill first came before the House, the House cut the requests \$113 million. The Senate restored \$65 million of that amount. The conference figure is \$28 million above the House figure, but \$37 million below the Senate figure.

I might add that of the \$28 million that was added by the Senate, \$11 million was for the U.S. Coast Guard.

Of that amount, \$2,500,000 was for special expenditures incident to the recent terrific storm along the Atlantic coast. That storm came after the

House had passed its bill, and it was an unanticipated expense at that time. After the House had passed its bill the Coast Guard found that the storm had cost them \$2,500,000, and they asked the Senate to add that amount. The Senate did add it. We thought it was a proper addition and we readily agreed to it.

The rest of the \$11 million for the Coast Guard was for shipbuilding. Our committee had recommended that no allowance be made for the shipbuilding program in the House bill because of the fact that we have, over a long period of time, been trying to get a long-range plan for maintenance of various Coast Guard facilities such as airplanes, ships, and shore installations. They have been working on development of such a plan for a long time. The report had not been presented to our subcommittee. The present long-range plan for airplanes was submitted to the House some 5 years ago and we are now operating under that plan.

I may say that the purpose of such a plan is that we may take care of replacements in a more orderly way instead of having them come in and asking for all the replacements in one year and none the next. It would mean a more uniform expenditure for replacements in these three categories.

In an effort to force the report we refused to put anything in our bill for ship construction until that report was submitted. The report has been completed now, and we agreed to a restoration of part of the funds that had been stricken by the House. We had stricken \$14 million. We agreed to a restoration of \$8.3 million.

Another \$11 million was for the Internal Revenue Service. Frankly, we feel that the additional amount of \$11 million for Internal Revenue is more than was necessary, but the Senate was very insistent on this item. They felt that we needed more revenue agents in order to raise the large sums of money required at the present time to operate the Government. We finally agreed to a restoration of \$11 million for that item for which they had added \$17 million.

There were very few restorations outside of those two items, which took up \$22 million of the \$28 million that the report shows over and above the House bill.

I think you will want to know something about personnel. When this bill was first presented to us 20,696 additional personnel were requested. A large part of that was for the Post Office Department. You understand that the personnel in the Post Office Department depends on the volume of mail. We thought during World War II we had reached the peak of volume in the Post Office, but strange to say the volume has increased every single year since the war and it is now increasing steadily each year.

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

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. It is not only a question of mail volume, it is also a problem of expanded delivery areas. Is that not correct?

Mr. GARY. That is correct, and in addition to the increased volume, they are increasing and extending their services to areas that heretofore have not enjoyed adequate postal services.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, the increased appropriation is required for that reason as well as the increase in volume of mail.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman is correct, and I thank him for his contribution.

As we did not feel the 20,696 employees requested were necessary, in the House bill that number was reduced to 11,213. In the Senate bill it was raised to 16,300.

In this conference report there are 12,568 additional employees which we think will adequately take care of the expanding departments and the increased volume of mail.

Mr. Speaker, I have given the highlights of this conference report. I shall be glad to answer any questions. I feel that we have arrived at a fair compromise; and, as I say, this is not a 50-50 cut, but the House has an advantage. Thirty-seven million dollars has been cut from the Senate bill and only \$28 million has been added to the House bill. So it is a split of 3 to 2.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I note an increase in both vehicles and in the appropriation for the Secret Service over and above the original House figure. It would be my hope, I may say to the gentleman, that some of the extracurricular activities we have noted of late with reference to the Secret Service might be dispensed with so that we can stop the steady increase in the personnel and expenditures for the Secret Service.

Mr. GARY. I may say to the gentleman this represents a very substantial cut in the number of employees and in the amount of money that the Secret Service requested. We felt some increase was necessary on account of the counterfeiting activities. We are having a great deal of trouble these days with counterfeiting. Most of these additional employees will be employed in connection with the law enforcement activities of the Secret Service which is a very important activity.

Mr. GROSS. I hope that is the case, but from some of the pictures and news stories I have been reading, that is not exactly the whole story.

Mr. GARY. I will say to the gentleman that our committee has never reduced any amount we felt necessary to guard the life of the President of the United States and his family.

Mr. GROSS. I want the President of the United States and his family to have all the protection that is necessary, but I do not know of any reason why Secret Service operatives should be operating speedboats to tow people around water skiing and other activities along that line, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. GARY. I think that is a matter we will have to leave up to the Secret Service. They are charged with a specific duty, under the law. The manner of performing that duty is an administrative detail which they must determine. The Congress of the United States cannot undertake to handle the administrative affairs of the Secret Service.

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

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

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I concur fully in the statement of the gentleman from Virginia. This conference report represents a favorable and a most equitable settlement of the differences between the House and Senate bills. The House was able to retain about three-fourths of the original cuts made by the House in the bill, and I recommend that the conference report be agreed to.

Mr. GARY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, in further explanation of this conference report, I include as a part of my remarks the following table:

Treasury, Post Office, and Executive Office appropriation bill, 1963 (H.R. 10526)

Item	Budget estimates	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
					Budget estimate	House	Senate
TITLE I—TREASURY DEPARTMENT							
Office of the Secretary.....	\$4,660,000	\$4,480,000	\$4,540,000	\$4,510,000	-\$150,000	+\$30,000	-\$30,000
Bureau of Accounts:							
Salaries and expenses.....	3,838,000	3,800,000	3,800,000	3,800,000	-38,000		
Salaries and expenses, Division of Disbursement.....	26,975,000	26,500,000	26,500,000	26,500,000	-475,000		
Total, Bureau of Accounts.....	30,813,000	30,300,000	30,300,000	30,300,000	-513,000		
Bureau of Customs.....	66,000,000	64,600,000	65,300,000	64,775,000	-1,225,000	+175,000	-525,000
Bureau of Engraving and Printing, air conditioning of buildings.....	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000			
Bureau of the Mint.....	6,680,000	6,480,000	6,480,000	6,480,000	-200,000		
Bureau of Narcotics.....	4,580,000	4,580,000	4,580,000	4,580,000			
Bureau of the Public Debt.....	48,000,000	47,750,000	47,750,000	47,750,000	-250,000		
Coast Guard:							
Operating expenses.....	220,000,000	217,500,000	220,000,000	220,000,000		+2,500,000	
Acquisition, construction, and improvements.....	39,000,000	25,000,000	39,000,000	33,330,000	-5,670,000	+8,330,000	-5,670,000
Retired pay.....	32,700,000	32,000,000	32,700,000	32,350,000	-350,000	+350,000	-350,000
Reserve training.....	16,500,000	16,500,000	16,500,000	16,500,000			
Total, Coast Guard.....	308,200,000	291,000,000	308,200,000	302,180,000	-6,020,000	+11,180,000	-6,020,000
Internal Revenue Service.....	513,000,000	480,000,000	492,000,000	486,000,000	-27,000,000	+6,000,000	-6,000,000
Office of the Treasurer.....	16,675,000	16,450,000	16,450,000	16,450,000	-225,000		
U.S. Secret Service:							
Salaries and expenses.....	5,850,000	5,300,000	5,650,000	5,475,000	-375,000	+175,000	-175,000
Salaries and expenses, White House Police.....	1,216,000	1,216,000	1,216,000	1,216,000			
Salaries and expenses, guard force.....	369,000	369,000	369,000	369,000			
Total, U.S. Secret Service.....	7,435,000	6,885,000	7,235,000	7,060,000	-375,000	+175,000	-175,000
Fund for payment of losses in shipment.....	(525,000)	(525,000)	(525,000)	(525,000)			
Total, title I, Treasury Department.....	1,006,343,000	952,825,000	983,135,000	970,385,000	-35,958,000	+17,560,000	-12,750,000
TITLE II—POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT							
Payment for Public Services.....	(247,800,000)				(-247,800,000)		
Administration, regional operation and research.....	91,194,000				-91,194,000		
Administration and regional operation.....		75,600,000	75,600,000	75,600,000	+75,600,000		
Research, development, and engineering.....		10,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	+12,000,000	+2,000,000	
Operations.....	3,562,000,000	3,535,000,000	3,548,500,000	3,535,000,000	-27,000,000		-13,500,000
Transportation.....	601,500,000	590,000,000	599,000,000	594,500,000	-7,000,000	+4,500,000	-4,500,000
Facilities.....	177,000,000	167,000,000	173,000,000	167,000,000	-10,000,000		-6,000,000
Plant and equipment.....	122,000,000	116,000,000	120,000,000	120,000,000	-2,000,000	+4,000,000	
Total, title II, Post Office Department.....	4,553,694,000	4,493,600,000	4,528,100,000	4,504,100,000	-49,594,000	+10,500,000	-24,000,000

Treasury, Post Office, and Executive Office appropriation bill, 1963 (H.R. 10526)—Continued

Item	Budget estimates	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
					Budget estimate	House	Senate
TITLE III—EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT							
Compensation of the President.....	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$150,000			
White House Office.....	2,545,000	2,545,000	2,545,000	2,545,000			
Special projects.....	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000			
Executive Mansion and grounds.....	658,000	658,000	658,000	658,000			
Bureau of the Budget.....	5,677,000	5,600,000	5,677,000	5,650,000	-\$27,000	+\$50,000	-\$27,000
Council of Economic Advisers.....	584,000	584,000	584,000	584,000			
National Security Council.....	550,000	550,000	550,000	550,000			
Total, title III, Executive Office of the President.....	11,664,000	11,587,000	11,664,000	11,637,000	-27,000	+50,000	-27,000
TITLE IV—FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT							
Emergency fund for the President.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000			
Expenses of management improvement.....	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000			
Total, title IV—Funds appropriated to the President.....	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000			
TITLE V—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES							
Tax Court of the United States.....	1,784,000	1,784,000	1,784,000	1,784,000			
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.....	375,000	375,000	375,000	375,000			
President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy.....	326,000	300,000	300,000	300,000	-26,000		
Total, title V, independent agencies.....	2,485,000	2,459,000	2,459,000	2,459,000	-26,000		
Grand total, titles I, II, III, IV, and V.....	5,575,386,000	5,461,671,000	5,526,558,000	5,489,781,000	-85,605,000	+28,110,000	-36,777,000

Mr. GARY. 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 conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include a table with reference to the conference report just adopted.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL AND SELECT COMMITTEE TO CONDUCT AN INVESTIGATION AND STUDY OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE EXPORT CONTROL ACT OF 1949

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Resolution 704 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of the investigation and study to be conducted by the select committee created by H. Res. 403, not to exceed \$10,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The official stenographers to committees may be used at all meetings held in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Resolution 705 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the investigations and studies authorized by H. Res. 75 of the Eighty-seventh Congress, incurred by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$25,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Sec. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia if not otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Resolution 728 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by H. Res. 86, Eighty-seventh Congress, incurred by the Committee on Agriculture, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$25,000, including expenditures for the employment of account-

ants, experts, investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Sec. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings, if not otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS' TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH ALLOWANCE

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Resolution 735 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, until otherwise provided by law, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Committee on House Administration, such amounts as may be necessary to pay (1) toll charges on strictly official long-distance telephone calls, and (2) charges on strictly official telegrams, cablegrams, and radiograms, made or sent by or on behalf of each Member of the House of Representatives (including the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico), other than the Speaker, the majority leader, the minority leader, the majority whip, and the minority whip, aggregating not to exceed ten thousand units during a term. The units authorized under this resolution shall be in addition to the number of units to which such Member otherwise may be entitled during a term.

Sec. 2. As used in the first section of this resolution, the words "unit" and "term" shall have the meaning given such words by section 2 of the Act of June 23, 1949 (2 U.S.C. 46g).

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 174]

Alford	Green, Oreg.	Powell
Anfuso	Gubser	Purcell
Baring	Harrison, Va.	Rains
Bass, N.H.	Hébert	Rogers, Colo.
Blatnik	Hoffman, Mich.	Rogers, Tex.
Blitch	Kilburn	St. Germain
Boggs	King, Utah	Saund
Bolton	Kowalski	Scherer
Buckley	Loser	Smith, Miss.
Celler	McSween	Spence
Coad	McVey	Taber
Cramer	Madden	Teague, Calif.
Curtis, Mass.	Morrow	Thompson, La.
Davis, Tenn.	Moulder	Willis
Diggs	Norblad	Winstead
Flynt	Peterson	Yates
Frazier	Pilcher	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and eighty-five Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963

Mr. WHITTEN. 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 bill (H.R. 12648) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12648), with Mr. HARRIS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the Clerk had read through section 606 ending in line 23, page 31 of the bill. Are there further amendments?

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I think the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] was recognized yesterday before we adjourned.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was about to recognize the gentleman.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] rise?

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOLE: On page 31, after line 23, insert the following:

"SEC. 607. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act or any funds available for expenditures by corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used for propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat

legislation pending before the Congress in violation of present law."

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I have studied this amendment and note that it simply prohibits the use of any funds provided in this bill for propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation pending in the Congress. I see no opposition. So far as I am personally concerned, it is a good amendment. Would the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] accept the amendment?

Mr. WHITTEN. I would not feel like accepting it because I think the matter is covered by law at the present time. I call attention to section 1913, title 18 of the United States Code. I will point that out at the conclusion of the gentleman's speech. I think the matter in the amendment is already covered by law.

Mr. DOLE. I might agree to a certain extent so far as section 1913, title 18 of the United States Code is concerned, but I think it needs some clarification. My amendment has particular reference to the type of lobbying that has been carried on in the past 6 or 8 months or 2 years by many, many Federal employees connected with the U.S. Department of Agriculture and other departments of Government.

The purpose of the amendment is to remind the executive branch that employees of the Federal Government cannot be propagandists to be used to support or oppose pending legislation.

I agree that once legislation is enacted, Federal employees, regardless of the party they belong to, have the right, duty, and obligation to properly administer the law.

It is wrong, however, to ask any Federal employee who has civil service status to lobby for pending legislation. That has been going on all over the country. It has happened in my congressional district. It is wrong to permit such activity by any employee at public expense.

In March 1962, in Oberlin, Kans., a member of Freeman's Advisory Committee on Wheat made a speech in support of H.R. 10010. He made references to Congress, which I did not think were necessary. He was clearly lobbying for pending legislation; namely, the administration's farm bill.

There have been many examples of abuses in this respect and if there is such a law then perhaps a more active approach by the Department of Justice is needed. We have had the President himself in April tell State ASCS directors not to let their Congressman get lonesome. It has been reported Secretary Freeman suggested Federal-State Extension Service employees start participating in politics to help shape future farm legislation.

It was some time in January of this year that John Macy, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, issued what was known as the Macy memorandum. In that memorandum he indicated it was proper for Department of Agriculture and other Federal employees to go out

and explain pending legislation. In other words, to lobby for pending legislation. After certain Members of the Senate challenged the ruling, in April 1962, Macy revised his memorandum to meet the objections raised. The revision, if followed, would have prevented the explaining of programs pending in Congress.

I received a letter dated April 27, 1962, from Mr. Freeman's Administrative Assistant Secretary, Joseph Robertson, indicating USDA department heads were notified of the Macy memorandum revision which would prevent further lobbying, or promotion of pending legislation.

There is still considerable evidence that in many areas of the country Federal employees are still promoting pending legislation. Some county ASCS offices do it through newsletters to farmers, all at taxpayers' expense.

About a month ago we witnessed some fine examples of lobbying off the House floor Chamber by members of the Department of Agriculture who were trying to get certain farm legislation passed.

Again let me state my amendment goes further than section 1913 of title 18 of the United States Code. It covers not only that section but also provides that department or other Federal employees who are traveling around the country cannot do so if the purpose of their speaking engagement is to lobby, promote, or oppose pending legislation.

We have seen along the New Frontier time after time, example after example of Federal employees going out to promote pending legislation. When the medicare issue was raised they did it all over the country, mostly speaking to empty houses, but they were there, speaking about medical care for the aged at the President's request and the taxpayer's expense. I think my amendment will stop that and a lot of other unnecessary expenditure of public funds.

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

Mr. DOLE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. I do not know whether this would fall within the purview of the gentleman's amendment, but during the course of the hearings I inquired of the folks who testified before our committee what it cost to bring all the State committeemen down here for that big confab they had here in Washington several years ago in which they were all received on the White House lawn. I was told that it amounted to \$58,893. I think that is the kind of thing that ought to be stopped, and I think the gentleman's amendment should prevail.

Mr. DOLE. I thank the gentleman and again state the amendment should be adopted for the benefit of the public, of Congress, and for the benefit and protection of Federal employees themselves. This is true regardless of party or the administration in power. If such activity is wrong then the amendment should be adopted.

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

Mr. Chairman, a few evenings ago I came across a very interesting article

published in the current Saturday Evening Post by Harold H. Martin entitled "Farmer Khrushchev: He Has His Troubles. While Mr. K. Rants and Raves, Ideology and Climate Snarl Russia's Farm Program." As a non-farmer from Brooklyn, Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi whether these statements made by Mr. Martin are correct:

The American farmer long ago learned that the same cattle cannot economically produce both milk and meat, and that good egg layers are scrawny birds for the table. Mr. Khrushchev keeps 15 million more cows than we do, but his dual purpose herds produce only a third of the amount of meat and 10 million pounds less milk. His 14 million more chickens yield only about a quarter of the meat and less than half of the eggs that American broiler and layer industries provide.

Now, I should like to ask my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] who is intimately experienced with the farm program and considered an outstanding expert on this subject, if Mr. Martin's are correct statements.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman for his comment with reference to me. I would say that several years ago I had the privilege of visiting with our agricultural attaché who had been in Russia for 4 years and who had traveled throughout much of Russia. We have in this country become specialists. We produce highly specialized beef cattle, and our dairy herds are strictly for dairying purposes. And, we have done that in practically every direction you can look. In Russia it takes 50 percent of the people working on the farms to feed the people. Not only that, but the end result is an inferior quality of meat. In our country it takes about 20 percent. They provide a superior quality with less than 10 percent of our people to produce the food.

May I say another interesting thing, since the gentleman raised the question. We were told that for many years agriculture in Russia was dominated by a line of scientists who thought that heredity had very little to do with improving dairy herds. And, that retarded Russia greatly. Only in recent years have they begun to select the finest specimens for breeding purposes.

Mr. ROONEY. Then, I deduce from what the distinguished gentleman has said that Mr. Martin's statements are substantially correct.

Mr. WHITTEN. Certainly.

Mr. ROONEY. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

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

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. The gentleman has approached a most interesting and significant point. In Russia today we are told that about 5 percent of the agricultural land is actually farmed under a special program which permits a certain amount of freedom to the farmer. These are noncommunal farms. This 5 percent free land apparently produces 50 percent of the meat, eggs, milk, and vegetables produced in the Soviet Union.

Mr. ROONEY. I might say to the distinguished gentleman that that subject is also discussed in Mr. Martin's article in the Saturday Evening Post, and it appears that if it were not for those Russian people in the free enterprise part of Soviet agriculture, they could not produce enough to adequately feed their population.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] can take a great deal of pride in that article, because many of the things mentioned in the article insofar as American agriculture successes are concerned came about because they had the support of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to join with my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL], and say that this entire Nation is deeply indebted not only to our good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], who just addressed the House, but to other Members from the cities of this country. With only 10 percent of the people on the American farms, more and more of the welfare of American agriculture is in the hands of these patriotic Members of Congress who come from our cities, and I want to say so for the RECORD.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ROONEY. I should like to say that I have never had any trouble with regard to my votes on farm legislation because I fully realize that if we do not have successful, thriving farm communities, we do not have a market for the refrigerators, the radio and television sets, the automobiles and other items manufactured in our cities.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, in connection with the amendment which has been read, I do not think any of us approve the use of Federal employees in any way to promote or defeat pending Federal legislation. I, personally, do not know whether this has existed or not. I do know that in all the years I have been in the Congress, whichever party has been in charge of the Department of Agriculture, the other party has felt that various employees were taking an active part. That has been true each and every year under each and every administration.

Mr. Chairman, I do not approve of that course of conduct, if it has existed. But with respect to the immediate amendment now pending I would call attention to the fact that if this is going on, it is in violation of section 1913 of title 18 of the United States Code, which I shall read, as follows:

1913. Lobbying with appropriated moneys.

No part of the money appropriated by any enactment of Congress shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device, intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress, to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the intro-

duction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriation; but this shall not prevent officers or employees of the United States or of its departments or agencies from communicating to Members of Congress on the request of any Member or to Congress, through the proper official channels, requests for legislation or appropriations which they deem necessary for the efficient conduct of the public business.

Whoever, being an officer or employee of the United States or of any department or agency thereof, violates or attempts to violate this section, shall be fined not more than \$500 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; and after notice and hearing by the superior officer vested with the power of removing him, shall be removed from office or employment.

Mr. Chairman, the latter part of that section provides for the penalty. May I say that the gentleman's amendment provides no penalty and the matter, in my judgment at least, is already covered by substantive law. If these things have been going on in this administration, or in the preceding administration, or the one that preceded that, and these reports and rumors have always come to our attention, the section which I have just cited would cover it.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, in response to an inquiry on the part of the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB], the Attorney General recently has rendered an informal opinion which casts some doubt upon the content, the purpose and the effect of section 1913, title 18 of the United States Code. In light of that opinion does the gentleman not agree that it would be prudent and wise for this body to reaffirm its conviction on this point?

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say if we did it on all bills—I think it would probably be better to reaffirm it that way than to pick out one particular department. However, in my own opinion the language of the statute is sufficiently broad to prohibit the use of employees to promote or help defeat legislation. I think it is quite clear. For that reason I do not think the amendment is necessary.

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

Mr. Chairman, this matter has been discussed on the floor on several occasions. I would like to make reference to two instances when I referred to it and called it to the attention of the House membership. One instance refers to a meeting in Springfield, Ill., the State capital.

At this meeting of the ASC in Springfield, Ill., all the committeemen were advised, with the Under Secretary of Agriculture present, that while they could not be denied voting as they saw fit, they were expected to support the President's program or resign. In other words, they were expected to be politically active in behalf of the Kennedy administration.

I likewise called attention to a quotation that I placed in the RECORD from the New York Times which reads as follows:

The cooperative Federal-State Extension Service is being asked to enter the political

arena to help shape future farm policies and program.

As the article continues:

[This] would impose on the service a role it has studiously avoided in its long history.

Likewise, when President Kennedy invited ASC officials to the White House, 150 of them, this is what the wire services reported.

President Kennedy today delicately suggested to members of the State agriculture stabilization and conservation committees that although they are prohibited by law from lobbying for specific farm legislation, they should not permit Members of Congress to be lonesome.

Very frankly, I said then that I never thought that the President of the United States would in effect condone such action. I never thought that a President of the United States would tell employees that they should not allow a legal prohibition against lobbying for legislation to deter them in such effort.

I think this is a good amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE]. If the present restriction on lobbying by Government employees has been abused before during other administrations, let us now take care of the problems through the adoption of this amendment.

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

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I asked the gentleman from Illinois to yield so that I might ask the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Mississippi, a question. He questions whether my amendment is needed because of existing law. My interpretation of the section the gentleman read indicates it refers only to influencing Members of Congress. I have here a complete report which appeared in the Oberlin, Kans., paper in my district. Lud Strnad, who is a member of the Secretary of Agriculture's Advisory Commission on Wheat went into my district and made a political speech on H.R. 10010 in his official capacity. One statement he made was:

I would like farmers in this community to ask Congress to vote this bill out so you can have a choice.

To me he was clearly promoting pending legislation.

Perhaps this statute has been construed too strictly but it seems to me it applies only to influencing Members of Congress. It should apply to members of advisory committees and all Federal employees and prevent them from going around the country trying to sell a program pending before Congress.

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

Mr. ARENDS. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment merely says that they shall not do what the gentleman says has been done. That is all it amounts to. The statute says that it is against the law to do it and if they do it

they are subject to penalties. I say that the statute which I quoted is much stronger than the gentleman's amendment, so that what the gentleman is suggesting is unnecessary. That is the way I see it.

Mr. DOLE. We do agree with the basic premise that it should not be done.

Mr. WHITTEN. I think the statute speaks for itself. I quoted it a while ago. An employee may not use appropriated funds either to promote or defeat legislation, and, if he does, he is subject to penalties provided in the section. That goes much further than the gentleman's amendment, which is why I say that the amendment is not necessary and does not reach the problem that he points out.

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

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

Mr. JENSEN. I simply wish to say that everybody knows, every Member of Congress knows that neither the gentleman from Mississippi nor any member of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations ever used political pressure on anyone to be for or against any item or for or against a bill. A reaffirmation of the law which the gentleman from Mississippi has just read I think is very much in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] has expired.

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

Mr. Chairman, I know, as everyone else knows, that every administration does put some pressure on Members of Congress to support its programs. But never in all the 24 years I have been in Congress have I seen as much pressure brought on the Members of Congress to support the administration's position on agriculture as I have seen during this session and the last session of Congress. There have been so many pressures brought on Members of Congress relative to the agricultural program that it is becoming a national scandal. I hope the gentleman from Mississippi will not oppose this amendment. As I understood him he is only saying that the law is already on the books to do the thing that this amendment seeks to do. The facts are that there are too many people in the Department of Agriculture that are paying no attention to the law. I hope the amendment will be agreed to. I do not condone such anti-American practice regardless of party.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think I can state quite emphatically that the law on the books now is being at least as diligently enforced under this administration as it was under the previous one. It is nice to play a little politics, but sometimes the license used here in discussing instances I think goes beyond the limits we all know to be true.

I happened to serve on the Post Office Committee back during the previous administration. I am surprised that some

of the distinguished gentlemen in the minority have such short memories, because many of my colleagues on that committee in the minority protested bitterly at the pressure being placed on them. As a member of that committee, not a part of the party then in the majority, I also experienced heavy pressure, pressure clearly violative of the present requirements of law, when the Postmaster General resorted to the use of Government wires to his postmasters telling them to phone us, yes, even to come back here and tell us to vote for his bills. He did not do that once, he did it a number of times. He came into this building and established a headquarters where he called in the Members, cajoling or threatening or offering any possible incentive to get their support.

I do not approve of this type of action by this administration or the previous one, but I deeply resent the implication by some who have spoken today and who know better that this is new and novel. That it is not; and it has gone on under others of very recent vintage.

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

Mr. MOSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. I think the gentleman has just proved the point we are attempting to bring out in this amendment.

I agree perfectly with the gentleman that there have been pressures brought on Members of Congress by every administration. So let us remind the people in this Government now, in this administration, and in future administrations that there is a law on the books which denies them the privilege of using appropriated funds for such purposes and for propaganda purposes.

Mr. MOSS. I agree with the gentleman, but the only thing that puzzles me is why this great enthusiasm to alert and remind people about this law develops on the other side of the aisle only when a Democrat occupies the White House.

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

Mr. MOSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. May I say this: A lot of what has been said is true, but when the charge is categorically made that during the consideration of the farm bill this year there was more so-called pressure than ever before, I think we should call for specifics. I do not know of a single instance this year when a Cabinet officer has come to the Capitol Building and lobbied during the consideration of the farm bill or on any other bill.

Mr. MOSS. The gentleman, however, recalls the previous administration when the Postmaster General came to the Capitol.

Mr. ALBERT. I do. And I will say that I have seen assistant Cabinet officers on the Hill during both administrations, but I have not objected to their being up here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

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

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman briefly.

Mr. ARENDS. I want to say to the gentleman from California, who has just spoken, and I say this in the utmost sincerity, this is the first time in my many years in the Congress—and I have been here a few years longer than the gentleman from California—that I have ever heard of politics being injected into the Extension Service of this country. The gentleman will have to prove that point differently if he thinks that it is not true. We will forget about politics in the Post Office Department, because none of us is so naive as to believe that it has not in the past or presently is not going on, regardless of what administration is in power. But this is the first time, I repeat, that I have ever heard politics being injected into the Extension Service, and the gentleman, I feel sure, cannot prove anything to the contrary.

Mr. MOSS. I have not injected politics with reference to any service.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief statement?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. The majority leader referred to the fact that during this administration no Cabinet members have been in the Capitol. I recall when we had a certain bill which was being hotly contested, when the Secretary of Commerce—and I do not know whether he realized the situation or not and, of course, I have nothing but the highest regard for him—I saw him right here in the Speaker's lobby—not only here in the Capitol, but in the Speaker's lobby, within 15 feet of the Speaker's desk, buttonholing Members as to how they should vote on the legislation.

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

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I can say specifically that neither the Secretary of Commerce nor any other Cabinet officer has buttonholed me or lobbied me during the consideration of any bill in the House.

Mr. HOEVEN. This should not be a matter of partisan politics. If the basic law is sufficient, as is contended by the gentleman from Mississippi, then certainly no harm will be done by adopting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas. Let us reiterate, re-emphasize, and reexpress the will of Congress in this regard.

It seems to me that all of my colleagues should welcome this kind of amendment for their own protection, and especially my good friends on my right, who were under terrific pressure during consideration of the late, lamented farm bill.

I do not condone what happened in prior administrations; this type of propaganda and pressure is wrong in any administration—past, present, and future. I firmly believe that the repre-

sentatives of a free people have the duty and the right to legislate and to exercise their own good judgment on every piece of legislation without high-pressure tactics by Government departments and agencies.

During consideration of the omnibus farm bill a few weeks ago, the Secretary of Agriculture and a representative of the White House held court in the Speaker's room adjacent to the House Chamber, and certain Members were called in to be high pressured to vote for the farm bill. I have never seen anything like this during my long service in the Congress. It should be stopped.

There is no reason in the world why the representatives of the Federal Government should belabor themselves on any piece of legislation. If we want their advice we can ask for it. Such pressure is not in the best interests of good legislation.

In my own State of Iowa I was amazed not too long ago when the new Iowa administrator of the Federal Crop Insurance Agency called his subordinates together and told them in effect: "I expect you to go out and talk for the administration's farm program. And don't let me hear you say anything against it."

This story appeared on the front page of the Des Moines Register. Many other examples could be cited as to pressure tactics used by the Department of Agriculture. We should welcome the attempt to reemphasize the clear intent of the Congress by adopting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas. We should do this for our own protection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am not interested in trying to prove who has violated the intent of the law. I do not think anything is gained by such an attempt. I think perhaps it could be proven that there has been pressure from both sides of the political aisle depending upon which administration may have been in power. But I do agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] that when the extension division of our Government becomes involved and are encouraged to participate, in the political arena the Congress then should issue some kind of directive that would prevent that from happening regardless of the administration.

I would like to refer to the statement made by my friend the gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS] about short memories, and I would like to refer to the fact that I served as an Administrator of the Rural Electrification program. Just to show you how meticulously this Hatch Act is administered sometimes, in this instance a Democrat-controlled House of Representatives, which Mr. Moss should recall, and one of the great ridiculous charges leveled at me was that I was in Duluth, Minn., and drank some coffee with some Republicans, I called attention to the fact that if drinking coffee was a violation of the Hatch Act, there would be thousands and thousands of Minnesota Scandinavians in jail. The

charge was dropped attended by a good deal of laughter from the gallery.

Getting back to the amendment before us, I think if we adopt this amendment it will be a notice served on certain administrative officials in our Government that we are against such tactics and are all concerned regardless of party.

I hope the amendment is adopted.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, may I remind the gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS] that we served on a Post Office and Civil Service Committee together under the Eisenhower administration. He well knows that I, too, was subject to some pressures at that time, but somehow or other I was able to resist them.

Let me say that under the Eisenhower administration I offered several amendments to various bills providing practically what the gentleman's amendment suggests be done here. Those amendments were accepted in some instances by the Democrat chairmen of committees, or they were voted on and adopted, I am pleased to say, with the help of Democrats as well as Republicans.

As far as I am concerned, the past record is clear on this matter. I rebelled against these pressures and activities under the Eisenhower administration and tried to do something about it. I trust that the same restrictions will be adopted now.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DOLE) there were—ayes 83, noes 96.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. DOLE and Mr. WHITTEN.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 118, noes 172.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1963".

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like at this time to extend my warmest admiration and praise for the House Subcommittee on Appropriations to Agriculture for its diligent work on behalf of the farmers of the Nation. I am aware of the long hours of tedious work put in by the subcommittee members, and commend them for their patience and thoroughness in hearing out all sides of the issues that came before them.

However, I would be remiss in my duties as Congressman from the First District of Montana if I did not express my disappointment in the omission of the proposed Soil Research Laboratory at Sidney, Mont., for the Northern Great Plains region. When this research laboratory was first announced by the Department of Agriculture in September

of 1961, our distinguished Senate Majority Leader **MIKE MANSFIELD** spoke to his colleagues, expressing his delight at this opportunity and recognition for the State of Montana.

I am hopeful that when this legislation is considered in the Senate our colleagues there will give favorable reconsideration to the inclusion of this well-merited and promising undertaking for the people of the Northern Great Plains region.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote against H.R. 12648—the Department of Agriculture and related agencies appropriation bill for 1963—because, while it contains funds for a number of programs that I fully support, it also contains money for other programs and the advancement of policies that I cannot support and the subjects, unfortunately, are not divisible.

I also regret that the Michel amendment did not carry on yesterday; however, I am hopeful that the debate thereon may serve as an indication on the part of many of us of growing concern over the manner in which the ambitions of some people in behalf of the rural electrification program may have forced it beyond the point that Congress intended it should go.

I have taken this time, therefore, to call the committee's specific attention to a situation that has developed—at least in my area—with respect to the telephone-loan program under REA.

In reading the committee report, and in listening to the debate, I note that telephone-loan funds for REA have been reduced, in H.R. 12648, from the original budgetary request of \$135 million down to only \$80 million.

Upon leafing through the hearings, in order to try to find the reason for this rather sharp reduction, I found only an expression of dismay, you might say, or at least certainly of disappointment, on the part of a Mr. Richard Dell—Deputy Administrator for the REA—over the fact that the demand for telephone loans has not developed, for some reason, to the extent that had previously been anticipated.

May I say, based on what has been happening in my area, that I share Mr. Dell's surprise. Quite evidently, if more people only knew it, here is a real fertile field for anyone with any degree of enterprise and initiative, not to mention public spirit.

Why do I say that? Well, in my section of New York State, which is nowadays a lot more suburban in character than it is rural, a small group of developers from outside the area have been going about acquiring the controlling stock interest in those few, remaining, independent telephone companies of the type that used to provide the bulk of telephone service for our rural people. The gentlemen to whom I refer, and I will gladly provide specifics if the committee should want them, have so far acquired three such companies in my general area, and are in the process of

acquiring three others at the present time.

Of course, they are using REA funds to aid them in the acquisition process, and are using REA funds to extend and improve the systems that they either now own or are in the process of buying.

Now, all this is fine and no one would object if their ambition was solely that of bringing new and improved telephone service to our rural subscribers. However, on inquiring of the REA into one of these ventures at the request of some of those same subscribers who are not so sure they like the way things are going, I find that this group has so far received a total of federally subsidized REA loan funds amounting to \$2,543,000 for an investment on their part of only \$260,600, and, if their pending applications go through, will eventually receive a total of \$3,496,000 from the REA with an investment of only \$385,060 on their part.

That is the equivalent of about a 10 percent margin, which is a pretty good deal in anybody's book—especially when it is 2-percent, 35-year money we are talking about—and would surely seem like an open invitation for anyone to build a telephone empire on a shoe-string—and a subsidy, since the general taxpayers are underwriting a part of the investment. And, after one got his empire rebuilt, if he did not want to do anything else with it he could always peddle it to somebody else, taking back a mortgage for the sales price at, say, 5 or 6 percent, thus pocketing the difference in interest charges, and "Hurrah for Uncle Sam."

Seriously, Mr. Chairman, I do believe that this is a matter which ought to have the committee's further consideration, to the end, at least, of determining whether or not REA's loan-security requirements ought to be revised so as to discourage the possibility of speculation by absentee promoters, and in favor of encouraging local ownership and initiative within the original intent of Congress when it established this most important program.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, this bill contains many very important provisions which are necessary for the general prosperity and well-being of the Nation and the American people.

These include support of vital research activities, plant and animal disease and pest control, meat inspection, essential foreign currency purchases, State agricultural experiment stations, the valuable Federal extension service, conservation operations, watershed protection, flood prevention, economic research service, the essential school lunch program, Farmers Home Administration, foreign assistance programs, and other constructive, helpful features.

For these reasons, I propose to support the bill in the House and hope it may be enacted.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 12648, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the current fiscal year.

I have noted with regret that efforts to correct this bill, to remove its inequities, to eliminate its shortcomings, to trim its waste, have not been successful.

For years, yes for decades, the city dweller has been supporting the farmer to the tune of some \$1,500 per year per farm. He is not only paying for these subsidies in the form of higher taxes, in the form of less money to spend for his own family, but also in the form of higher food prices.

In other words, he has been taxed to raise prices for himself and his children.

If the folly stopped at this point, it would be bad enough. But it does not.

Not only must he pay these higher taxes. Not only must he pay these higher prices, but if he is in the food business, or in the clothing business, he also is, in many cases, paying higher taxes and higher prices to put himself out of business.

Not too long ago, the House passed the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. In most respects, it was a good bill. It was an effort to restore competition with the rest of the world. It was an effort to give our business and our industry a freer rein in the world marketplace.

The Trade Expansion Act was passed to encourage our businessmen to go out into the world after new markets. Coupled with realistic tax depreciation schedules, and our industrial know-how, I think we have the tools we need to restore prosperity to our sagging economy, to raise our already high living standards even higher, and to lick our chronic, nagging problem of unemployment, which is not only causing misery to many, but also is wasting the productive output of millions of our citizens.

So what do we do with this appropriation bill. We throw out the arguments we have heard in favor of the trade expansion bill. We reject the sound reasoning which prompted the House to approve this attempt to increase trade within the Free World, and instead we substitute a bucket of hogwash.

We not only permit the farmer to collect one Federal subsidy for the land he takes out of production. We permit him to take two subsidies on the same land. He not only is permitted, under the terms of this bill, to divert land under the feed grains program to the tune of some \$55 an acre, but we then turn around to this farmer and tell him, "no, that isn't enough."

"Come over here to the Federal feed trough," we tell him, "and wallow in some more of these dollar bills which have been plucked from the Federal tax tree. Don't worry where this money comes from. The supply is unlimited. Don't worry about things like our bal-

ance of payments, our national debt, or the tax load on your city cousins. Just come join our ACP program and live in luxury with no work, no expenses, no effort on your part."

Frankly, I do not think the farmer is going to fall for this latest brand of hogwash, and I am certain that the city dweller has had just about enough.

On the one hand, the Agriculture Department is telling us that it is striving valiantly, toiling heroically, to reduce the output on our farms, to solve our problems of overproduction through reductions in acreage. On the other hand, we have the Agriculture Department dispensing fertilizers, chemicals, irrigation projects, with an eye to the voting machines and the ballot boxes, so that our farmers can produce even more surplus farm goods on the acres the Federal Government has deemed the farmer can farm.

Of course, not all farmers can take advantage of these double subsidies. Only the chosen few will be permitted to participate, the farmers who know more about Washington and the Agriculture Department than they do about farming.

We already have a clear indication of exactly what is involved in this appropriation bill in one of the amendments which was offered and rejected here today.

The amendment would simply have limited federally paid, federally employed Agriculture Department employees from becoming built-in rural precinct workers for the Kennedy administration.

What was the answer of the House? What was its statesmanlike decision in this important subject of using a person's tax dollars to elect candidates not of his own choosing? The decision was this: The taxpayer has no right to control the political actions of these employees. In fact, he has no right to stop the practice of using his tax money to keep people in office who have no business being there in the first place.

This is a bit of a switch on the "no taxation without representation" we heard so much about in our history texts in years past. Not only are the city dwellers denied representation in the Agriculture Department, despite the fact that 90 percent or better of the costs of this Department are paid by the urban dweller, but these funds we are asked to appropriate today would be used against the city dweller to bury him with higher food prices, higher taxes, and higher subsidies for those farm goods which go into foreign trade.

Then we wonder why business is sick. We wonder why our economy is not marching forward as it should. We wonder why we hear talk of new massive Federal programs, new massive Federal outlays, tax cuts for this reason and that reason to head off financial disaster.

Does not the administration realize that the only way to march forward is to get the load off the backs of our people? Does not this administration real-

ize that only by hauling in the anchor on waste can we hope to sail forward? How can we even hope to move away from the dock unless we cut this umbilical cord we have connected to the farmer and let him start to live in freedom rather than inside the Federal womb.

I agree with my colleagues that the farmer is the backbone of our society, but I resent, and I will resist, this latest attempt to remove the farmer's backbone and make him a charity case subject to Federal annual handouts at the taxpayers' expense.

I have yet to meet a real dirt farmer who believes in the folly we have before us today. But then the Agriculture Department experts, who have never been closer to a farm than the supermarket, would say "he really doesn't know what is good for him, anyway."

Mr. Chairman, this bill is an utter disgrace, and I will vote against it.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the Members of the House, in addition to the remarks I made yesterday on my amendment, I would like to call attention to some of the conservation practices which are now being carried on by the conservation program which I feel are reason for questioning their continuation. The list includes liming materials, the rock or colloidal phosphates, gypsum, or sulphates. These materials are used to permit the growth of so-called conserving crops. However, in most instances and in more than 14 of the States, these practices exceed 25 percent of the amount allocated to conservation and are repetitive practices on the same land, which increases the fertility of the soil and goes far beyond the basic conservation program. Other conservation practices are removal of stone walls or hedgerows described as necessary to permit contour and field strip cropping and to permit the construction of terracing. Other practices listed under the agricultural and conservation program include fencing trees or shrubs; digging wells for livestock water; installation of storage tanks or troughs in connection with wells for livestock water; springs or seeps for livestock water; installation of water storage tanks or troughs in connection with springs or seeps, dams, pits or ponds for livestock water; installation of tanks or troughs in connection with livestock water; and installation of storage tanks and pipelines for livestock water. Also included are the reservoirs for irrigation. I am sure that all of these practices in technical terms fit the definition, but most of these practices I have listed include production in addition to conservation. These practices I believe should be reviewed and in many instances

should be curtailed or even abolished. I know of some instances where the Government agent has been so active in stimulating the agricultural and conservation program that he promoted development on farms even though the owner was hesitant to initiate such a project.

These practices point up the trend away from the intent of the basic legislation, and I am sure departs considerably from what was intended when Congress enacted the original law.

Although this program is carried on in every State of the Union, there is a wide variation between the States in the portion of the State which participates in the program. For example, Hawaii has only 6 percent of its total farmland participating; whereas Vermont has 64 percent of its farmland participating in the program. The other States range all the way in between these extremes. Technically such practices conserve the resources of the land, but in actual practice during a period of rotation, would increase the annual yield to the participant.

The amount of Federal funds flowing into such States and into these farm areas is a substantial addition to the farm resources. For example, in Ohio only 13 percent of the farms in the State participate. However, the estimated total gross assistance for the year 1960 was in excess of \$6.25 million, and 66 percent of this allocation was used for the establishment of covering crops, with 44 percent being spent for liming materials.

In checking back over a previous report, I find that in 1958, 14 percent of the farms in Ohio participated in the agricultural conservation program, with 42 percent of the funds being spent for liming materials. In Indiana, 20 percent of the farms in 1960 participated in the agricultural conservation program, with the estimated total gross assistance in excess of \$6 million, with 45 percent being spent for liming materials.

Although the total cost to the Federal Government for the agricultural conservation program has remained at about the same level since 1945, the number of participating farms has decreased. Yet, at the same time, the average total assistance per farm has more than doubled. In 1945 there were 2,956,000 farms participating under the agricultural conservation program; in 1960 this decreased to 1,029,000. In 1945 this represented 68 percent of the total cropland. Yet in 1960 this percentage has decreased to 30.

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, last fall the ASCS agent in Manassas, Va., along with his committee blackmailed many of the lime dealers in the area into paying for a dinner to promote lime. The dinner was held in a church in Centerville, Va., for the farmers in Prince William and Fairfax Counties. The lime dealers were asked to "cough up" \$25 to \$50 to

finance the affair where the agent gave a speech strictly for the purpose of promoting the use of lime. It is my understanding that many of the lime vendors and the farmers who attended were disgusted with the entire operation.

I briefly mentioned yesterday an ad from the New Castle Record, New Castle, Va., showing the cost examples for some conservation practices followed by a list of agricultural conservation program approved vendors. Under unanimous consent, I include the entire ad at this point in my remarks:

ATTENTION FARMERS OF CRAIG COUNTY: FREE FERTILIZER AND LIME

Yes, get a ton free for every ton you buy through your local A.S.C.S. Office.

ACP initial signup now in progress. Will run through January 15.

Farmers, are you participating in the agricultural conservation program (ACP)?

All can participate.

If you are not participating, ask yourself:

1. Does your land need conservation improvement?

2. Is someone else getting your share of assistance?

If your answers to these questions are "Yes," "Jump off your tractor and go to the County ASCS Office."

The following are cost examples for some conservation practices:

Liming 5 acres of farmland at the rate of 2 tons per acre (lime delivered and spread):
 10 tons lime at \$4.75----- \$47.50

ACP cost share assistance:
 2.35 x 10 tons----- 23.50
 Plus small cost share increase--- 8.60
 Total ACP assistance----- 32.10

Total cost to farmer----- 15.40

Fertilizing and liming 5 acres permanent pasture; lime at the rate of 2 tons per acre and fertilizer at the rate of 800 lbs. per acre of 5-10-10:

10 tons lime at \$4.75----- 47.50
 2 tons fertilizer at \$50----- 100.00
 Total cost----- 147.50

ACP cost share assistance:
 10 tons lime at \$2.35----- 23.50
 2 tons fertilizer at \$22----- 44.00
 Plus small cost share increase--- 14.00
 Total ACP assistance----- 81.50

Total cost to farmer----- 66.00

Seed winter cover on 10 acres cropland—Seeding 1 bushel rye per acre and applying 400 lbs. per acre of 5-10-10:

10 bu. rye at \$1.35----- 13.50
 2 tons fertilizer at \$50----- 100.00
 Total cost----- 113.50

ACP cost share assistance:
 10 bu. rye at \$1.35----- 13.50
 2 tons fertilizer at \$22----- 44.00
 Plus small cost share increase--- 13.70
 Total ACP assistance----- 71.20

Total cost to farmer----- 42.30

Spray 10 acres of permanent pasture for controlling competitive shrubs:
 Cost of material (2,4-D and 2,4,5-T) per acre at \$6.25----- \$62.50
 Estimated cost per acre for spraying at \$2----- 20.00

Total cost to farmer----- 82.50

ACP cost share assistance:
 Per acre for material----- 23.00
 Per acre for spraying with power equipment----- 16.50
 Plus small cost share increase--- 11.80
 Total ACP assistance----- 51.30

Total cost share to farmer---- 31.20

Purchase orders will be issued for lime and fertilizer in 1962. When these orders are requested by the farmer the cost share assistance is paid direct to the approved dealer. He in turn bills you for the difference.

This ad through the cooperation of your ACP approved vendors listed below:

Economy Hardware & Farm Supply, Fertilizer, New Castle, Va.; John H. Pullen, Fertilizer and Ground Limestone, Clifton Forge, Va.; Richmond Guano Co., Fertilizer, Richmond, Va.; Rockydale Quarries Corp., Ground Limestone, Roanoke, Va.; Catawba Mercantile Co., Fertilizer, Catawba, Va.; W. R. Estes, Fertilizer, New Castle, Va.; Willis Humphreys, Fertilizer, Paint Bank, Va.; W. G. Matthews Jr., Inc., Ground Limestone, Clifton Forge, Va.; Montgomery Lime Corp., Ground Limestone, Christiansburg, Va.; Christiansburg Fuel & Supply, Inc., Fertilizer, Christiansburg, Va.; Rural Supply Co., Fertilizer, Covington, Va.; Joe M. Sublett, Fertilizer, New Castle, Va.; the American Agricultural Chemical Co., Fertilizer, Greensboro, N.C.

Now these are good examples of the type of practice that is continuing throughout the country and the elimination of these evils was the purpose of my amendment which was defeated yesterday.

Further, Mr. Chairman, I wish to bring to the attention of the House certain information I have obtained about a recent loan of the REA which I think is an outstanding example of complete irresponsibility by that agency. I think this loan demonstrates everything that is wrong with REA that was brought out in debate yesterday and which demonstrates why the Congress has to regain some control over the way this agency is handling the public's money.

On July 6, REA approved a loan of \$18 million to the Big Rivers Rural Electric Cooperative, of Owensboro, Ky. The loan is for the construction of a 66,000-kilowatt steam generating plant and 282 miles of transmission lines, according to the press release of REA.

However, even this press release of the agency does not appear to be factual if one is to go by newspaper stories concerning this project. And according to the newspapers, this is not a 66,000-kilowatt plant but a 75,000-kilowatt plant and the financial requirements are not \$18 million but some \$25 million.

However, far more important is the background surrounding this loan. In

the first place, as with all other such loans, it was handled in complete secrecy. The co-op receiving the loan is a federation of three distribution co-ops which now receive all their power from the Kentucky Utilities Co. and the Louisville Gas & Electric Co.

Mr. Clapp at no time approached these existing suppliers to determine whether they are providing adequate electric supplies and whether they could meet all future demands of the co-ops and whether the price for this power was reasonable. In fact, Mr. Clapp even ignored communications from the Kentucky Utilities Co. when they approached him after having got wind of the loan application from newspaper accounts.

When the company requested information from Mr. Clapp on which to make cost comparison studies in order to protect their existing contracts with the cooperatives, Mr. Clapp refused them the information. The company made its request to Mr. Clapp on June 28 and on July 6 Mr. Clapp approved the loan. On the face of it, his haste appears deliberate and completely irresponsible.

I have it on firm assurance from the company that not only do they have completely adequate supplies of power now for these co-op members, but are completely capable of supplying all their future demands. However, even more significant is the fact that on the basis of present comparative data and the experience with other co-ops which are being supplied by the Kentucky Utilities Co., there is no likelihood that REA-financed facilities will result in a lower cost of power to the cooperatives. Finally, there is one other point to remember. The law under which Mr. Clapp operates very clearly states that he is authorized to make loans "to persons in rural areas who are not receiving central station service."

Thus, we see that Mr. Clapp has gone contrary to every single criteria that would have carried out the intent and purpose of the REA Act. He has ignored the availability of adequate supplies of power. He has ignored the question of cost. He has ignored the law under which he is supposed to operate. This leaves only the third criterion which he himself instituted, but which he has not advanced as the reason for this Big Rivers loan. And in any event, in view of the existing relationship between this co-op and its electric company suppliers, the third criterion is completely meaningless.

Mr. Chairman, I regard this loan as one of the most highhanded, indefensible actions taken by the REA Administrator since he has been in office; and I wish to insert in the Record at this point a letter from Mr. Floyd I. Fairman, president of the Kentucky Utilities Co., to Mr. Clapp, which sets forth in complete detail all the pertinent facts in this case. I urge every one of my colleagues to read it if they want to know just exactly what is going on in the REA these days.

The letter follows:

KENTUCKY UTILITIES Co.,
Lexington, Ky., July 13, 1962.

Mr. NORMAN M. CLAPP,
Administrator, Rural Electrification Admin-
istration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. CLAPP: We were amazed to read in the newspapers on Saturday, July 7, 1962, that your office had on July 6 approved a loan of \$18 million in Federal funds to Big Rivers RECC [Big Rivers] for the construction of a 75-megawatt steam electric generating plant and 266 miles of transmission lines in west Kentucky.

We understand that the House Committee on Agriculture, in its report with respect to pending legislation relating to your Administration, recommended that interested parties certainly should be notified of the making of an application for one of these large generation and transmission loans, and afforded an opportunity to submit to you pertinent facts and their own proposal for the furnishing of such service to the involved distribution cooperatives. Although your office well knows of the vital interest of Kentucky Utilities Co. (KU) in the subject matter of this loan application, contrary to the recommendation of the House committee, your office did not advise us of the making of the application and you did not afford us any opportunity whatever to submit pertinent facts relative to the application. Our information concerning the application for the loan was obtained from newspaper accounts.

When we learned from newspapers of the application for the loan, we requested a meeting with your office and, on June 28, 1962, at our request two representatives of Kentucky Utilities Co. met with you and Assistant Administrator Richard H. Wood. At that meeting, we advised you of our firm opinion that the cost of power to the three involved distribution rural electric co-ops would be substantially less if they continued to purchase their requirements from the private utilities which have been serving these co-ops for years; and we made express request that you furnish to us copies of the loan application of Big Rivers and supporting data, including the feasibility report and cost studies. Your office declined to furnish any of such information to us, and stated that we should request such information from Big Rivers.

In accordance with that advice, on July 2, 1962, we wrote to the president of Big Rivers and made express request for this information, stating in our letter that we wished such information "in order that we might make some comparison of the cost figures under your [Big Rivers] plan and under the rate schedule and offer made by our company." A copy of that letter was sent to you and necessarily was received by you prior to your announcement of approval of the loan.

You thus were fully advised—before you approved this application—of our interest in the matter and of the fact that we were actively seeking available information for the purpose of submitting cost data to your office. We are not willing to assume that the speed with which you acted to approve this loan was for the deliberate purpose of announcing the approval before we had any opportunity whatever to prepare and deliver to you the data which you were advised we were in the process of preparing, and yet that is the result of your hurried action.

Under the circumstances, your action in approving this application is all the more distressing because, on the facts of this case, we are convinced that your approval of the loan far exceeds your authority under applicable Federal statutes and even under the criteria for considering these generation

and transmission loans established by your own office.

It is beyond question that this loan did not receive from your office the informed consideration which should be given the expenditure of \$18 million of the taxpayers' money. When our representatives were in your office on June 28, you stated that you had not reviewed the application and supporting data but that you would do so. You could not have made a careful study of the data by the time you announced your approval of the loan on July 6.

The handling of this loan application of Big Rivers adds support to the fears, expressed in our industry, that your office is proceeding as fast as it can to the socialization of the electric industry in this country without regard for the laws enacted by or the intention of Congress.

THE INTEREST OF KENTUCKY UTILITIES CO.

Big Rivers is an association of three-member distribution rural electric cooperatives: Green River RECC, Henderson-Union RECC, and Meade County RECC. Big Rivers does not at the present time own, and has not heretofore owned, any facilities for the generation, transmission, or distribution of electricity. Continuously from the time of their organization, the three distribution co-ops have been supplied all of their power requirements by investor-owned utilities, except that for a time Green River RECC purchased some of its requirements from the city of Owensboro, Ky., municipal plant, which arrangement has now been terminated.

Presently, Green River and Henderson-Union RECC's purchase all of their power from Kentucky Utilities, while Meade County RECC purchases its requirements from Louisville Gas & Electric Co. (L.G. & E.). The 1962 load of Green River is 20,400 kilowatts, and of Henderson-Union is 13,600 kilowatts, or a total for the two of 34,000 kilowatts. If Big Rivers should construct its proposed generation and transmission facilities, Kentucky Utilities would, as a first result, immediately lose this load in excess of 34,000 kilowatts. In addition, our experience with a generation and transmission co-op already established in Kentucky—East Kentucky RECC (East Kentucky)—has been that, once the taxpayer-subsidized generation and transmission facilities were available, this generation and transmission co-op began competing with Kentucky Utilities and actively soliciting municipalities which had for years been customers of Kentucky Utilities. Our interest in the present application of Big Rivers is, therefore, very direct.

THE GRANTING OF THE LOAN TO BIG RIVERS RECC WOULD BE ILLEGAL AND BEYOND YOUR AUTHORITY AS ADMINISTRATOR

The authority for making of loans by you as Administrator is contained in section 902 of title 7 of the United States Code in the following language:

"The Administrator is authorized and empowered to make loans in the several States and territories of the United States for rural electrification and the furnishing of electric energy to persons in rural areas who are not receiving central station service."

If discussion were confined to your proper authority under the statute, or even more broadly to congressional intent in making Federal funds available to your agency, there would be not the slightest question as to the illegality of your making this loan. These distribution co-ops are receiving, and since their creation have received, nothing but central station service. More broadly speaking, the construction by Big Rivers of the proposed generation and transmission facilities is in no way necessary to or even in aid of rural electrification in Kentucky.

While in our view a discussion limited to your statutory authority as Administrator to make these loans would be entirely appropriate, we are aware that argument so restricted would not carry much weight. We will therefore consider the criteria which your agency has adopted in considering loans of this character.

AN EXISTING ADEQUATE AND DEPENDABLE SOURCE OF POWER IS AVAILABLE

We understand your first criterion to be whether an adequate and dependable source of power is available as an alternate to generation and transmission facilities constructed with taxpayers' funds loaned by your agency. Of this there can be no question in this instance.

The systems of Kentucky Utilities and Louisville Gas & Electric are interconnected with each other and with the systems of other utilities so as to be part of one of the largest power pools in the world. Power from the systems of these utilities will be infinitely more dependable than could possibly be achieved by the single station, single unit system proposed by Big Rivers. Also, there is far more than adequate capacity in the systems of Kentucky Utilities and Louisville Gas & Electric to take care of any conceivable load growth which the distribution co-ops might experience, and such capacity will continue to be maintained.

No consideration of your first criterion could possibly justify the granting of this loan.

THE RATES OFFERED BY EXISTING POWER SOURCES WOULD RESULT IN A LOWER COST OF POWER THAN THE COST FROM REA-FINANCED FACILITIES

In making comparisons based upon rates from available sources of energy, you apparently ignore the differentials resulting from loan of the taxpayers' money to co-ops at the sacrificial 2 percent rate and from tax exemptions enjoyed by the co-ops. Private utilities are expected to obtain their financing at the going market rate and pay present-day burdensome taxes, and still offer a cost of power as low as the subsidized co-ops. In final analysis, a saving in power cost by the 2 percent subsidy and tax exemptions is no real saving in power cost at all.

We will, however, make this comparison of costs on your basis.

These three distribution co-ops have for years been enjoying, from both Kentucky Utilities and Louisville Gas & Electric, very favorable rates duly filed with the Kentucky Public Service Commission. The Louisville Gas & Electric rate is designated REC-2. It is substantially the same as the Kentucky Utilities rate 61. For convenience, both such rates will be referred to in this letter as "rate 61." Since we have in Kentucky the one REA-financed generation and transmission co-op, East Kentucky, we have an excellent basis for comparing the costs to distribution co-ops of power purchased from such federally financed generation and transmission co-ops as against power purchased from the private utilities under rate 61. The three co-ops which purchase from Kentucky Utilities and Louisville Gas & Electric under rate 61 are not members of East Kentucky.

East Kentucky commenced actual operation as a generation and transmission co-op in 1954. Even 5 years later, by 1959, the average power cost to East Kentucky's 16 member co-ops which purchased from it was 8.3 mills per kilowatt-hour. By comparison, for the year ending June 30, 1959, the cost to Green River and Henderson-Union under Kentucky Utilities' rate 61 was, respectively, 7.2 mills and 7.3 mills. Over the 5-year period 1955-59, Green River and

Henderson-Union saved \$383,000 as against what their power costs would have been under the average rate paid by the co-ops which purchased from East Kentucky.

To remove any area of doubt resulting from consideration of load factors, we have computed (1) the actual cost to Green River and Henderson-Union under Kentucky Utilities' rate 61 for the 12 months just ended May 31, 1962; and (2) what the costs to these same two co-ops would have been under rates available from East Kentucky during this same period of time. Green River and Henderson-Union actually had power costs under rate 61 of, respectively, 7.12 mills and 7.06 mills per kilowatt-hour. Had their purchases been from East Kentucky under rates available from it, the cost of each would have been 7.42 mills.

As of May 1, 1962, East Kentucky placed into effect a new rate which has been given consideration in the foregoing computation. Even if that new rate had been available through the entire 12 months ended May 31, 1962, Green River's and Henderson-Union's costs under the new rate throughout that period would have been 6.90 mills and 6.92 mills—only, respectively, 0.22 mill and 0.14 mill less than under rate 61. Thus, not only have the rates offered by Kentucky Utilities and Louisville Gas & Electric afforded a lower cost of power, but considering that in excess of \$66 million of the taxpayers' moneys have been invested in the East Kentucky system—with probably another \$25 million to be sought for completion of its Burnside plant—there is no likelihood that the REA-financed facilities will result in a lower cost of power. We remind you that the Kentucky Utilities rate 61 was achieved without the 2-percent money or tax exemption subsidies.

In any event, the latest East Kentucky rate cannot possibly be considered as one which Big Rivers might achieve in the foreseeable future. East Kentucky already has in service a generating capability of 192 megawatts with another unit having a net capacity of 105 megawatts soon to be in service. By comparison, Big Rivers proposes an inefficient system of only 75-megawatts capacity. Also, it required East Kentucky, even though subsidized by the taxpayers to the extent of \$66 million, more than 8 years of operation to achieve a rate as low as the Kentucky Utilities' rate 61. Further, as the load factors of the co-ops improve, their power costs under rate 61 are progressively declining. As noted, for the 12 months ending June 30, 1959, the costs to the two co-ops purchasing from Kentucky Utilities were 7.2 mills and 7.3 mills; by the calendar year 1961, those costs had decreased to 7.15 mills and 7.088 mills; and for the 12 months ending May 31, 1962, they had further decreased to 7.12 mills and 7.06 mills. Thus, by the time Big Rivers could place into operation its proposed system, the costs to the co-ops under rate 61 obviously will be even lower than their present costs of 7.12 and 7.06 mills, respectively.

In the newspaper account of your approval of this loan, the manager of Big Rivers is quoted as having said that construction of the generating plant and transmission lines will mean a saving to the co-ops of \$3,500,000 to \$4,000,000 in the first 10-year period after the facilities are completed. If the data filed with your office purport to show any such savings as those, a cursory study of those figures would have demonstrated their complete invalidity; and it is not to be assumed that you accepted any such totally unfounded claims as a basis for approving the loan. Had you given us the slightest opportunity to present to you the pertinent facts, we could have demonstrated, and now can demonstrate, to your complete satisfaction that any such claimed savings by Big Rivers are totally baseless.

A full and complete investigation and hearing with respect to the cost of power criterion in connection with this loan will conclusively establish that the power costs to these distribution co-ops by continued purchases from the dependable systems of Kentucky Utilities and Louisville Gas & Electric will be substantially lower than the co-ops could possibly experience from the system which Big Rivers proposes to construct.

THERE IS NO NEED FOR THIS LOAN TO BE MADE TO PROTECT THE SECURITY OR EFFECTIVENESS OF ANY REA-FINANCED SYSTEM

This reference obviously is to the third criterion adopted by your agency in 1961 in considering applications for generation and transmission loans. The factors here to be considered are not definitely set forth in any statement of policy. This is one area in which a hearing will be of particular value to all concerned. We have noted your public comments to the effect that these loan applications will be viewed favorably where REA borrowers find themselves forced to rely on a hostile source for their future power supply. We do not believe that even Big Rivers would represent to you that Kentucky Utilities or Louisville Gas & Electric constitutes a hostile source of power supply.

Our relations with the distribution co-ops associated in Big Rivers have always been excellent and singularly free of any friction. There has not been an instance in which a question arising was not talked out openly and fairly and resolved solely between Kentucky Utilities and the co-ops it serves. Neither party has in a single instance found it necessary to take any matter under discussion to the Public Service Commission of Kentucky or to the courts. Kentucky Utilities and Louisville Gas & Electric have cooperated fully with these co-ops in their programs, and every request by them for power or services has been promptly met.

We, of course, are aware of your views on the territorial integrity of co-ops. There is in this area no conceivable basis for your approving this loan.

The present contract between Kentucky Utilities and Green River RECC expires in January 1965. The contract between Kentucky Utilities and Henderson-Union RECC is cancelable on 2 years' notice. The relatively short terms of these contracts have been at the co-ops' insistence, and we have always been prepared to enter into contracts to supply their power needs at the very favorable rate for such period of time as the co-ops might wish.

Congress never intended that Federal funds be made available to co-ops at the 2-percent rate for the purpose of engaging in destructive competition with private utilities for industrial, commercial, and even municipal loads. However, prior to the making of the present application by Big Rivers, we offered to these co-ops new contracts which would not restrict the co-ops in any way whatever as to the character or type or size of load they could serve. The largest industrial loads would be available to them.

Just as the co-ops, however, say they wish protection against the raiding of customers and territory they developed, so do we. The proposed contracts which we submitted therefore contain restrictions against either party's invading territory developed and served with adequate facilities by the other. The provisions we suggested would operate in precisely the same manner for the protection of the co-ops.

The contracts we offered to Green River and Henderson-Union RECC's fully meet the requests in your pertinent directives to co-ops and particularly those in your bulletin 3-3 of February 12, 1962. Unless co-ops

wish contracts which protect them as to customers and territories they have developed but at the same time leave them free to raid territories and customers of private utilities, we do not believe there can be any objection to the provisions we offered to these two co-ops.

At the recent meeting in your office, Assistant Administrator Wood did question whether one phrase in our proposed contracts was sufficiently definitive as to the territory or area intended. In contract provisions of this sort, all of us are trying to deal in advance with situations which have not arisen. Language necessarily must be somewhat general. Since returning from Washington, our representatives have carefully considered Mr. Wood's comment, but are somewhat at a loss as to how to be more specific in terms. As we stated to you in our meeting, however, if either your office or Big Rivers will suggest a reasonable alternate phrase or provision, we will doubtless find it acceptable; we have no difference in principle.

In any event, this phrase relating to service area—your only objection to our proposed contracts—is a detail of the most minor sort. Our contracts will give the co-ops full freedom of action as to all classes of customers and the territorial protection you say they need, with no more than identical reciprocal protection to us. You could not possibly have considered any objection to our proposed contracts a justifiable basis for granting this loan. Your action in announcing approval of the loan, without having first submitted or had Big Rivers submit to us a draft of contract or counterproposal, convincingly demonstrates that the minor point raised by Mr. Wood did not constitute a genuine objection to our proposed contracts.

We are firmly convinced that, in this entire area of your third criterion, there is no possible justification for approval of this loan. If any party has any comments to the contrary or criticism of Kentucky Utilities in any phase of its relations with these co-ops, we request that we be advised of the precise comment or criticism and afforded an opportunity to meet it squarely.

THE MATTER OF SECRECY IN THE CONSIDERATION OF THESE LOANS AND THE NEED FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION AND HEARINGS

To the present time, your agency has been singularly free of any kind of supervision or regulation in its spending of billions of dollars of the taxpayers' moneys. Congress has never considered individual projects prior to the spending of Federal funds. You have resisted any check by the courts on your spending of these funds.

These circumstances should be considered as imposing upon you a duty of extra care in your investigation of loan applications and your decisions to spend these vast amounts of public funds. To the contrary, your office has shrouded its activities in this field in the utmost secrecy and has acted in such manner as to make it impossible even for interested parties to present pertinent facts which necessarily should be considered in determining your proper course with respect to one of these applications.

As stated at the outset of this letter, although you did not see fit to notify us of the making of this application, we learned of it and promptly put you on notice of our interest and of our conviction that the making of the loan would be unlawful. We requested information which would have enabled us to demonstrate to you the impropriety of your granting this loan. When you refused us this information and referred us to another source, we promptly went to that source and, by a copy of our letter, notified you what we were doing. We put you on notice that we were satisfied that cost

studies would demonstrate the impropriety of granting the loan, and that we were proceeding to prepare factual data for submission to you.

Instead of demonstrating any interest in receiving and considering further pertinent information you acted immediately to approve the loan before we could place in your hands such factual data which, if ignored, might have embarrassed you in granting the loan.

THE INTEREST OF THE GENERAL PUBLIC IS NOT RECEIVING ANY ATTENTION WHATSOEVER IN YOUR OFFICE'S CONSIDERATION OF THESE GENERATION AND TRANSMISSION LOANS

Thus far in this letter, we have dealt only with the interests of the distribution co-operatives and their individual members in stating to you that the facts of the present matter do not begin to justify the making of this loan. In other words, the immediate expenditure of \$18 million of Federal funds—and the inevitable ultimate expenditure of additional millions of dollars on this same project—would not result in any benefit to these co-ops and their members.

There is another factor, however, which we are satisfied you are giving no weight whatever. That is the interest of the general public in this wholly wasteful expenditure of its money.

The present application of Big Rivers was, according to the newspapers, not for a loan of \$18 million for the construction of the 75-megawatt generating plant and 266 miles of transmission lines, but a loan of \$25,297,000 for the construction of the plant and 592 miles of lines. The power contract between Meade County RECC and Louisville Gas & Electric does not expire until 1968. It is our understanding that, for this reason, the project as now approved postpones for several years the construction of the transmission lines to serve Meade County RECC and postpones for this same short time the expenditure of the additional \$7,297,000 for this part of the project. Thus, within the next several years it is definitely contemplated that \$25,297,000, rather than \$18 million, of Federal funds will be spent on this project.

Further, as you well know, once one of these generating plants and its system of lines is constructed, the spending of Federal funds on the project has only begun. East Kentucky similarly started with an initial loan of about \$12 million; but additions to its system have already cost the taxpayers in excess of \$66 million, and at least another \$25 million will undoubtedly be sought by East Kentucky for installation of additional capacity in its Burnside plant.

Even if the expenditure of these uncounted millions of dollars for a new generating plant and system of transmission lines for Big Rivers would substantially benefit the distribution co-ops and their members—and that is positively not so in this case—still, such benefit as the co-ops would derive should be weighed against the interest of the general public in this expenditure of its moneys. We do not understand the intent of Congress, as expressed in its laws, to be that Federal funds can be expended for the construction of cooperative generating plants and transmission systems at any time such expenditure may result simply in lower costs to the distribution co-ops. After all, the procurement of capital at a 2-percent rate plus the tax exemptions enjoyed by co-ops should be expected to ultimately result in somewhat lower costs. Again, we do not understand that to be the criterion. Rather, we understand the law to be that Federal loans for generating plants and transmission systems are not authorized when adequate and dependable power is available to the distribution co-ops at

fair and reasonable costs, considering that the investor-owned utilities which supply such power must obtain their capital at going market rates and pay applicable taxes.

In this instance, an impartial study would establish that the power costs to these distribution co-ops from the private utilities, are not only entirely fair and reasonable, but are in fact less than the costs the co-ops would experience from the Big Rivers project.

Particularly at the present time, responsible public officials in all branches of government are demanding that unnecessary Federal expenditures be avoided. On the facts of this case, the expenditure of, first, \$18 million, and then another \$7,297,000, and ultimately many more millions of dollars of Federal funds for the construction of the Big Rivers project would represent an unjustifiable waste of taxpayer funds. This expenditure cannot be justified for any legitimate purpose of rural electrification. It can be explained—not justified—only as a step in the determined program of your agency to establish a system of federally owned and federally financed utility operations to destroy and replace the free enterprise system of utilities in this country.

If this program is to be adopted at all, a determination to that effect would be the sole prerogative of Congress and not of your agency. If, contrary to the intent of Congress, your agency attempts to further such program, it is apparent that the only remedy is for the control of Federal funds for rural electrification purposes to be withdrawn from your agency and returned to the Congress.

REQUEST FOR REVOCATION OF YOUR APPROVAL OF THE LOAN AND FOR A HEARING ON THE APPLICATION

If you are willing to consider this loan application on its merits and after a full development of the facts, we request that you immediately (1) revoke your approval of the loan, (2) make available to us information so that we can prepare and submit a detailed study of a comparison of costs to the co-ops of obtaining their power under the several possible alternatives, and (3) hold a hearing at which all interested parties will be given an opportunity to present to you facts which should be considered before the taxpayers' funds are committed.

If your objective in administering the Rural Electrification Act is to make these large loans of public funds only, as Congress intended, for legitimate purposes of rural electrification, and in instances where the distribution cooperatives cannot obtain their power from private sources at rates which are entirely fair and reasonable, we feel that you will grant our request, permit a full development of the facts in connection with this loan application and thereafter reconsider it on its true merits. The making of the loan to Big Rivers would represent needless waste of Federal funds for the purpose of placing another federally subsidized generation and transmission co-op in a position to engage in destructive competition with investor-owned utilities.

Very truly yours,

FLOYD I. FAIRMAN,
President.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, at this point I wish to request permission to insert in the RECORD two resolutions pertaining to the REA. The first resolution is by the Taxpayers' Association of the State of South Dakota directed to the empire building of REA, and the second resolution is by the South Dakota Stock Growers Association directed to

the expansion of REA beyond the intent and purposes of the original act. These two resolutions are indicative of the growing nationwide concern over the unrestrained and unbridled activities of this Federal lending agency:

RESOLUTION OF SOUTH DAKOTA TAXPAYERS, PIERRE

THE TAXPAYERS' WATCHDOG

A considerable number of the members of the South Dakota Taxpayers Association are customers of the Rural Electrification Administration cooperatives. They have been strong supporters of the original concept of bringing power to the rural areas. Current practices of the REA show a decided trend toward empire building. Realizing these facts in relation to the REA system, the board of directors of the taxpayer association has approved the following resolution:

"Whereas the South Dakota Taxpayers Association has always stood for private and free enterprise and has opposed special privilege for one industry as opposed to another industry; and

"Whereas the Rural Electrification Administration was established for the purpose of furnishing electric power to isolated areas where central station power was not available; and

"Whereas the REA has largely accomplished this purpose since 98 percent of the farms and ranches of the Nation are now served with electricity with plans for reaching a 100 percent goal; and

"Whereas, the South Dakota Taxpayers Association commends the REA for the fine job well done in serving the farms and ranches in South Dakota; and

"Whereas approximately five out of six customers now being connected nationally by the REA are nonfarm and nonranch: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the South Dakota Taxpayers Association, by action of its board of directors in regular meeting in Pierre, S. Dak., on June 9, 1962, opposes further expansion of the REA cooperatives beyond the intent and purpose of the original act; and be it further

Resolved, That REA cooperatives be fully compensated for territory and properties annexed to private power companies."

This resolution makes clear the belief of the association in our free enterprise system; that we oppose segments of the economy receiving undue special advantages; and the necessity to strictly limit the operation of Government when it oversteps the powers which have been granted to it.

R. LYLE BARTON,
Executive Director, South Dakota Taxpayers Association.

RESOLUTION OF SOUTH DAKOTA STOCK-GROWERS ASSOCIATION
REA

Whereas the South Dakota Stockgrowers Association has always stood for private and free enterprise and has opposed special privileges for one industry as opposed to another industry; and

Whereas the REA was established for the purpose of furnishing electric power to isolated areas where central station power was not available; and

Whereas the REA has largely accomplished this purpose since 98 percent of the farms and ranches nationally are now served with electricity with plans for reaching 100-percent goal; and

Whereas the South Dakota Stockgrowers Association commends the REA for the fine job well done in serving the farms and ranches in South Dakota; and

Whereas approximately five out of six customers now being connected nationally by the REA are nonfarm and nonranch: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the South Dakota Stock-growers Association, in convention in Sturgis, S. Dak., June 2, 1962, opposes further expansion of the REA beyond the intent and purpose of the original act; and be it further

Resolved, That in any case when any REA loses territory because of annexation by a city that full compensation for their facilities be granted on a fair and equitable basis.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I think it is important to put the generation and transmission activities of the Rural Electrification Administration in their proper perspective.

We were reminded yesterday that the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 did not intend for REA to make loans primarily for electric cooperatives to generate their own supply of power. So, I will not take time to review that important history.

The part of this picture which is of particular concern to me—and I think should be of concern to every conscientious Member of this House—is that even though we have achieved the enviable position in this Nation of having almost 98 percent of the farms electrified—which was the basic purpose for which Congress enacted the Rural Electrification Act of 1936—the magnitude of money requests from this agency is increasing rather than decreasing. Perhaps we see a new variation of Parkinson's law which might read: "As a bureaucratic agency approaches completion of the goal established for it, the amount of money requested from the taxpayers increases rather than decreases."

Mr. Chairman, let no one misunderstand my position. As I have consistently said, and repeated yesterday, that in filling its assigned task of distributing electric power to residents of rural areas who cannot obtain power from commercial sources, the REA has clearly met a well-defined need and has played an important role in the economic upgrading of many rural areas. However, I must draw the line in my own mind when the agency wants to assume as its primary function the granting of loans for the generation of electric power at subsidized interest rates and freedom from payment of Federal income taxes.

To show this trend on generating loans, I prepared a brief table showing generation and transmission loans as a percentage of total loans for each fiscal year from 1936 through February 1, 1962. To me, this was very revealing and has caused me serious concern. For example, in 1936 only 0.2 percent of total loans went for generation and transmission purposes; by 1940, 1.4 percent; 1950, 36.4 percent; in the decade to 1960, the percentage fluctuated between 19 percent in 1954 to a high of 40.4 percent in 1960. Now, on February 1, 1962, we see 57 percent of all loans granted by REA going for generation and transmission purposes, and the request for fiscal 1963 is for about 60 to 65 percent for generation and transmission loans. Every indication is that it will

continue to increase in future years. Under unanimous consent, I insert this brief table at this point:

Rural Electrification Administration total loans granted—Generation and transmission loans granted by fiscal years 1936-62

Fiscal year	Total electric loans granted	Generation and transmission loans granted	Generation and transmission loans as percentage of total loans
1936	\$13,910,404	\$28,000	0.2
1937	45,025,813	1,482,000	3.3
1938	29,254,853	1,115,000	3.8
1939	139,149,829	3,484,000	2.5
1940	41,632,050	586,000	1.4
1941	100,054,672	5,612,150	5.6
1942	91,152,724	28,162,700	30.9
1943	6,700,978	1,695,294	25.3
1944	31,930,124	3,017,550	9.5
1945	26,343,238	5,719,924	22.2
1946	289,372,488	31,920,043	10.6
1947	254,521,172	33,134,895	13.0
1948	313,023,099	39,978,033	12.8
1949	448,859,597	85,000,526	18.9
1950	375,151,456	136,439,210	36.4
1951	221,733,800	51,159,000	23.1
1952	165,425,811	61,387,000	37.1
1953	164,972,682	28,939,500	22.0
1954	167,104,100	31,749,760	19.0
1955	167,530,430	41,882,500	25.0
1956	189,804,800	61,251,939	32.3
1957	300,461,514	120,153,676	39.9
1958	241,636,869	86,338,132	35.8
1959	177,292,100	64,814,397	36.5
1960	220,108,000	88,971,495	40.4
1961	274,507,218	151,938,830	55.3
1962	103,144,000	261,000,000	59.3

Source: Annual reports of Rural Electrification Administration.

Mr. Chairman, at this time when almost everyone is saying that we need a reduction in taxes to stimulate the national economy, I think it is more important than ever to reduce Federal spending as much as possible. I realize that my amendment would not have reduced the overall amount of money which REA will be allowed to borrow from the Treasury, but by placing the \$100 million limitation on the granting of generation and transmission loans it would have put the program back on the right track and would have resulted in some savings to the taxpayer in future years.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, even though my amendment was defeated, I was very encouraged with the vote, and the next time around I will win. I am sure Mr. Clapp realizes this; and, therefore, I can see no reason why when the Administrator comes to us for his appropriations next year he cannot give us specific details on all the large generation and transmission loans he is planning to make in a coming fiscal year.

The procedure involved in building an electric generating plant is a pretty involved one. It simply cannot be done in haste, and it cannot be done in a short period of time.

I am informed that the procedure will go something as follows: First, the cooperatives which are planning to construct a generating plant will have a preliminary meeting to discuss proposed costs. This meeting will usually be attended by their consulting engineer and the local REA engineer and sometimes an engineer from the REA Washington area office. The consulting engineer presents his estimate of the cost of preparing a study of the proposed genera-

tion and transmission project and, if satisfactory, general funds of the cooperative are voted to finance this study. The engineer must be furnished with load data and load center locations by the distribution cooperatives. He must then determine suitable plant site, lay out the backbone transmission system, and determine substation sites. He must obtain bids on all equipment involved. When all of his data is prepared, he must prepare an economic study for submission to the cooperatives. This economic study is then presented by the cooperatives to the REA Washington office to be checked by the Washington office engineers.

A study of this kind would take at least 1 year to prepare. As the study progresses, the feasibility of the project can usually readily be determined. By the time it reaches the REA Washington office, the REA area director should be in a position to know whether the project has any merit. After it reaches his office and is assigned to an engineer to study, there will probably be 6 to 8 months required before the engineer can make his recommendation to the Administrator as to the feasibility of the project.

It seems apparent, therefore, that the Administrator should be in a position to have a rather precise estimate of the feasible projects that will be submitted to him for consideration during the following fiscal year at the time that he appears before the Appropriations Committee with his request for funds.

I fail to see how there can be any validity to the argument by the Administrator that he cannot come before the Congress with complete details of all the large generation and transmission loans he plans to make in any fiscal year.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the claims that my amendment, which was defeated, would leave the REA borrowers in a bad way financially, is not valid. Let us look at the facts. The net margin—excess of revenues over expenses—of REA borrowers in 1960 was \$87,212,359; up from \$69,389,622 in 1956. The long-term debt as a percent of net assets had declined from about 88 percent in 1956 to 78.6 percent in 1960. In 1960 only 30 REA borrowers had deficits in their net margins—out of 959 borrowers—as against 277 in 1950. The REA borrowers in 1960 had investments and special funds of \$350,537,000 in 1960; up from \$143,561,000 in 1956. That is a gain of \$207 million in 5 years. These are readily available funds that can be tapped to meet a special situation.

Now, let us look at the cost of power bought by REA borrowers. According to NRECA's "Rural Electric Fact Book," 1960, the cost of power bought from investor-owned electric companies declined from 1.24 cents per kilowatt-hour in 1940 to 0.80 cent in 1958, or a decline of 38 percent. What happened to the cost of power bought by co-ops from REA borrowers? From 1940 to 1958 it fell from 1.28 cents to 1.16 cents, or a decline of only a little over 9 percent. REA borrowers buying power from electric companies have received greater re-

ductions in power costs since 1940 than those buying from other REA borrowers.

In conclusion, I wish to repeat that the 133-to-94 count on the vote on my amendment is indicative of the fact that more Members are becoming aware of the need for additional legislation in this area, and I would assume that in the next session we will see Congress once again regain control over this program that has gotten completely out of hand.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr HARRIS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12648) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

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

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MICHEL. I am constrained to say "Yes," Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MICHEL moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

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

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 346, nays 41, not voting 48, as follows:

[Roll No. 175]

YEAS—346

Abbutt	Alexander	Andrews
Abernethy	Andersen,	Anfuso
Addabbo	Minn.	Arends
Albert	Anderson, Ill.	Ashley

Ashmore	Glenn	Moore
Aspinall	Gonzalez	Moorehead,
Auchincloss	Goodling	Ohio
Avery	Granahan	Moorhead, Pa.
Ayres	Grant	Morgan
Balley	Gray	Morris
Baker	Green, Oreg.	Morrison
Baldwin	Green, Pa.	Morse
Barrett	Griffiths	Mosher
Barry	Gross	Moss
Bass, Tenn.	Hagan, Ga.	Multer
Bates	Hagen, Calif.	Murphy
Battin	Haley	Murray
Beckworth	Halleck	Natcher
Beermann	Halpern	Becker
Belcher	Hansen	Bel
Bennett, Fla.	Harding	Broomfield
Bennett, Mich.	Hardy	Bruce
Berry	Harris	Church
Betts	Harrison, Wyo.	Clancy
Blatnik	Harsha	Collier
Boland	Harvey, Ind.	Corbett
Bolling	Hays	Curtis, Mo.
Bonner	Healey	Curtis, Ill.
Bow	Hechler	O'Hara, Mich.
Boykin	Hemphill	O'Hara, Ill.
Brademas	Henderson	O'Konski
Bray	Herlong	Olsen
Breeding	Hoeven	O'Neill
Brewster	Hollifield	Ostertag
Bromwell	Holland	Passman
Brooks, Tex.	Horan	Patman
Brown	Huddleston	Pelly
Broyhill	Hull	Perkins
Burke, Ky.	Ichord, Mo.	Prost
Burke, Mass.	Inouye	Philbin
Burleson	Jarman	Pillion
Byrne, Pa.	Jennings	Pirnie
Byrnes, Wis.	Jensen	Poage
Cahill	Jeon	Poff
Cannon	Johnson, Calif.	Price
Carey	Johnson, Md.	Pucinski
Casey	Johnson, Wis.	Qule
Cederberg	Jonas	Randall
Celler	Jones, Ala.	Reece
Chamberlain	Jones, Mo.	Reifel
Chelf	Karsten	Reuss
Chenoweth	Karth	Rhodes, Ariz.
Chipperfield	Kastenmeier	Rhodes, Pa.
Clark	Kearns	Riehlman
Cohelan	Kee	Riley
Colmer	Kelly	Rivers, Alaska
Conte	Keogh	Rivers, S.C.
Cook	Kilgore	Roberts, Ala.
Cooley	King, Calif.	Roberts, Tex.
Corman	King, N.Y.	Rodino
Cunningham	Kirwan	Rooney
Curtin	Kitchin	Roosevelt
Daddario	Kluczynski	Rosenthal
Dague	Knox	Rostenkowski
Daniels	Kornegay	Roudebush
Davis	Kowalski	Roush
James C.	Kunkel	Rutherford
Davis, John W.	Kyl	Ryan, Mich.
Dawson	Laird	Ryan, N.Y.
Delaney	Landrum	St. George
Dent	Lane	Santangelo
Denton	Langen	Saylor
Diggs	Lankford	Schadberg
Dingell	Latta	Schenck
Dole	Lennon	Schneebell
Dominick	Lesinski	Schweiker
Donohue	Libonati	Schwengel
Dorn	Lindsay	Scott
Dowdy	Lipscomb	Scranton
Downing	McCulloch	Seely-Brown
Doyle	McDonough	Selden
Dulski	McDowell	Shelley
Durno	McFall	Sheppard
Dwyer	McIntire	Shipley
Edmondson	McMillan	Short
Elliott	Macdonald	Shriver
Ellsworth	MacGregor	Sibal
Everett	Mack	Sikes
Evins	Magnuson	Siler
Fallon	Mahon	Sisk
Farbstein	Mailliard	Slack
Fascell	Marshall	Smith, Iowa
Feighan	Martin, Mass.	Smith, Va.
Fenton	Martin, Nebr.	Springer
Finnegan	Mason	Stafford
Fisher	Mathias	Staggers
Flood	Mathews	Steed
Forrester	May	Stephens
Fountain	Meador	Stratton
Frelinghuysen	Miller, Clem	Stubblefield
Friedel	Miller,	Sullivan
Garland	George P.	Taylor
Garmatz	Miller, N.Y.	Teague, Tex.
Gary	Milliken	Thompson, Tex.
Gathings	Mills	Thomson, Wis.
Gavin	Moeller	Thornberry
Gialmo	Monagan	Toll
Gilbert	Montoya	Tollefson
		Trimble
		Tuck
		Tupper

Ullman	Weaver	Williams
Vanik	Weis	Wilson, Calif.
Van Belt	Westland	Wilson, Ind.
Van Zandt	Whalley	Wright
Vinson	Wharton	Young
Waggonner	Whitener	Younger
Wallhauser	Whitten	Zablocki
Walter	Wickersham	Zelenko
Watts	Widnall	

NAYS—41

Adair	Devine	Keith
Alger	Dooley	Michel
Ashbrook	Findley	Minshall
Becker	Fino	Osmers
Bell	Ford	Pike
Broomfield	Fulton	Ray
Bruce	Goodell	Robison
Church	Griffin	Rogers, Fla.
Clancy	Hall	Rousset
Collier	Harvey, Mich.	Smith, Calif.
Corbett	Hiestand	Thomas
Curtis, Mo.	Hoffman, Ill.	Udall, Morris K.
Derounian	Hosmer	Utt
Derwinski	Johansen	

NOT VOTING—48

Alford	Harrison, Va.	Purcell
Baring	Hébert	Rains
Bass, N.H.	Hoffman, Mich.	Rogers, Colo.
Blitch	Judd	Rogers, Tex.
Boggs	Kilburn	St. Germain
Bolton	King, Utah	Saund
Buckley	Loser	Scherer
Coad	McSween	Smith, Miss.
Cramer	McVey	Spence
Curtis, Mass.	Madden	Taber
Davis, Tenn.	Morrow	Teague, Calif.
Flynt	Moulder	Thompson, La.
Fogarty	Norblad	Thompson, N.J.
Frazier	Peterson	Willis
Gallagher	Pilcher	Winstead
Gubser	Powell	Yates

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Teague of California for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Cramer for, with Mr. Taber against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.

Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Norblad.

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Scherer.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Curtis of Massachusetts.

Mr. Loser with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Peterson with Mr. Gubser.

Mr. St. Germain with Mr. Morrow.

Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Judd.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. McVey.

Mr. Rains with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.

Mr. BELL 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.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the Record on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

EQUAL PAY ACT OF 1962

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the

Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11677) to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by certain employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce and to provide for the restitution of wages lost by employees by reason of any such discrimination.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 11677, with Mrs. KELLY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. ZELENKO. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Madam Chairman, the objective sought by this legislation is wage justice for working men and women. Discriminatory wage practices based upon sex, like other forms of discrimination in employment, are contrary to our basic traditions of freedom and fairplay.

The payment of wages on a basis other than that of the job performed is not only harmful to the individual worker and our economy, but also to our Nation's image abroad. The fact that employers still pay lower wage rates to women workers for the same or comparable work as that performed by men workers in the same place is contrary to every concept of equality and justice in which we so strongly believe.

While H.R. 11677 is not expressly directed at women—and testimony shows that it will be equally beneficial to men—it should be noted that the principal immediate beneficiaries of this legislation will be the working women of the Nation. It seems almost incredible that there should still be need for a Federal law to protect women workers from such a form of discrimination and exploitation as exists in the payment of unequal wage rates for equal work. The fact that such discrimination continues to be widely practiced was glaringly revealed in testimony from virtually every segment of economic endeavor tables. What makes this revelation even more shocking is that in 1961 there were approximately 24¼ million women in our work force, making up a total of one-third of our Nation's total labor force. By 1970 that figure is expected to rise to 30 million. These women are needed to feed our economy and they should be given the same in-

centives that encourage men to improve their skills and productivity. That women are a vital and productive element in our labor force cannot be denied. The plain and undeniable fact is that these working women, by their vast contributions in the labor force—both in times of war and peace—have become indispensable partners with men in the growth of our economy. As equal partners in the labor force, they are entitled to be treated as equal partners in enjoying the fruits of their labor.

Women are in the labor market because they have to work to support themselves, their children, their parents, and to supplement the incomes of their husbands, where inadequate. In 1961 women were the heads of 4.6 million families—about 10 percent of all families in the United States. These families owed their sole support to a working woman.

The legislation prohibits an employer having 25 or more employees, engaged in commerce, or in the production of goods for commerce, from discriminating between his employees at the same plant by paying lower wages to one sex than he pays to the other sex for a comparable job requiring comparable skills except where there is a valid discrimination due to a merit system, seniority or bona fide job classification.

The bill would diminish the possibilities of using women to force wages down and of taking advantage of the sharp competition for jobs in times of substantial unemployment. The bill provides that no employer will reduce the wage rate of an employee for the purpose of eliminating the differential in wage rates prohibited by the act. It would stimulate another worthwhile purpose—that of maintaining the purchasing power of workers to add to their prosperity and the growth of our economy.

Because of the fact that there may be instances in the bargaining between an employer and a union in which the bargaining agreement might require the employer to continue or institute a wage differential for comparable work based solely on sex, I shall offer an amendment which would prohibit any union or other bargaining unit acting on behalf of employees from causing or attempting to cause the employer to discriminate against any individual in violation of this act.

I am pleased to inform this committee that organized labor, which has fully

supported this legislation, favors this amendment.

I urge this committee to give its full support to this vital legislation.

Under permission previously granted, I include the following:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR
AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,

Washington, D.C., July 24, 1962.

HON. HERBERT ZELENKO,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ZELENKO: It is my understanding that a question has arisen as to the attitude of the AFL-CIO toward the inclusion in the equal pay bill of a provision prohibiting unions from causing or attempting to cause an employer to discriminate against any individual in the payment of wages on the basis of sex.

The Fourth Constitutional Convention of the AFL-CIO adopted a resolution which called attention to the large number of women employed in industry and stated:

"Women must be encouraged to join labor unions, to participate actively in union affairs, and to rely upon unions to protect and advance their basic interests."

The resolution reaffirms the federation's support of the principle of equal pay for equal work, through collective bargaining contracts and through appropriate legislation, both State and Federal. Specifically, the resolution called for "abolition of discriminatory employment practices against women in hiring and layoffs, in seniority rights, promotion, and training opportunities for jobs."

Accordingly, the AFL-CIO would have no objection to the inclusion of a provision along the lines outlined above in the equal pay bill. We would, however, be strongly opposed to inclusion in the bill of any of the other changes proposed in the so-called Ashbrook amendment.

Sincerely yours,

ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,
Director, Department of Legislation.

Another representative group of white-collar workers are bank tellers, for whom salary data were collected by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in 1960. Even though the salary data were separated by the length of experience of the tellers and the type of work done, women's average earnings were consistently lower than men's.¹ For example, the following table shows that women note tellers with under 5 years' experience typically averaged \$5 to \$15 a week less than men in the same occupational group:

¹ In this report, the data are combined for all banks in each survey area. Thus, as stated previously, the differences in earnings are partially accounted for by variations in wages between small and large establishments, in job content, and in length of service.

Banks, May-July 1960—Comparison of average weekly earnings of women and men note tellers (under 5 years' experience)

Area ¹	Number of workers		Average weekly hours		Average weekly earnings			Area ¹	Number of workers		Average weekly hours		Average weekly earnings		
	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Difference ²		Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Difference ²
Atlanta	27	6	39.0	39.0	\$67.00	\$72.50	-\$5.50	Miami	31	19	38.5	39.0	\$62.50	\$68.00	-\$5.50
Boston	44	13	35.5	36.5	69.00	77.00	-8.00	Milwaukee	22	14	39.5	39.5	63.50	64.50	-1.00
Chicago	26	66	39.5	39.0	78.50	89.50	-11.00	Minneapolis-St. Paul	27	15	39.5	40.0	65.00	88.50	-23.50
Dallas	21	11	40.0	40.0	64.00	79.50	-15.50	Newark-Jersey City	44	41	36.0	36.0	72.00	80.00	-8.00
Denver	56	6	40.0	40.0	63.00	91.00	-28.00	New York City	21	125	37.0	36.5	75.00	80.50	-5.50
Detroit	7	7	40.0	37.5	64.50	73.50	-9.00	Providence	17	12	36.0	37.0	64.00	66.00	-2.00
Houston	27	23	40.0	40.0	69.50	89.00	-19.50	St. Louis	19	16	37.5	38.5	62.50	80.00	-17.50
Kansas City	16	12	40.0	40.0	63.50	74.50	-11.00	San Francisco-Oakland	60	68	40.0	40.0	71.50	81.50	-10.00
Los Angeles-Long Beach	289	102	40.0	40.0	77.00	82.50	-5.50	Seattle	43	16	39.5	40.0	67.50	85.00	-17.50

¹ Includes all survey areas in which both men and women in this occupation were paid on a time basis.

² Refers to the amount by which women's earnings vary from men's earnings. Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

SERVICE WORKERS

There are about 3.4 million women and 2.9 million men classified as service workers (excluding private household workers). Earnings data for service workers have been

collected by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in selected service industries, including power laundries, hotels, and hospitals. The following tables present wage comparisons in

these industries for occupations employing both men and women workers on a time basis and show marked wage differences favoring men.

Power laundries, April-July 1960—Comparison of average hourly earnings of women and men workers

Occupation and area ¹	Number of workers		Average hourly earnings		
	Women	Men	Women	Men	Difference ²
Assemblers:					
Boston.....	120	29	\$1.12	\$1.45	-\$0.33
Chicago.....	224	96	1.12	1.24	-.12
Detroit.....	59	26	1.09	1.20	-.11
Los Angeles-Long Beach.....	273	12	1.35	1.84	-.49
Newark-Jersey City.....	85	27	1.17	1.29	-.12
New York.....	142	83	1.16	1.38	-.22
Philadelphia.....	120	13	1.14	1.27	-.13
Clerks, retail receiving:					
Chicago.....	122	14	1.17	1.58	-.41
Newark-Jersey City.....	42	13	1.12	1.48	-.36
Identifiers:					
Boston.....	14	44	\$1.16	\$1.31	-\$0.15
Chicago.....	82	119	1.09	1.32	-.23
New York.....	46	86	1.16	1.36	-.20
Markers:					
Boston.....	51	30	1.12	1.22	-.10
Chicago.....	167	8	1.13	1.22	-.09
Los Angeles-Long Beach.....	156	13	1.32	1.63	-.31
New York.....	65	42	1.20	1.43	-.23
Philadelphia.....	43	6	1.12	1.24	-.12

¹ Includes occupations which cover both men and women workers and are generally paid on a time basis.

² Refers to the amount by which women's earnings vary from men's earnings. Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Private hospitals, mid-1960—Comparison of average weekly hours and earnings of women and men workers

Occupation and area ¹	Number of workers		Average weekly hours		Average weekly earnings		
	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Difference ²
PHYSICAL THERAPISTS							
Buffalo.....	9	9	39.5	40.0	\$81.50	\$91.00	-\$9.50
Chicago.....	65	18	39.5	40.0	81.00	98.50	-17.50
Los Angeles-Long Beach.....	80	20	40.0	40.0	99.00	91.00	+8.00
Minneapolis-St. Paul.....	31	7	40.0	40.0	95.50	120.50	-25.00
New York.....	105	41	37.5	38.5	80.50	89.00	-8.50
Philadelphia.....	32	8	40.0	39.5	85.50	100.00	-14.50
San Francisco-Oakland.....	39	9	40.0	40.0	95.50	99.50	-4.00
X-RAY TECHNICIANS							
Baltimore.....	44	24	40.0	40.0	69.00	74.00	-5.00
Boston.....	144	34	40.0	40.0	69.50	74.50	-5.00
Buffalo.....	36	12	39.0	40.0	70.00	75.00	-5.00
Chicago.....	195	96	40.0	40.0	81.00	86.00	-5.00
Cincinnati.....	30	10	40.0	39.5	64.50	72.00	-7.50
Cleveland.....	79	19	40.0	40.0	70.00	78.00	-8.00
Dallas.....	12	10	40.0	40.0	66.50	74.50	-8.00
Los Angeles-Long Beach.....	107	40	40.0	40.0	86.00	87.00	-1.00
Minneapolis-St. Paul.....	65	20	40.0	40.0	66.00	71.00	-5.00
New York.....	159	178	38.0	38.0	79.00	79.00	0
NURSING AIDS							
Philadelphia.....	152	14	40.0	40.0	\$65.50	\$68.50	-\$3.00
Portland.....	24	7	40.0	40.0	82.50	89.00	-6.50
San Francisco-Oakland.....	69	16	40.0	40.0	85.00	89.50	-4.50
Baltimore.....	1,726	395	40.0	40.0	37.50	44.50	-7.00
Boston.....	1,640	387	40.0	40.0	49.00	52.50	-4.50
Buffalo.....	1,294	96	40.0	40.0	46.00	52.50	-6.50
Chicago.....	4,987	380	39.5	40.0	50.00	58.50	-8.50
Cincinnati.....	839	91	40.0	40.0	40.00	47.00	-7.00
Cleveland.....	1,634	381	40.0	40.0	45.50	54.50	-9.00
Dallas.....	417	87	40.0	40.5	35.00	41.50	-6.50
Los Angeles-Long Beach.....	3,209	268	40.0	40.0	57.00	60.50	-3.50
Minneapolis-St. Paul.....	1,146	171	40.0	40.0	55.50	60.00	-4.50
New York.....	6,232	1,271	39.5	39.5	46.50	49.50	-3.00
Philadelphia.....	1,849	520	40.0	40.0	37.50	39.00	-1.50
Portland.....	511	54	40.0	41.5	58.00	61.00	-5.00
San Francisco-Oakland.....	1,037	228	40.0	40.0	64.50	65.50	-1.00

¹ Includes all areas in survey in which both men and women were working as physical therapists, X-ray technicians, and nursing aids and were paid on a time basis.

² Refers to amount by which women's earnings vary from men's earnings. Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Hotels, March-July 1960—Comparison of average hourly earnings of women and men room clerks

Area	Number of workers		Average hourly earnings		
	Women	Men	Women	Men	Difference ¹
Boston.....	9	69	\$1.43	\$1.53	-\$0.10
Buffalo.....	39	44	1.38	1.56	-.18
Chicago.....	39	149	1.37	1.76	-.39
Cleveland.....	16	32	1.44	1.48	-.04
Detroit.....	32	56	1.52	1.51	+.01
Kansas City.....	17	50	.92	1.30	-.38
Los Angeles-Long Beach.....	41	151	1.39	1.61	-.22
Miami.....	17	132	\$1.53	\$1.65	-\$0.12
Milwaukee.....	13	30	1.49	1.68	-.19
Minneapolis-St. Paul.....	13	46	1.40	1.44	-.04
New York.....	15	530	2.03	1.96	+.07
Philadelphia.....	7	65	1.56	1.69	-.13
St. Louis.....	15	48	1.18	1.44	-.26

¹ Refers to the amount by which women's earnings vary from men's earnings.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

PLANT WORKERS

Comparative earnings of men and women classified in three plant jobs and employed in identical establishments were analyzed in the Bureau of Labor Statistics' community wage survey of 1958-59. Again, it is pertinent to note that individual plant averages

for men and women in a specific job may be influenced by variations in job content and length of service.

It is interesting to note that the differences in average earnings of men and women were found to be least among passenger elevator operators and greatest among janitors. Men and women elevator operators

had similar average earnings in a majority of the establishments. However, for janitors and packers, the women's averages were below the men's in at least 70 percent of the establishments. In the latter firms, the difference was typically 15 cents an hour or more, as shown in the following table.

Establishment differences in earnings of men and women plantworkers

[Distribution of establishments by relationship between establishment averages for men and women in selected plant occupations, 20 labor markets, winter 1958-59]

Relationship of women's hourly earnings to men's	Janitors, porters, and cleaners	Packers, shipping	Elevator operators, passenger	Relationship of women's hourly earnings to men's	Janitors, porters, and cleaners	Packers, shipping	Elevator operators, passenger
Establishments with women's average higher than men's ¹	58	16	14	3 to 5 cents.....	52	9	3
25 cents or more.....	3	2	5 to 7 cents.....	64	10	7
23 to 25 cents.....	7 to 9 cents.....	63	8	6
21 to 23 cents.....	1	9 to 11 cents.....	63	14	6
19 to 21 cents.....	5	11 to 13 cents.....	63	14
17 to 19 cents.....	2	1	13 to 15 cents.....	56	6	2
15 to 17 cents.....	2	3	15 to 17 cents.....	45	6	5
13 to 15 cents.....	6	2	17 to 19 cents.....	52	2
11 to 13 cents.....	2	2	19 to 21 cents.....	47	6	1
9 to 11 cents.....	2	1	21 to 23 cents.....	38	6	2
7 to 9 cents.....	4	3	1	23 to 25 cents.....	28	6
5 to 7 cents.....	13	3	2	25 cents or more.....	319	43	3
3 to 5 cents.....	18	3	7				
Establishments in which difference was less than 3 cents.....	284	39	61				

¹ Limited to establishments in which the difference in average hourly earnings is 3 cents or more. Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

The occupation of operatives included 3.3 million women and 8.4 million men in 1961, but relatively few of these workers appeared to be doing similar work. The numerous wage surveys made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in manufacturing industries yield relatively few examples of men and women in the same occupations and paid on a time basis. The examples which may be found virtually all show women receiving lower average earnings than men, as illustrated in the following occupational data for six manufacturing industries:

Manufacturing industries, 1960-61—Comparisons of average hourly earnings of men and women, by occupation

Occupation and area ¹	Number of workers		Average hourly earnings			Occupation and area ¹	Number of workers		Average hourly earnings		
	Women	Men	Women	Men	Difference ²		Women	Men	Women	Men	Difference ²
A. Nonelectrical machinery (May 1961): Assemblers, class C, Chicago, Ill. Machine-tool operators, production, class C: Chicago, Ill. Hartford-New Britain-Bristol, Conn.	613	734	\$1.68	\$2.07	-\$0.39	D. Women's and misses' dresses (August 1960): Hand pressers: Fall River-New Bedford, Mass. New York City: All shops..... Contract shops.....	230	58	\$1.71	\$1.78	-\$0.07
B. Men's and boys' shirts (except work-shirts) and night shirts (May 1961): Sewing machine operators, New York City..... Sewing machine operators on sport shirts: New York City..... New York State.....	167	1,138	1.71	2.05	-.34	E. Synthetic textiles (August 1960): Twister tenders, ring frame, North Carolina..... Uptwisters, North Carolina..... Weavers: Allentown-Bethlehem, Pa. Maine and New Hampshire..... North Carolina.....	125	155	2.09	3.61	-1.52
C. Candy and other confectionery products (November-December 1960): Dipping machine operator helpers, Chicago, Ill.....	123	470	1.61	2.33	-.72	F. Miscellaneous plastic products (February 1960): Finishers, molded plastic products: Chicago, Ill..... Newark-Jersey City, N.J. Injection-molding machine operators, Chicago, Ill.....	79	73	1.87	3.84	-1.97
	99	432	1.73	1.94	-.21		509	318	1.29	1.29	0
	378	21	1.51	1.98	-.47		118	261	1.25	1.33	-.08
	318	17	1.52	2.06	-.54		49	65	2.02	2.07	-.05
	441	17	1.44	2.06	-.62		9	16	1.66	1.72	-.06
	357	11	1.22	1.35	-.13		33	109	1.60	1.64	-.04
							1,180	451	1.39	1.58	-.19
							336	105	1.43	1.46	-.03
							1,508	940	1.49	1.56	-.07

¹ Includes all surveyed occupations in the 6 industries which cover both men and women workers paid on a time basis only. Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.
² Refers to amount by which women's earnings vary from men's earnings.

Wage or salary income of women and men, 1955-60 (year-round full-time workers)

Year	Median wage or salary income		Percent women's income of men's
	Women	Men	
1960.....	\$3,293	\$5,417	61
1959.....	3,193	5,209	61
1958.....	3,102	4,927	63
1957.....	3,008	4,713	64
1956.....	2,827	4,466	63
1955.....	2,719	4,252	64

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

Even for the same major occupational groups, there are substantial differences in men's and women's incomes. In 1960, the greatest difference existed in the average earnings of men and women sales workers. The relatively best situated were the women

clerical workers, who averaged almost seven-tenths as much as men clerical workers. Comparative earnings of men and women in the same major occupational groups are shown below:

Wage or salary income of women and men in selected occupations, 1960 (year-round full-time workers)

Occupational group	Median wage or salary income		Percent women's income of men's
	Women	Men	
Sales workers.....	\$2,428	\$5,755	42
Managers, officials.....	4,173	7,241	58
Service workers (except private household).....	2,418	4,089	59
Operatives.....	2,970	4,977	60
Professional workers.....	4,384	6,848	64
Clerical workers.....	3,586	5,247	68

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

Average earnings of men and women workers, 1960

[Average annual wage or salary income]	
All workers:	
Men.....	\$5,417
Women.....	3,293
Sales workers:	
Men.....	5,755
Women.....	2,428
Managers, officials, etc.:	
Men.....	7,241
Women.....	4,173
Professional workers:	
Men.....	6,848
Women.....	4,384
Operatives:	
Men.....	4,977
Women.....	2,970
Service workers (except private household):	
Men.....	4,089
Women.....	2,418
Clerical workers:	
Men.....	5,247
Women.....	3,586

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

ECONOMIC INDICATORS RELATING TO EQUAL
PAY, 1962

I. JOB HIRING ORDERS

When reporting job vacancies to employment offices, employers in States without equal pay legislation sometimes list a vacancy with a single job title but a higher hiring rate for men than for women. About 120 examples of job orders with wage differentials were found by a Women's Bureau rep-

resentative who visited public employment offices in five cities in 1961. A majority of the job orders examined, however, indicated that employers desired either "men only" or "women only" for a specific job opening. Many other job orders, of course, listed one job title and one job rate, without any sex preference.

Most of the hiring orders with wage differentials based on sex were for clerical, service, or sales jobs. Probable reasons for

this concentration are such factors as the kinds of jobs for which both men and women are hired, the prevalence of piece rates for many factory jobs, and different practices which employers follow in seeking various types of workers.

The following table is based on job orders on file in five public employment offices and lists selected examples of jobs with wage differentials:

Job hiring orders with wage differentials—Selected job orders in 5 cities, 1961

Job title	Industry	Hiring rate		Pay period	Job title	Industry	Hiring rate		Pay period
		Women	Men				Women	Men	
City A					City D—Continued				
Bookkeeper	Laundry	\$60.00	\$75.00	Week.	Bookkeeper	Moving	\$350.00	\$450.00	Month.
		70.00			Clerk-typist	Printing	60.00	65.00	Week.
Clerk typist	Distillery	1.87	2.19	Hour.	Copywriter	Publishing	55.00	Up to	Do.
Counter worker	Restaurant	.85	.90	Do.			60.00	100.00	
Multilith operator	Printing	1.25	Up to	Do.	General office clerk	Oil refining	300.00	325.00	Month.
		1.50	2.00		Keypunch operator	Metal manufacturing	240.00	260.00	Do.
							245.00	268.00	
City B					Meat helper	Retail trade	1.775	1.82	Hour.
Auditor	Hotel	90.00	100.00	Week.	Order clerk	Metal manufacturing	225.00	275.00	Month.
Bookkeeper	Construction	80.00	100.00	Do.			275.00		
		85.00			Presser, machine	Drycleaning	1.60	1.75	Hour.
Clerk-typist	Dental laboratory	240.00	275.00	Month.	Receptionist-salesclerk	Retail trade	70.00	80.00	Week.
Cook	Restaurant	35.00	45.00	Week.	Salesclerk	do	1.15	1.25	Hour.
Do	do	40.00	65.00	Do.			1.20		
Do	do	40.00	45.00	Do.	Silk screen printer	Business service	1.22	1.37	Do.
Do	do	45.00	50.00	Do.	Traffic clerk	Wholesale trade	270.00	300.00	Month.
Do	do	50.00	60.00	Do.					
Do	do	50.00	65.00	Do.	City E				
Do	do	50.00	55.00	Do.	Accounting clerk	Retail trade	42.00	45.00	Week.
Do	do	1.00	1.25	Hour.	Assembler	Electrical manufacturing	1.40	1.65	Hour.
Counter worker	Drugstore	33.00	35.00	Week.	Do	do	1.25	1.40	Do.
Do	Restaurant	33.00	38.00	Do.			1.35		
Do	do	35.00	40.00	Do.	Bookkeeper	Insurance	350.00	400.00	Month.
Do	do	40.00	45.00	Do.	Do	Printing	325.00	375.00	Do.
Do	do	45.00	50.00	Do.	Bookkeeping machine operator	Retail trade	300.00	325.00	Do.
Credit clerk	Retail trade	50.00	60.00	Do.				350.00	
Dishwasher, machine	Restaurant	38.00	45.00	Do.	Collector	Business service	250.00	350.00	Do.
General office clerk	Hospital	55.00	60.00	Do.	Cook	Restaurant	1.15	1.25	Hour.
Grocery checker	Retail trade	60.00	75.00	Do.			1.35	1.50	
Salesclerk	do	1.00	1.25	Hour.	Do	do	1.35	1.50	Do.
Do	do	1.00	1.125	Do.	Credit clerk	Wholesale trade	285.00	400.00	Month.
Teller	Credit agency	2,800.00	3,000.00	Year.			300.00		
Typist	Business service	65.00	75.00	Week.	Dishwasher, machine	Hospital	1.31	1.42	Hour.
					Elevator operator, passenger	Retail trade	1.40	1.60	Do.
City C					General office clerk	Wholesale trade	250.00	300.00	Month.
Cook	Restaurant	35.00	45.00	Do.	Grocery clerk	Retail trade	1.15	1.25	Hour.
		40.00	50.00		Inventory clerk	Metal manufacturing	250.00	300.00	Month.
Counter worker	do	30.00	40.00	Do.	Inventory control clerk	Machinery manufacturing	300.00	400.00	Do.
Grocery checker	Retail trade	56.88	62.90	Do.			450.00	550.00	
					Presser, machine	Dry cleaning	1.50	1.75	Hour.
					Do	do	45.00	60.00	Week.
					Salesclerk	Retail trade	50.00	60.00	Do.
								65.00	
					Do	do	1.00	1.25	Hour.
					Tailor	do	65.00	75.00	Week.
City D									
Accounting supervisor	Social service	310.00	325.00	Month.					
		325.00	350.00						
Animal hospital attendant	Animal hospital	1.15	1.25	Hour.					
Bookkeeper	Machinery manufacturing	70.00	85.00	Week.					
		75.00	90.00						
Do	Construction	65.00	75.00	Do.					
		75.00	100.00						

Mr. KEARNS. Madam Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN].

Mr. GRIFFIN. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the principle of the bill which is before the House today. As will be noted, the minority members of the Committee on Education and Labor joined in reporting this bill from the committee. As far as I know, there is little or no real opposition to the basic purpose of this legislation.

Madam Chairman, it is interesting to recall that the Republican platform in 1960 advocated equal pay for equal work, without discrimination on the basis of sex. The Democratic platform of 1960 contained a similar plank calling for equal pay for equal work.

During the deliberations of the committee on this bill a number of amend-

ments were offered and some were adopted. So the bill before us today is not precisely the legislation sent up by the administration.

There will be further amendments offered here on the floor of the House today. I should like to say, at the very outset, that our amendments, which will be relatively few in number, are designed to strengthen the principle of the bill and to make it practical and workable. It is not enough, I think, just to be blindly in favor of equal pay for equal work. We must also look at the language of the bill, and we must try to see how it will actually operate. I know that the women in this Congress, as well as the women around the country, are the last ones who would want, unduly or unnecessarily to inflict economic dislocation or to create serious unemployment.

Madam Chairman, I am very delighted and very pleased that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York, Mr. ZELENKO, has indicated at the outset that he favors and, in fact, will himself offer the amendment which I had earlier proposed to include labor organizations within the scope of this bill. I think it should be recognized that while most labor organizations are sincere in their statements favoring equal pay for equal work without regard to sex, and while the international labor organizations proclaim this over and over again, it is still a fact that, at the local levels, some labor unions—and I do not say a majority, or that there are a great many, but there are some, that do engage in discriminatory practices against women. In other situations, labor unions merely

condoned or do not object to such discrimination.

Madam Chairman, if we are to prohibit an employer, as we will under this bill, from discriminating in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, then surely it is only reasonable to make the prohibition applicable insofar as possible to labor organizations, for they are often directly involved in creating the conditions or situations which are discriminatory. In some union contracts today one wage scale is provided for women and a different scale is provided for men. In other instances discrimination is brought about in more subtle ways through the classification of employees and their jobs.

In an organized establishment, obviously, the union plays a very important part in determining the classification of jobs and employees. In negotiating, a union could propose and insist upon a classification system that would be in violation of this law.

I have not proposed the amendment, which the gentleman from New York [Mr. ZELENKO] has now agreed to offer, for the purpose of indicting the labor movement or labor unions in general, because such an indictment would not be justified. In fact, a good many labor organizations do have equal pay for equal work provisions in their union contracts and in their constitutions; they enforce these provisions and live up to them.

When she appeared before the subcommittee, the distinguished and charming Assistant Secretary of Labor, the Honorable Esther Peterson, pointed out, at page 58 of the hearings, that only 38 percent of labor organizations, surveyed in 1956 by the Labor Department, actually had equal pay provisions in their contracts.

This does not mean that all the rest of the unions condone or encourage discrimination; however, it is interesting to note that equal pay provisions apparently have not enjoyed high priority in the contract negotiations of many unions.

The amendment to include labor unions, which will be a part of the substitute to be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ZELENKO], is a good amendment from another standpoint; labor unions are made accountable and responsible for their part, if any, in discriminating against women, this should help immeasurably in the administration of this act. Those who do not want hordes of bureaucrats roaming around to enforce this law can find here a way to make the bill self-policing, at least in establishments where there is union organization. This is an important, a sound, and a good amendment. I commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. ZELENKO] for supporting my amendment and for offering it. The amendment will strengthen the equal pay bill and make it more effective. I wish also to commend the AFL-CIO as well as the other members of our committee for their support of my amendment.

Mr. ZELENKO. Madam Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Madam Chairman, I have been assigned the task of explaining the enforcement procedure under this act. Whether one is for it or against it, each one is entitled to have a summary explanation of the enforcement procedures. Briefly, they are as follows:

First, a charge is filed. The charge must be filed under oath. A complainant cannot just file a piece of paper somewhere; it must be under oath. And the complaint must be filed by or for a person who is aggrieved. Outsiders may not file these charges. In addition to this, the complaint must cover an act that was committed within 1 prior year. Under other Labor Standards Acts—for example, Walsh-Healey, the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Davis-Bacon Act,—it is 2 years. Under this act it is 1 year. The act must have been committed within the previous year.

After the charge has been filed, the Secretary files a written charge with the employer only if there is reasonable cause to believe that there has been a violation. He must find that there is reasonable cause. He must, at the time he files this charge with the employer, set forth the facts upon which the charge is based and he must provide a copy of the charge that was filed with him, so that in any event the employer will know the nature of the charge which was filed.

Mr. KEARNS. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEARNS. Does not the gentleman think we are taking a new path in a problem here affecting men with families and women who are widows?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Any legislation involves new paths. I will say that this bill we are considering is extremely cautious in the new path we are taking.

After the employer has been served with a copy of the charge, the Secretary can make investigations and then he will either dismiss it or hold a conference with the employer. First he must resort to informal procedures rather than go into court first. So there is a conference with the employer, if there is reasonable cause to believe there has been a violation. Then if the employer will not through these informal procedures comply with the law, a civil action can be filed in a Federal district court. At this point it could, of course, be dismissed or the Secretary can ask for an injunction to prohibit continuation of this violation of the law. In the event there is restitution, it cannot be for more than twice the wages that would have been owed. Of course it is limited to a period of 1 year prior to the time of the notice of the charge.

In the case of Government contracts, and there are a good number of them now, we have provided that the contracts shall include an agreement that

they will not violate the law. If they violate the law, then, only after a court has determined that they have violated the law, may they be prohibited from getting Government contracts until they obey the law. This prohibition against being awarded more contracts is only for the time they are deemed by the court to be in violation of the law and their agreement and have refused to purge themselves of that violation.

I think the procedure here, although it is effective, is rather cautious.

Mr. HARDY. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. In the beginning of the gentleman's remarks he called attention to the fact that whenever a charge is made it must be presented in writing and under oath, and by or on behalf of the person claiming to be aggrieved. Would the gentleman indicate who could bring such an action?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. "On behalf of" in this case means an agent, either an agent you appoint or one that by operation of law is deemed to be your agent.

Mr. HARDY. That is the thing I wanted to be sure is spelled out, so that we would not have some self-appointed individuals running around making unfounded allegations or initiating unwarranted actions.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That was the purpose, so that the person himself or someone that he permits to act on his behalf must file the charge.

Mr. HARDY. The individual aggrieved would have to request that someone act for him?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Yes; that is right.

Mr. KEARNS. Madam Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER].

Mrs. DWYER. Madam Chairman, the Equal Pay Act of 1962 deserves our wholehearted support.

What does the act provide? It provides for simple justice for the women of this country who work for a living. Women should not be discriminated against in the wages they are paid just because they are women. Who can quarrel with the aim of H.R. 11667, to prevent such discrimination in certain employment related to interstate commerce? Who will say with seriousness that a worker deserves less for doing the same work as another worker because one is a man and one is a woman? The result that the bill seeks is merely payment of "the rate for the job." It does not prescribe wages; it does not tell an employer what rates he shall pay, nor does it prevent a union from bargaining for wages at any particular level. It merely says to individual employers within its coverage, "You may not make invidious distinction in wage rates based on sex alone."

Madam Chairman, the measure before us is just to men as well as to women. Further, it is just to employers because it protects them against the unfair com-

petition of those who underpay their women workers. Justice alone is a sufficient argument for this bill—but let me mention, too, some practical arguments for its adoption which are also weighty. The importance of this bill today does not arise from chance; it arises from the growing importance of women in our labor force. Today, we have more than 24 million women workers; 10 years from now, that figure will exceed 30 million. These workers are indispensable to our national well-being—to our survival—and they need and should have the incentive of fair and equal treatment in the basic economic area of wage rates.

Please remember that H.R. 11667 will confer no special favors on women workers. It will require only that they be accorded the dignity that comes from equality of treatment and the recognition of the worthiness of their labor. There is nothing more degrading to a worker than to be downgraded in pay for reasons that have no rational basis. We cannot afford such discrimination against the vital part of our work force which women now represent. We need the skills, we need the efforts, and we need the talents of our women workers. We will only receive the full benefits of their efforts when we reciprocate in rewarding their efforts equally with those of men.

There are those who say that we do not need this bill. Ten years ago exactly, Madam Chairman, there were those in New Jersey who used this same argument. But we persisted, and New Jersey became one of the few States—at that time—to enact an equal pay for women statute. As the sponsor of that legislation, I can state in accuracy and in pride that the results have been highly beneficial. I believe the time has long since arrived, however, when the benefits and protections of an equal pay law should be extended beyond the borders of individual States and embrace all of interstate commerce.

Madam Chairman, I wish that I could agree that this bill is not needed, that there are no instances of unequal pay practices which still require correction. But, unfortunately, that is not the case. Discrimination against our women workers cannot be visualized in terms of past history. The more than 50 statements of witnesses at the recent hearings refute the notion that wage discrimination has been ended. It exists now and must be stopped. Though enlightened employers and enlightened unions recognize the evils of unequal pay practices, their efforts alone are far from adequate to stamp them out, since the unorganized woman worker is most vulnerable to these practices.

Madam Chairman, the Equal Pay Act of 1962 is a sound and constructive bill based on the fundamental principle that the worker is worthy of his hire—regardless of whether a man or a woman. Moreover, the act is also an economic necessity to mobilize the full productive force of our womanpower. It should be

passed without crippling amendments and without delay.

Mrs. MAY. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MAY. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 11677, the Equal Pay Act of 1962.

I do not consider women a special class to be set aside for special privileges, but I do feel strongly that women are first-class citizens whose equal rights under the law should be protected.

We in the State of Washington are fortunate to have good laws, by and large, which give protection to men and women on an equal basis. But in many States, women are not receiving equal pay for equal work. The Equal Pay Act of 1962 is intended to eliminate discrimination in wage rates based on sex where men and women are performing similar or equal work for the same employer. The proposal would apply to employers whose employees are engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce.

It is widely recognized, Madam Chairman, that the payment of lower wage rates to workers of one sex for the same work as that performed by the other sex has an undesirable effect on the economic life of the entire Nation. Such practices tend to affect adversely the general purchasing power and the standards of living of workers. Unfair competitive advantages are enjoyed by employers who pay discriminatory rates based on sex. In addition to the economic ills caused by discriminatory wage practices, such practices violate fundamental principles of justice and impair prestige of the United States in international affairs.

A nondiscriminatory wage level makes possible the maximum utilization of worker skills. This, together with collateral benefits, such as morale improvement, may stimulate production and lessen the effects of unfair competition.

Thus, Madam Chairman, it is of great importance that the Congress eradicate discriminatory pay practices in interstate commerce, and without hesitation I urge favorable consideration of this legislation by this body at this time.

Mr. ZELENKO. Madam Chairman, at this time I am happy to yield 5 minutes to a pioneer in this legislation, the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN].

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Madam Chairman, may I say first of all that I appreciate the comment of the chairman of the subcommittee. However, I must say, in all fairness, that the gentlewoman from New York who is presiding here introduced legislation in this body long before I did, as have others of my colleagues. I have worked for this legislation during the 8 years I have been in Congress and even longer than that.

I would like to comment, Madam Chairman, that perhaps no piece of legislation has served as the basis of so many jokes as legislation having to do with equal pay for equal work, and I suppose that many of us have enjoyed them. But I must also say to my colleagues that for many millions of women throughout the Nation this is not a joke. To me, it is something we are deeply concerned about.

I may also say I have never considered myself as a suffragette, and yet this is a piece of legislation on which I feel very strongly. This bill is the culmination of a long struggle. Although bills have been introduced every year dating back to World War II they never have reached the floor of the House.

I do not need to read the statistics, but there is demonstrable proof of wage discrimination against women—in the professions, in clerical positions, in skilled and in unskilled categories.

I quote from a survey report submitted to the hearings before the Select Committee on Labor of the Committee on Education and Labor in March of this year:

At the University of Wisconsin, a placement official observes: "The double wage standard still holds, except in mathematics and sciences." Starting salaries for women will edge upward this year but will still lag by \$50 to \$100 a month behind offers to men for equivalent positions.

I quote the following from page 31 of the hearings:

For example, in a 1961 survey of wages in nonelectrical machinery firms in Chicago, women assemblers (class C) averaged \$1.68 an hour, while men averaged \$2.07; women machine-tool operators (class C) averaged \$1.71, while men averaged \$2.05. In the latter classification, in the Hartford-New Britain-Bristol, Conn., area, the difference was even greater—\$1.61 for women, as compared with \$2.33 for men. Among drill-press operators, single or multiple spindle (class C) in Chicago, women averaged \$1.73 an hour and men averaged \$1.94 an hour.

Similar patterns emerge from surveys in the clothing industry in New York City, in confectionery products in Chicago, and even in some of the newer industries.

Women weavers in other States including Maine, New Hampshire, and an area in Pennsylvania also averaged 5 and 6 cents an hour less than men.

In another of the newer industries, plastic products (February 1960, Chicago) women employed as finishers (on molded plastic products) received average hourly earnings of \$1.39; and men, \$1.58.

A retailer seeking an accounting clerk offered \$42 a week for a woman employee and \$45 a week for a man worker. A distillery with a clerk-typist job to be filled offered \$1.87 an hour for a woman employee and \$2.19 an hour for a man worker. An electrical manufacturer with a job opening for an assembler offered \$1.40 an hour for a woman worker and \$1.55 an hour for a man employee. A machinery manufacturer seeking a bookkeeper offered from \$70 to \$75 a week for a woman worker and from \$85 to \$90 a week for a man.

The following table is very revealing in this matter of discrimination in industry.

Employer job orders for workers, 1961

Job title	Industry	Hiring rate		Period
		Women	Men	
Accounting clerk	Retail trade	\$42.00	\$45.00	Week.
Assembler	Electrical manufacturing	1.40	1.55	Hour.
Do.	do	\$1.25-1.35	1.40	Do.
Bookkeeper	Machinery manufacturing	70.00-75.00	\$85.00-90.00	Week.
Do.	Insurance	350.00	400.00	Month.
Do.	Printing	325.00	375.00	Do.
Do.	Moving	350.00	450.00	Do.
Clerk typist	Distillery	1.87	2.19	Hour.
Do.	Printing	60.00	65.00	Week.
Copywriter	Publishing	55.00-60.00	Up to 100.00	Do.
Credit clerk	Retail trade	50.00	60.00	Do.
Do.	Wholesale trade	265.00-300.00	400.00	Month.
Elevator operator, passenger	Retail trade	1.40	1.60	Hour.
General office clerk	Oil refining	300.00	325.00	Month.
Do.	Wholesale trade	250.00	300.00	Do.
Grocery checker	Retail trade	56.88	62.90	Week.
Inventory clerk	Metal manufacturing	250.00	300.00	Month.
Key punch operator	do	240.00-245.00	260.00-265.00	Do.
Order clerk	do	225.00-275.00	275.00	Do.
Receptionist-sales clerk	Retail trade	70.00	80.00	Week.
Sales clerk	do	1.00-1.05	1.25	Hour.
Do.	do	1.00	1.125	Do.
Tailor	do	65.00	75.00	Week.
Teller	Credit agency	2,800.00	3,000.00	Year.
Traffic clerk	Wholesale trade	270.00	300.00	Month.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau. "Economic Indicators Relating to Equal Pay, 1962."

Seven million women in the United States are employed at jobs that pay less than \$1 an hour.

In 1960 the median wage for men workers was \$5,417 and for women it was \$3,293—\$2,124 less.

The Chairman of the Civil Service Commission has stated that the ratio of women to men in Federal positions paying \$10,000 or more was 17 to 1,430. This great disparity in per capita earnings is reflected in per capita retirement annuities, which are \$1,417 for women and \$1,805 for men.

A February survey by the Wall Street Journal covering 30 college placement officials and 50 corporation personnel executives showed that the starting salaries for women graduating from college this June would lag \$50 to \$100 a month behind job offers to men graduates for equivalent positions.

These wage discriminations can be documented over and over again. Women are paid on a different basis than men, but they pay taxes on the same basis as men.

Many years ago, Edmund Burke said: Where there is abuse, there ought to be clamor.

I think it is fair to say that women's organizations with membership of 12 million have been clamoring—have been working against various forms of discrimination for many, many, years.

Today in this House we have the opportunity to do what we promise at election time. We Americans, men and women alike, recently have felt a surge of pride and gratitude because of the thoroughness of Dr. Frances Kelsey, the woman researcher who refused to approve for distribution in the United States a dangerous, deforming drug that had been marketed in other countries. Passage of this bill means that any women, such as Dr. Kelsey, who work in private laboratories shall receive fair play in the form of pay equal to that of their fellow male scientists.

In supporting this equal pay legislation, the American Association of University Women, the Business and Pro-

fessional Women's Clubs, the National Association of Woman Lawyers, the National Education Association, the National Council of Catholic Women, the National Council of Jewish Women, the National Council of Negro Women, the American Nurses Association, the National Board of the YWCA—all of these organizations supporting equal pay legislation—are simply asking for fair treatment, for which there is no substitute.

Also may I suggest that this legislation has been studied very carefully by the memberships of these organizations. A bill that is called equal pay for equal work, but that is watered down, that has the enforcement procedures removed, that says much but means nothing—this kind of bill will not fool anyone. These women have too long suffered the abuses of this discrimination. They know exactly what is in the bill, and they know that any crippling amendment that might be offered in the guise of strengthening it will not do so.

I may say to my colleagues I hope that, if and when crippling amendments are offered, they will be defeated by substantial majorities.

What does this bill do? It is a modest approach to a problem of great magnitude. This bill does not establish any minimum wage, it does not fix any wage rate at all, it does not in any way affect the seniority system or the merit system, it does not affect the job classification program unless there is discrimination based purely on sex. It does not affect area wage differentials, it does not affect the wages paid between one employer and another.

Yesterday when I was on the floor, I heard comments that if this bill were passed it would drive the textile mills out of one section of the country to another. I would say to my colleagues that nothing could be further from the truth.

This bill applies only to employees employed by 1 employer within a single location, and only if there are 25 or more employees in that particular plant. I

cannot see how anyone could object to provisions as essentially fair as these.

It seems to me the question for us to decide is: Are we going to condone employment practices that discriminate against women? Are we going to condone a basic injustice to women workers?

It is against this background and this order of problems that we consider this legislation today. The United States has made great progress against other forms of discrimination, but the United States is lagging behind other countries in doing something about this.

Madam Chairman, I urge the support of this bill and recommend its passage.

Mr. ZELENKO. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT].

Mr. DENT. Madam Chairman, this is a very important piece of legislation. Its aims have been approved by many of our leading educators, labor and business leaders, and in the main is widely supported by the people of all areas of activities.

The principle of equality cannot be denied in any field of endeavor in a nation whose basic ruling concept is one based upon equality.

I have supported efforts in this direction over a whole generation of legislative activities. I am happy to be able to lend my support in this effort today.

Our committee has given this bill many hours of study and many days of public hearings.

We believe it to be essential to the continuing growth of our economy and to the enhancement of our way of life.

The following analysis shows how thorough the committee has been:

SUMMARY OF MAJOR PROVISIONS OF EQUAL PAY ACT OF 1962—H.R. 11677

Section 3: "Employer" means any person (except the United States or any State or political subdivision thereof) engaged in commerce or the production of goods for commerce who has 25 or more employees.

Section 4: Employers shall not discriminate in the payment of wages because of the employee's sex. Employers must pay equal wages to employees doing comparable work the performance of which requires comparable skills. Wages differentials based on seniority, merit increase or bona fide job classification programs are not deemed discriminatory.

Section 5: The Secretary of Labor shall provide rules and regulations for administering this act. The employer's good faith reliance on such regulations shall be a valid defense in any alleged violation proceedings.

Section 6: Whenever a charge is filed by or on behalf of a person claiming to be aggrieved or by the Secretary, a copy thereof shall be sent to the respondent and an investigation shall commence. If the investigation discloses a violation, the Secretary shall attempt to effect compliance, by informal means of conference, conciliation, and persuasion. Failing voluntary compliance, the Secretary may bring a civil action in the proper U.S. district court. No such action may be brought if based on violations occurring 1 year prior to the filing of the charge. If the respondent is found guilty of the charged violation, it may issue an injunction and order payment of back wages plus liquidated damages not exceeding the amount of back wages. Issues of fact may be heard by a master, and the proceedings shall be advanced on the court docket. The remedies provided by this section shall be

exclusive. Labor Department attorneys may appear and represent the Secretary in any litigation, subject to the direction and control of the Attorney General.

Section 7 authorizes the Secretary to supervise back-wage payments owed to an employee.

Section 8: No Federal contract involving \$10,000 or more shall be let unless it stipulates that the contractor is subject to all provisions of this act. No contract may be awarded any person adjudged in violation of this act until he has complied with all court orders.

Section 9: Posting requirement.

Section 10 preempts State law except that the Secretary may cede jurisdiction over certain cases where State law is not inconsistent with this act.

Section 11 authorizes the appropriation of sums (not in excess of \$1,500,000 for fiscal 1962) as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Section 12 provides that this act become effective 120 days after date of enactment.

Mr. KEARNS. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mrs. WEIS].

Mrs. WEIS. Madam Chairman, I wholeheartedly endorse the Equal Pay Act of 1962, which has the basic purpose of securing wage justice for working women by preventing discriminatory wage practices on the basis of sex in employment in interstate commerce.

The fact that a law is required to insure the democratic principle of equal pay for equal work should be a source of embarrassment in America—the world's leading democracy. However, as we all know, discrimination in wage payments on the basis of sex continues to exist, even though it is often successfully concealed.

In the past, in the area of remedial labor legislation, the Federal Government has been a source of inspiration to the States by leading the way. It has also often provided models for other countries to adopt. In the area of equal pay for women, however, the Federal Government lags far behind. Twenty-two States have equal pay laws; and Canada, our neighbor to the north, has a Federal law and eight provincial laws. I think it is imperative that Congress, by the enactment of this legislation, eliminate the tarnish of unequal pay practices on the irrelevant basis of sex from an otherwise respectable record of achievement in labor legislation.

Mental capacity, talent, imagination, and initiative are not parceled out on the basis of sex. In the space age, with the premium on excellence in these various qualities, this Nation cannot afford to waste its human resources by discriminatory pay practices which demean and cheapen the contributions of women. We need policies and practices which stimulate maximum effort and excellence in performance. I can think of no more pernicious method of discouraging women employees from making their maximum contribution than to pay them less, merely because they are women. Moreover, the specter of unequal rewards for equal or superior endeavors tends to discourage young women from exerting extra efforts preparing for the more rewarding careers. The actualities of unequal pay are disheartening to the work-

ing women and dampen the incentive for excellence in job performance.

Equal pay for women is important to help maintain the stability of the Nation's work force; to insure maximum utilization of our human resources and to promote our economic growth. Madam Chairman, equal pay for equal work is an expression of our national ideals which should be embodied in the laws of this Nation. I strongly urge the enactment of this legislation.

Mr. KEARNS. Madam Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND].

Mr. HIESTAND. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the principle of equal pay for equal work. No one can argue against that principle. It is a fundamental principle of American liberty and fairness. We want to see equal pay for equal work.

My own personal experience over a great many years attests the fact that we have put into practice this principle. Women have been employed in very large numbers all over the United States in the companies with which I have been associated, and consistently and constantly we adjusted the rates based upon production, the compensation being in relation to how much an individual could produce, regardless of sex.

There are many jobs that women can do much better than men. We do, however, adhere to the principle that equal pay is the American way.

Madam Chairman, that does not mean that the bill before us is perfect.

In my judgment it is far from it in some ways. It is weak in some ways; it is punitive in other ways. It is poorly drawn and could be self-defeating in some ways, and that you and I certainly do not want to tolerate. Let us not be swayed by sentimental or emotional appeal. That is not necessary in this House of Representatives. We believe in equal pay for equal work.

While "equal pay for equal work" is a fundamentally sound and desirable principle, its application in specific cases is often extremely complex and controversial due to the difficulty of comparing jobs in order to define what is, in fact, "equal work." I think there are few representatives of labor or management who would claim that it is possible to develop a job-evaluation system which could be depended upon in all cases to produce fair and mutually acceptable determinations of "work of comparable character on jobs the performance of which requires comparable skills."

I quote those words from the bill, and we are going to hear some more about the difference in those words. After all, "comparable" implies not necessarily "equal." There can be very unequal things compared, and what we want to be sure of is the title of the bill carries through in the language of the bill and in its meaning.

In an area of industrial relations where a sound principle cannot be consistently applied by clear-cut administrative determination, the only effective way to achieve the desired objective is through voluntary action and collective bargaining. Governmental control in such an

area is completely unjustified and would only multiply the army of bureaucrats that would be needed to exert such control.

This bill would largely increase the power of the Secretary of Labor and the executive branch.

If the gap between principle and practice in this matter is so great as to involve substantial injustice and economic loss, it seems to me that the most desirable approach by the Federal Government would be through research, education, and persuasion. The exercise of compulsive power by the Federal Government provided for in H.R. 11677 would, in my judgment, interfere with normal collective bargaining and involve the Government in problems that can most justly and efficiently be worked out by labor and management.

Now, this bill is not a wage-fixing bill. As it is worded, it would seem to be, because it would imply that one company with units in various parts of the country would have to pay the same rates for equal jobs; at least, parallel jobs. That is not practicable and it is not what this House has in mind. Discrimination we wish to stamp out as between men and women of equal abilities and equal production. They should be similarly and equally compensated, and we all agree on that. But, this bill needs several very important amendments, and I hope that to make this bill effective the Members of the House will be present and listen to them and will sustain these amendments, because they can make this bill effective, and it might not otherwise be so.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I note on page 2:

It was the intention of the committee in designing the legislation not to create an additional Federal bureaucracy but to employ existing investigatory facilities already available within the Department of Labor and thus to minimize the administrative costs of this new program.

Now, it is my understanding that this bill is going to require 242 additional employees; that the initial cost will be a million dollars per year, and that within 3 or 4 years the cost will increase to \$1.7 million-odd a year. Would the gentleman care to comment on the statement in the report that this is not going to increase the bureaucracy?

Mr. HIESTAND. That is a matter of opinion. Matters of the future are matters of opinion. I think the gentleman from Iowa is correct in his interpretation. It is going to cost more. It cannot be intelligently administered, effectively and fairly administered without them, and I think his estimate may be correct.

Mr. GROSS. I am relying on an estimate made by the Department.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I ask the gentleman whether it is not true that the estimate of additional personnel referred to by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is not the estimate submitted by the Department of Labor in compliance with Public Law 801 of the 84th Congress

which requires where there is to be additional expenditure for personal services of \$1 million or more as a result of new legislation, there must be submitted an estimate of the number of additional positions for the ensuing first 5 years?

Mr. HIESTAND. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. JOHANSEN. My question is this: Is it not a fact that the estimate of 242 additional new positions is based on that very report?

Mr. HIESTAND. It is.

Mr. ZELENKO. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Madam Chairman, the Equal Pay Act of 1962, H.R. 11677, which is now before the House, is a bill which will assure wage justice for the 24½ million women now in our work force. It will encourage women, as well as men, to develop their skills and potentials to the maximum in the assurance that they will be compensated in their work on the basis of their job performance. Sex should play no part in the determination of wage rates. It has been clearly established that women are equally, and sometimes more, skilled and competent to perform comparable work as men. Men and women are equal partners in the labor force and hence are entitled to be treated as equal partners in the rate of their compensation. The bill now before us is simply to assure workers that they will be paid on the basis of their job performance without regard to sex.

Equal-pay bills have been introduced in every session of Congress since 1945 by Members of both political parties. H.R. 11677 has the support of many distinguished Members of this Congress, of specialists in the field of labor relations, of unions, of national organizations. At hearings before the Select Subcommittee on Labor of the Education and Labor Committee, overwhelming evidence was presented of the continuing practice of paying women workers less than men for doing comparable work, of the vital contribution of women workers to the labor force and the economy, of the compelling reasons which force women to work, of the degrading effects on worker morale and productivity caused by unjust wage discrimination, and of the undercutting of the wage rates to men when women workers can be obtained at less pay.

I have devoted my life to the battles of eliminating unjust discrimination of all kinds. Wage discrimination based on the worker's sex, crosses color, religious, and ethnic lines. It affects the women of all races, creeds, and ethnic backgrounds.

This bill, if passed, will be primarily and immediately beneficial to women. More specifically, it will be even more beneficial to Negro women who, because of the dual discrimination they encounter, are the victims of the most unjust wage rates. This bill will relieve them at least of the downgrading discrimination based on sex.

The Equal Pay Act is a measure long overdue and vitally needed. This is our opportunity to show the hard-working ladies of our land that we, the Members of this great House of Representatives, appreciate the economic contributions they have made and continue to make in our society, and that we feel they are entitled to the full fruits of their labor without discrimination.

Mr. ZELENKO. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Madam Chairman, for the past 40 years women workers have become an increasingly significant part of this country's labor force. The more than 24 million working women are about one-third of the labor force today. One-third of all adult women work.

These women workers are essential to our economy. They work to support themselves and their families, or to contribute to essential family living expenses. Over 2 million working women qualify technically as heads of families. Others who do not so qualify are still the primary wage earner in the family. Many married women work to help put their children through college. According to the American Association of Land Grant Colleges and State Universities tuition to State residents at major public universities has increased an average of 71 percent in the period from 1952 to 1960.

Women workers tend to be found in the lower paying occupations. And, at hearings held this session by the Select Labor Subcommittee of the Education and Labor Committee, workers themselves, unions, national organizations, and specialists testified to the continuing practice of paying women workers less than men for the same or comparable work. This inequality has serious effects on the standard of living of these workers and their families and it is demoralizing to all workers.

Only 22 States have equal-pay laws and these vary widely in coverage and effectiveness. A Federal law is needed to protect women workers in those States without such legislation, or with ineffective laws, and to protect employers in States with such legislation or voluntarily complying from unfair competition from those paying a lower wage to one group of workers than to others performing comparable work.

H.R. 11677, the Equal Pay Act of 1962, prohibits discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in interstate commerce or the production of goods for interstate commerce. It exempts employers of 25 or fewer persons. By providing for administration and enforcement by the Secretary of Labor, it makes it possible to use existing machinery.

H.R. 11677 has been endorsed by a distinguished list of Members of this Congress, by other knowledgeable individuals, by national organizations, and by unions. I urge support of it here.

Mr. ZELENKO. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Madam Chairman, I do not believe any of my worthy colleagues have emphasized the point that we are lamentably behind many other countries in taking action to require equal pay for equal work irrespective of sex, or that the lack of Federal equal pay legislation reflects on our international standing.

The U.S. representative on the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women, the Honorable Gladys Tillett, made telling observations on this in her testimony on H.R. 11677. Mrs. Tillett has recently made an on-the-spot study of the position of women in southeast Asia. She said:

Everywhere I found that great emphasis is being placed on full equality for women. All the countries I visited had given women full political rights and the majority had adopted laws or constitutional provisions requiring equal pay.

Countries mentioned which have either constitutional or statutory provisions requiring equal pay included: Burma, Indonesia, Thailand, Japan, India, and Vietnam.

As a delegate to the ILO meeting of 1961, I was impressed by the fact that the ILO Equal Pay Convention has been adopted by 38 countries and that the European Economic Community under the Rome Treaty has established an equal pay principle with which all of the member countries have agreed to comply.

Throughout the world, strong movements for equality are apparent among many peoples. Is it any wonder therefore, that in this country—young in age but one of the oldest in the world in democratic tradition—women should strive to be rid of a lingering inequality which is in direct opposition to this tradition. There is no doubt that women workers should be assured the very basic return of equal pay with men for the same job performance in our industrial life.

We need as never before to update our entire economic machinery. We need to utilize our best brains and skills and none should be denied or discouraged by outworn prejudices and practices. I therefore strongly endorse H.R. 11677.

Mr. ZELENKO. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

Payment of wages in accordance with the requirements of the job is a basic principle of our American free enterprise system. However, as between the sexes, this principle is not fully applied. Unequal pay between men and women employed by the same employer on the same or comparable jobs is found to some extent at almost every occupational level. Wage discriminations exist both for factory workers and for highly trained professional women and business executives. This is both unfair and contrary to our principles. Women compose an integral and essential part of this country's labor force, constituting

approximately one-third of the total number of workers. Women as well as men work because of economic necessity, and many working women support children, dependent parents, or husbands. The cost of food, rent, and other essentials of living are the same for both men and women.

However, it is not these considerations but the proven efficiency of women workers and the essential part they play in the economy which entitle women to equal pay. Women workers have amply demonstrated their ability to perform a wide variety of jobs successfully and skillfully.

Men workers as well as women workers, their families, and employers benefit from equal pay. Women benefit by receiving the rate for the job instead of a lower rate based on their sex. Men benefit through increased job security since employers are discouraged from replacing them with lower paid women. The families of both men and women workers benefit. Employers benefit through the removal of a source of poor morale, labor disputes, and unfair competition on the basis of wage rates. The community as a whole benefits from the greater purchasing power.

I urge adoption of this legislation which would give women equal pay to that paid men for similar work.

Mr. ZELENKO. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS].

Mr. DANIELS. Madam Chairman, less than 50 years ago a majority of women in this country did not enjoy the right of franchise. Gradually 22 States enacted State laws granting suffrage to women. Then in 1920, Congress enacted the well-known 19th amendment to the Federal Constitution:

The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States, or by any State, on account of sex.

Thus women gained political rights.

Today we are not fighting for voting rights. We are fighting, however, for the economic rights of women, those rights which are now of equal importance to women throughout our Nation. Again 22 States have taken the initiative—this time by enacting State laws granting equal pay for equal work to women. And again the time has come to adopt a Federal law eliminating discrimination of the sexes.

H.R. 11677, the equal pay bill of 1962, represents such an attempt to eliminate discrimination on account of sex. The bill simply prohibits an employer having employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce from discriminating between employees by paying lower wages to one sex than he pays to the other sex for substantially the same job. The equal pay bill proposes that the Secretary of Labor prescribe such regulations and rules as he deems necessary and appropriate for the administration of this act, that he have the right to investigate and gather data regarding the wages, hours, conditions, and practices of employment in any industry subject to this act, and that if his endeavors to eliminate any

unlawful discriminatory practice by the informal methods of conference, conciliation, and persuasion fail, the Secretary shall have the power to petition any U.S. district court within the jurisdiction of which the violation of this act occurred. The jurisdiction of the court shall then be exclusive and its judgment final.

Let me emphasize that this legislation does not try to standardize wage rates between different employers within an industry. It does not attempt to fix any minimum wage. It does not even suggest that employers in similar industries charge similar rates. It is merely a bill which states the basic rule of equality of opportunity—a bill which merely advocates the principle that two human beings making the same contribution should both receive the same reward, the same pay. The issue is as simple as that.

Now let us examine the drastic need for such legislation and the benefits which will be accrued by all when such legislation is passed. As was mentioned previously, only 22 States have enacted State laws granting equal pay for equal work to women. It is a fact that throughout our Nation women are being discriminated against. One need only review the testimony received by the Select Subcommittee on Labor to confirm this fact. Assistant Secretary of Labor Mrs. Peterson points out that in 1960 women's median wage and salary income was just 61 percent of men's income. Mrs. Peterson further shows that these percentage differences prevail in nearly all the major occupational groups. A female accounting clerk, bookkeeper, clerk-typist, elevator operator, grocery checker, tailor, and so forth, almost invariably receive a smaller salary than do their male counterparts. Discrimination of the sexes exists in retail trade, wholesale trade, insurance, printing, moving, and in a myriad of other occupations.

The time has come for us to leave the dark ages and eliminate discrimination of the sexes. As long as this discrimination prevails, unfair competition will flourish. This bill will substantially diminish the possibilities of using women to force wages down and of taking advantage of the sharp competition for jobs in times of severe unemployment.

Few will doubt that of two people doing the same work, the one receiving less pay is more likely to be discouraged and his or her efficiency affected. This bill will destroy any psychological handicap plaguing female workers and will consequently maximize the utilization of the available labor resources. This bill will decrease labor disputes. This bill as Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg states will also stimulate another worthwhile purpose—that of maintaining the purchasing power of workers to add to their prosperity and the growth of our economy. This bill will help not only certain women, but rather the entire country.

It is important for us all to remember that women do not work for pin money. They work because they need to work. Widowed and separated women are often the only wage earners in the family. Many single women and some married women carry the entire responsibility

for family support. Women were the heads of 4.6 million of the country's families in 1961. These families—1 out of every 10 families—cannot afford the results of discrimination of the sexes. We as an economic body and as a moral Nation cannot afford this antique form of discrimination.

Figures for 1961 show that 24½ million women were working or seeking work. These women constitute a third of our labor force. We cannot treat a third of our labor force as second-class citizens.

Is there any logical reason for discriminating against the female sex? The answer is an emphatic "no." Why should women be paid less than men for the same work, when they have demonstrated beyond any doubt that they are capable workers.

The equal pay bill is not a revolutionary proposal. On the contrary, it is conservative in that many countries have long enacted such legislation. Burma in its Constitution of 1947 guarantees to women the same pay for similar work. Indonesia, in its provisional Constitution of 1950, provided that every worker shall have the right to equal pay for equal work. Japan requires equal pay in its Constitution of 1949. The countries of the European Common Market—France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg—have similarly adopted the equal pay principle. There is absolutely no reason why the United States, leader of the Western bloc, should lag behind in this important area of progress.

The support for this bill is overwhelming and bipartisan. The present administration, the former administration, labor, management, civic and religious groups have all endorsed the legislation.

Every witness who appeared before the committee, and there were many, testified in favor of the bill. Rarely have I seen such support for any bill, and rarely has such support been more justifiable. I urge my colleagues to similarly support H.R. 11677, Equal Pay Act of 1962.

Mr. ZELENKO. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT. Madam Chairman, I am very much in favor of H.R. 11677, the Equal Pay Act of 1962, and strongly urge the membership of both parties here in the House to vote for its passage.

As you know, in our great State of Pennsylvania, we now have on our statute books a law granting equal pay for equal work regardless of sex, and so forth. We are proud of this achievement and today are 1 of the 22 States that have finally given just recognition to the workingwoman.

Mr. Speaker, our economic growth today can, in great measure, be attributed to the women who are employed in industry and in our Government. They have made great strides over the last hundred years and have proved their abilities in every field of business. According to statistics, approximately 24

million women are employed in our Nation today. This figure is expected to increase to about 30 million by 1970, so I am sure you can readily see why this legislation is needed if we are to continue to lead the world in the field of business.

In my city of Philadelphia, where unemployment today is an acute problem, it is not uncommon for the woman of the house to trade her broom and stove for a typewriter or a sales order book. She is aware that her husband is unable to get a job, so she pitches in and becomes the breadwinner. This determination and will to earn is not a sin or a disgrace—it is just plain commonsense, and all women who must work to provide for their families are to be commended and not condemned.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will grant equality in employment to all, whether man or woman, black or white. Such legislation has been long needed. I urge its immediate passage.

Mr. ZELENKO. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Madam Chairman, we have before us today H.R. 11677, legislation which if passed will be titled the Equal Pay Act of 1962.

The objective of this legislation is to insure equal compensation, for the same work, to women as well as men.

Certainly there can be no valid argument against the objective of this bill. It is common knowledge that in many industries, in many States in the Nation, there does exist discrimination in wages and salaries paid to women. I know of few instances where women are paid more for their labor than men doing the same kind of work. There are, however, many instances where women are, by comparison, paid less than men.

There are at this time more than 24 million women in our work force. It is estimated that this number will grow to 30 million by 1970. In almost every field of endeavor they are making valuable contributions to our Nation's production capacity.

The Congress, of course, must confine its legislation to those areas under Federal jurisdiction. The employees affected therefore would be those working in producing goods for commerce as defined in the laws and decisions pertaining to interstate commerce. The scope of coverage also would be, for comparative purposes, on discriminatory practices, applicable to the employees of a particular employer.

Madam Chairman, for many years I have been an employer of both men and women in my own capacity as a businessman. During those years I have paid wages and salaries on the basis of ability to do the specific task. There have been instances where I have paid salaries to women that were higher than paid to men doing the same type of work. This was done because of their superior talents in a specific skill. Contrariwise, I have paid men higher salaries than women doing similar work, but in those instances the women were less skilled in their tasks or lacked seniority or other privileges attained by years of service.

Madam Chairman, in my opinion this approach is the proper approach. It will provide equal pay for equal work. This approach will not affect laws which are now on the statute books that are designed to protect women because of biological differences, marital provisions and obligations as mothers of children, inheritance law protection to wives and mothers, and other well-established principles which have been long established in our society.

This legislation is long overdue. I do not support it from the standpoint of sentimentality, but from the standpoint of simple justice. I trust that this legislation will be enacted without further delay and that all amendments designed to cripple the effectiveness of this legislation will be defeated.

Mr. ZELENKO. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS].

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of this measure which is long overdue in this country. It is really a sort of disgrace to all of us that it is necessary to legislate on the subject of equal pay for comparable work.

It seems to me that an equal pay bill is made morally more necessary in this country by the number of FEPC laws that have been passed, which have excluded discrimination based on sex. The result is that the only person you can legally discriminate against in such areas is a white woman.

Colored women cannot be discriminated against because they are colored and thus protected by FEPC laws. They have a right of appeal denied white women. As a white woman who believes that white women are just as entitled to nondiscriminatory treatment as anybody, I support this measure.

Mr. KEARNS. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

Mr. GOODELL. Madam Chairman, I take this time only to express some reservations with reference to this legislation. There will be amendments presented on the floor. I hope that the membership will analyze these amendments carefully, because they will all be presented in a constructive spirit in an effort to improve the legislation.

Madam Chairman, this particular issue does not divide our country along party lines or partisan lines. If we are going to have an effective equal rights bill we should present the country with a law that is as workable and practicable as possible. It would be a disservice to the women of our country if we passed a law which, when its impact is felt, is likely to raise a great many of our employers and unions in opposition to it.

I feel that in some respects this particular bill is a sleeper. There are provisions here which are going to come back to haunt us if we do not take action to correct them. I should hope on a non-partisan basis when the time comes for reading the bill that all the Members will listen carefully to the debate on both sides and work hard to improve this bill so we will have the very best possible

legislation to promote an admittedly very fine objective, a nonpartisan objective.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I wonder if the proposed amendments will include one dealing with section 10 of the bill, on page 11, which provides, as follows:

No employer to whom section 4 applies shall be required to comply with any law of any State, or political subdivision thereof, prohibiting discrimination in rates of pay on account of sex.

Mr. GOODELL. I do not plan to offer such an amendment myself, but I have information that an amendment of that nature will be offered, yes.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. PELLY. I wonder if the gentleman could tell me what the position of the administration is on this legislation? I have read the report and I cannot find any reference to any agency reports.

Mr. GOODELL. I should yield to the chairman of the subcommittee to speak for the administration, I believe.

Mr. ZELENKO. What was the question?

Mr. GOODELL. How does the administration feel on this legislation?

Mr. ZELENKO. This is the administration's legislation.

Mr. PELLY. There is nothing in the report to indicate that. I appreciate knowing that the agencies of the Government that have reported on this legislation are favorable; I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GOODELL. I might say to the gentleman that the administration submitted a bill which is almost identical to this bill, but there were changes made in the bill and there will be further changes made in the substitute that will be offered.

Mr. ZELENKO. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN].

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Madam Chairman, as the sponsor of H.R. 571 in this Congress and of similar bills in previous Congresses since my first term in 1953, to provide an equal pay bill, I strongly support the bill now pending, H.R. 11677. I shall strongly oppose amendments intended to weaken this bill into meaninglessness.

Because of the many requests for time to speak on this bill today and in view of the fact that I spoke at some length on the merits of the bill on June 14, in the debate on the rule, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks I made at that time be included at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. When I spoke on June 14, it was in the expectation that we would immediately take up the bill after adoption of the rule. The remarks I made then are just as applicable to

the bill now as they were on June 14, and they are as follows:

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, this is indeed a great moment for those of us in the House of Representatives who have been sponsoring bills for many years to require equal pay according to the work performed, with no discrimination because of sex. The fact that this bill comes before us today on a bipartisan basis, on the unanimous recommendation of the members of the House Committee on Education and Labor, proves that while the wheels of Congress often grind slow, the results can be quite dramatic.

As the sponsor of H.R. 571 and of similar bills in preceding Congresses, I wholeheartedly endorse the Zelenko bill on which we are taking action today, H.R. 11677. It is a bill which has teeth in it to require compliance, but it is primarily a bill to lead and guide the way to the most effective kind of compliance, and that, of course, is voluntary compliance.

The States will continue to have basic responsibility in this field—if they will accept it. But the Congress has the obligation to act for the protection in interstate commerce of fair competition, decent labor standards, and plain, ordinary fairplay. This legislation is long overdue.

A worker's skill should determine his or her wage rate, not the sex of the individual employee. Where men and women are doing similar work with similar abilities, their paychecks should be the same. The Federal Government is required to recognize this principle in civil service employment; many unions have succeeded in writing it into their contracts with private employers. But, throughout the country, many women workers are victimized—there is no other word for it—by outmoded concepts and customs which hold that a woman works at a job in order to occupy her time before marriage, or just to get away from home, and therefore can be paid less than a man for the work she does.

Most women work because they must; others work because they have skills which our economy desperately needs. All of these workers are entitled to fair treatment, regardless of their reasons for being in the employment force. This legislation will help assure such fair treatment for most women employed in interstate commerce. I hope it will also stimulate the States to act more effectively in assuring fairness for women employed in purely intrastate commerce, or in firms with less than 25 employees.

As I told the subcommittee at the time hearings were conducted on this legislation last March, my recollections from my own career in the business training field prior to my marriage, reinforce my view of the importance of this legislation.

As training director of Felt & Tarrant, the Comptometer company, in St. Louis, it was my job, not only to direct the training of students in the use of our machines, but also the job placement activities in helping them find employment.

The Comptometer is a good piece of equipment, not a mechanical brain or an electronic robot but a responsive device for using the brains of the operator in reducing complex mathematical computations into quick answers. It is far more than an adding machine. It will perform rapidly and accurately, if properly used.

It was my experience that women had greater dexterity in the use of this equipment, generally speaking, than men did. Most of the students were women. The jobs they later filled were not restricted to women but, like most office positions, were held mostly by women. I stress again the fact that learning to use the equipment required more than routine application and mental capacity. Yet the wage scales generally in effect in private industry for women able to

use this equipment were substantially lower than the salaries paid men for doing work requiring similar, or even less highly developed, skills.

The job rates did not reflect the skills of the operators, but rather the sex. And this is true in most fields where women predominate among the employees.

The skill should determine the wage paid, not the sex of the employee. We do not want to see instances of women getting jobs in preference to men because the wage rate for women is lower, but this often happens. Let us stop this undercutting of standards. It is certainly to the advantage of all workingwomen to do so; it is also to the advantage of workingmen. And it is the right thing to do.

Mr. KEARNS. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, first of all, before I read my prepared statement, something I have very seldom done in the years I have been here, I want to congratulate the members of the majority and the members of the minority; the staff of the majority and the staff of the minority, although the latter comprises only one. I do feel they have done a wonderful job trying to prepare this legislation and the amendments I think have been well prepared and dutifully considered.

Madam Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 11677. I have long favored, in and out of Congress, equal pay for equal work. At the present time many women in America are discriminated against in the matter of rates of pay, and this is grossly unfair. These women are often the breadwinners for a family or elderly parents. The need for sufficient money to support this family or these parents is certainly present. In this day and age, I cannot conceive of one valid reason for refusing to pay equally as between men and women when a woman or a man is performing equal work.

The subcommittee which handled this bill, as well as the full Education and Labor Committee, are to be commended for the legislation which they have forwarded to the House floor. In the present bill there are a number of important safeguards. For example, the Secretary of Labor can institute an investigation only after it is charged, in writing, and under oath, by a grieved person, that a violation has occurred or when the Secretary, himself has reasonable cause to believe that an investigation will disclose that a charge is true. Moreover, the Secretary is then limited to an investigative and mediation role and all enforcement proceedings must be in a U.S. district court. This last point is extremely important, and here the committee has recognized and reestablished the importance of a judicial proceeding where all rights of due process will be protected. There will not be an administrative proceeding which all too often results in the same person performing as judge, jury, prosecutor, and investigator.

Unfortunately the bill as now written contains several defects. The major defect is that nowhere are discriminatory activities on the part of labor unions prohibited. As you know, Madam Chairman, labor unions are presently prohibited from causing or attempting to

cause an employer to discriminate under the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act. In the Equal Employment Opportunities Act, which our committee has recently reported out and which is now pending before the Rules Committee, the labor unions similarly are prohibited from such activity. Unless this prohibition is applied in this bill, there will be a major loophole which may well mean that the law, if enacted, will be meaningless and ineffectual. I am certain that an overwhelming majority of the Members of the House of Representatives will want to amend the present bill so as to prohibit discriminatory conduct on the part of unions.

Another possible defect in the present bill occurs because the bill, in section 4, refers to discrimination in any place of employment. It was the intent of the full committee that the charge of discrimination and the investigation be restricted to the particular establishment wherein the grieved employee is employed. Unfortunately the language of the bill is ambiguous and could be construed differently. It should be noted that the Labor Department has stated that "place of employment," which is used a number of times in the Fair Labor Standards Act, never has been defined by them to mean more than one plant. This is certainly the type of interpretation which the committee intended to have placed on this phrase. This is pointed out in the committee report. Therefore, I want the record to clearly reflect that by place of employment we mean the one particular plant or establishment wherein the grieved person is employed.

I urge that H.R. 11677 be enacted, with the amendments that will be offered today.

Mr. GOODELL. Madam Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. Eighty-four Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 176]

Alford	Harrison, Va.	Plicher
Anfuso	Hébert	Powell
Ashley	Hoffman, Mich.	Pureell
Aspinall	Judd	Rains
Baring	Kilburn	Rogers, Colo.
Bass, N.H.	King, Utah	Rogers, Tex.
Blitch	Kluczynski	Rousselot
Boggs	Loser	St. Germain
Bolton	McSween	Saund
Buckley	McVey	Scherer
Coad	Macdonald	Smith, Miss.
Cramer	Madden	Spence
Curtis, Mass.	Mason	Steed
Davis, Tenn.	Merrow	Taber
Dawson	Michel	Teague, Calif.
Diggs	Minshall	Thompson, La.
Flynt	Moulder	Willis
Frazier	Norblad	Winstead
Gubser	Peterson	Yates

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having assumed the chair, Mrs. KELLY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 11677, and finding itself without a quorum, she had directed the roll to be called, when 378 Members responded to

their names, a quorum, and she submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. ZELENSKO. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. HANSEN].

Mr. RYAN of New York. Madam Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN of New York. Madam Chairman, I should like to commend the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. HANSEN] for her longtime interest in this field. She sponsored similar legislation in the House of Representatives in the State of Washington which was enacted in 1943.

It is interesting to note that our women legislators have been in the forefront of the fight for this legislation. The bill before us today is the culmination of years of effort on the part of our colleagues of the opposite sex. Equal pay bills have been introduced for a long time by many Congresswomen, including Representatives EDITH GREEN, MARTHA GRIFFITHS, EDNA KELLY, LEONOR SULLIVAN, JESSICA WEIS, KATHERINE ST. GEORGE, and FLORENCE DWYER. Somehow the Congressmen are "Johnnies come lately" in this area.

I should like to commend our colleague, the gentlewoman from Oregon, EDITH GREEN, for her role in advancing this legislation. She has introduced equal pay bills ever since her election to this House. On August 24, 1961, she sponsored the administration bill for equal pay—H.R. 8898. The bill before the House today is almost identical to H.R. 8898. As a member of the President's Commission on the Status of Women, the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] has worked with dedication and determination to see that women receive equal treatment with men in employment.

Madam Chairman, I support this bill to provide justice in the pay envelope to both men and women by forbidding employers in interstate commerce to discriminate among their employees on the basis of the sex of the worker in setting rates of pay.

Discrimination in the form of a rate differential for comparable work when performed by women instead of men is based on a discredited notion that a woman, although she may accomplish as much or more, deserves less pay than a man. It is shocking to think that one would pay a woman less than he would pay a man for doing the same work.

We may not be aware of the role women have come increasingly to play in the economic life of America. The civilian labor force in April of this year numbered nearly 71 million. Over 24 million were women; well over one-third of this total. By 1970 it is estimated that the number of women workers will approach 30 million. In 1920 there were about a quarter of that number, 8.2 million. The place of women in our labor force has changed since 1920. Traditionally, they were only temporarily a part of that force. A girl left school, worked for a few years, married, and

left the labor force for good. This was never a true or a complete picture of the place of women in the labor force, but it was sufficiently accurate to gain a wide degree of acceptance.

Today it is not true at all. Whereas, as recently as 1930, 40 percent of women workers were under 25 years of age and less than 20 percent over 45, today the proportions are reversed. Less than 20 percent in 1960 were under 25 and nearly 40 percent are over 45. Women enter the labor force, leave it temporarily to have children, and return to it, for good. In 1930, 29 percent of working women were married. In 1961, 61 percent of the women who work were married. This is one of the significant and major changes in our labor force in this generation. Working women are as much a permanent part of the labor force as the working men.

The studies submitted by the Department of Labor during the hearings are clear evidence that this bill is needed. Simply by examining job orders placed with public employment agencies in five cities last year, the Department uncovered a wide variety of discriminatory practices. A grocery chain offered to hire checkers at \$56.88 per week for women. A man received \$62.90 to start. An inventory clerk in a factory received \$250 a month if a woman; \$300, if a man. A department store hired men as sales clerks at \$1.25 per hour; \$1 was offered to women. Tailors were to be paid \$75 if males, \$65 if females. A printing plant would pay women bookkeepers \$325 a month, but offered men \$375.

Perhaps the worst example of blind prejudice was the electrical manufacturer who was hiring assemblers. In this industry the deft fingers and steady nerves of women give them, if anything, an advantage over men in assembly work. Other things being equal, women would probably prove worth more rather than less to an employer on this type of work. Yet the offer was: \$1.40 an hour for women; \$1.55 an hour for men.

It should be noted that this bill does not raise wages. Each employer is left entirely free to set his own wage standards within the existing framework of law. Neither would it prevent an employer setting different wages, area differentials, in plants located in different areas of the United States. But once set, it prohibits paying a wage differential between men and women for work of a comparable character at the same location on jobs the performance of which requires comparable skills. If a woman does the same work as a man, she must receive the same pay.

The bill would prohibit three separate acts of discrimination:

First. An employer engaged in commerce or the production of goods for commerce may not pay wages to any employee at a rate less than he pays in the plant to any employee of the opposite sex for comparable work.

Second. An employer may not meet this requirement by reducing the wages of an employee to remove such a differential in wages rates. He must raise the wages of the employee discriminated against. This is not intended and would

not prevent any employer from making wage adjustments which are not an attempt to avoid obligations under the bill.

Third. Finally, an employer may not discharge or discriminate against any employee for any action he or she may take to assert his or her rights under the law.

The bill would vest the administration of this law in the Secretary of Labor. The Secretary is expected to make every effort to administer the law in such a way as to secure an end to discrimination through education and by voluntary action. An informed and specialized staff such as the Department of Labor possesses should be able to administer the law with only infrequent resort to the courts. With their knowledge of wage rate practices and methods they should be able to secure the voluntary discontinuance of violations. From the Department's experience in administering the Fair Labor Standards Act would come the ability to supervise the restitution of wages, not paid because of discrimination, to the employees discriminated against.

To this end, the bill authorizes the Secretary of Labor to supervise payments of wages withheld in violation of the law; to hold sums owing employees in a special deposit account, subject to disbursement by the Secretary; and to cover sums which cannot be paid to employees within 3 years into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

My own State of New York was among the first of the 22 States which now have laws aimed at ending discrimination between men and women in pay for comparable work. New York's law became effective nearly 20 years ago, on July 1, 1944. To that extent, New York has taken a stand on the principle of nondiscrimination on the basis of sex.

However, it is not a strong law. Its standards for the determination of what constitutes discrimination in wage rates are not clear. The authority granted the commissioner of labor to enforce the law is not adequate. The law does not require the keeping of records by the employer or the posting of notices informing employees of their rights. It makes no provision for the collection of back wages due employees who suffer discrimination. And it provides no adequate means of enforcement.

One reason the State of New York has not acted to provide a more adequate law is because it has been and is faced with the problem of interstate competition. At the time New York's law was passed, only three other States, Michigan, Montana, and Washington, had laws of any kind prohibiting discrimination in wage on the basis of sex. The passage of the Federal law will act as a spur for the States who now might fear the competition of other States to pass effective laws. Section 10 provides that the Secretary of Labor may, by agreement, cede to a State agency jurisdiction over any cases where such State has a statute applicable to the determination of such cases, if the provisions of the State laws are not consistent with the provisions of the Federal law.

It is clear that we need this law. We need it to protect employees who need

protection against unfair, unequal, and unjust treatment. I urge its adoption.

Mrs. HANSEN, Madam Chairman, first I would like to commend the Speaker of the House of Representatives this afternoon for honoring American women by having preside over the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union the very distinguished gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

Madam Chairman, I am strongly in support of this measure, because 19 years ago this summer our own State was one of the first in the Nation to enact this type of legislation and place it on the statute books.

Madam Chairman, I do have a few responses that I would like to make to various Members who have commented on this measure. In reply to my colleague from the State of Washington, may I say that yesterday President Kennedy made very clear his position on antidiscrimination for women in all Federal agencies.

Madam Chairman, the second thing I would like to comment upon is the statement made by the gentleman from California who said "we are for the principle of the bill." I say to the Members of the House of Representatives it is very easy to be for principle. Nevertheless, it is the "buts" and the crippling amendments which destroy the enactment of the principle.

Madam Chairman, may I say that I think this is one of the fundamental equalities that all of us assumed should be possessed by all women. In reiterating the words of the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS], may I say that those who enjoy the privileges of equal suffrage never expected that this legislation would become necessary. However, it is necessary if we would utilize our womanpower.

Time after time in the history of our Nation and during its critical hours, eloquent proof of the skill potential of women workers has been proven. We know that the demands of industry for higher skills are unremitting and will continue to grow. The equal pay rate base which this bill would require will supply an unmatched incentive for the acquisition of these skills.

The Labor Committee reported it without dissent. The witnesses who appeared before the Select Labor Subcommittee to testify on it supported it without dissent. Many of the able Members of this body have urged its passage either by appearing before the subcommittee or filing statements of approval. These Congressmen and Congresswomen, who actively support the equal pay principle embodied in the bill, are both Republicans and Democrats.

There comes a time when the forces of right—shall we say—take over and seem to chart an undeviating course. I believe that time is now for the adoption by Congress of an equal pay law. Proposals for equal pay have been introduced in many Congresses and even reported. Today we have the opportunity for enactment.

The proposal has one simple and laudable purpose, to assure wage justice for workers. It prohibits an employer

whose employees are engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce from paying a lower wage rate to employees of one sex than he pays to the opposite sex for performing substantially the same job. In more technical terms, under this bill, employees of a single employer must be paid the same wage rate irrespective of their sex for work of a comparable character on jobs, the performance of which requires comparable skills.

It does not in any way provide for the equalization of wage rates between different employers. Moreover, it permits different wage rates where the rates are based on a seniority or merit increase system or a bona fide job classification system of an employer. It strikes only at the degrading and arbitrary practice whereby an employer downgrades an employee—usually a woman—by paying less for her product than one made by a man.

As the hearings made clear by referring, for example, to job orders filed by employers with the local employment service offices, employers without any justification frequently have dual pay scales for men and for women performing the same jobs.

While other discriminations exist against women workers—some of which are deeply embedded in our culture—none is more flagrant and I think actually more cruel than the discriminatory pay practice which this bill would seek to end in commerce channels insofar as employers of 25 or less employees are concerned.

One argument which one hears advanced against equal pay legislation is that in time and because of some undefined circumstances, discriminatory pay practices will just disappear. This lame assertion, in essence without any persuasive power, was refuted by specific testimony at the recent hearings.

Mrs. Esther Peterson, Assistant Secretary of Labor, for example, expressed her deep concern that the pattern of wage rate discrimination on the basis of sex was being mirrored in some of the newer industries. We cannot rely, therefore, on the vaguely optimistic prediction that somehow things will turn out to bring about wage justice whether Congress does anything or not. The facts prove otherwise. We have a responsibility to act in adopting the measure reported and I urge that we discharge this responsibility.

If we are going to be consistent in pursuing methods of effective manpower utilization, we cannot afford to reject this bill. Without a measure of this kind, tremendous manpower—or rather womanpower—waste is inevitable. At present, approximately 24¼ million workers are women. By 1970 this number will grow to 30 million. The degree of skill level which these workers will achieve has a great deal to do with their incentives and their morale.

Industry during World War II was willing then to pay equal pay. The opportunity of eradicating differentials was seized upon as a means of raising wage levels under stabilization in a tight

labor market in which production had to be maximized.

The fair, equal wage rate levels which H.R. 11677 will require will, I believe, once more stimulate our women workers to efforts such as they made in wartime.

It is significant to me that the bill provides expressly for the Secretary of Labor to attempt to settle violation cases through persuasion without pursuing the court action enforcement which is authorized. It is my opinion that much can be done to eliminate discrimination in this way. Discrimination of this kind involves not only economics but also ethics. I look forward to a signal record of voluntary settlements under this bill, stemming from ethical considerations.

It is to be pointed out that employers who have a "good faith" defense will not suffer any penalties under the act. Also, that in voluntary settlement cases, the employer will be liable for the payment of only the sum of back wages. When court enforcement of the equal pay mandate is necessary, the court may include in its enforcement order the payment of an additional amount to the aggrieved employee not to exceed the back wages found to be due.

The bill is a balanced bill. It will help the downgraded worker—whether man or woman. It will contribute a factor of stabilization in employment relationships and help to support and increase our purchasing power.

When we vote for H.R. 11677, all our people will come under "equal protection of the law," in the way which our Constitution promises. It is difficult to believe that we can default from making this promise come true.

Mr. ZELENKO, Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. FOST].

Mrs. FOST, Madam Chairman, those of us who have long sponsored equal pay for equal work legislation once again urge passage of the legislation under consideration today. It is part of the historical fight of women for full equality under the law on their basic rights as workers and citizens, and enactment is long overdue. Discrimination in any form is evil and unjust. And discrimination against workers—solely on the grounds of sex—is both socially immoral and economically unsound. It is a hangover from an antiquated social order not at all in step with the enlightened thinking of this 20th century.

It was the Second World War that proved beyond the shadow of a doubt that women workers were capable of performing many jobs on the production line as well as in the offices of industry. Today, almost two decades since the end of the war, some one-third of the working population is made up of women. In 1970, we are told, the present 24.5 million women in the work force will have grown to more than 30 million. Yet, despite this growing role of women in our economy, the vestiges of discrimination remain which deny them equal pay for equal work. This means a hardship to the millions of women who are the sole support of their families through widowhood or for other reasons.

The bill now before Congress does not seek to give women workers any special protection, nor does it set forth any revolutionary provisions. It simply asks for the end of unfair and illogical discrimination against the female sex. It rightly declares that, as a matter of national policy, "work of comparable character on jobs requiring comparable skills" should receive equal remuneration, regardless of whether the work is performed by a man or a woman.

There is nothing in this legislation that would set pay rates. There is nothing in it that would prevent pay differentials because of seniority, merit, or bona fide job classifications. It calls for nothing more than the prohibition of discrimination against an employee because that employee happens to be a woman.

"Equal pay for equal work" is not a new concept. Twenty-two States have such laws, although many of those statutes have no teeth and are little more than policy positions. Both of our neighbors—Canada and Mexico—have Federal legislation in this area. And 36 nations have adopted an International Labor Organization conference agreement mandating equal pay.

There is no excuse for the United States to lag behind in this important area. If we are to truly reflect the leadership of the free world, and set an example for womanhood everywhere, then we must demonstrate our principles through the passage of this legislation.

As I told the Select Subcommittee of the House Labor Committee during hearings, this bill already has the support of both the Democratic and Republican Parties, the AFL-CIO, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

I want to add a word of praise, in conclusion, to the gentleman from New York, Chairman ZELENSKO, and his subcommittee for having steered this legislation to the floor of the House at this early date. I strongly urge the Members here to give it their wholehearted support.

Mr. KEARNS. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY].

Mr. BARRY. Madam Chairman, as the sponsor of House Joint Resolution 540 which proposes an amendment to the Constitution relative to equal rights for men and women, I rise today in support of the bill before us, H.R. 11677, which seeks to provide equal pay under Federal law in interstate commerce activities. I commend my colleagues on the House Education and Labor Committee who have contributed their time and efforts to this legislation, the need for which has been clearly demonstrated.

There are currently 24¼ million women employees in the United States, and women are taking an ever-increasing part in our Nation's productive resources. In almost every area where women are employed they are doing the same or comparable work to that performed by men, and they should be paid accordingly. Those employers who recognize this comparability will not be affected by the provisions of this legislation, as it applies only to those who adhere to the outmoded belief that women

are inferior to men and therefore should be paid less for their skills.

Persons working for employers having more than 25 employees and who are engaged in interstate activities will be afforded the protection of H.R. 11677. States rights will be protected to the extent that the Secretary of Labor, by agreement, may cede to a State agency jurisdiction over any cases where the State has effective anti-wage-discrimination statutes. The bill has a realistic maximum appropriation authorization, it does not propose to establish a new administrative agency but instead makes use of available executive resources, it offers ample protection for men and women alike subject to its provisions. In my opinion, Madam Chairman, this bill deserves the unanimous support of the Congress.

Mr. KEARNS. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN].

Mr. HALPERN. Madam Chairman, as a cosponsor of this legislation I rise in support of it. I heartily commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. ZELENSKO] for his superb work and leadership on this issue. The objectives of this bill are long overdue and highly desirable. I trust it will be approved overwhelmingly.

The bill will go far in eliminating a thoroughly inequitable employment practice. It would establish wage justice for working men and women. It would insist on equal opportunity in all areas of interstate employment regardless of sex. Enactment of this bill establishes once and for all that work of comparable character, requiring comparable skill, must be compensated on a nondiscriminatory basis.

Unfortunately today in the United States too many women still work under wage and opportunity handicaps. The time has come when we need to banish all discrimination against working women and to wipe out these longstanding pay differentials between men and women doing the same work.

I urge my colleagues to join me and the other supporters of this bill to make this a day to be remembered by all women. Let us leave this House today with the knowledge that we have wiped out a great social inequity.

Mr. ZELENSKO. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS].

Mr. KEARNS. So that none of you will have any ideas about an early departure this evening, we have several important amendments pending. I just want to give this foreword to you. The law we are passing now, the way it is written, may be devastating to the Nation unless the amendments are adopted.

The House in its wisdom today can do a good job. I am making this appeal, the last speech I will have on this particular bill, that we stay on the floor and do a job on our amendments.

Mr. ZELENSKO. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA], the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. RIVERS], the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania [Mrs. GRANAHAN], and the gentleman

from Pennsylvania [Mr. TOLL] be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Madam Chairman, I am one who believes every worker should be paid for the job he or she does, without adding to or subtracting from the rate of pay because of the sex of the employee. That is why I believe that the old myth that women are inferior workers should be destroyed today. For by our votes here today, we can tell our country and the world that we know that it takes the skills of women, as well as of men, to maintain a healthy economy.

Wage discrimination based on sex should have no place in our American economic structure. As long as we have such discrimination, whether against men or women, so long will we be placing barriers in the way of the full participation of needed workers in American economic and social life.

We all know that women are not inferior workers. We have seen examples of their outstanding performance during two World Wars. We have seen them come into the labor market and do successful jobs there as the need for their services has grown.

Today women are employed in almost every kind of occupation. Most jobs today can no longer be designated as "men's work" or "women's work." Most jobs today can be done by any worker, whether man or woman, with the proper skills and training.

And payment for work should not be based on sex. It should be based solely on the job.

That is why I support H.R. 11677, the Equal Pay Act of 1962. That is why I urge its support by my colleagues.

Our Nation should not suffer because of unfair wage practices, and, in my opinion, H.R. 11677 would do much to remove the likelihood of such unfairness.

Letters have come into my office from many women in my district telling of the discriminations they have suffered on the job. Although they do the same work that men do, many of them write that they are paid at a lower rate because they are women.

This is not fair. This is not democratic. This is not good business.

Enactment of this bill will give all of our workers equality and justice in the labor market.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Madam Chairman, I rise to speak in favor of H.R. 11677, a bill comparable to one I introduced early in this Congress. In supporting this legislation Members of this body are showing their appreciation of the contributions American women have made to this country, its economy, and to our democratic institutions. Highlighting this statement is the presence of the distinguished gentle ladies who are Members of this House, and all of whom have worked for many years in fostering the type of legislation now before us.

From the early days of our history, when the colonists were struggling for

adequate food and shelter for their families, American women have worked side by side with their men to provide—with in the context of freedom and human dignity—security for their families and security for their country.

Now as the amazing tools of improved technology have freed women from devoting all of their time to the cares of the home, they have been making numerous and significant contributions to America's productivity, improved standard of living, and our national security.

Today we find that one-third of our total working force is composed of women. About half of these women are single, about half are married. An important fact to note, I believe, is that of the married women who are employed in the American labor force, only one out of six is a mother with children under 3 years of age. This indicates, I feel sure, that mothers of young children do not want to work, and do not work, unless dire necessity compels them to work.

The vast majority of our women workers, I am sorry to say, are bunched in the lower pay, lower status, bracket of our economic scale. Over 4 million of these workers are heads of families. Others must work to supplement incomes of their husbands.

For these reasons—and for the further reason that the world's leading democracy should apply to all its citizens the principles of fairness and justice—I commend H.R. 11677 to provide equal pay for equal work for men and women employed in interstate commerce and upon certain Government contracts.

I trust that this measure will be enacted.

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Madam Chairman, many of our businessmen who profess to be bitterly against communism—and who are, I am sure, genuinely against communism—nevertheless practice one of the basic principles of communism in the treatment of some of their employees.

The Communists claim that in their system, the principle which governs is "From each according to his abilities; to each according to his needs."

Under that theory, every employee doing similar work and using similar skills and abilities would receive a different rate of pay depending not upon job performance, but upon whether the worker was single or married, a parent or childless, male or female, a provident investor or an unlucky one, a homeowner or renter, and so on. Of course, in practice, operating such a complex wage system would be almost impossible; and even the Communists apparently have finally recognized that wage scales must reflect the skills used, rather than the personal needs of the worker for more or less pay than another worker.

Yet we still have signs of this system persisting in this country, particularly when employers insist on paying women workers less than men for doing similar work requiring similar skills and abilities and performance. And occupations and professions in which women make up the majority of the employees usually carry lower salary or wage levels than other fields, on this communistic theory that

women workers perhaps may not need as much pay.

Madam Chairman, I support the equal pay bill now before the House because I believe these outmoded practices must now be eliminated in interstate commerce. We need trained women in all of the professions and in many technical skills. We have all been urging the girls in school to continue with their education, to develop employment skills, so that they can help meet the production requirements of our economy. It is up to the Congress to make sure that the women who are needed in the labor force—whose skills are required—are treated fairly and without discrimination in the salaries and wages they are paid.

To permit employers to discriminate on the basis of sex—to pay women workers less merely because they are women, and regardless of the relative skill and performance of the employee on the job—is to deny one of the basic principles of fairness in a democracy, and is, as I said, the practicing of a form of communism which even the Communists now seem willing to concede does not make any sense.

Mr. TOLL. Madam Chairman, I am glad to have the opportunity to support H.R. 11677, which prohibits discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages. In the 86th Congress I introduced House Joint Resolution 255, proposing an amendment to the U.S. Constitution providing that equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex. In the 87th Congress I introduced House Joint Resolution 430 to the same effect.

I agree with the report presented by the committee that the objective sought by this legislation is wage justice for working men and women. The Democratic platform of 1960 contained as one of the objectives the following language:

We support legislation which will guarantee to women equality of rights under the law, including equal pay for equal work.

This bill makes good on the part of the platform promise.

In the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, where I live and in which I have the honor to represent a Philadelphia district in this Congress, the clear-cut right of women to equal pay for equal work was recognized by the enactment of Public Law 1913 in 1959. The people of Pennsylvania have always been leaders in the movement to establish equality in all fields of human endeavor. It is a pleasure to represent people in the Commonwealth which enacts liberal legislation of this kind and also to participate in the action taken today in the House of Representatives, which I hope will also enact such liberal legislation.

Mr. ZELENKO. Madam Chairman, in concluding this debate I would say that the proposed amendments to be offered by the minority should come as a surprise not only to them but to those of us who took part in the committee operation, for this bill in the form in which it was written and the substitute as I shall offer it, with only slight amendment, had the careful consideration of

all of the members of the committee and was voted out favorably unanimously. I ask the Members of this Committee to consider carefully every phase and every section of this bill as urged by the committee. The amendments which I understand will be offered by the minority will gut this bill and all we will have will be a title.

At this time I wish to commend all the members of our committee, the distinguished chairman of our committee and particularly the distinguished gentlewoman from New York who is presiding, for I understand it is only the second time in a century that we have had the honor and privilege of having a female colleague who is incomparable, doing incomparable work with equal skill for equal pay, presiding.

The fundamental principle of equal pay for equal work must be established as a touchstone of our national labor policy. H.R. 11677, the Equal Pay Act of 1962, involves no revolutionary concepts. Its principles are as old as the fight for freedom from all forms of prejudice, discrimination, and injustice.

This is not a partisan bill. Equal-pay legislation was included in the platforms of both the Democratic and Republican Parties. It has received the endorsement of our great union and management organizations. Our colleagues on both sides of the aisle have testified in support of this legislation.

I specially commend and compliment our incomparable female colleagues who have, with us, been performing comparable work for comparable skills for equal pay, for their understanding of the problems of wage discrimination and their efforts through the years to enact this much-needed remedial legislation. The gentle lady from Oregon, the Honorable EDITH GREEN, one of the hardest working and effective members of the Committee on Education and Labor, who have long pioneered for this bill, is to be congratulated on her efforts, as is the gentle lady from Washington, the Honorable JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, also a vital force on the committee. Similar legislation was introduced by the following gentle ladies whose support is greatly acknowledged: the Honorable JESSICA McC. WEIS, of New York, the Honorable MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, of Michigan, the Honorable EDNA F. KELLY, of New York, the Honorable LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, of Missouri, the Honorable KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, of New York, and the Honorable FLORENCE P. DWYER, of New Jersey. I also wish to commend the Honorable GRACE FOST, of Idaho, and the Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON, of Ohio, for their invaluable assistance.

In the spirit of this legislation and not wishing to discriminate against the male Members of this body, I wish to acknowledge the introduction of similar legislation by the following gentlemen: the Honorable Abraham J. Multer, of New York, the Honorable Hugh J. Addonizio, of New Jersey, the Honorable Ralph J. Rivers, of Alaska, the Honorable James G. Fulton, of Pennsylvania, and the Honorable Seymour Halpern, of New York.

I would also like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the leadership of

President Kennedy and the administration for including this bill as an important part of the administration's legislative program.

I would be remiss if I did not specially acknowledge the great leadership and assistance of my colleague, the gentleman from New York, Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, without whose direction and guidance this bill would not have reached its present stage of success, and all of my distinguished colleagues on the Education and Labor Committee who gave of their time, effort, and work-product to perfect the equal pay legislation for your consideration today.

I am truly privileged and honored to be a member of the team behind the equal-pay-for-equal-work legislation. I am doubly pleased since the principle of equal pay has been a personal legislative objective of mine for many years.

It remains now for us of the present Congress to build upon the real progress that has been made and to translate this widely accepted principle into equally widely accepted practice, by enacting this Federal law which concretely forbids discrimination in wage rates on the basis of sex.

Mr. CURTIN. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 11677 which is legislation officially designated as the "Equal Pay Act of 1962."

I feel that it is high time that members of the female sex receive the same pay for the same work as do members of the male sex.

It is, of course, obvious that there are certain types of work which must be performed by men, particularly those involving heavy manual labor. It is equally as well known that there are also certain types of work involving skill of a delicate kind which can best be performed by women. For each of these types of work, the one performing the same, whether a man or a woman, should receive a wage commensurate with the work.

However, there is a tremendous middle ground of thousands of positions, or types of work, which women can perform just as efficiently and effectively as can men. In all of such types of work there certainly should be no distinction in the pay for the same; women should not be asked or expected to do such work at a cheaper pay than do men.

Let us end such discrimination wherever it shall exist, and a big stride in accomplishing this will be by the enactment into law of this legislation.

Mrs. BOLTON. Madam Chairman, as a longtime advocate of the principle of equal pay for comparable work performed by men and women, I am glad to speak in favor of H.R. 11677. This bill is similar to one I sponsored in the 85th and 86th Congresses. As a matter of fact, such legislation has been introduced in every session of Congress since 1945 by members of both parties—so this is a bipartisan effort.

There are over 24 million women in the labor force today and by 1970 we shall have over 30 million. Most women work to contribute to essential living

expenses for themselves or their families. For example, over 6 million single women workers support themselves; over 2 million working women are heads of families; others are the primary wage earner in the family although not technically the family head. Married women who are not the primary wage earner in the family work to raise family living standards and to send children through college. The contribution of these women to the Nation's productive resources must be encouraged and maximized. Equal pay for equal work legislation will help create the necessary incentive.

It is a matter of simple justice to pay women the same rate as a man when she is doing the same or comparable job. We have equal pay in the Government and it has worked out well through the Federal classified civil service. It is good to note that real progress has been made in the matter of equal pay for equal work through the enactment of State laws. Twenty-two States now have equal pay laws on their statute books. However, a Federal law is needed to give complete and adequate coverage. I am glad that special provision is made in this bill to permit cession of Federal jurisdiction where State statutes mirror Federal provisions. This should give encouragement to the States to continue progress in this field through the enactment of their own laws.

It is my hope that the House will give favorable consideration to H.R. 11677.

Mr. COHELAN. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of this long overdue legislation to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex in the payment of wages.

The right of equal opportunity is one of the great pledges of the United States to its citizens. In the field of employment this pledge should at least mean the right to equal pay for work of comparable character which requires comparable skill. Both the hearings and report of the House Committee on Education and Labor make it very clear, however, that such is not the case—that discrimination in wage payment on the basis of sex continues to exist—that unequal pay has not been nearly so widely eliminated in practice as it has in theory.

Such discrimination is obviously contrary to the basic principles upon which this country was founded and upon which it has grown strong. It is, furthermore, economically wasteful and from the viewpoint of our national security we cannot afford such waste.

Madam Chairman, for these and the reasons so ably presented by the distinguished members of the Education and Labor Committee, I urge that we approve this legislation without delay. I would also like to express the hope that before the close of this present Congress we will be able to consider and pass another bill, already approved by the same committee, which would enable us to move still further ahead in the promotion of the equality of man and his opportunities—the equal employment opportunities bill of 1962.

Mr. ALBERT. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL]

may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McDOWELL. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 11677, a bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by certain employers and to provide for the restitution of wages lost by employees by reason of such discrimination.

The principle of equal pay, or payment of a rate based on the job performed, is fundamental to the American free enterprise system. Both employers and union leaders find its application important to the morale and efficiency of workers in their daily employment. It benefits the community by upholding the general level of wages, and maintaining purchasing power. In practice, it has proved workable and advantageous.

Leading women's and civic organizations have long promoted the equal-pay principle as furthering a major American objective—the maintenance and development of a high level of economic activity and employment. In recent years, the increasing employment of women on many types of jobs, often in new and complex fields and on the same basis as men, has contributed to this objective.

To encourage the use of women's highest skills, many organizations and individuals seek a more nearly universal application of the equal-pay principle, through voluntary action by employers, collective bargaining, and legislation.

The cost of food, rent, and other essentials of living are the same to both men and women consumers. Women as well as men work because of economic necessity, and many working women support children, dependent parents, or husbands. However, it is not these considerations but the proven efficiency of women workers and the essential part they play in the economy which entitle women to equal pay.

Mr. LINDSAY. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of this bill—H.R. 11677—commonly known as the equal pay for equal work bill. I represent a large segment of the garment district in New York, and among my constituents I count a great number of needleworkers. This bill means a great deal to them. It provides simply that for equal work women shall receive the same rate of pay as men, except where such payment is made pursuant to a seniority or merit increase system or a bona fide job classification program which does not discriminate on account of sex.

Madam Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK]. This amendment would nullify the impact of this law in any State which has enacted, or will enact, equal pay laws.

This amendment would destroy the bill. It is a State preemption bill. It would encourage industry to shop for low-wage and wage-differential States. Either we have a Federal law or we do not. And the Federal law should be universal in its application. This amendment, Mr. Chairman, would in it-

self result in discriminatory application of the law, and it should be defeated.

Madam Chairman, this legislation embodies a very sound principle and it should be enacted.

Mr. DONOHUE. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DONOHUE. Madam Chairman, as our immediate inspiration to unanimously approve this measure, H.R. 11677, the Equal Pay Act of 1962, we need only to look around us and observe the most competent, industrious, distinguished and gracious ladies whom we are privileged to call our colleagues. I know we unanimously agree that these distinguished lady legislators work as hard and as diligently as any male Member of the Congress and indeed, by their gracious presence, contribute more to this body than any male Member. There is no thought here of a differentiation in legislative salary because of sex.

For our background inspiration to promptly and favorably act on this bill, we need only to reflect that it is designed simply and solely to provide wage justice for working women.

We all realize that the origin of the wage rate differential for men and women performing comparable jobs in the false concept that a woman, because of her very nature, somehow or other should not be given as much money as a man for similar work.

This antiquated concept has been long and completely demonstrated to be false and it is indefensible from every standpoint. This being so, we may wonder why this legislation is necessary.

The answer is furnished to us in the authoritative information provided by witnesses before the House Committee on Education and Labor and the impressive array of statistics unhappily proving that discrimination in wage payments, on the basis of sex, continues to exist even in this modern space age.

Recognizing that the concept of wage payment discrimination against women is false; having before us the surprising but overwhelming evidence that such discrimination still continues to exist; and realizing that this measure represents the correction of basic injustice being visited upon women in many fields of endeavor, let us, I urge you, firmly reject any crippling amendments and proceed immediately and unanimously to the enactment of this measure extending simple wage justice to the increasing corps of America's working women.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Equal Pay Act of 1962".

Mr. ZELENKO. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ZELENKO: Strike out all after the enacting clause and

insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Equal Pay Act of 1962'.

"DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

"Sec. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds that the existence in industries engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce of wage differentials based on sex—

"(1) depresses wages and living standards for employees;

"(2) prevents the maximum utilization of the available labor resources;

"(3) tends to cause labor disputes, thereby burdening, affecting, and obstructing commerce;

"(4) burdens commerce and the free flow of goods in commerce; and

"(5) constitutes an unfair method of competition.

"(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of this Act, through exercise by Congress of its power to regulate commerce among the several States and with foreign nations, to correct the conditions above referred to in such industries.

"DEFINITIONS

"Sec. 3. When used in this Act—

"(a) 'Person' means an individual, partnership, association, corporation, business trust, legal representative, or any organized group of persons.

"(b) 'Commerce' means trade, commerce, transportation, transmission, or communication among the several States or between any State and any place outside thereof.

"(c) 'Goods' means goods (including ships and marine equipment), wares, products, commodities, merchandise, or articles or subjects of commerce of any character, or any part or ingredient thereof, but does not include goods after their delivery into the actual physical possession of the ultimate consumer thereof other than a producer, manufacturer, or processor thereof.

"(d) 'Produced' means produced, manufactured, mined, handled, or in any other manner worked on in any State; and for the purposes of this Act an employee shall be deemed to have been engaged in the production of goods if such employee was employed in producing, manufacturing, mining, handling, transporting, or in any other manner working on such goods, or in any closely related process or occupation directly essential to the production thereof, in any State.

"(e) 'Employ' includes to suffer or permit to work.

"(f) 'Employer' includes any person acting directly or indirectly in the interest of an employer in relation to an employee, but shall not include the United States or any State or political subdivision of a State, any labor organization (other than when acting as an employer), or anyone acting in the capacity of officer or agent of such labor organization, or any person having fewer than twenty-five employees.

"(g) 'Employee' includes any individual employed by an employer.

"(h) 'Wage' paid to any employee includes the reasonable cost, as determined by the Secretary, to the employer of furnishing such employee with board, lodging, or other facilities, if such board, lodging, or other facilities are customarily furnished by such employer to his employees: *Provided*, That the Secretary is authorized to determine the fair value of such board, lodging, or other facilities for defined classes of employees and in defined areas, based on average cost to the employer or to groups of employers similarly situated, or average value to groups of employees, or other appropriate measures of fair value. Such evaluations, where applicable and pertinent, shall be used in lieu of actual measure of cost in determining the wages paid to any employee.

"(i) 'State' includes a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico,

the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, Wake Island, the Canal Zone, and Outer Continental Shelf lands defined in the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act.

"(j) 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Labor.

"(k) 'Labor organization' means any organization of any kind, or any agency or employee representation committee or plan, in which employees participate and which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of work.

"PROHIBITION OF WAGE RATE DIFFERENTIAL BASED ON SEX

"Sec. 4. No employer having employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce shall discriminate, in any place of employment in which his employees are so engaged, between employees on the basis of sex by paying wages to any employee at a rate less than the rate at which he pays wages to any employee of the opposite sex in such place of employment for work of comparable character on jobs the performance of which requires comparable skills, except where such payment is made pursuant to a seniority or merit increase system or a bona fide job classification program which does not discriminate on the basis of sex, nor shall any employer reduce the wage rate of an employee for the purpose of eliminating the differential in wage rates prohibited by this section. No labor organization, or its agents, representing employees of such an employer shall cause or attempt to cause such an employer to discriminate against an individual in violation of this Act. No such employer and no such labor organization shall discharge, cause to be discharged, discipline, or otherwise discriminate against any employee on account of any action taken by such employee to invoke, enforce, or assist in any manner in the enforcement of the provisions of this Act.

"ADMINISTRATION

"Sec. 5. (a) The Secretary shall have authority to prescribe rules and regulations necessary for the administration of this Act. In any action or proceeding based on any alleged violation of this Act, no person shall be subject to any liability or punishment for or on account of the commission by such person of an unlawful discriminatory practice prohibited by this Act if he pleads and proves that the act or omission complained of was in good faith, in conformity with, and in reliance on, any written interpretation or opinion of the Secretary. Such a defense, if established, shall be a bar to the action or proceeding, notwithstanding that after such act or omission, such interpretation or opinion is modified or rescinded or is determined by judicial authority to be invalid or of no legal effect.

"(b) In connection with any investigation of a charge filed under section 6, the Secretary or his representative may enter and inspect such places and such records (and make such transcriptions thereof), question such employees, and investigate such facts, conditions, practices, and matters as he may deem necessary or appropriate to determine whether any person has violated any provision of this Act, or which may aid in the enforcement of the provisions of this Act.

"(c) For the purposes of any investigation conducted under this Act, the provisions of sections 9 and 10 of the Federal Trade Commission Act of September 16, 1914, as amended (15 U.S.C. 49, 50), shall be applicable to the jurisdictions, powers, and duties of the Secretary or any officers designated by him, except that the attendance of a witness may not be required outside of the State where he is found, resides, or transacts business, and the production of

evidence may not be required outside the State where such evidence is kept.

"ENFORCEMENT

"Sec. 6. (a) Whenever it is charged in writing under oath by or on behalf of a person claiming to be aggrieved, or, when the Secretary has reasonable cause to believe an investigation will disclose the charge is true, a written charge is filed by the Secretary (and such charge sets forth the facts upon which it is based) that an employer or labor organization has engaged in a discriminatory practice prohibited by section 4, the Secretary shall furnish such employer or labor organization (hereinafter referred to as the 'respondent') with a copy of such charge and shall make an investigation of such charge. If the Secretary determines, after such investigation, that the charge is true, he shall endeavor to eliminate any unlawful discriminatory practice by informal methods of conference, conciliation, and persuasion.

"(b) If the Secretary has failed to effect the elimination of an unlawful discriminatory practice and to obtain voluntary compliance with this Act, or in advance thereof if circumstances warrant, he shall have the power to bring a civil action to prevent the respondent from engaging in such unlawful practice.

"(c) Each United States district court and each United States court of a place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States shall have jurisdiction of actions brought under this Act. Such actions may be brought either in the judicial district in which the unlawful discriminatory practice is alleged to have been committed or in the judicial district in which the respondent has his principal office. No such civil action shall be based on an unlawful discriminatory practice occurring prior to the effective date of this Act or more than one year prior to the filing of the charge and the giving of notice thereof to the respondent, unless the person aggrieved thereby was prevented from filing such charge by reason of service in the Armed Forces, in which event a period of military service shall not be included in computing the one-year period.

"(d) If the court finds that the respondent has engaged in or is engaging in an unlawful discriminatory practice charged in the complaint, the court may enjoin the respondent from engaging in such unlawful practice, and shall order the respondent to take such affirmative action, including the payment of back wages, plus an additional amount not to exceed the back wages found to be due, as may be appropriate. No order of the court may issue if the wage discrimination was based on some factor other than sex.

"(e) In any case in which the pleadings present issues of fact, the court may appoint a master and the order of reference may require the master to submit with his report a recommended order. The master shall be compensated by the United States at a rate to be fixed by the court, and shall be reimbursed by the United States for necessary expenses incurred in performing his duties under this section. Any court before which a proceeding is brought under this section shall advance such proceeding on the docket and expedite its disposition.

"(f) The provisions of the Act entitled 'An Act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes', approved March 23, 1932 (29 U.S.C. 101-115), shall not apply with respect to civil actions brought under this section.

"(g) Attorneys of the Department of Labor may appear for and represent the Secretary in any litigation, but all such litigation shall be subject to the direction and control of the Attorney General.

"(h) The remedies provided in this section for violations of this Act shall be exclusive.

"SUPERVISION OF WAGE PAYMENTS

"Sec. 7. The Secretary is authorized to supervise the payments of any amounts owing to any employee which have been withheld in violation of this Act. Any sum owed an employee and paid to the Secretary under this Act shall be held in a special deposit account and shall be paid, on order of the Secretary, directly to the employee. Any such sum not paid to an employee because of inability to do so within a period of three years shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

"Sec. 8. (a) Except as hereinafter provided in this subsection, in any contract made and entered into by any executive department, independent establishment, or other agency or instrumentality of the United States, or by the District of Columbia, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, or the Canal Zone, or by any corporation all of the stock of which is beneficially owned by the United States (all of which are referred to hereinafter as agencies of the United States), for the manufacture or furnishing of any materials, supplies, articles, or equipment, in any amount exceeding \$10,000, there shall be included stipulations under which the contractor (1) is required to compensate all persons employed by him in the manufacture or furnishing of such materials, supplies, articles, or equipment, in conformity with the requirements of this Act, and (2) shall be subject to all other provisions of this Act. The Secretary of Labor may, when he deems that special circumstances in the national interest so require, exempt a contracting agency from the requirement of including the provisions of this subsection in any specific contract.

"(b) No contract shall be awarded by the United States or any agency thereof to any person finally determined to have violated any of the provisions of this Act or any stipulation entered into in compliance with subsection (a) of this section, or to any firm, corporation, partnership, or association in which such person has a controlling interest, until the contractor has complied with all orders issued to him pursuant to section 6. The Comptroller General is authorized and directed to distribute to all agencies of the United States a list containing the names of persons ineligible for contract awards under this section. The Secretary shall cause the names of persons who have complied with orders issued pursuant to section 6 to be removed from this list.

"POSTING

"Sec. 9. Every employer subject to this Act shall keep posted in a conspicuous place in or about the premises where any employee is employed such excerpts from this Act and from the regulations issued pursuant thereto as will provide information adequate to inform employees of their rights under this Act.

"EFFECT OF OTHER LAWS

"Sec. 10. No employer to whom section 4 applies shall be required to comply with any law of any State, or political subdivision thereof, prohibiting discrimination in rates of pay on account of sex. The Secretary is empowered by agreement with any agency of any State to cede to such agency jurisdiction over any cases where such State has a statute applicable to the determination of such cases the provisions of which are not inconsistent with the corresponding provisions of this Act or has received a construction not inconsistent therewith.

"APPROPRIATION

"Sec. 11. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums (not in excess of \$1,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30,

1963), as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

"EFFECTIVE DATE

"Sec. 12. This Act shall take effect one hundred and twenty days after the date of its enactment."

Mr. ZELENKO (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

Mr. WESTLAND and Mr. GRIFFIN objected.

Mr. ZELENKO (during the reading of the amendment). Madam Chairman, I renew my request that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that it be open to amendment at any point.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Madam Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I wonder if we can have the assurance from the other side of the aisle that we will have a clear exposition of the points of difference between the substitute offered by the gentleman and the original bill voted out by the committee.

Mr. ZELENKO. I assure the gentleman that will be done.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Madam Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman make clear, since the amendment will not be read, that his proposed amendment in the nature of a substitute is H.R. 11677 as it was reported by the committee with several amendments. One is an amendment to include labor organizations within the coverage of the bill. Another amendment is on page 4 and relates to the place of employment. It includes, on page 7, certain perfecting amendments, relating to the coverage of the labor organizations within the scope of the bill. On page 9, there is a conforming amendment beginning at line 19. With those exceptions and certain minor perfecting amendments, is the gentleman's proposed substitute the same as the bill reported out of the committee?

Mr. ZELENKO. The gentleman is substantially correct.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ZELENKO. Madam Chairman, the amendment offered at this point does not substantially change the bill as reported. The one major change in the substitute amendment from the main bill appears on page 5 of the bill.

The major change is that there is included in the bill a prohibition against the labor unions or organizations that might attempt to coerce or influence or bargain an employer to violate the provisions of this act. Up to this point, it was the employer that was liable. But it is thought that, perhaps, in his bargaining activities between labor management and unions, there might come a point where because of the insistence of a labor union, he might be obliged to

violate the law as it applies to discrimination regarding the sexes. As I said, during the debate, organized labor is in favor of this amendment. They are willing to be placed in this bill and to be subject to its penalties, if they are involved in any violation. As a matter of fact, as the gentleman pointed out during the debate, this will once and for all make it a labor-management joint sponsorship on this bill for equal or comparable pay for comparable work and comparable skills.

The remaining amendments are merely perfecting amendments, at the bottom of page 4. It is the sense of this bill that if there is a difference in the wage scale between the sexes that that difference would be resolved and the act would only apply in the very place where these people of opposite sexes are working. It does not establish a minimum wage. It is not industrywide nor area-wide. If, in a factory on A Street, a man is being paid 60 cents an hour and a woman is being paid 50 cents an hour in that plant, this law would apply and the wages or pay would be equalized.

The perfecting amendment on the bottom of page 4 reiterates that particular point; it spells it out more clearly.

Mr. GOODELL. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZELENKO. I yield.

Mr. GOODELL. It is my understanding, and I think it is the Government's understanding, that the Fair Labor Standards Act uses the phrase "place of employment" in a number of places, and it has been interpreted uniformly by the Labor Department to mean one plant, and that as used in this bill it would mean one plant or one establishment.

Mr. ZELENKO. The gentleman is correct; that is the purpose of the bill; that is the meaning of the word "place."

Mr. GOODELL. So by no stretch of the imagination could "place of employment" mean a company, firm or business.

Mr. ZELENKO. No, it does not.

Madam Chairman, the other amendments are technical and perfecting in nature.

On page 9 an amendment was included at the bottom of the page inadvertently which should have been omitted.

I would say in regard to the other amendments that they are technical and perfecting.

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

Mr. ZELENKO. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. I am a little curious as to why in view of these changes that have been made, a clean bill was not introduced and reported out by the committee and brought here for action. I raise that question because several things occur to me as far as procedure is concerned. The first one is that perfecting amendments can be offered to the substitute, but as I understand the rule, such amendments to the substitute as may be adopted would not be subject to separate votes later in the House. Second, that if a substitute is adopted, then the only motion to recommit that would be available to the minority would be a straight motion to recommit. As

I say, I am just curious as to why this particular procedure was followed by the majority members of the committee.

Mr. ZELENKO. I would say to the gentleman from Indiana that the reason was that we had a number of technical and perfecting amendments as indicated with just one amendment of real significance, to put labor organizations in the bill. So we thought in the interest of expedition and clarification they should be put into one bill. That is the reason.

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

Mr. HALLECK. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ZELENKO] may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. ZELENKO. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I must say to the gentleman that if there was just one amendment of substance to be offered it could have been done in the committee, and the same applies to the technical and perfecting amendments. Certainly they would not encounter any great difficulty.

I must observe that this sort of procedure, as far as the minority is concerned, makes it a little difficult for us to work our will with respect to this legislation.

The only further suggestion I can make under the circumstances is that the substitute and any amendments thereto be fully explained by speakers on the majority side who are familiar with the changes that have been made in the original bill so we may be informed as to what they are. They seem to be quite extensive.

Mr. ZELENKO. May I suggest to the respected minority leader that the changes made are familiar to Members on his side. As I say, aside from the technical and perfecting amendments there is but one amendment, the one bringing labor unions into the bill. The members of the committee are in practical agreement. It has been discussed and is known to Members on both sides of the aisle.

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

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

Mr. GRIFFIN. I think the remarks of the minority leader were particularly appropriate. Of course, I did not object to the gentleman's request because he had provided me with a copy of his proposed substitute in advance; however, I agree that it is unfortunate that the bill has been presented to the House in this manner. I regret some of the gentleman's remarks earlier during general debate, when he referred to the fact that minority members of the committee propose to offer certain amendments to the bill on the floor.

I did not particularly appreciate the remarks in view of the fact that the gentleman from New York, himself, has

incorporated in his substitute one very important amendment, and several other amendments, which had not been considered by the committee. However, we agree now that these amendments are needed and are sound. I hope the gentleman will recognize the right and the prerogatives of those on this side to offer amendments, too, even some of the amendments may not have been considered in the committee because, obviously, this bill has not received the full, complete and adequate consideration in the committee that it should have had, in my opinion.

Mr. ZELENKO. I did not mean to imply that there was any motive or any intention to offer new material on the floor. What I did say was that during the course of deliberations in the committee many of the Members who are now offering variations, such as "equal" instead of "comparable," voted in the committee on those very points.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment to the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. ST. GEORGE to the amendment offered by Mr. ZELENKO: On page 4, line 5, strike out "for work of comparable character" and insert in lieu thereof "for equal work".

On page 5, line 1, strike out "comparable" and insert in lieu thereof "equal".

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Madam Chairman, when I spoke on the rule for this bill on the 14th of June, I brought this question up. I feel it is a very important question. I am not a member of the committee, but I asked permission of the committee to offer this amendment and speak on it briefly.

What we want to do in this bill is to make it exactly what it says. It is called equal pay for equal work in some of the committee hearings. There is a great difference between the word "comparable" and the word "equal."

In most people's opinion, and in the opinion of Webster's Dictionary, it is quite evident that there is a difference. I am going to read what it says:

Equal: Exactly the same in measure, quantity, number or degree; like in value, quality, status or portion; characterized by justice; fair; uniform; equitable; level; evenly balanced or portioned.

"Equal" implies no difference in amount, number, value.

This is not true of the word "comparable." The word "comparable" opens up great vistas. It gives tremendous latitude to whoever is to be arbitrator in these disputes.

What I may consider comparable work some of my colleagues may not consider comparable. You may have two people asked to do the same thing. You may think one does incomparably better than the other. That, it seems to me, is getting completely away from what we are trying to do in this bill.

Mr. LANDRUM. Madam Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANDRUM. Madam Chairman, I want to support the amendment offered by the distinguished gentlewoman from New York. I recall that on the same day

referred to by the gentlewoman, when the rule was under debate on June 14, the gentleman from Georgia also raised the question of the advisability of using the word "comparable" instead of the word "equal."

If, in fact, we want to establish equal pay for equal work, then we ought to say so and not permit the trooping around all over the country of employees of the Labor Department harassing business with their various interpretations of the term "comparable" when "equal" is capable of the same definition throughout the United States.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for his contribution.

Mr. COLMER. Madam Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. I would be interested to know, following the colloquy, who makes the determination of what is comparable work under the bill. Maybe I should have asked somebody else.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Well, I would say to the gentleman that it seems to me quite obvious it would be up to the Department of Labor where these things will be determined, and for that very reason I will say to the gentleman I think the only difficulty is to make it clear that the bill is to produce and foster equality. When you give this latitude by using the word "comparable," you are destroying the main purpose of the bill.

And, if my friend would yield to me for another moment, I would like to point out that in the report on this bill, in the testimony given by the very distinguished Assistant Secretary of Labor, the Honorable Esther Peterson, she said:

The absence of an equal pay clause in a union contract does not necessarily mean that pay is not equal; some contracts specify one rate for the job, and no equal pay provision is needed. Of the 315 contracts studied by the Women's Bureau that did not have equal pay clauses, some applied to firms with job evaluation plans or other wage payment provisions based on a rate-for-the-job policy.

Four times in that one paragraph the word used is "equal" and not "comparable."

It seems to me quite evident, Madam Chairman, that while this seems to be a very slight change, it would strengthen the bill; it would make it do more what we want it to do, and that is to tighten it up.

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

Mr. ZELENKO. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman from New York for his indulgence.

Now, I agree, and I have always agreed, and it has always been my prem-

ise and that, I think, of most of the people, that what we really want is equality. We do not want favors. There are certainly many things that men can do better than women, and before the majority of the House gets too thrilled by that statement, there are very many things that women can do much better than men. As a woman, I do not particularly want to be compared to a man, and I am quite sure that that goes for my male colleagues as well.

Mr. JOELSON. Madam Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. I think this might be an appropriate time to quote what was said in the debate in the French Chamber of Deputies when differences between the sexes were referred to; namely, "Vive la Différence."

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Well, I would be inclined to agree with the gentleman on that, too.

In summing up, I would like to say that I have always agreed with the words of that great pioneer for women's rights, Susan B. Anthony. She said this 100 years ago and, Madam Chairman, it is just as true in my book today if women are to truly take their place in the body politic and in the Nation: Men, their rights and nothing more. Women, their rights and nothing less.

For that reason, Madam Chairman, it seems to me that equality is what we want: nothing more and nothing less.

Mr. ZELENKO. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York.

Madam Chairman, I hesitate not only because of my deep respect and affection for the gentlewoman from New York to oppose her in most anything, but I regret that I must do so at this time, for if the gentlewoman's amendment were adopted it would create a situation in which the law would be unenforceable. I was disturbed by the question as to whether "equal" is the same as "comparable" or identical. I discussed this with the Secretary of Labor, and I should like to read his answer to me in writing. It is as follows:

The language as so changed, in our opinion, could spell defeat for the bill's purpose. "Equal" may be interpreted to have a rigid connotation such as "exact uniformity," "of the same measure," and so on—incompatible with an effective equal pay law which necessarily must be applied on the basis of similarity between one job in relation to another job but not the exactness of two jobs.

If a showing of equality was a requisite to establish the requirement of equal pay, the conscious introduction of one slight and trivial factor might be considered sufficient to justify a lower wage rate.

"Comparable" is a key word in our proposal. It is used in both tests which are essential under the proposal to establish the resemblance between jobs necessitating equal pay, that is, "work of comparable character" on jobs requiring "comparable skills." It connotes an identity of work operation and skill permitting a realistic and practical appraisal of two jobs to determine whether they have enough like characteristics and skill demands to warrant the same basic pay rate.

I thought initially, after discussing this with the Secretary, that this basis was a new concept. But I see that there is legal precedent for the word "comparable." The word "comparable" is the only enforceable word to activate this law. I find it in the National War Labor Board's use of the word during World War II. During that struggle and during the time when the National War Labor Board was in operation there was in effect an equal pay policy in which there was no discrimination on the basis of sex.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Madam Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZELENKO. I would be happy to yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I would like to say to the gentleman that of course the National Labor Board to which the gentleman refers is rather old hat. I mean it goes back quite a long way.

I would also like to point out to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ZELENKO]—as I am sure he already knows—that the word "comparable" appears in some State statutes. But there are an equal number of State statutes carrying the word "equal" in their labor laws.

I do not want to argue with the gentleman because I know the gentleman knows far more about this than I do, and I would not even venture to step into the arena with him. But here, again, we are not "comparable."

I would like to say that what the gentleman has said merely bears out what I have thought right along I have guessed the word "comparable" to mean. In reality by using that word you are not giving full equality; you are making this differential which is the one thing I am not particularly anxious to see. You are going back to that good old adage that women are so weak and delicate that they need protection. I think equality is one thing, but when we go into these hazy words, it is another matter.

Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. ZELENKO. May I say to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] that my knowledge in the arena is no match for her charm or persuasiveness.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Under the theory of equal pay for equal work, if that were applied to this Congress it could be said that no two Members could draw the same pay?

Mr. ZELENKO. That would be correct.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. The Secretary of Labor has said to the committee:

The language as so changed, in our opinion, could spell defeat for the bill's purpose.

I would say to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS], that in this Congress there are

no two Members who have equal size districts to represent, who have an equal amount of mail, who have an equal number of conferences or equal committees or subcommittees on which to serve. The chairman of the Appropriations Committee and a new member on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee do not perform equal work.

If there were a wage differential in the Congress of the United States—and the men Members received a higher wage than did the women—and this were to come to the point of proving that there was absolutely equal work, we could not prove that this were true. But if the word were "comparable," meaning that the men and women Members of Congress were doing comparable work, then we could require the same amount of pay.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ZELENKO] has expired.

Mr. ZELENKO. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ZELENKO. Madam Chairman, may I continue further in response to the gentleman from New York [Mrs. St. GEORGE]. There is no intention in this bill not to afford the women the equality they deserve. But on the question of comparability of jobs this is true even in regard to the work of one man vis-a-vis the work of another man. But what has happened in the past and what we are attempting to correct is that regardless of the similarity of the comparability of jobs, which in the case of men has returned equal pay, in the case of women this has not been true.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Madam Chairman, may I tell my friend that I am grateful to him for helping my argument. He has used the very words I have used to prove that women have not had equality. May I say also that while we are talking about comparability and the jobs of Members of Congress, which is an extremely good comparison, that I happen to know that one of the largest districts in the whole of the United States is represented by a woman. I do not say for that reason that she should be paid more than some gentleman who may represent barely 300,000. But I do say this, that whether it is her district, my district, or the district of the very distinguished gentleman in the well of the House, we all have the same responsibility, whether it be to 10 people or whether it be to 1,000.

Mr. ZELENKO. I respect the contention of the gentleman from New York, but I just as respectfully urge that she is mistaken in her argument for this reason. Equality of pay is what we are seeking for comparable or, if it could be enforced, equal work. The point is that the only enforceable legislation that could be effective to achieve equal pay would be that legislation based on comparable pay, comparable work, re-

quiring comparable skills. And it is on that basis that equal pay is achieved, man against man and man against woman.

Madam Chairman, just to conclude my argument, this policy of determining the equality of pay based on the comparability of work was established by the War Labor Board and worked effectively and became the guiding principle on job classification. The leading case in which this very point arose was that of General Motors, Nos. 125 and 128, reported in 3 War Labor Board Reports 348. This very point was raised:

The Board has directed the parties to include in their new agreement a provision that wage rates for women shall be the same as for men where they do work of comparable quantity and quality in comparable occupations.

There was another case, Browns & Sharpe Manufacturing Co., No. 101, 3 War Labor Reports 321, and the relevant quotation from that case is:

That wage rates for women shall be the same for men where they do work of comparable quantity and quality in comparable operations.

General Order No. 16 of the National War Labor Board stated:

Adjustments which equalize the wage or salary rates paid to males for comparable quality and quantity of work on the same or similar operations and adjustments in accordance with this policy which recognize or are based on differences in quality or quantity of work performed may be made without approval of the War Labor Board.

What we have here is the statement of the Secretary, who is bound to enforce the law, giving us a definition which he says is enforceable and which in past practice under Government auspices the War Labor Board has found to be enforceable. Anything else, as he urges, would vitiate the purposes of the act, because it could not be enforced with exactitude.

There is a labor experience here. There is a classic word, "comparability." It is the same as "anatomy." You cannot change anatomy. It acquires a certain classic meaning. In labor-management decisions the word "comparability" or "comparable" has a classic meaning, and it means comparable work for comparable skills which lead to equal pay, for no job one as to the other is exactly the same. If an employer wishes to avoid the law, all he has to do is change one operation.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The question of legal precedence for the words "equal" and "comparable" has been raised by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ZELENKO]. Of the States which now have laws in this area, it may be of interest to know that 5 use the term "comparable," while 11 States use "equal," "same," or "equivalent."

Let us look at other countries of the world. The International Labor Organization has a convention which has been ratified by 38 countries on this subject which calls for "equal pay for equal work." The countries of the European Common Market in their Treaty of

Rome adopted a provision binding themselves to provide "equal remuneration for equal work as between men and women."

Lastly but not unimportantly, in the 1960 Democratic platform the pledge was made to provide "equal pay for equal work," and in the Republican platform of 1960 the pledge was made to provide "equal pay for equal work."

I urge support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HOSMER. Madam Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Madam Chairman, I rise to ask the chairman of the subcommittee questions on two subjects. One has to do with the mention during general debate of the difference in beginning job offers to men and women, indicating that women's pay offers generally are a little less than those of men graduating from college. I wonder if a part of that is based on the employer's anticipation that in hiring a woman he is less likely to have her on the payroll for a long number of years after training her for the work and, therefore, some of the fixing of wages has that in mind. Is that a factor that is considered or not considered by the bill that is before the House today, or is it a legitimate thing to consider?

Mr. ZELENKO. It is a legitimate thing to consider for this reason: Where there is a merit system, a seniority system, or a bona fide classification system, there could well be a difference in the wage between a man and a woman, but this law takes into consideration those areas where you do not have the merit system, the seniority system, or the classification system.

In further response to the gentleman's question in which he asks whether this difference was due to the fact that perhaps some woman or women had worked in a place for some time, may I indicate that in a table which appears on page 63 of the hearings the job requests looking for workers are replete in every industry with requests for workers such as accounting clerks, assemblers, and many other types of available jobs. So there is a definite and vital need for this legislation.

Mr. HOSMER. My other question has to do with State laws that require special treatment, for instance, requiring certain rest periods or prohibiting the employment of women over so many hours of overtime a week, where it does not have that effect on the men.

Now an employer has some of those considerations in mind when he fixes wages, and I am wondering if those are legitimate considerations and if they are considered in the legislation before us.

Mrs. GREEN. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mrs. GREEN. This matter was considered by the committee. It was certainly considered when the legislation was originally drafted. It was a matter of a great deal of study and consideration by all of the women's organizations throughout the Nation that have

studied this type of legislation over a long period of time. They do not feel that the factors which you have mentioned should be responsible for the tremendous difference there is in wage scales between men and women throughout the country in the professions, the skilled, semiskilled and clerical fields and in all kinds of work. But it was a factor that was considered.

Mr. HOSMER. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. HANSEN. Madam Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Madam Chairman, I have before me a digest of State equal pay laws. It becomes increasingly obvious as we review these laws and look through them that the words "similarly" or "comparably" are used. In this particular act, the word "equal" can possibly become a monstrosity and cause of tremendous administrative technical difficulties. I think even in our own offices those who try to use the words "equal work" as a base of all operations are in administrative difficulty.

Madam Chairman, this is a matter of commonsense. Historically, as we have listened and read the debates in our own State legislatures over the years where, of course, these laws were established for the first time, and in hearings before their committees, the administrative difficulties were developed. If you go through these State laws, you will find that State after State has begun to modify their language and there is often the use of the word "comparable" or the word "similar."

If I had the time, I could read many of these to you. Massachusetts, particularly, spells out "similar." I believe the State of Michigan, and the gentleman from Michigan probably knows this, uses the word "similar." In the State of Oregon and in the State of Washington, the words "comparable" and "similar" are used. I note in some of the other States, the prohibition is that "there shall be no discrimination because of sex." It is spelled out in just that way—period.

So, Madam Chairman, I think if we review the history of this legislation in these 50 States of ours and, certainly, all of us are interested in the experience in the several States since that is why we are here, to interpret that State experience and to bring to our debate the useful State experience for assistance in the solution of our national problems, and to use it as a floor for solution.

Thus, Madam Chairman, let us use these historical State experiences, particularly those of administration. Let us use the word "comparable."

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

Madam Chairman, I am not a member of the committee, but I have familiarized myself with the bill and with these words. It seems to me that a requirement of the word "equal" is just what the dictionary says. The word "equal" means "exactly the same in measure."

My impression of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is that her amendment would require an impossible proof, an impossible amount of proof, to require that the

work and the skill be exactly equal. I think this would be an absolute impossibility. To have such an amendment in this legislation would be like having no bill at all. I think it would be much better to have the word "comparable" in the legislation.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN. I do not yield at this time, Madam Chairman.

The word "comparable" as taken from the dictionary, means "capable of being compared with; worthy of comparison to; to represent as similar; to liken." This is more nearly possible of proof. This means, then, that in substance we would actually be passing a bill in good faith. Leaving in the word "comparable" is leaving in a possibility of proof of similarity and comparability of work and of skill. I very much favor equal pay for both sexes for comparable work of comparable skill and I therefore urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment and retain a practical enforceable piece of legislation.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN. I yield.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Under the distinction the gentleman has just drawn between the word "equal" and "comparable" how would it work out in actual practice? Let us take for example a store that is departmentalized. In one department they sell ladies' hosiery, and in another, shoes, yet in each department they employ salesmen and salesladies operating under a number of conditions, doing their work either on straight salary, or salary and commission, or maybe straight commission. It is well known that as between these two departments greater profit is made on shoes than on ladies' hosiery. Under the definitions the gentleman has just given how can there be comparability between these two departments when there is this wide difference in profits? Is the employer to give the same money to all these people when the profit they produce in their respective departments is not on a comparable or equal basis and there is a great variation in the owner's earnings and ability to pay.

Mr. OLSEN. This proposition, of course, does not refer to profit. It is that there can be no discrimination of pay by reason of sex.

Mr. WAGGONNER. If it has no relationship to the returns to the owner, is not he the one being discriminated against?

Mr. OLSEN. The store owner cannot discriminate between the two sexes where there is comparable skill at comparable work.

Mr. WAGGONNER. But if they are not making the same profit in the store percentagewise or dollarwise in their departments how can they be comparable in what they produce for the owner?

Mr. OLSEN. Here is the way I look at it; I say there would be several classifications, and within any of the classifications there should be the same pay for either sex, given comparable skills. If there were an entirely different classification, people in the lesser classification would not be entitled to the same pay

as those in the higher classification; but within any one classification the pay should be the same for either sex where the work is comparable and the skill is comparable.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Let us look at it from this point, then. This amendment and this legislation is intended for a noble purpose; there is no doubt about that, but I fear sincerely that this is going to work against the success of the legislation that is being considered here, because the man in business is going to be fearful every time he hires a woman that he is letting himself in for a civil lawsuit.

Mr. OLSEN. Not at all, because he only has to treat them the same when they are in the same classification.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Not comparable, but the same. Then "same" means the same thing as "equal" and is satisfactory as a substitute for the word "comparable."

Mr. OLSEN. No, it does not.

Mrs. MAY. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Madam Chairman, it is beginning to sound to me that we have shifted from the battle of giving equal pay for equal work to women to a battle of semantics. I rather think that is what is happening here.

Consistently, before my service in Congress and during my 4 years in Congress, I have been in favor of this legislation. For the past 24 hours I have been studying the amendment and the implications of the difference between "comparable" and "equal." I assure you I would not do one thing to weaken this legislation; I want to strengthen it. Therefore, I support the amendment as offered by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE], because I think it does do that.

In my opinion, the word "equal" is going to make this act easier to administer. I would also like to point out that we use the word "similar" not "equal" in the State of Washington. There are many reasons why they use different words in different States. But what really is important, is it not, is legislative intent? We are making that record of legislative intent right now, and attempting to tie this down to a word that will make the legislation easier to administer and fairer to all and more acceptable to those who are going to be involved in this legislation.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I want to thank the gentleman for her support so eloquently stated.

I would like to ask her, while we are on this subject, if she does not think, in view of the statement that has been made here, that the word "equal" is a legislative monstrosity, that we might do very well to change the wording of the Declaration of Independence where it says that all men are created free and equal and substitute the word "comparable."

Mrs. MAY. The gentleman from New York makes an excellent point.

Mr. STRATTON. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Madam Chairman, I am not interested so much in the philosophical argument that has been raised in the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from New York, as to the relative virtues of these two words, as I am in the practical effect of the amendment if it is adopted.

I represent a district where glove manufacturing is an important operation. I wonder, if the gentleman's amendment were adopted—and I would like to get the view of the chairman of the subcommittee on this—and we were confronted with a situation in Gloversville, for example, where we have people sewing knitted gloves in one building and sewing leather gloves in another, whether under the gentleman's amendment it may not turn out this is not equal work, because in one case you are sewing knitted gloves and in the other case you are sewing leather gloves? If the gentleman's amendment were adopted, would it not be easy for an employer to argue in such cases that these operations were not equal, so if all of those sewing knitted gloves happened to be women and all of those sewing leather gloves happened to be men, might it not be possible in that case, under the St. George amendment, for an employer to evade the clear intent of Congress in passing this legislation?

I would like to know if the chairman would not agree with me if we keep in the word "comparable", then similar or comparable work is clearly being performed whether the gloves are woolen, leather, red, or blue, and thus there can be no possible excuse for evading the payment of equal wages.

Mr. ZELENKO. The gentleman is correct. This is a question of enforceability. Equal pay and equal work is a gross term, but when it comes to enforcement the word "comparable" has a meaning. It has the meaning which exists in this bill. It is a workable meaning, and the only workable meaning to evade the provisions of this act would be for one to change the job slightly. I agree with the gentleman if you put in the word "equal" we will have no equal pay bill.

Mr. STRATTON. I want to thank the chairman, because I think this is a vital point. The gentleman from New York is extremely persuasive, and on the philosophic issue there is a lot to be said for her views. But the practical situation turns out to be completely different. I want to see that the women in my congressional district are effectively protected and therefore I must oppose the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mrs. St. George].

Mr. HALLECK. Madam Chairman, on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mrs. St. George and Mr. ZELENKO.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 138, noes 104.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GOODELL. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOODELL to the amendment offered by Mr. ZELENKO: Beginning in line 4 on page 5, strike out "nor" and all that follows down through "section" in line 7.

Mr. GOODELL. Madam Chairman, it is difficult to deal dispassionately with this particular subject. As one of my colleagues said a few minutes ago, "Anybody who says that marriage is a 50-50 proposition, either does not understand women or does not understand fractions."

However, Madam Chairman, I present this amendment with a very serious and objective purpose. I frankly favor the general objective of this legislation. But I say to the Members of the House in all sincerity that there are some provisions in this bill—and my amendment would correct one of them, particularly—if allowed to remain and become law could be the sleepers of this entire legislative session. They could rebound to the very great harm of the movement for equal rights for women. We may find, if this becomes law in its present form, that the women will be at us from one side and the retailers and the small businessmen will be erupting under our feet. And we will have a very difficult time. This amendment in simple terms on page 5, line 4, eliminates these words:

Nor shall any employer reduce the wage rate of an employee for the purpose of eliminating the differential in wage rates prohibited by this section.

A little while ago, before we started this debate, a representative of retailers spoke to me outside and he said—and I use the word advisedly—that they are in panic over the implications of the language as it stands today and the possible ramifications for small business and for retailers who employ large numbers of men and women. They agree with the objective and they want to promote that objective. But we all know today, perhaps it is wrong but it is true, that it is a common practice in many small industries, and particularly in the retail business, to pay men more, because they are the heads of households, the heads of families, they are supporting the children; and employers are employing women side by side with the men and paying them less. This bill is designed to correct that. We can pay them without discrimination on the basis of sex; but the provision in the bill will require every employer without variation to raise all the women's pay up to the men's pay. He cannot negotiate with his employees. Now what can the employer do? The first thing he can do is fire all the men, or fire all the women who are in this category. And, believe me, I think we all know he will do this if it means the difference between staying in business and going out of business. He will have no choice. There will be no room for negotiations of any kind.

The second thing he can do is to try to devise some means of evading the law. He will probably use his imagination to get around the purposes of this

law because he will find them unworkable in their practical impact upon him. Of course, if the impact is serious enough, he may just throw up his hands and go out of business and they will all lose their jobs.

If he is represented by a union he may not under this provision go to the union heads and explain his problem sincerely and say, "I want to do what you are doing, I want to promote your purposes to get them all on an equal basis, but there is no opportunity for negotiation; I have to raise all the women right up to the men's level."

I do not think we want to do this. One final alternative; if he has unions he can perhaps sustain a loss for a few years and stop hiring women because they create a problem to him in this respect. I do not think that is the purpose of the proponents of this legislation. I think if we take out this provision there will be an adjustment that will provide equal pay for equal work.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Goodell] has expired.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Madam Chairman, I believe sincerely if we take this out there will be flexibility in here to protect the women, to give them the protection under the law without prejudicing their case with the businessmen who have to meet these additional costs. We will have a transition period during which the ladies will achieve equality without actually doing more harm to their purpose than good.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I ask the gentleman whether his solution is not simply to go forward and say to the man, "Look, there is a woman working beside you, side by side, but now we have to take care of women's rights so we will reduce your rates."

Mr. GOODELL. When we legislate wage rates we have problems. I say there should be flexibility in approaching this problem. We should not say to the employer arbitrarily that regardless of the circumstances he has to raise all the women up to the level of the men. He can go to the union and explain his problem if his workers are represented by unions and negotiate a reasonable compromise in equating these two. We are not passing a wage-fixing bill to raise wages. We are trying to make equality the purpose of this bill. It seems to me we do not have the necessary flexibility in the bill without this amendment.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Obviously the gentleman refers to the fact that he talked to a retail man and the retail man did a good job, but 80 percent of the retail business is nonunion. How is this employer the gentleman referred to going to negotiate with a union that does not

exist? Obviously, I think, the gentleman has been kidded a little bit by the gentleman he talked to.

Mr. GOODELL. I appreciate the gentleman's comment, but this is an amendment I have felt very strongly about for a long while. I think the retail people are just awaking to the implications of the bill as it is written here.

Mr. ZELENKO. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Other than protesting his desire to allow women to achieve equality in pay rates, the subject of the distinguished gentleman's argument was, "Let us equalize them downward." This was put into the bill for a specific reason. The purpose of this bill, as it is amended now, is to enable women to achieve equal pay for equal work. The gentleman argued for the word "equal." This spells it out with exactitude so there can be no mistake in enforcing it. This sentence which he seeks to delete does the very same thing. Then it says that the woman who does not receive equal pay for equal work shall receive it under this bill. So the very purpose of this bill is to raise her up to the higher level of the man so that she may be equal. This spells it out. In this instance the gentleman wishes to delete a sentence which spells out the duty of the enforcer and the requirement of the law with exactitude. May I ask the gentleman, How else would he equalize the pay of women in a case where a woman has been discriminated against but to raise her pay to that of the man, unless you lower the man's pay? Is this not the only way to equalize it?

Mr. GOODELL. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZELENKO. I have asked the gentleman a question, and I yield for an answer.

Mr. GOODELL. In all sincerity, I would hope and expect that in the normal circumstances the employer would raise the pay of the women to the same level as that of the men. This would be the normal solution to the problem. But if it is economically impossible for the employer to do so, then if it is so inflexible as you have it in your bill he either has to go out of business or fire the women or the men. We can equalize it if we make it flexible, without this kind of harsh and drastic provision.

Mr. ZELENKO. The gentleman's amendment would vitiate the purpose of the bill. It would counteract the proposal, because what it would do would be to invite the employer to reduce the man's pay to that of the woman's. Here her pay must be raised.

I urge the members of the committee to vote down this amendment. If you do not, all you will have is the title, and you will not have a bill which will give equal pay for equal work.

Mr. GOODELL. Will the gentleman concede that the administration bill sent down here by Mrs. Peterson in the administration did not include this sentence, that this was added by the subcommittee as an afterthought?

Mr. ZELENKO. That is right. The gentleman was one of those who ap-

proved it. The gentleman was one of those who put this sentence in and voted for it.

Mr. GOODELL. No, I did not. This was not adopted unanimously in the committee, it was adopted by a yea-and-nay vote, and there were nay votes. There was an attempt to amend the bill as it came out of the subcommittee. But the point is, I think that Mrs. Peterson sent up a bill that left out this sentence.

Mr. ZELENKO. They sent up a bill with the word "comparable," but we improved the bill because we wanted to make sure that when they made an equalization it would not be downward, it would be upward.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Madam Chairman, I hope the Members of the House will take a good look at this amendment. It is a very important amendment. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], has said, the language he proposes to strike was not in the administration bill when it was sent up to the House. The administration did not include or advocate the provision when the bill was proposed.

Are we about to pass an antidiscrimination bill or are we about to pass a wage-fixing bill? That is the issue right now.

Let us look at the situation where one plant employs all women; another plant doing the same kind of work in another State or in another county employs mostly women but a few men. Assume that the management of the latter plant has discriminated—they have employed a few men and pay them 50 cents or a dollar an hour more than the women. They would be in violation of this law. The management of such a plant must do something about it. They must come into compliance with the law. As it is written this bill says that the only thing they can do is to raise the wages of all the women by 50 cents or a dollar an hour.

In many situations, the wages of the women will be raised to the wages of the men to comply with this law. But should this be an inflexible requirement under which we leave no choice? In some instances, I am sure, it might be equitable to pay a rate somewhere between the rates paid to men and the women. I am sure that in some cases the men and the unions involved would be willing to take a slight reduction, if necessary, in order to keep the plant operating. But under this bill, they could not work out such a solution no matter how equitable and desirable it might be.

This is not an issue that has been dreamed up. I refer you to the hearings. Look at page 145 of the hearings. There appeared before the subcommittee the head of the Bureau of the Women's Division of the Pennsylvania Department of Labor who testified concerning this bill. Pennsylvania has a State equal pay law, and listen to what she said. This is very important:

The big problem comes when the number and proportion of workers affected is high and the size of the wage differential is large. The problem may be further compounded when a corporation's plants are operating in

several States and management can shift production from one State to another.

The department of labor and industry has not yet succeeded in getting compliance in several cases of clear-cut violation for this reason. In one Pennsylvania plant of a corporation with plants in other States, 441 women are being paid approximately 20 cents per hour less than 239 men in the same occupation—a major one in the business.

To immediately raise the women's rates to the men's would increase the annual wage cost by \$176,000 a year. The manufacturer threatened to move his Pennsylvania production to newer facilities in other States. The department at first consented to allow the company some time to come into compliance by transferring the men to other jobs.

However, the location of the plant and the relatively few openings for men in other occupations and the union security rights created problems that have made this approach to compliance impracticable.

I might add, also, that many people would question the propriety of considering any such adjustment a proper one, but we were in a difficult position because we did not want to see the men put out on the streets.

I want to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. ZELENKO] one question. Is there anything in this bill or in any other bill which would preclude an employer who is faced with this situation from just firing the men or firing the women?

Mr. ZELENKO. The question cannot be answered that simply.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes; it can be answered.

Mr. ZELENKO. The bill itself says this:

No such employer shall discharge or otherwise discriminate against any employee on account of any action taken by such employee to invoke, enforce, or assist in any manner in the enforcement of the provisions of this Act.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I did not say that any of these employees had made the charge. Suppose the Secretary of Labor brings the charge?

Mr. ZELENKO. The Secretary of Labor under the provisions of the act would not bring the charge unless he had reasonable cause.

Mr. GRIFFIN. All right; that is all he needs.

Mr. ZELENKO. And the gentleman was the one who wrote that provision into the act.

Mr. GRIFFIN. That is right. He can bring the charge, if he does have reasonable cause. I make the flat statement that, except in instances where union contracts are in effect and preclude it, the only course which this bill leaves in hardship cases is to fire the men or fire the women. To leave the bill in this condition would be most unfortunate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Madam Chairman, I would like to read the sentence that follows the testimony which the gentleman from Michigan read when he quoted the witness from Pennsylvania:

A Federal equal pay law such as you are here considering is the obvious answer to the problem.

In Pennsylvania they have an equal pay law so they cannot discriminate against women. In adjoining States they do not. Therefore, industries might move to adjoining States where they can pay women less than they do in Pennsylvania. A Federal equal pay law is the obvious answer.

Madam Chairman, I urge the defeat of this amendment.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Madam Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I thank the gentlewoman for that observation, and she is absolutely right, that the witness from the State of Pennsylvania was in favor of a Federal law. But I submit that that point, as interesting as it is, does not bear on the argument I was making. Suppose we have the Federal law? Now to follow the situation that I gave to you: One company had all women working in their plant and another company in Pennsylvania or any other State has half men working in their plant. You are going to say that—

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Madam Chairman, I refuse to yield further. I do not agree with the argument of the gentleman from Michigan. The gentleman cites a case as applying to the point he tries to make, and then when I read the ensuing language by the same witness, the gentleman says that it does not apply in this particular case. I submit that it does apply. The witness before the committee was saying that if an equal pay law is not enacted for all of the States, then the kind of incident which she cited would happen in many cases because the plant would be moved into an adjoining State, where the employer is allowed to pay women lower salaries than they pay to men workers.

Madam Chairman, I urge the defeat of this amendment, which further cuts the heart out of this bill.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Madam Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and to direct a question to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

What is the gentlewoman's response to a situation in which the bulk of employees currently are women and in which the women are currently receiving a lower hourly rate and in which the economics of the situation prohibits an immediate increase in pay to equal the pay of the minority of men in the plant? Under the rigidity of the bill, as I understand it, what alternative rests with the employer?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I would say to the gentleman from Michigan and to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that the purpose of this bill is to provide equal pay for women. The purpose of the bill is not to depress wages. If the pending amendment is adopted, you will not be providing equal pay, but

you will be depressing the wages of both men and women.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I respectfully submit to the gentlewoman that she has deliberately evaded my question. What happens in an industry or in a plant in which the situation is as I have described it?

I submit, Madam Chairman, the answer is that the plant goes out of operation and the entire payroll is laid off.

Mr. GOODELL. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. GOODELL. I would like to state that in my opinion, in all sincerity, my colleague has exaggerated the effect of this amendment in opposition to it, because the administration submitted this bill without the provision which I propose to delete. I am sure they would not support a bill here for equal rates leaving this out if it was thought vital and the heart of the bill.

Mr. ZELENKO. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ZELENKO. The administration admitted it had omitted this most necessary sentence in the bill, otherwise equalization would be downward. This spells it out exactly. You could put one man into this operation at a lower wage and depress the wages of all the women, or you could put one woman in one plant and depress the wages of all the men if this amendment carries.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Madam Chairman, I repeat, I did not hear the gentleman answer my question.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ZELENKO) there were—ayes 103, noes 85.

Mr. ZELENKO. Madam Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. GOODELL and Mr. ZELENKO.

The Committee again divided and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 132, noes 116.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASHBROOK to the amendment offered by Mr. ZELENKO: Strike out lines 17 through 25 on page 11 and the first two lines on page 12 and insert the following:

"EFFECT OF OTHER LAWS

"Sec. 9. This Act shall not apply with respect to any employee who is employed in a State in which there is a State law which prohibits discrimination in rates of pay on the basis of sex and provides that such law may be enforced in the courts of the State through civil or criminal actions."

Mr. ASHBROOK. Madam Chairman, I would like to announce to the House that this will be the last amendment which the Members on our side of the aisle have to offer to this bill, at least as far as the members of the committee are concerned.

Madam Chairman, of all the amendments which have been offered this is probably the easiest amendment to understand. All of us can agree in principle with the purpose of this bill. This amendment, in effect, asks one question: What compelling reason is there, since we all agree in principle with this bill, to strike down the laws of 22 States?

Madam Chairman, the following States have legislation on the books at the present time: Alabama, Arkansas, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Hawaii, Illinois, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Montana, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

Madam Chairman, I venture to say that in the course of the next few months every single one of us will go home to hit the campaign trail and talk about the separation of powers and about the need to have responsible, autonomous States. Yet here we are saying the actions of 22 States involved will have no force whatsoever. I suggest that there can be but two reasons to justify striking down all 22 State statutes: Either you are going to say that the States are not competent to act, or you are going to say that the States which have acted did not act in a competent manner. I suggest that both allegations are untrue and that the States which have acted and which have enacted laws of this type should not, therefore, be placed in the position of having their laws wiped off the books.

Madam Chairman, I was very much interested in the comments made by the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. HANSEN], when she spoke of the wealth of experience that had been built up in the administration of these laws by the State. I ask the simple question: Are we now going to say that those States have not been doing a proper job? You States do not know what ought to be done here. We are going to completely strike out your laws and your efforts to correct this problem in your own respectful manner.

Madam Chairman, I suggest that this is a very important amendment to the bill and that it should command the earnest support of all who believe truly in the separation of powers, who believe in the responsibility of the States and who do not fall for the idea that every answer to every problem should emanate from Washington.

Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Madam Chairman, it seems to me that the purpose on one side of the aisle is abundantly clear now. A few moments ago when an amendment was offered, the gentleman from Michigan quoted a woman from Pennsylvania as objecting to the situation at the present time because it would force an industry to move to another State where they did not have the same kind of law. The gentleman from Michigan supported the amendment on this basis, that this would be unfair. Now we have an amendment which says in effect, "We do not want

the laws in all of the States to be the same. We will pass a meaningless Federal law, but we will allow the State laws in 22 cases to take precedence over the Federal law. So that if we have an industry which is forced to pay higher wages under the Federal law it will move to an adjoining State where it can get away with anything."

The gentleman from Ohio is right. There are 22 States that have an equal pay law at the present time. If his amendment is adopted it will extend an open invitation to all of the other States in the Union to pass the most meaningless legislation they could conceive of, which would simply say, "Let us have equal pay for equal work for men and women in this country." This is all it would do. I think now we see the clear picture of what the Republicans have done. They have taken out of the bill the enforcement procedures in it. They have said upon the record, "Oh, we love women and we want women to be paid the same wages men are paid, but we make it impossible to enforce the Federal law. Then we say that the Federal law has no meaning, that the State laws will take precedence."

The Solicitor of the Department of Labor says that he knows of no comparable provisions allowing State laws to supersede Federal legislation in existing labor law or in any other law.

I suggest, if this amendment is approved it will completely nullify or completely contradict the purpose of this legislation. No matter how weak a State law is, the Federal Government could not apply this legislation.

Let me cite some specific States. Illinois has had an equal pay law since 1944. It applies only to employers who are engaged in manufacture. It does not require employers to keep any records, nor does it specifically place responsibility for enforcement in a State labor commissioner. It says that wage differentials based on sex are not prohibited where authorized by contracts between the employer and a recognized bargaining agent.

The people on this side of the aisle supported the amendment which was offered by the gentleman from New York which brought the labor unions under it. Again, if the amendment is adopted, which was offered by the gentleman from Ohio, this will make it impossible in the State of Illinois, according to the State law which would supersede the Federal law, to be enforced there.

I might say also that there are laws in New Hampshire and Rhode Island which permit a differential in wage rates, and if a woman worker is covered by a union contract which establishes a wage differential based on sex then the law does not apply.

Pennsylvania has an equal pay law with some teeth in it. But here is the testimony of the same woman who was cited by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN]. This is her testimony before our committee:

We in Pennsylvania will welcome the day when the Federal Government will take over responsibility for equal pay statutes where interstate commerce is involved. There is

still a wide field of employment where the State will continue to have sole responsibility for securing equal pay for equal work. Then the Federal law should be released to concentrate our limited resources on interstate cases.

I might cite Arkansas which also has an equal pay law with enforcement powers. Here is the testimony of the Commissioner of Labor for Arkansas who is also the President of the International Association of Government Labor Officials. This official from Arkansas says:

It may very well be that the Congress is a quarter of a century late in preparation of such an equal pay law, but certainly its passage should not be delayed further.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] has expired.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Madam Chairman, I would say to my colleagues, with every single women's organization in the United States supporting the bill which was voted out by the full committee, with every single one of these organizations having studied these possible alternatives and turned them down, let us not commit a farce of standing on the floor of this House and voting for one amendment after another which destroys the purpose of equal pay for equal work. And I say finally that I do not think we can go home to our congressional districts and explain away this kind of action. The women who have suffered the abuses of discrimination will not stand idly by for words that mean absolutely nothing.

Mr. GOODELL. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Madam Chairman, it is with great reluctance, in view of my esteem for my colleague from Ohio, that I rise in opposition to this amendment. Let me state it simply and I will sit down. What this amendment does is that it will provide that any State with any kind of an equal-pay-for-women act will then make the Federal law completely inoperative in that State. It is a State preemption. It means that any State which does not want the Federal law to apply need only enact the title of an equal-pay bill. There is no concept or standard in here for judging the adequacy of the State law, no standard whatsoever. If the State enacts just the title of an equal-rights-for-women bill, it would appear it would then negate the entire Federal law. I think the amendment in effect would gut this bill and destroy it. In good faith, I cannot support it, even though I feel I would prefer to have States rights given all possible opportunity to take over and do this job where they have the will and the desire. I do not like the provision of this bill which says the Federal law preempts all State laws on this subject, but we have the

choice between gutting the bill or voting down this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Would the gentleman agree that the language that it has been proposed be taken out is essentially the language of the Taft-Hartley Act?

Mr. GOODELL. I guess it is, yes.

Mrs. MAY. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mrs. MAY. I should like to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague from New York, and thank him for them. It has been stated categorically that we on this side are trying to gut this bill, that we are trying to ruin it with amendments. I for one do not accept that comment. I am not trying to do that. This is why I oppose this amendment. I do agree with the remarks made by my colleague from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] that if this amendment were adopted it would make a mockery of this bill and would negate everything we are trying to do. I thank the gentleman for his opposition to the amendment, and join him in it.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Would it not also be right to point out that in the bill there is this language:

The Secretary is empowered by agreement with any agency of any State to cede to such agency jurisdiction over any cases where such State has a statute applicable to the determination of such cases the provisions of which are not inconsistent with the corresponding provisions of this Act or has received a construction not inconsistent therewith.

In other words, it is the intent of this Congress and certainly of the committee that wherever there is a proper State statute, by arrangement with the Secretary of Labor that State can retain jurisdiction.

Mr. GOODELL. I agree with the gentleman. I have reluctance, however, about saying that the Federal Government will cede jurisdiction because similar provisions in other laws have not been operative.

Mrs. CHURCH. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. I certainly want to join the gentleman in expressing opposition to this amendment. I think the gentleman for so strongly indicating what damage its acceptance would bring. There are many here today who have sincerely sought to strengthen this bill by amendment. It nevertheless is my suspicion, from what I have seen and heard, that many on both sides of the aisle have sought to weaken it by amendment because they wish the measure either to fail or at least to be rendered ineffective. I am happy to say that there are many on my side of the aisle who desire a good, workable,

effective bill. I certainly hope that before the evening is spent we may pass a bill to enact the principle concerned, namely, that there should be no discrimination in employment pay on the basis of sex. I thank the gentleman for his statement against this weakening amendment, and join him in opposing it strongly.

Mrs. DWYER. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mrs. DWYER. Madam Chairman, I very strongly oppose the so-called Ashbrook amendment. In my judgment, this is the most seriously restrictive and damaging amendment which has been offered this afternoon, and there have been several unfortunate ones which I have also opposed.

This amendment would make a shambles of consistent administration of an equal pay law. In practice, it would substitute State law for Federal law in an important area of interstate commerce. It would defeat the very purpose of the constitutional provision empowering Congress to regulate commerce between the States.

Moreover, it would introduce into the field of equal pay a whole system of new inequities and discriminations. Individual State laws differ greatly. Several are simply statements of purpose. Many are not enforced. The effect of this amendment, therefore, would be to attempt to regulate commerce under a wide variety of inconsistent standards.

Furthermore, States which have not yet enacted equal pay laws would be governed by the Federal statute, which in general is a much more effective instrument than most individual State statutes. This would mean an additional disproportion. Employees in States which have had the initiative to provide equal pay protection would find themselves at a disadvantage with employees in States which failed to enact any such equal pay law.

The fundamental purpose of this legislation, Madam Chairman, is to provide uniform standards and uniform protection to cover all employees in interstate commerce. This purpose would be gravely violated by adoption of the amendment.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ASHBROOK. The gentleman from New York will admit the other side of the coin is the fact—if this amendment is not passed, what we will be doing here today is striking down 22 State laws and the efforts in 22 States to improve the situation; is that not correct?

Mr. GOODELL. I agree to this extent. The first thing this bill does, if it is enacted into law, is to strike out 22 State laws that are now in operation.

Mr. ASHBROOK. And that is whether they are good laws or bad laws.

Mr. GOODELL. If it is agreed that those 22 laws are operating effectively, then they may seek to come under the jurisdiction of the State agency.

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

Madam Chairman, I regret that the amendment dealing with section 10 was not in the form of a motion to delete the entire section. I question whether such an amendment would now be in order after the disposition of this amendment. But I take this time to read to this House, and I am not addressing myself alone to the Republican side, I am addressing myself to those on the other side of the aisle who day in and day out and year in and year out have expressed their concern over the practice and principle of Federal preemption—I invite the attention of all of my colleagues who have feelings on that score to these words:

No employer to whom section 4 applies shall be required to comply with any law of any State or political subdivision thereof prohibiting discrimination in rates of pay on account of sex. The Secretary [of Labor] is empowered by agreement with any agency of any State to cede to such agency jurisdiction over any case where such State has a statute applicable to the determination of such case, the provisions of which are not inconsistent with the corresponding provisions of this act.

I suggest that the language I have just read to you is built-in, absolutely guaranteed, Federal preemption. I suggest that this is a complete reversal of the once honored and once effective 10th amendment to the Constitution which declares that powers not specifically granted to the Federal Government or denied by the Constitution to the States shall be reserved to the States or the people. Now the question of whether there is to be a reservation of powers to the States is to be within the determination of one man, a Federal official, the Secretary of Labor. I oppose this provision and my opposition to it has nothing whatsoever to do with the avowed purpose and principle of the basic legislation. In lieu of the opportunity to express our opposition to this form of Federal preemption in the amendment that I would have liked to propose, I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. GOODELL. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. GOODELL. I take this moment since my time ran out a little while ago to clarify one point.

The gentleman from Ohio asked me if the effect of this law would be to negate all State laws. It would negate State laws to the degree that it covers employers that have more than 25 employees. If the Federal law applies to the employees, the State law would not apply but the State laws would continue in effect as to all the situations that are presently covered which the Federal law would not cover.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNS. I yield.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. May I ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] if it would equally negate the State as dealing with interstate commerce? It does not have anything to do with laws in the 22 States that are trying to regulate intrastate affairs.

Mr. GOODELL. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNS. I yield.

Mr. GOODELL. I agree with the gentleman, but I am afraid that most of the units covered by this law are in interstate commerce, and most of the units that are covered by State law are in interstate commerce under the present interpretation of commerce, so what the gentleman says is absolutely true. If there are companies not engaged in interstate commerce they would not be covered by the Federal law; therefore the State law would still cover them.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNS. I yield.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I would ask the gentleman from New York this: The State of Ohio has such a law which I was somewhat instrumental in passing, being in the legislature at the time. This law covers the situation of 10 employees or fewer. What would be the situation in a case like that? Would the gentleman care to say?

Mr. GOODELL. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania will yield, 10 or fewer employees would be covered by the State law. The Federal law applies to plants which have 25 or more employees and are in interstate commerce.

Mr. ALGER. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Madam Chairman, I am taking this time only to put in the RECORD at this point for the information of my colleagues some very interesting statistics which should be considered, such items as hours of labor, nightwork, industrial type work employment before and after childbirth, occupational limitations, sitting, weight-lifting requirements, and other specifications, implying that there is a difference between the sexes, a difference of such nature that if this bill passes in its present form it will result in eliminating an awful lot of women from work, because they will be competing with men who are not limited in these categories.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I include supporting material.

Madam Chairman, now that I have heard the debate and some of the amendments, I recognize that perhaps it is foolhardy for any male Member of Congress to take the floor of the House to question the provisions of a bill—the stated purpose of which is to give equal rights to women in the matter of wages and salaries. Let me preface my remarks, therefore, with the direct statement that I firmly believe in women, in their rights, and above all, in their noble role as women in the scheme of creation, in their inspiration to ever uplift mankind, and in the many fields where they equal or surpass men.

In raising these points I am arguing as much for the job rights of women, job rights which have been hard won and must be protected, as I am in pointing out some of the imperfections of this bill. In our desire to eliminate injustice and inequity wherever it may exist, let us not create greater problems which may bring about greater injury and more blatant injustice.

In the first place, the equal pay bill of 1962, as I see it, puts the Federal Government unconstitutionally in the field of prescribing wages, wage policies, and working conditions in the various States. This bill will control, through the Office of the Secretary of Labor, the setting of wages, and the hiring and firing of workers, clearly outside the jurisdiction of the Federal Government and an outright invasion of States rights. This is bluntly brought out in section 10 of the bill which states:

No employer to whom this act applies will be required to comply with any law of any State or political subdivision thereof prohibiting discrimination in rates of pay on account of sex.

Anyone who believes in States rights, therefore, must be opposed to this effort to enforce Federal regulation of State laws.

No one, certainly not I, contests the equality and fairness of workers being paid the same amount for the same work done. This is not what is really at stake in this bill because the intent of the bill goes far beyond. This bill tries to equalize men and women as being the same in meeting the conditions of work, ability to maintain the same standards on all jobs, and the ability to produce the same output.

The bill fails to recognize the physical differences between men and women. It has been stated many times, sometimes in jest, often very seriously, that there is a difference between men and women. To this I subscribe, and the very difference makes this bill inapplicable. The natural results of the passage of this bill could react to the detriment of the female workers.

There are State laws, which this bill says may be ignored, which make special provision for working women—laws providing stated rest periods and special accommodations so that women workers will not be forced to stand for long periods. I say these are good laws and are intended to protect women because of their physical differences. We are trifling with danger to permit, yes, encourage, disregard of these laws.

No one can contest the basic structure of the female body, designed for the greatest of all human achievements, the reproduction of life. Because of this physical structure women need periodic rest periods unlike a man. Prior to the menopause the structure of a woman's body and all her functions are designed to enable her to fulfill the reproductive processes. She cannot, therefore, stand for long periods, nor lift unusual weights, nor even engage in many of the physical activities necessary to put her on an equal basis with a man on the job, without perhaps having serious effect upon her child-bearing ability. We must look to her for continuance of the race and, gentlemen, this is even a more important responsibility than the part woman may play in our economic or mass production enterprises.

Comparable production, which is what we are really talking about in comparable work, must be on a continuous basis and the comparison must be on a daily basis, every working day of the month, every month of the year. The effect of this

bill may well be to put a number of women out of work, when they are not able to match the output of men. This bill will cost some women their jobs, it seems to me.

The other aspect of this bill is the effort to put the Federal Government into yet another field of our lives with the always-present danger of increased bureaucratic controls, increased interference with private business, and in further regimentation of the individual. Here we put into the hands of the Secretary of Labor and his associates the power to determine equal skills, equal capability, comparable work, and comparable accomplishments. How infallible will he be? We may determine this to some extent with the experience we have had with Davis-Bacon and Walsh-Healey where the absolute power of the Secretary of Labor has increased the cost of production in many cases and has resulted in unfair and indiscriminate penalties against the business community. This further invasion by the Federal Government, giving the Secretary of Labor new powers, in the language throughout this bill, will lead to further regimentation of private industry. This bill, therefore, does not lead in the direction of correcting an inequity, but rather will be destructive to private business.

Protect our women we must. Assure them every equality which they are able to assume, but please let us not jeopardize their more basic rights nor adopt a measure which, in the end, will move us one step nearer to loss of economic freedom for all our people, women as well as men.

At this point, Madam Chairman, I would like to put in this debate some of the State law now in effect concerning women, as different from men, in working. Many of these differences are right and necessary. These differences, recognized now in law, so far as correct in representing differences between the sexes in their work, will result in women losing their jobs if this Equal Pay Act of 1962 is passed.

STATE LABOR LAWS FOR WOMEN (AS OF APRIL 1, 1958)

During a century of development, the field of labor legislation for women has seen a tremendous increase in the number of laws and a notable improvement in the standards established. Today, each of the 48 States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico have laws relating to the employment of women. The principal subjects of regulation are (1) minimum wage; (2) equal pay; (3) hours of work, including maximum daily and weekly hours, day of rest, meal and rest periods; (4) industrial homework; (5) employment before and after childbirth; (6) occupational limitations; and (7) other standards, such as seating provisions and weight-lifting limitations. Not every State and territory has enacted legislation in each of these fields, and the standards established vary widely.

In some jurisdictions different standards apply to different occupations or industries. Only the highest standards established for the principal subjects of regulation, in effect April 1, 1958, are shown in this summary.¹

¹ Women's Bureau publications analyzing State minimum-wage laws and orders (Bull. 247, 50 cents) and State hour laws for women

Laws relating to minors are mentioned only if they also apply to women.

HOURS OF WORK

The first enforceable law which regulated the hours of employment of women became effective in Massachusetts in 1879. Today 45 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico have established standards governing at least one aspect of women's hours of employment; i.e., maximum daily or weekly hours, day of rest, meal and rest periods, and nightwork. Some of these standards have been established by statute, others by minimum-wage or industrial-welfare orders.

MAXIMUM DAILY AND WEEKLY HOURS

Forty-three States and the District of Columbia have laws which regulate the number of daily and/or weekly hours of employment for women in one or more industries. These limitations have been established either by statute or by orders. Five States—Alabama, Florida, Indiana, Iowa, and West Virginia—do not have such laws; laws of Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico set no maximum daily or weekly hours but require the payment of premium rates for time worked over hours specified.

One-half of the States (24) and the District of Columbia have set maximum hours of 8 a day, 8 a day and 48 a week, or 48 or less a week.

Nine States have maximum 9-hour day, and of these all but one (Idaho) have a maximum 50- or 54-hour week.

Minnesota has no daily hour limitation in its statute; weekly hours are limited to 54.

Nine States have a maximum of 10 hours a day and from 50 to 60 a week.

The highest standard (the fewest maximum hours) for each State and the District of Columbia applicable to one or more industries is shown here. Standards for Georgia, Montana, and South Carolina are applicable to both men and women.

Highest standards established for daily and weekly hours in 44 jurisdictions are as follows:

	Maximum hours	
	Daily	Weekly
Arizona.....	8	48
Arkansas.....	8	48
California.....	8	48
Colorado.....	8	48
Connecticut.....	8	48
Delaware.....	10	55
District of Columbia.....	8	48
Georgia.....	10	60
Idaho.....	9	48
Illinois.....	8	48
Kansas.....	8	48
Kentucky.....	10	60
Louisiana.....	8	48
Maine.....	9	50
Maryland.....	10	60
Massachusetts.....	9	48
Michigan.....	9	54
Minnesota.....	8	54
Mississippi.....	10	60
Missouri.....	9	54
Montana.....	8	48
Nebraska.....	9	54
Nevada.....	8	48
New Hampshire.....	10	48
New Jersey.....	10	54
New Mexico.....	8	48
New York.....	8	48
North Carolina.....	9	48
North Dakota.....	8½	48
Ohio.....	8	48
Oklahoma.....	9	54
Oregon.....	8	44

¹ Day-of-rest law provides, in effect, for 48-hour week; 9 hours a day permitted if time worked over 8 hours a day is paid for at 1½ times the employee's regular rate.

(Bull. 250, 40 cents) can be purchased from the Superintendent, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. Mimeographed summaries of State labor laws affecting women will be furnished by the Women's Bureau on request (specify State).

	Maximum hours	
	Daily	Weekly
Pennsylvania.....	10	48
Rhode Island.....	9	48
South Carolina.....	10	55
South Dakota.....	10	54
Tennessee.....	10	50
Texas.....	9	54
Utah.....	8	48
Vermont.....	9	50
Virginia.....	9	48
Washington.....	8	48
Wisconsin.....	9	50
Wyoming.....	8	48

Virtually all State hour laws cover manufacturing; most of them apply to a variety of other industries as well. Standards are usually the same for manufacturing and nonmanufacturing. However, in four States, the highest standards established for daily and weekly hours apply to nonmanufacturing. For manufacturing establishments, the maximum daily and weekly hours in these four States are:

	Daily	Weekly
Connecticut.....	9	48
Kansas.....	9	49½
Montana.....	8	48
Ohio.....	9	48

DAY OF REST

Twenty-two States and the District of Columbia have established a maximum 6-day workweek for women employed in some or all industries; in six of these States this standard is applicable to both men and women. Jurisdictions providing for a 6-day maximum workweek are: Arizona, Arkansas, California (men and women), Colorado, Connecticut,² Delaware, District of Columbia, Illinois (men and women), Kansas, Louisiana, Massachusetts (men and women), Nevada, New Hampshire (men and women), New Jersey, New York (men and women), North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Utah, and Wisconsin (men and women).

Besides the 23 jurisdictions with laws limiting the workweek to 6 days, 8 States have laws which prohibit employment on Sunday with specified exceptions: Alabama, Florida, Maryland, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Virginia, and West Virginia.

Eight other States—Georgia, Maine, Michigan, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Texas, and Vermont—have Sunday "blue laws" which prohibit the performance of work by an individual. These, since they do not regulate employment, are not listed with the day-of-rest laws shown above.

Three additional jurisdictions—Rhode Island, Kentucky, and Puerto Rico—have laws which require the payment of overtime rates on the seventh day or on Sunday, thus, in effect, encouraging a 6-day workweek. The Rhode Island statute, under the jurisdiction of the department of labor, prohibits employment on Sundays and holidays, but allows work of necessity and charity to be performed on such days by special permit, provided time and one-half the worker's regular rate is paid. The Kentucky law requires the payment of time and one-half the worker's regular rate for work on the seventh consecutive day for persons working at least 40 hours a week. Puerto Rico provides for

² Standard shown is applicable to females; another statute prohibits Sunday employment of all employees in commercial occupations or work in any industrial process with specified exceptions. (Employees covered by statute who are employed on Sunday must be relieved of duty for 1 of the following 6 days.)

a day of rest but permits work on such a day at double the employee's regular rate.

MEAL PERIOD

Over half of the States (26), the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico provide that meal periods, varying from one-third of an hour to 1 hour in duration, must be allowed women employed in some or all industries; in 4 States, these provisions apply to men as well as women. Meal periods are provided for by statute, orders, or regulations in 28 jurisdictions: Arkansas, California, Colorado, Delaware, District of Columbia, Indiana (all employees), Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Nebraska (all employees), Nevada, New Jersey (all employees), New Mexico, New York (all employees), North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Puerto Rico.

Arkansas and North Dakota combine meal- and rest-period provisions. In addition, a Wyoming statute mentions a lunch period in a provision for required rest periods.

REST PERIOD

Eleven States have provided for rest periods (as distinct from a meal period) for women workers, five by statute and six by wage order. The statutes in Kentucky, Nevada, and Wyoming cover a variety of industries (in Wyoming, applicable to women standing continuously); laws in New York and Pennsylvania apply to elevator operators not provided with seating facilities. Rest periods in one or more industries are provided by wage orders in Arizona, California, Colorado, Oregon, Utah, and Washington. Most of the provisions are for a 10-minute rest period within each half day of work.

NIGHTWORK

In 20 States and Puerto Rico nightwork for adult women is prohibited and/or regulated in certain industries or occupations.

Twelve States and Puerto Rico prohibit nightwork for adult women in certain occupations or industries or under specified conditions: Connecticut, Kansas, Massachusetts, Nebraska (except by permit), New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, South Carolina, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin, and Puerto Rico.

In North Dakota and Washington, the prohibition applies only to elevator operators; in Ohio, only to taxicab drivers. Utah prohibits the employment of women in restaurants on a split shift after midnight.

In eight other States, as well as in several of the States which prohibit nightwork in specified industries or occupations, the employment of adult women at night is regulated either by maximum-hour provisions or by specified standards of working conditions: California, Delaware, Maryland, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and Rhode Island.

Two additional States—Arizona and Virginia—and the District of Columbia prohibit night messenger service for females under 21; the Arizona law is also applicable to males under 21.

INDUSTRIAL HOMEWORK

Eighteen States and Puerto Rico have industrial homework laws or regulations: California, Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Puerto Rico.

These regulations apply to all persons, except for Oregon, where the provisions apply to women and minors only.

In addition, the Hawaii territorial wage-and-hour law empowers the commission of labor and industrial relations to issue rules and regulations restricting or prohibiting industrial homework where necessary to protect the standards of the wage-and-hour law.

EMPLOYMENT BEFORE AND AFTER CHILDBIRTH

Six States and Puerto Rico prohibit the employment of women in one or more industries or occupations immediately before and/or after childbirth. These standards are established by statute or by minimum-wage and welfare orders. In addition to the prohibition of employment, Puerto Rico requires the employer to pay the working mother during an 8-week period one-half of her regular wage or salary and provides for job security during the required absence. Women may not be employed in—

Connecticut, 4 weeks before and 4 weeks after childbirth.

Massachusetts, 4 weeks before and 4 weeks after childbirth.

Missouri, 3 weeks before and 3 weeks after childbirth.

New York, 4 weeks after childbirth.

Vermont, 2 weeks before and 4 weeks after childbirth.

Washington,³ 4 months before and 6 weeks after childbirth; 4 weeks before and 4 weeks after childbirth.

Puerto Rico, 4 weeks before and 4 weeks after childbirth.

Rhode Island's Temporary Disability Insurance Act provides that employed women are entitled to cash benefits for maternity leave 6 weeks before and 6 weeks after childbirth.

OCCUPATIONAL LIMITATIONS

Twenty-five⁴ States have laws or regulations which prohibit the employment of adult women in specified occupations or industries or under certain working conditions because they are considered hazardous or injurious to health and safety. In the majority (17) the prohibition applies to women's employment in or about mines (clerical or similar work is excepted from the prohibition in half of these States). Nine States prohibit women from mixing, selling, or dispensing alcoholic beverages for on-premises consumption, and one State (Georgia) prohibits their employment in retail liquor stores.

The following States have occupational limitations applicable to—
Mines: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Maryland, Missouri, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Utah, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

Establishments serving alcoholic beverages: California, Connecticut, Illinois,⁵ Indiana, Kentucky, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Wyoming.

Eleven States prohibit their employment in other places, occupations, or under certain conditions:

Arizona: In occupations requiring constant standing.

Colorado: Working around coke ovens.
Massachusetts: Working on cores over 2 cubic feet or 60 pounds.

Michigan: Handling harmful substances; in foundries without approval of the department of labor; operating polishing wheels, belts.

Minnesota: Placing cores in or out of ovens; cleaning moving machinery.

Missouri: Cleaning or working between moving machinery.

New York: Working in basements of mercantile establishments or restaurants without permits; coremaking, or in connection with coremaking, in a room in which the oven is also in operation.

³ Standards established by minimum-wage orders vary according to industry covered.

⁴ In addition, a Florida statute authorizes the city of Tampa to prohibit females from soliciting customers to buy alcoholic beverages.

⁵ Illinois State law empowers city and county governments to prohibit by general ordinance or resolution.

Ohio: As crossing watchman, section hand, express driver, metal molder, bellhop, gas- or electric-meter readers; in shoe-shining parlors, bowling alleys as pinsetters, pool-rooms; in delivery service or motor-propelled vehicles of over 1-ton capacity; in operating freight or baggage elevators if doors are not automatically or semiautomatically controlled; in baggage and freight handling; trucking and handling by means of hand trucks heavy materials of any kind; operating emery wheels, belts; in blast furnace and smelter.

Pennsylvania: In dangerous or injurious occupations.

Washington: As bellhop.

Wisconsin: In dangerous or injurious occupations.

The majority of the States with occupational limitations for adult women also have prohibitory legislation for persons under 21 years. In addition, nine States have occupational limitations for persons under 21 only. Most of the limitations apply to the serving of liquor and to the driving of taxicabs, school buses, or public vehicles; others prohibit the employment of females under 21 years in jobs demanding constant standing, or as messengers, bellhops, or caddies.

SEATING AND WEIGHTLIFTING REQUIREMENTS

A number of jurisdictions through statute, minimum-wage orders, and other regulations have established employment standards for women relating to plant facilities such as seats, lunchrooms, dressing rooms and rest-rooms, toilet rooms, and to weightlifting. Only the seating and weightlifting provisions are included in this summary.

Seating: Forty-five States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico have seating laws; all but one (the Florida law) applies exclusively to women. Illinois, Maryland, and Mississippi have no seating laws.

Weightlifting: Ten States and Alaska have statutes, rules, regulations, or wage orders which specify the maximum weight women employees are permitted to lift, carry, or lift and carry. Following are the highest standards established for weightlifting and carrying in the 11 jurisdictions:

Any occupation: 15 pounds in Utah; 25 in Alaska and Ohio; 35 in Michigan.

Foundries and core rooms: 25 pounds in Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, and New York.

Specified occupations or industries (by wage order): 25 pounds in California and Oregon; "excessive burdens" in Washington.

Madam Chairman, for these reasons I must oppose the bill, the various amendments notwithstanding. Amendments cannot correct the bill's basic inequities.

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

Madam Chairman, all afternoon we have sat here and heard some of our colleagues say how they favor equal rights for ladies, how they feel that they should be protected. We have before us at this moment the prize implement of this wrecking crew which is aimed at further weakening and destroying a bill which has already achieved a position of significant meaningfulness by reason of the amendments we have adopted.

What this amendment does is to offer an incentive to every industry—the same industries which have appeared here and indicated some measure of acceptance of this bill—to take the next plane to the State capital to have the legislature enact some kind of meaningless legislation which will for all intents and purposes sound good but signify nothing, and which will, for all intents and purposes, deprive the women of any oppor-

tunity for equal pay which they might have had under the bill, having secured the maximum legislation in the several States which has a meaning in equal rights and equal pay for equal skills. It offers nothing and, as a matter of fact, offers no protection to women workers at all. They thereby would secure exemption from this substantially weakened if not emasculated piece of legislation which we are now considering.

The function of this amendment is simply to enable States to pass meaningless legislation offering no protection to the women whatsoever and to provide exemption for industry and provide an opportunity to secure or draw away industry from industrialized States which have meaningful legislation of their own.

This amendment is bad legislation. It is an attempt further to deprive the women of equal rights, despite the high sounding preamble which is in the bill. It will work nothing but mischief and hardship on laboring women, upon women workers, and upon States which really try in good faith to comply with standards set forth in the bill we have before us or any legislation of its nature.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOELSON. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOELSON: After section 4, add the following:

"Sec. 5. Whenever the word 'sex' is used in this Act, the words 'or race' shall be added immediately thereafter."

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Madam Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. JOELSON. Madam Chairman, I am not going to attempt any impassioned oratory or stirring speech on this subject, because I know it has been hashed and rehashed, but I cannot in good conscience sit by while we are talking about discrimination in employment and not offer this amendment.

That is all I have to say.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Madam Chairman, I insist on my point of order. The amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey is not germane to the bill under discussion, which has to do with equal pay for equal work. It does not cover the subject which the gentleman from New Jersey has covered in his amendment. Therefore, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair feels that the point of order made by the gentleman from Oregon is well taken, and, therefore, sustains the point of order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMS to the amendment by Mr. ZELENKO: Page 2, line 21, strike out the period and insert the following: "and shall include United States congressional office staffs and United States congressional committee staffs, notwithstanding the number of persons employed in such offices."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Madam Chairman, I suspect this amendment will test the sincerity of those who want to inflict this legislation on the people of the country. If we are going to pass this legislation, and if the legislation is good enough to put on the employers who are engaged in interstate commerce, indeed it should be acceptable to us for application in our own offices.

It is just a matter of fairness. If it is good for the country, it must be good for congressional offices.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I hope the gentleman is not saying that this Member at least does not pay equally to women for equal work in his office, because I think I do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let me say to the gentleman that if he does he will not be affected, but the amendment will make the rest of the Members do the same thing.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I am delighted that he has offered this amendment. It was my opinion that that was already covered by the bill, but if the language was not clear enough to include congressional staffs, I will be very happy to support the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the gentlewoman for her erudite contribution.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. JOHANSEN. I suggest to the gentleman from Mississippi that the apparent purpose of his amendment is to adhere to the Scriptural philosophy of "Physician, heal thyself."

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman is correct. I was told a moment ago that the definition of an orator was a fellow who was willing to lay down your life for his country.

Mr. WAGGONER. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WAGGONER. The gentlewoman from Oregon says this has application to congressional Members and their staffs. I do not know of any congressional staff that has 25 people in their employ. So, would that apply to Congressmen even though they do not have 25?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, yes. This amendment takes care of that situation specifically.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I am getting to be concerned about this bill. Does this mean that if I vote for this bill that I will have to increase my wife's allowance?

Mr. WILLIAMS. May I say to the gentleman that if he is in the same shape I am in, your wife gets all of what

you have, anyway, so I do not suppose it makes much difference on that score.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHITENER. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITENER: On page 5, line 14, after the word "Act" strike out the remainder of line 14, and all of lines 15 through 25, inclusive.

Mr. WHITENER. Madam Chairman, I am sure that the committee did not intend what they have said in this provision of the bill. If they did, it should be cause for alarm to all of us. The language which we would strike by this amendment says this, in substance: "No person shall be subject to any liability or punishment for or on account of the commission by such person of an unlawful discriminatory practice prohibited by this Act if he pleads and proves that the act or omission complained of was in good faith, in conformity with, and in reliance on, any written interpretation or opinion of the Secretary."

Now, on page 7 of the report, in the second paragraph it says this about this section:

It also provides that no person will be subject to any liability or punishment because of a violation of the act if he shows that the act or omission which constituted the violation was in good faith, in conformity with, and in reliance on, a written interpretation or opinion of the Secretary.

Now, if I can interpret language, it is saying that the only defense is where the individual has in good faith misinterpreted the interpretation of the statute given by the Secretary of Labor.

We have seen in recent weeks a great effort made in so many areas of law enforcement to get away from the burden of the prosecution, or the one who is trying to impose a penalty upon someone, having to prove their case and have seen them trying to shift the responsibility to the accused.

I say to the Members of the House that such procedure is as contrary to the fundamental principles of jurisprudence of this country as is the Communist Manifesto.

Madam Chairman, in the 22d volume of Corpus Juris Secundum we find this language:

In accordance with the general rules that the prosecution always has the burden of proving the guilt of the accused beyond a reasonable doubt, accused never has the burden of satisfying the jury of his innocence, but has only the burden of raising a reasonable doubt of his guilt. And it has even been held that he does not have that burden. However, there is a manifest distinction between the burden of proof and the burden of adducing evidence also known as the burden of explanation, and, while the burden of proof never shifts, the burden of adducing evidence may shift from side to side, according to the testimony.

Madam Chairman, I know that none of us here would want to place upon any person charged with violating a statute, which is in its nature penal, the responsibility of proving his innocence. Certainly you would not want to limit his

defense to his being able as a layman to understand these voluminous interpretations that are generated in various Government agencies.

I am not talking about the merits of the equal pay situation. I am not talking about these fine political issues that are drawn. I am interested in preserving in our country some semblance of order in the courts of the country and some protection to the people who come before those courts, whether they are administrative tribunals or duly constituted courts of justice.

Madam Chairman, I urge that this amendment be adopted because it is offered in all seriousness and earnestness.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] may be permitted to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. WHITENER. I certainly would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I want to say that I have the very highest regard for the ability of the gentleman from North Carolina who is now in the well of the House, and I know what he is concerned about. However, I do not interpret this language in the same way as the gentleman does.

Mr. WHITENER. Which I think points out exactly what the accused is going to be up against, because in 9 out of 10 cases he will not interpret the language of the Secretary of Labor in his interpretative bulletins as the Secretary may.

Mr. GRIFFIN. If the gentleman will yield further, the language which concerns the gentleman was put into the bill in committee for the precise purpose of giving a person charged with violation an additional defense to such defenses as he might have otherwise. If a person has obtained and has relied upon an interpretation made by the Secretary, he should not later be declared in violation because a court decides that the Secretary was wrong. This is language similar to language in the Portal-to-Portal Pay Act, an amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act, which was designed to give an employer charged with a violation an additional defense in the event he had in fact relied upon an interpretation provided by the Secretary, even though it was later declared to be erroneous. This language would provide an additional defense. It would not relieve the prosecutor from the burden of proving that the law had been violated.

Mr. WHITENER. I would say in answer to the gentleman if that was the purpose of the committee in engrafting this language to this bill, then the committee has engaged in a vain exercise because an accused would have that right under our basic law, whether it was contained in the bill or not. Certainly, no one can be charged and con-

victed or held liable to penalty for an act done in good faith, when such act is based upon language of an interpretation by the enforcement agency of government. You are not contending, certainly, that you had to have this in the act in order to give a man a defense to a charge made against him?

Mr. GRIFFIN. If the gentleman will yield further, I certainly think it is well to have this protection set forth in the act, because I do not think it is altogether clear that one can rely, under ordinary circumstances, upon an interpretative letter from an administrative agency as a defense.

Mr. WHITENER. Would not the gentleman agree with me, based upon reading the report of the committee, in reading the bill, that there must be, in order to successfully defend one charged with a violation, proof by the accused that he acted in good faith in interpreting the bulletins or the rulings of the Secretary of Labor?

Mr. GRIFFIN. If the gentleman will yield further, I will have to say that I do not agree altogether with that interpretation.

Mr. GOODELL. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield.

Mr. GOODELL. Madam Chairman, I can understand the gentleman's concern but I am afraid that he may cloud the legislative history inadvertently by his amendment. This language was put in the bill, not to put the burden in any way upon the Secretary or the Government or the employees to show that there has been discrimination. That burden remains the same. In other acts, particularly the Portal-to-Portal Act, we had a situation where the Secretary exempted certain employers and thereafter the courts ruled that the Secretary's exemption was invalid. As I recall, the Government tried to convict certain employers of violating the act even though they in good faith had relied upon the Secretary's interpretation of the act. We want to be sure that this does not happen with respect to this bill.

Mr. WHITENER. The gentleman and his committee have worked in good faith on this matter; still reasonable minds differ as to the content of their effort.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] has expired.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Madam Chairman, if the gentleman will read further in the same section of the bill, he will see some of the language the amendment seeks to strike out. In line 21 you say:

Such a defense, if established, shall be a bar to the action or proceeding.

I do not know what the committee was thinking about there because there must be a proceeding before this element of proof is developed and a bar does not occur after the proceeding is once commenced. The bar must occur, if you are

going to get technical and use lawyer's language, before the proceeding starts.

Mr. GOODELL. Madam Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further; assuming that the Secretary has exempted a certain group of employers; he has issued regulations saying that their situation clearly does not violate the act. Now, suppose the court later gives an interpretation that differs from the Secretary's. We want to bar any further action against an employer whose only violation resulted from his good faith reliance upon the Secretary's interpretations.

Mr. WHITENER. But the gentleman's committee, in the language of the bill has used the word "action" and after the disjunctive "or" the word "proceeding." The action is in the court; the proceeding is before the Secretary. You say the proceeding will be barred and the proceeding is not barred unless accusation against the accused is prohibited before he ever gets to the stage of a proceeding. The bar cannot occur after the proceeding started.

Mr. GOODELL. That is not the intent of the language, and I shall take time myself to clarify it with the sponsors of the bill on the other side of the aisle to be sure that the legislative history will be clear on this point. This language adds an additional defense. I think the language is clear, that the Government cannot proceed against an employer if he has relied in good faith on the Secretary's interpretation.

Mr. WHITENER. If the intent of the committee was to provide an additional defense, why did they not say that in the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] has again expired.

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

I wish to suggest that by raising this question the gentleman from North Carolina has served a very good purpose, because the legislative intent has been clarified. If there is any doubt or question, let it be clear, certainly so far as the members of this committee are concerned, that we do not intend the interpretation placed on the particular language by the gentleman from North Carolina. I think it would be too bad if this amendment should carry and this language were stricken out, because the language is intended to provide an additional defense and it serves a good purpose.

Mr. GOODELL. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield.

Mr. GOODELL. I would like to ask the gentleman to yield to the members of the committee on the other side of the aisle so there can be a clear legislative history with reference to the intent.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The intent was very clear in the committee to do the same thing we did in the Labor Stand-

ards Act, and that was to provide an additional defense rather than an exclusive defense. I believe the language is clear. Let it be clear that that is our intent on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. WHITENER. Madam Chairman, if the gentleman will yield; if that was the intent of the committee, would it not have been very simple to say in the bill that in addition to any defenses which an accused may have he shall have this good-faith defense that you mention?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Perhaps the gentleman may be correct; there may be better ways to say it. If the gentleman were to propose an appropriate amendment I would like to support him.

Mr. WHITENER. Does not the gentleman know, further, that the courts have consistently held that notwithstanding the common law presumption of innocence, by statute that presumption can be weakened or even destroyed in certain situations?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Let me say that I agree with the general argument the gentleman is making, but I do not think it applies to this situation.

Mr. WHITENER. Would the gentleman agree that if he and I in good faith might have some difference of opinion about the meaning of the language, a poor accused would find himself in a rather difficult situation?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Ordinarily, a person can only look at the statute itself. In many situations, if one relies upon an interpretation of some administrator, he does so at his own peril in the event a court later declares that the administrator was mistaken. However, in this bill we want to protect the employer and the union who rely in good faith upon such an interpretation and to provide that this can be pleaded as an additional defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The amendment was rejected.

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

Madam Chairman, I take this time to address a question or two to the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the subcommittee.

I have before me a list of the positions in the Department of Labor that will be needed from 1963 to 1967 in order to carry out the provisions of the legislation we have before us. As a member of the Department of Labor Appropriations Subcommittee, I am very much interested in this, because many times as we have acted on these bills estimates have been given to your committee as to the employee level, but when we come to consider the budget the employee levels are from 50 to 150 percent larger than the testimony that was given to the legislative committee.

The figure that was given to the gentleman's committee by the Department of Labor was that it would take 242 additional people in the Department of Labor to carry out the provisions of this act—172 would be professional people and 70 of them clerical. This same employment

level is listed from 1963 through the fiscal year 1967.

My question is, How many of these people are in the Solicitor's Office and how many of them are in the Wage and Hour Division?

Mr. ZELENKO. I am bound by the documents I have before me, which are the same as the gentleman has, as a matter of law. Under the heading "Administration" there are 34 professional and 21 clerical. Under the heading of "Enforcement" there are 18 professional and 15 clerical. And under the heading "Investigations and Supervision of Wage Payments," there are 120 professional, 34 clerical.

I would assume that under the heading of "Professional" you would perhaps have persons associated with the Solicitor's Office, but that would be a matter for the Personnel Division of the Labor Department to work out. I could not give the gentleman an answer exactly.

Mr. LAIRD. This includes the total for all divisions within the Department of Labor?

Mr. ZELENKO. I would assume that in accordance with the statement of the Department these people will be brought in from the different divisions of the Department, if possible, without the creation of a new bureau. As to the exactitude of the particular profession or from which department, I cannot say.

Mr. LAIRD. The total cost of this program then up to 1967 would be \$2,430,000?

Mr. ZELENKO. That is an estimate of the Department of Labor. It is only an estimate. I would hope the actual cost would be less. As required by law, that was necessary to be submitted to us and that is why you have it. It is an estimate of the Department of Labor.

Mr. LAIRD. There would be no reason that a regular wage-hour investigator in the Wage-Hour Division would concern himself, however, with the enforcement of his law.

Mr. ZELENKO. That might be so, but I would say this, that would be up to the departmental structure and that personnel officer to divide the investigators into the various departments.

Mr. LAIRD. You are not proposing that we have separate investigators for this particular act as opposed to the Wage-Hour Act, the Davis-Bacon Act, and the Walsh-Healey Act?

Mr. ZELENKO. I would suggest to the gentleman that would be a matter for the administrator and I would assume, if he had capable investigators who can investigate, then they will be just as capable of investigating the other of the various acts the gentleman mentioned. I cannot be of further assistance to the gentleman, I regret, than what appears in this document.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHANSEN. As a member of the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee, I am interested in the statement purportedly made by the Department of

Labor—that no new supergrades are going to be required. I wonder if the gentleman has any confidence in that assurance in view of the fact that a minimum of 242 additional permanent positions are to be added.

Mr. LAIRD. I would accept the statement of the gentleman, the chairman of the subcommittee, that this is the recommendation of the Department of Labor and that they will stand by it through 1967.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I certainly have every confidence in the good faith of the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Wisconsin, but I want the record to show clearly that if we are not confronted with a request for supergrades very shortly after the enactment of this bill, I will be quite amazed.

Mr. DOMINICK. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment to the pending amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOMINICK to the amendment offered by Mr. ZELENSKO: Page 11, line 18, after section 10, strike out the remainder of line 18 down to and including the word "sex" in line 21.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Madam Chairman, my parliamentary inquiry is whether the Committee of the Whole has not already acted on such an amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. An amendment to this section was rejected.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Then, Madam Chairman, I presume it is too late, but if it is not too late, I would like to reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order comes too late.

The gentleman from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. DOMINICK. Madam Chairman, we had considerable discussion a short time ago about the Federal Government preempting the laws of 22 States, one of which is Colorado, by the passage of this bill, and we seem to have gotten wound up during debate on an equal pay for women bill with the question of State and Federal powers, pricefixing, and a whole group of other things. The one thing I think we should be sure not to do as Members of the House today is to put ourselves on record as a Congress that wants to preempt State laws. Obviously, any law that Congress passes which deals with this subject matter is going to be effective and the courts are going to have to interpret the law. But where you have laws of States, already in effect, which may be even stronger than this law or which may cover different subjects or which may have different points of view, it seems to me that we also want those State laws to remain in effect. We do not want to outlaw the State commissions that we have dealing with this subject in the 22 States and simply move the employees from there

down to Washington, which might easily be the effect if we leave in this first sentence of section 10.

Please note that the rest of section 10 would remain in the bill if my amendment is adopted. The Federal Government will then be cooperating with the State agencies and in effect asking those States to coordinate their programs with the Federal program rather than having in the bill a specific statement that the Federal Government is going to take over the whole field.

Mr. GOODELL. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. GOODELL. I would point out to the gentleman that the language says that no employer to whom this Federal law applies shall have to comply with the State law. If we knock that language out I ask the gentleman if it is his intent that those employers and businesses who employ fewer than 25 employees be not covered by State law?

Mr. DOMINICK. They will be covered by the State laws.

Mr. GOODELL. In other words, this says specifically the language you strike out, not only that the Federal law preempts the State where there are more than 25 employees, but also states specifically that State law continues to apply where there are fewer than 25. It is not an attempt to make State law apply to fewer than 25.

Mr. DOMINICK. That is completely correct. It certainly is not. This law is going to apply to employers engaged in interstate commerce who have 25 or more employees. What we are seeking to avoid is saying here by act of Congress that we are in favor of eliminating State laws in this field. I think what we are saying here, unless the language is amended, could be considered to be a complete preemption in this field over any State law, whether they have 25 employees or whether they do not.

Mr. GOODELL. If the gentleman will yield further, I agree with him.

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

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Madam Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Madam Chairman, this language is similar to an amendment we considered earlier which was rejected. This amendment is designed to achieve the same purpose. If you strike out the first sentence of section 10 you are saying that these 22 States will have their laws supersede the Federal law. This destroys the bill's purpose of equal pay for equal work. It simply means that the weakest State laws, the State laws that are ineffective and are unenforceable, will take effect and that the Federal law will not apply. We considered this once before. I urge the defeat of this amendment at this time.

Mr. DOMINICK. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. The point I am making in this is that you are leaving in the rest of this section 10 in which power

is specifically given to the Secretary to enter into agreements with the States where they have comparable provisions.

There is nothing in this amendment which is designed to say we are going to leave State laws in effect and that they would supersede this law. What I am trying to say is that Congress is not in favor of passing a law which preempts all aspects of this field, and this is what we are saying unless we strike that sentence.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. If the gentleman would look at the first sentence he will see it reads:

No employer to whom section 4 applies shall be required to comply with any law of any State, or political subdivision thereof, prohibiting discrimination in rates of pay on account of sex.

Mr. GOODELL. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield.

Mr. GOODELL. I am fearful that the gentleman by her statements is creating legislative history if this amendment passes. I do not believe what she says is entirely accurate with reference to the effect of the passage of this amendment. All it would do, it seems to me, is strike this preemption clause. It would leave the Federal law in effect. It would also leave the State law in effect. The courts would have to decide, where there was conflict, whether State or Federal law applied; but I do not believe there would be a preemption by the State law over Federal law in that sentence if this amendment were enacted.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. The gentleman at least is in agreement that if this amendment is adopted that in 22 States the State law would supersede the Federal law.

Mr. GOODELL. If the gentleman will yield, I do not agree. What it does is that in those 22 States their laws stay in effect but the Federal law obviously takes precedence.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Then you are saying in effect that you want the Congress to remain silent on whether the Federal or State law supersedes.

Mr. GOODELL. If the gentleman will yield further, I just want to clarify the record in the event this amendment is enacted.

I do not want it to have the effect that the gentleman says it will have, and I do not believe it does have that effect.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I think it should be clear that the gentleman's amendment is doing what the gentleman from New York said; that is, we would be creating a no man's land where no one would know whether the Federal law or the State law operated until we actually had a case that might go either way. It seems to me that the obvious intent of the committee is that in the instances under section 4 the Federal law shall apply.

Mr. GOODELL. Will the gentleman agree with me that the Federal law shall

continue to apply even if the amendment is adopted?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I think it will be completely up in the air. Somebody will say that the State law applies, not the Federal law. I am not a lawyer, so it would not help me, but it would help a lot of other lawyers and result in a lot of litigation.

Mr. GOODELL. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I am afraid I must ask the chairman of the subcommittee about this, because I do not want the legislative history to do something that the amendment obviously would not do.

Mr. ZELENKO. I will say this amendment should be opposed because it will raise a gray area which will not exist if the bill remains in the form in which it is at the present time.

Mr. GOODELL. Conceding it does raise a gray area, the gentleman agrees this does not do the same thing that the previous amendment did?

Mr. ZELENKO. It would create an area of coexistence which would not be peaceful. So I oppose the amendment.

Mr. GOODELL. I understand the gentleman resists it, but the Federal law would continue to apply, perhaps in conflict with the State law, and perhaps it would create a gray area where there would be no jurisdiction.

Mr. ZELENKO. May I suggest to the gentleman it could not apply at all. It would be coexistence but not a peaceful one. I urge the amendment be voted down, because it would unclarify something that is clear now.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. But it is the genius of our Federal system that we have peaceful coexistence between the Central Government and the State governments. Is that not the genius of our system, that the Federal law prevails when there is a conflict, and at the same time the right of the State to legislate is preserved in this area where there is no conflict?

Mr. GOODELL. I may say to the gentleman I agree with his statement. I feel if the amendment is enacted the Federal law will continue to apply in all these 22 States. There may be conflicts where we do not know which law is going to apply to an individual situation, but I do not want the legislative history mixed up.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment to the substitute offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ZELENKO].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GRIFFIN: Page 5, line 15, after the word "Act" insert "a person charged with such alleged violation shall have all defenses otherwise available, and no".

Mr. GRIFFIN. Madam Chairman, this is an amendment which seeks to recognize and clarify the point made by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] a short while ago.

Mr. ZELENKO. This clarifies a point that was raised by the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes.

Mr. WHITENER. Madam Chairman, I would like to express to the gentleman my gratitude for his usual fairminded approach to these matters and say to him I believe he has materially improved my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ZELENKO], as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mrs. KELLY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11677) to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by certain employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce and to provide for the restitution of wages lost by employees by reason of any such discrimination, pursuant to House Resolution 677, she reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on the amendment. The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

THE REFUGEE FAIR SHARE LAW

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, July 1, 1962, marked the termination of the fourth 6-month period during which certain defined refugees were paroled in the United States by the Attorney General pursuant to the so-called Fair Share Act, Public Law 86-648.

The law requires the submission to the Congress of semiannual reports on the operations authorized thereunder and in order to keep the House informed, I include in the RECORD the fourth semiannual report, which follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE,

July 17, 1962.

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Operations under the act of July 14, 1960 (Public Law 86-648) continued in Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, and Lebanon during the fourth 6-month period ending June 30, 1962. Registrations of 5,217 refugees during this period reflected an increase of more than 43 percent over the previous 6-month period. More than 1,100 registrations were received during the month of June alone and were probably occasioned by the belief that the act would expire on June 30, 1962.

The enactment on June 28, 1962, of Public Law 87-510 which extended Public Law 86-648 indefinitely, made no change in the numerical limitation of 500 "difficult to resettle" cases provided for in section 2(b) of the act. A total of 259 refugees have been approved for parole under this section and an additional 72 cases have been referred to the voluntary agencies for documentation. With the exception of this category of cases, the Service has experienced no difficulty in obtaining the necessary assurances from the interested voluntary agencies.

Including the fourth period, the number authorized by statutory fair share totaled 16,490 and the total number of refugees who had registered since the beginning of the program exceeded this number by only 2,887. Statistics for the first four periods are tabulated below:

	1st, 2d, 3d periods	4th period	Total
Authorized by statutory fair share.....	13,416	3,074	16,490
Pending beginning of period.....		289	
Registered during period.....	14,160	5,217	19,377
Total registered (pending plus received).....	14,160	5,506	
Found qualified for parole.....	9,322	3,074	12,396
Rejected or otherwise closed.....	4,838	1,533	6,371
Pending end of period.....	289	899	

The continuation of established screening procedures resulted in 526 cases being rejected during the period on the following grounds:

Ineligible.....	77
Security risks.....	47
Criminal.....	30
Medical rejects.....	21
Immorality.....	4
Undesirability.....	60
Split families (spouses and children left behind in country of origin).....	106
Firmly settled.....	82
Spouses and children of above principals.....	99

Total..... 526

Additionally, 1,007 cases were closed because the applicants had taken advantage of

resettlement in other countries or had withdrawn their applications for other reasons.

Registrations in the various countries during the program are shown in the following chart:

Country	In camp	Out of camp	Total
Austria.....	807	1,622	2,429
Belgium.....		1,330	1,330
France.....		6,658	6,658
Germany.....	552	2,628	3,180
Greece.....	605	198	803
Italy.....	2,963	638	3,301
Lebanon.....		1,676	1,676
Total.....	4,627	14,750	19,377

The following is a tabulation of the registrations received during the period in the order of the established priority classifications:

1. Status of refugee acquired prior to Jan. 1, 1958.....	1,121
(a) Camp residents.....	66
(b) Out-of-camp residents.....	1,055
2. Status of refugee acquired since Jan. 1, 1958.....	4,096
(a) Camp residents.....	907
(b) Out-of-camp residents.....	3,189

The 899 cases within category 2(b) above could not be approved during the period because they exceeded the number authorized. These cases will be considered for approval within the next period only if approvals of the first three categories of priority do not preempt the numerical limitation for that period.

Some progress is noticeable in closing so-called refugee camps in the various countries and in reducing the population of these camps, as indicated in the following chart:

Country	Federal camps	Other camps	Non-national refugee population	UNHCR eligible refugees	Current INS registrations
Austria...	34	70	2,559	1,316	86
Germany...	31	397	7,691	6,729	284
Greece.....	2	0	(1)	(1)	160
Italy.....	4	0	2,823	2,001	215

¹ Information not presently available.

The Congress has approved private laws authorizing permanent resident status for three aliens in the United States, with the provisions that the number of refugees who may be paroled into the United States under the act of July 14, 1960, shall be reduced by a like number.

Upon receipt of assurances of housing and employment, 10,073 refugees had been referred to the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration for transportation to the United States and 8,260 had arrived in the United States as of June 30, 1962. In compliance with the provisions of section 2(a) of the act, detailed reports received on individuals paroled into this country are attached.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND F. FARRELL,
Commissioner.

PUERTO RICO

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from Ohio [Mr. Bow] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago it was my pleasure to be in San Juan, P.R., to attend the ceremonies which gave to the island a commonwealth status.

I had for some time prior to this occasion worked closely with the authorities of Puerto Rico in the establishment and ratification of their constitution giving them the right of self-government.

Before and since that time, I have been close to the people of Puerto Rico and have visited with them many times and have watched the phenomenal progress made in the economy of the island.

Puerto Ricans are a proud and resourceful people and I am proud to be able to count them as fellow Americans. They have proven their capacity for self-government and have accepted the responsibility of loyal citizens participating in government.

I desire to congratulate them today on this, the 10th anniversary of the Commonwealth.

Because of the maturity of the people of Puerto Rico, it would seem to me that they should definitely settle the question of their political status. This, I feel, should be done without interference by Members of Congress or by those in the executive branch of our Government. The right of local determination surely belongs to the citizens of Puerto Rico.

I have recently read a splendid article from the newspaper *El Mundo*, which is perhaps the leading Spanish newspaper of this hemisphere. I should like to call it to the attention of my colleagues:

Puerto Rico has more than enough maturity to settle its problems and, above all, we refuse to be used as a cat's-paw for personal gain.

In regard to the language to be used in our schools, our attitude has always been perfectly clear.

Puerto Rico has an absolute right to establish its own school system and is under obligation to preserve its native language. In this respect we maintain that the island, should it so decide, may achieve statehood without the least injury to its language, customs, traditions, and cultural values.

However, we are in favor of intensifying the teaching of the English language so that we may fully enjoy our common American citizenship with all the rights and responsibilities that it entails.

Furthermore, we beseech full respect for those groups that express their desire to send their children to schools where all subjects are taught in the English language. And it is a well-known fact that these schools teach the Spanish language so intensely that their Puerto Rican pupils do not only preserve their language but that they better their knowledge of it. Not only that, but those pupils whose mother tongue is English are made to learn the Spanish language.

Basically, we maintain that the hour has come when Puerto Rico must definitely settle the question of its political status.

So soon that the island settles this basic and essential problem to its existence, the

present inferiority complexes will disappear and we shall be on the way to face all other problems with absolute faith in our destiny.

THE LATE SENATOR FRANCIS CASE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, since this is the day set aside in the other body for recognition of the just respect due to a great U.S. Senator, FRANCIS CASE, who recently was called to serve in a higher body, I have asked unanimous consent to insert an editorial from the Custer County, S. Dak., Chronicle, the newspaper that Senator CASE published for so many years.

The editorial reads as follows:

"NOR LONG REMEMBER"

Thousands of words of eulogy have been, and will be, written and spoken about Senator FRANCIS CASE. Those words will in all likelihood fit into the category of which Lincoln had in mind when he said at Gettysburg "The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it will never forget what they did here."

Lincoln erred in his prediction. What he said is remembered, but what they did is, to most people, very vague.

It will not be so with FRANCIS CASE. What is said about him will be soon forgotten, but what he did will be long remembered. Stand anywhere in South Dakota and you will see evidence of his work—water conservation; the dams from Angostura to Big Bend; Mount Rushmore of which he was one of the original boosters and served on the national commission for many years until his death; national park and national forest improvements; Black Hills Ordnance Depot; Ellsworth Air Force Base; the Titan and Minuteman complexes; public buildings; hospitals; veterans facilities; rural electrification; airports; the list of major projects in which he had a hand is endless.

But it was the little things that he did for the people he represented that probably most endeared Senator CASE in the hearts of his people—the little personal matters such as a draft hardship case, a dispute with some Government agency, the encouragement of some young man or woman in a difficult time, help in securing a pension for someone, assistance in clearing an Indian claim—it was these little unpublicized acts for which he will be most remembered by his fellow South Dakotans.

Although the interests of his State were always uppermost, CASE made himself one of the most highly respected legislators in the Government, authorizing many important bills of national and international significance and his sound reasoning on the floor of the Senate commanded the respect of Members of both political parties.

Custer is proud to have been the home of FRANCIS CASE and is proud to have been able to share his abilities with the State and the Nation and the free world.

We regret that his most cherished ambition was left unrealized—his desire to retire from public life to his ranch and the outdoor life in the Black Hills he loved.

Bismarck said: "A really great man is known by three signs—generosity in the

design, humanity in the execution and moderation in success."

FRANCIS CASE was really a great man by that definition.

QUALITY STABILIZATION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I have listened to extensive discussions of the quality stabilization bill which the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], introduced and on which hearings have been held. As evidence of my support of this measure, I am today introducing a companion bill because it is, to my mind, of great importance to the small businesses of this country, and particularly to the independent retailers along the main streets of thousands of smaller communities in America.

Small business is suffering today from no want of sympathy. Sympathy abounds from every forum. Of sympathy, there is plenty.

Of interest, of concern, of diligence—of all these things—there is plenty. What is lacking is understanding—realistic comprehension and honest facing up to the nature of the real challenge—a challenge resulting from a breakdown in the fundamentals of our system. As a consequence, the small businessman, merely because he is small, no longer is able to compete as he must compete if he is to survive.

This is not a question of ability, of capital, of store location, or parking facilities. It is simply a fact that the workings of the marketplace today more and more exclude the small retailer as a competitor and, hence, eliminate him as a participant in our Nation's pattern of enterprise and as a social and cultural contributor to the life of his community.

Before a businessman, large or small, can have a business and be a businessman, he must have a product to sell. What we see in the marketplace today is a purposeful and deliberate effort to take from the small independent retailer the only products which he can sell. These are the best selling products in the marketplace, identifiable, honored, and famous brand names and trademarks.

The quality stabilization bill which I have introduced is a companion to others introduced by half a dozen distinguished colleagues. This bill, if enacted, will equalize rights in the distribution of identified articles. It will give the small businessman—the hardware dealer, the jeweler, the druggist, the electrical appliance dealer, the book dealer, and others—the opportunity to compete, to succeed, even to flourish.

The quality stabilization bill would give nobody a subsidy. It would cost the Government nothing. It would protect the independent retailer, add dynamic

incentive to the selling power of America's independent distributors and prevent retail monopolies.

What is more, the quality stabilization bill would give certain rights to brand owners who do not own or control their own distribution system but who distribute through the hundreds of thousands of independent retailers. These rights are already enjoyed by brand owners—such as the multimillionaire and even billionaire retail chains—who own their own distribution outlets and price-control their private brands.

If the bill becomes law more than 4 million small businessmen will have a better chance of staying alive as businessmen, and this Congress will have demonstrated to the Communist world that in America there is room for small business as well as big.

CAPTIVE NATIONS

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a dinner, sponsored by the Assembly of Captive European Nations in commemorating Captive Nations Week, was held at the National Press Club on last Wednesday, July 18, and the featured address was delivered by the Honorable Frans J. Goedhart, Member of Parliament of the Netherlands.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Socialist Party, and an outstanding business and civic leader in his country, I feel that Mr. Goedhart's remarks were extremely forceful and timely and certainly merit our review, and under leave granted, I insert them into the RECORD at this time:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE FRANS J. GOEDHART, MEMBER OF THE PARLIAMENT OF THE NETHERLANDS

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, as all of you know, Europe has made great strides forward and accomplished important progress in all fields during the last years. The EEC, the European Economic Community, is a booming success. We have now six countries, operating a Common Market. We may assume that Great Britain will adhere to it soon and then Ireland, Norway, and Denmark will follow suit. If no war or other catastrophic events intervene, within 10 or 15 years we, in Europe, can reach an economic level comparable to yours. Under American leadership and initiative we have organized the NATO alliance to defend our freedom, our way of life and our existence against the Kremlin and its pretensions for world leadership and world communism. Furthermore we are discussing now the possibility of an Atlantic Association, which will bring the United States and Europe still more close together. This is all very important and gratifying, but it is not sufficient, it is not enough.

The purpose of European Unity and Atlantic Association is to combine our efforts, to give a still higher standard of living to our peoples, to strengthen our common power and to be more and more a shining and attractive bulwark of freedom and democracy, inviting all other peoples to take advantage

of our experience and of the lessons we learned, and to share our responsibilities for a well-organized and peaceful world. In this process the heart of the matter is, however, to know clearly which are the dangers which threaten us, from where and how they will come. These dangers arise less from Kremlin policies as from our own willingness to become victims of illusions.

In 1945, at the end of World War II, the West has made unforgivable political mistakes. At that time most of our leading statesmen did not understand the aims of the Kremlin. The result was that we admonished and even pushed the peoples of Eastern Europe to ally themselves with the Communists and to accept them as partners in their governments. The result of this policy was that after a shorter or longer period all those countries fell prey to the power of the Kremlin and that they became Soviet colonies. In China we operated more or less in the same way. We admonished the Chinese National Party to accept the Communists as partners in government and the anti-Communist Chinese were put under heavy pressure by the West. It turned out that this was not a very efficient way to prevent a Communist take over in China.

One gets sometimes the sad impression that the only use of writing history is to amuse the historians. Stubbornly we refuse to learn the lessons of history. Today the same tragedy is going on in Laos. The Lao anti-Communists—who were certainly very weak, but nevertheless friends of the West—have been sacrificed. Now there is a so-called neutralist government in their country. One does not need to be a prophet to predict that within a rather short time Moscow could order a complete Communist take over in Laos.

At the same time we see the Communists penetrate into South Vietnam. There the United States is taking a firm stand and it is with feelings of gratitude and respect that I want to pay a tribute to the American soldier, helping there the Vietnamese against this Communist infiltration. The political initiative in South Vietnam is nevertheless still in the hands of the Communists and I am afraid that this will continue as long as there is no counter guerrilla fighting against the Communists in North Vietnam.

And what about Indonesia? There are reasons to assume that Sukarno has made a secret treaty with Moscow and that the Kremlin has promised to help Sukarno to bring about a Greater Indonesia, including a lot of territories which are not Indonesian at all. On the other hand there are indications that Sukarno has promised to liquidate the last remnants of Western economic influence in his country and to give Moscow complete control over all the Indonesian trade with third countries. Is this Indonesian dictator going to be a second Fidel Castro? I am afraid it is not only possible, but it seems to be probable. By making concession after concession to this so-called neutralist dictator, by giving him time and again more and more money and weapons, we will not be able to stop this process. The more we yield to blackmail, the less we will be respected, the more the neutrals will think, that the free world is a world of sheep.

I understand that some leading people in the United States believe that this country never had less freedom of action than today, and this because of the nuclear stalemate—the balance of terror. It is true that we all have the utmost interest in preventing a nuclear war. The same is true for the Communists—and they know it. The Kremlin however draws very different conclusions than we do. They believe that this nuclear stalemate gives them more freedom of action than ever before, as the West will never decide to start a big war.

I for one believe that we have for the same reason a tremendous freedom of action—short of war. For instance: At an appropriate moment the West could give all the necessary logistic support to the Chinese of Formosa so that they could help their unhappy brethren on the Chinese mainland. For instance: The West could assist people in the so-called neutral countries who want to get rid of governments, masquerading as neutral, but always taking sides with Moscow. For instance: The West could try to use all the possibilities of the United Nations. Why don't we raise there the issue of Soviet colonialism? Why don't we openly stand for liberty and freedom for Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Albania and the Baltic States? And for instance: When Ulbricht, Moscow's agent in Eastern Germany, who is in a desperate economic situation, is asking secretly for credits from the West, why don't we reply publicly that he can get them, on condition that he breaks down the wall in Berlin and releases all his political prisoners? We have unlimited possibilities, and unlimited freedom of action, if we stop being nice, vague, timid, and shy.

Our military defense is extremely important. We are still the strongest and that has to be maintained. Therefore we are still producing more and better missiles. In the same way we should concentrate on the cold war and on psychological warfare. We are still underestimating this necessity. In Europe we neglect this problem and, therefore, I am not in a position to criticize what is done in this field by the United States. I simply believe that it is not enough. Will this new Telstar satellite, this new magnificent achievement of American science and technology, be used for this purpose? I suppose that it will be possible for this Telstar to reach every TV set behind the Iron Curtain. This could give us a fine opportunity to speak regularly to the average Russian citizen. The cold war would thus be brought to the Kremlin's own door. The cold war front would move into the Soviet Union itself.

Some people in the free world believe that Soviet communism is mellowing. Perhaps this could happen in the future. I don't know. But to date I do not see any traces of this mellowing. I have read in the American press that a master plan for a reevaluation of your foreign policy has been submitted to the White House on the basis of this alleged mellowing. If the United States would be prepared to follow this line, it would provoke a new series of disgraceful events, the same as happened after Yalta and Potsdam. They are not mellowing, but they want to fool us as they have always done before. They want us to be nice to them, they want long-term credits, trade, and so on to bolster their system at our expense. They want to exploit our naivete, our innocence, and they want to make use of our willingness to believe in easy solutions.

To conclude, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for the award you have bestowed upon me. This is a distinction I highly appreciate. The Assembly of Captive Nations is an organization without power, divisions, missiles, and so on. You have only your convictions and your courage. You are fighting for the cause of freedom. That is what I always tried to do. I feel proud to be one of your many friends and allies. I thank you very much.

BACKLOG OF CASES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA JUVENILE COURT

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, on March 31, 1962, the backlog of cases in the District of Columbia juvenile court hit a record high of 2,631. I wish to call attention to the fact that it is now nearly 5 months since the President approved S. 486, authorizing the appointment of two additional judges to this court. I regret to say, however, that there has been no action yet taken to make the new appointments, although the newspapers report a spate of rumors on the subject. The primary purpose of this legislation was to relieve the already overburdened case schedule. Each day that these appointments are delayed is a further denial of speedy justice to those having business with the court. Postponement of the appointments makes more difficult the administration of justice and negates the action of the Congress already agreed to by the President on March 9, 1962.

THE SUPREME COURT DECISION RELATING TO SCHOOL PRAYERS

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, at the request of an esteemed constituent, Mrs. K. William Shields, of Amherst, N.Y., I submit, for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, her views on the recent decision of the Supreme Court relating to the recitation of prayers in New York State schools:

JULY 20, 1962.

HON. JOHN R. PILLION,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PILLION: The furor over the Supreme Court ruling that the New York regents' prayer is unconstitutional would seem to indicate widespread misunderstanding and confusion about the basic principles of religious freedom in a democracy.

As I understand it, the Supreme Court has simply forbidden any government to write an official prayer. Surely no one wants a government to tell him what prayer he and his children must say. This would amount to a secular religion, which is no religion.

If the Court's decision were to encourage more prayer in the home, and more time spent in the churches, it would promote religion in depth, which a secular school prayer could never do. And it protects our freedom to say the prayers of our choice. An official, general prayer would ultimately take all the vitality out of prayer, and hence, out of religion.

I believe that the Court's decision supports the fundamental principle of religious freedom, i.e., keeping the Government out of the business of religion. I would appreciate it very much if you could have this statement entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Respectfully yours,

DOROTHY L. SHIELDS.

THE HONORABLE JOHN W. McCORMACK

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BURKE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to call to the attention of the House the fact that our beloved and distinguished Speaker, the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, yesterday was designated an honorary life member of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States. The award conferred upon the Speaker reads as follows:

Whereas this association desires to recognize outstanding citizens and military leaders who have rendered extraordinary service to the cause of national defense and who have shared with this association its role in advancing a military policy which will provide adequate national security; and

Whereas particularly effective leadership in the national community has been evidenced in this field by the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, a member of the House Armed Services Committee and for a critical and significant period chairman of its subcommittee dealing with the Reserves; and Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, a wartime hero of the sea wars who later served as Chief of Naval Operations: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, That the above named citizen-leaders be invited to become, and are hereby designated as, honorary life members of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, and that appropriate ceremonies be arranged to confer this membership upon them.

The Reserve Officers Association of the United States is composed of members who served our Nation. They possess that spirit of patriotism that inspires the Nation whose sword and shield they are. For it is in the spirit of men, more than in wealth or the steel and explosives that wealth can purchase, that the security of America lies. Most important, of all the qualities that can make for the preservation, or the destruction, of a country, is that intangible but immediately identifiable quality known as morale.

The Reserve Officers Association of the United States possesses the talent of our military service and it is fitting and proper that we give credit to the accomplishments and abilities of our military men. Never before in our history have our Armed Forces played a more important role in our Nation. I commend the Reserve Officers Association of the United States for honoring the Speaker.

THE ROAD TO REVERSAL

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, in February of this year, the district attorneys of the State of Louisiana held their fifth annual conference sponsored by the attorney general of Louisiana in the city of New Orleans. The principal speaker during one of the sessions of this conference was Mr. Carleton Putnam, who chose the title, "The Road to Reversal." I have a copy of that address and under unanimous consent insert it in the RECORD for all my colleagues to read. I think it is a provocative commentary on one of the major problems facing us today:

THE ROAD TO REVERSAL
(By Carleton Putnam)

Chairman Gremillion, Governor Davis, members of the Supreme Court of Louisiana, Attorney General Patterson of Mississippi, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it goes without saying that I am greatly complimented by your invitation to speak here this evening. I am also greatly complimented by the action of your board of education in choosing "Race and Reason" for use in the schools of Louisiana.

By coincidence, within the last 24 hours, I have read two reviews of "Race and Reason," one appearing in the magazine *New South* published by the Southern Regional Council in Atlanta, and another in the *Reed*, a publication from the campus of Tulane University here in New Orleans.

Both of these reviews were amusing and well written. The only way they might perhaps have been improved would have been to have the reviewers read the book. In one case the writer is troubled by my failure to consider a certain important phase of the subject and he asks himself whether my omission may not be purposeful, since I might have had difficulty in dealing with the issue involved. Yet if he had read a few pages further, he would have discovered that not only had I dealt with it at some length, but had, I believe, disposed of it decisively. In fact I find on consulting the index that it contains no less than five different references to the subject.

Undoubtedly you have learned, as I have, that it is hard to make someone who disagrees with you listen to what you have to say. But it is a new experience—at least to me—not to be listened to, and then to be accused of not speaking.

Performances of that nature are difficult to answer. However, may I take this occasion to assure your board of education that I shall be glad to reply to all reviews they believe merit a response if they will call these to my attention. They have shown a confidence in me which I shall do my best to deserve.

On two occasions in the South last autumn I spoke on a subject which I called "This Is the Problem." In those talks I stressed the extent to which politically motivated equalitarian propaganda had infiltrated the life sciences since New Deal days and had spread from there throughout our churches, our mass media of communication, and our schools and colleges. I pointed out that this propaganda had captured the minds of northerners to a startling extent and had created a climate of public opinion on which the Supreme Court was counting when it handed down its desegregation decision in 1954. I emphasized my belief that to solve this problem we must first unmask the deception which has created that public opinion, and I suggested certain ways of doing it.

I mention those talks now because of their relation to what I want to say tonight. I am calling this speech "The Road to Reversal," and I propose to suggest to you as lawyers a few specific matters which I think may be helpful. But I can hold out little hope unless, while you are organizing your legal materials, you also go forward with a program of public enlightenment. We must have a two-pronged attack. Neither one is enough alone. On the one hand the climate of public opinion must be changed, on the other the change must be crystallized in specific legal action.

Both processes can and should be advanced together. A well prepared legal case can do a lot to educate the public mind. And I would guess that some well prepared and documented speeches by a few southern Governors and Senators might filter through to the courts. Organization is required in both spheres, but it is particularly needed in the legal sphere. Your legal case must not go forward too much in advance of your public enlightenment, and most especially your legal case must not go forward on half-cooked evidence.

I wish to avoid getting into the question, on which you alone are competent to pass, as to where you should attack and where defend. A besieged castle (or a series of castles) with a good moat, well provisioned and with a determined garrison, could often outlast the enemy. There may be many such situations in the South today, particularly if you use the time to destroy the illusion on which the morale of the foe depends. All of us know that at bottom this is not a legal war. It is a political war.

On the other hand, individual cases may arise where you will have an opportunity to go up again to the Supreme Court and challenge your trouble at its source. Such cases might be likened to individual soldiers trying to scale your walls, sometimes succeeding and being sealed off, if that's the best you can do with them, but surely the preferable strategy is to work for the day when the individual case at last presents a chance to reverse the 1954 decision. Procedural delays may work for a long time, and are certainly legitimate weapons. Yet the surest place to end the war is in the camp of the enemy.

When I speak of legal organization, therefore, I do not necessarily mean putting all your eggs in one basket, but rather making sure that channels of communication are kept open among the States so that when the right circumstances coincide, the best lawyers and the best witnesses coincide also. It may be that a south-wide committee for this purpose is desirable, or perhaps "clearinghouse" is a better word.

Whatever it may be called, or whatever the procedures you follow, the only sphere in which I can possibly offer any suggestions lies in the area of new scientific evidence, or I should say evidence not yet presented to the courts. I think I could assure you now that if a serious attempt were planned to reverse the Brown decision then I could name you a score of scientists who would be willing to testify—men who would come from abroad as well as Americans. Not all these men could be brought in for a case here, or a case there. They would have to be satisfied of the seriousness of the effort.

And I would have to caution you that to let yourselves be dragged into a nose-counting competition as to which side had the more scientists would be futile. A friend of mine estimated the other day that if we could have a vote of all the scientists concerned with this subject there would be a hard inner core of pressure group equalitarians who would make up 20 percent of the total. There would be a second group of courageous men, scientists willing to fight for the truth even at great cost to themselves, who would make up another 10 percent.

And finally there would be the remaining 70 percent who would take the easy road, the road of conformity and political expediency.

In such a situation there is no point in going into a nose-counting contest, which of course has no validity in science anyway. You've got to examine brains instead of counting noses, and because of the clamor on both sides you must go even further. You must finally say both to the American people and to the courts: "Gentlemen, examine the evidence for yourselves." The most disastrous thing that the American people, or the courts, can do today is to let themselves be led on a leash by a bunch of leftwing scientists and their conforming associates, bragging as dictators always do about unanimous votes, when even a cursory inspection of the facts will convince any reasonable man where the truth lies.

If you can read the books of the equalitarians without bursting into laughter, I'll be surprised. The trouble is, the public doesn't read them; it takes their conclusions on faith—a badly misplaced faith.

Now let me offer you a brief summary of my own experience in dealing with these people. Those of you who have not yet worked in the field may be less discouraged, less misled, if you are alerted to the tactics and the strategy these scientists have developed.

The first technique you'll meet will be the quantity count we've just mentioned. There will be an attempt to overwhelm you with the vast agreement against you. You'll be told that nobody—but nobody—believes any longer in innate racial limitations. Then you'll encounter what I might call the Herkovits gambit: You'll be assured that no one wants to be dogmatic about this but, really, the reason scientists don't discuss race seriously any longer is because they're bored with it—simply bored with it.

As a part of this phase of the matter you'll be given to understand that your position was perhaps excusable once, but now it's antediluvian. They'll tell you you're actually living back in the Jurassic age. They'll say you've been buried down here in the South, and you're pitifully out of touch with reality. There will be scorn, there will be politely veiled contempt, there will be condescension, there will be ridicule, there will be assurances that all this has been settled long ago and that there's no point in wasting time reopening it.

One thing, however, you won't find in this brushing-aside phase—you won't find one word that deals with the substance of the issues. You won't find one scientific fact in support of the equalitarian position. I remember talking to an old and seasoned scientific veteran last summer and I was expressing surprise that race and reason had so far met with no attempt at refutation by scientists. There had been denunciation, but no approach whatever to real refutation, no advancing of scientific arguments or facts that a reasonably intelligent person could take seriously. And this old fellow gave me sort of a grim smile and then he said: "You haven't seen any because they haven't got any."

So don't be disturbed by the big bluff—that would be my first admonition. My guess is that there will shortly be a lot of unanimous ballots and they will be spread throughout the northern press. My advice regarding them is briefly this: Call the bluff. Say to these gentlemen: "Could you for a few minutes stop counting your noses, endure your boredom and step back into the Jurassic age just long enough to give us something of scientific substance to support your views?"

Perhaps at this moment some of you in the audience are thinking: "Aren't you oversimplifying things a bit?" In one sense, yes, I am. There are other stages to this game which I'm coming to now. But I'm not oversimplifying the emptiness of the bluff. I

don't want you to be discouraged by it and I don't want you to be alarmed by it. Do not let the virus of conformity which is rampant today throughout the country in every phase of life infect you and frighten you as leaders in the battle against integration.

Now let me suggest the second stage. The second stage I might call the stage of evasion. I could give dozens of examples from my own experience which, I'm sure, will be duplicated by yours. But I have time for only one episode which I'll take from the recent meeting of the American Anthropological Association in Philadelphia last November. There are some 600 fellows of this association, a majority of whom I understand are social and cultural, rather than physical anthropologists—that is, they are more concerned with man as a product of his environment than as a product of his race or genes. One hundred and ninety-two of these 600 were present at the business meeting on November 17 and they voted unanimously in support of a resolution which reads in part as follows: "The American Anthropological Association repudiates statements now appearing in the United States that Negroes are biologically and in innate mental ability inferior to whites."

Upon learning of this resolution I immediately called a press conference in which I publicly asked the retiring president of the association (a Harvard man) a question which I transmitted to him privately in advance. This question was: "Do you also intend to repudiate the following published statement by your recently deceased Harvard colleague, Prof. Clyde Kluckhohn, a Viking Medal winner and a longtime equalitarian, who said shortly before he died: 'In the light of accumulating information as to significantly varying incidence of mapped genes among different peoples * * * it seems very likely indeed that populations differ quantitatively in their potentialities for particular kinds of achievement.'"

I also publicly asked the retiring president whether he intended to repudiate the published findings of Prof. C. J. Connolly, physical anthropologist at Catholic University whose studies of white and Negro brains disclosed a higher frequency of increased sulcation of the frontal lobes in whites than in Negroes.

And I asked the retiring president whether he intended to repudiate the published statement of Dr. Garrett Hardin, professor of biology at the University of California at Santa Barbara, which reads as follows: "As a result of recent findings in the fields of physiological genetics and population genetics, particularly as regards blood groups, the applicability of the inequality axiom is rapidly becoming accepted."

I then called the attention of the retiring president to the fact that none of these scientists were Southerners and I reminded him that Prof. Ruggles Gates, an Englishman who is probably the world's most experienced and distinguished physical anthropologist and human geneticist, had made the public statement that there were vast differences among races in mental ability and capacity for development. I wanted to know whether the retiring president had any substantive comment on any of these statements.

At this point the retiring president had apparently had enough, because he referred my questions to the new president, who was a professor at the University of California at Berkeley. This professor wrote me a letter which I would call a classic. He confined his comments to the quotation from Professor Kluckhohn, and this is what the new president said:

"Relative to the statement by Dr. Kluckhohn, this in no way contradicts the position which was taken by the Fellows of the American Anthropological Association at the business meeting in Philadelphia. For example, people certainly differ in eye color.

These differences are due to genetic causes. Very dark eyes are more efficient in the tropics, but this has nothing to do with the ability of people to participate in the democratic way of life."

To this I answered:

"My quotation from Kluckhohn was as follows: 'It seems very likely indeed that populations differ quantitatively in their potentialities for particular kinds of achievement.' You attempt to answer this quotation by citing differences in eye color and you make the obvious remark that these have nothing to do with the ability of people to participate in the democratic way of life. Kluckhohn spoke of differences in potentialities for achievement and these do have something to do with the democratic way of life. They particularly have something to do with the statement in your Philadelphia resolution which flatly equates white and Negro intelligence. Your answer is therefore completely beside the point. You cannot deceive a child of 10 with that sort of nonsense, so I wonder what your motives are."

Here the new president had apparently also had enough because I have heard nothing more from him since. I did have one further reverberation, and it came from the magazine *Science*. This magazine contained a news story which accused me of misquoting scientists, or at least quoting them out of context, so I telephoned the magazine and I asked what scientists they had in mind. They said, "Kluckhohn," so I said, "In what respect?" and their answer was, "Races may differ in their genius for music but this doesn't mean they are inferior in their adaptability to our civilization as a whole. Kluckhohn may have been referring to differences of that sort." First we had the eyes, now we had the ears.

In this case I wrote a letter to *Science* for publication, and once more I said, "For my part I am willing to leave it to the judgment of any reasonable person whether or not references to 'man's innate capacity' and to 'potentialities for particular kinds of achievement' do not also in all probability include achievement involving intelligence, and whether or not differences in potentialities for intellectual achievement do not involve inequalities of intellect—in other words, superiority and inferiority in processes important to our Western civilization."

Perhaps you will agree that "evasion" is not too strong a word for the Kluckhohn example. As to the other scientists I quoted, mention of them has been avoided by the opposition, except for one remark in a conversation I had with the editor of the *Washington Post* who said some scientist had told him that in Connolly's studies of white and Negro brains the selection was too small, to which I could only answer that if this scientist has a better series, let him produce it.

There's another kind of evasion illustrated by the Philadelphia meeting of the American Anthropological Association. The passage I read you from their resolution was only a part of the whole statement. I've mentioned it first because taken by itself it does present a clear issue. But it wasn't presented to the fellows or to the public in that way. Here's the way it was confused:

"The American Anthropological Association repudiates statements now appearing in the United States that Negroes are biologically and in innate mental ability inferior to whites, and reaffirms the fact that there is no scientifically established evidence to justify the exclusion of any race from the rights guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. The basic principles of equality of opportunity and equality before the law are compatible with all that is known about human biology. All races possess the abilities needed to participate fully in the democratic way of life and in modern technological civilization."

Notice that the second clause leaves open the question, What rights are guaranteed by the Constitution? Before 1954, not even the Supreme Court thought there was any right to attend an integrated school, and the current view of the Supreme Court may change. Notice next that nobody disputes the general principle of equality of opportunity and equality before the law—the only dispute concerns the novel application of the principle in this particular case. Notice finally that everybody wants to vote in favor of the democratic way of life, but integrated schools have never before been considered, nor need they now be considered, an essential part of participating in our democratic society. I've already learned of fellows who felt they really were voting on these second, third, and fourth clauses. If a resolution were deliberately written to seduce the minds of unwary voters, and to confuse the public in the impression it made, I can scarcely imagine a better one than this.

You practically have to take these equalitarians by the scruff of the neck and lead them up to the one issue and say, "Look—the issue here is not equality of opportunity. The issue here is not equality before the law. The issue here is not the democratic way of life. The issue here is that school integration is social integration, that social integration, always, everywhere, has and does lead to intermarriage in the long run and that intermarriage, under our population ratios in the South, will destroy our society. If you want to discuss this matter, discuss it, but don't confuse the minds of the courts and the American people by always changing the subject, by always evading this issue, by always slithering away to some broad and irrelevant generality."

While we're still on the topic of evasion, there is one more aspect of the subject to be considered. I've heard many leaders in politics and the press and elsewhere, when they've lost all the other arguments, fall back to their "view of history" or their "humanitarianism" or their "religion." Frankly, I've never been able to persuade any of them to tell me what their view of history is. I will admit that the editor of the *Washington Post* was kind enough to send me a copy of Alexis de Tocqueville's correspondence with Arthur de Gobineau which took place between 1852 and 1859. Since the editor also referred to this material editorially in the *Post* in an attack on the *Cosmos Club*, I assume he considers it of probative value.

But, after a careful reading, I am able to find only the argument that an acceptance of the theory of racial inequality is wrong (1) because the theory will have bad effects in the world at large, and (2) because the theory itself is un-Christian. Yet clearly we get nowhere in life by shrinking from the truth because we fear it. Such a policy is about as defeatist, about as decadent as any ever conceived. As Garrett Hardin has put it, "only those truths that are admitted to the conscious mind are available for use in making sense of the world."

And as to these constantly recurring references to Christianity, much as I admire Tocqueville, I would like to ask the editor of the *Post* to name the man he believes would be the American whom the North, at least, would rank next to Christ himself in his broad humanity, his compassion, his sympathy for the oppressed—the American whose picture remote Siberian peasants tack to the walls of their cabins out of a sixth sense of his meaning in history.

Here was a man who far surpassed Tocqueville as a symbol of the Christian life, both in faith and action. His name was Abraham Lincoln and, by coincidence, just as Tocqueville was writing his views in France, Lincoln was making his Charleston, Ill., speech: "I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and

black races * * * there is a physical difference between the white and black races which I believe will ever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality."

Once again, I would like to make one thing crystal clear concerning the matters of kindness of heart and Christian principles as they apply to the integration controversy. I do not believe in hurting others. My constant prayer is that I may never discourage anyone who is doing his best, never dampen anyone's enthusiasms or increase anyone's doubts. And I remind you that prior to 1954 the fact of racial differences was being handled with a minimum of talk about those differences. Even after 1954, the South, out of instinctive kindness to the Negro, went so far as to base its whole defense on other grounds.

And what was the result of that kindness? It was used against the South. It resulted in more and more encroachment. Standing here tonight, I place squarely upon the equalitarians the responsibility for raising the racial issue. It was their insistence and their brutality which forced upon all of us the stark necessity of stating the truth.

So you might just as well tell these people that the typical southern white father and mother are not lacking in humanity and are not un-Christian. This is not a question of humanity or Christianity unless self-defense is inhuman and un-Christian. On the contrary, if there is anything which is anti-Christ and anti-human in this situation it is the ideology which forces genetic suicide upon a defenseless minority.

Of the many forms in which pseudohumanitarianism attempts to deceive us, the latest is the argument you hear more and more nowadays about the difference between an individual and his race. We're told that we must think only about the individual as an individual, never about his race—that a human being is a human being, and that ends the matter. Well, a human being may be either a man or a woman. We don't look at a person without considering his or her sex, and neither shall we ever look at a human being without considering his or her race. You might remind these gentry that there are situations in which we segregate the sexes (there are even separate rest rooms in public places) and by coincidence in some cases the segregation is actually connected with control of the breeding process. I have already dealt with the major aspect of this problem on page 42 of "Race and Reason."

As a man whose life has spanned all of this century, I would like to remark that I have watched with approval and sympathy the movement for social justice in this Nation and throughout the world. I have seen nothing in it to contradict my understanding of American ideals until the momentum of the movement began to carry us beyond the point where injustice to everybody else became the price of further progress for the underdog. That's where the American ideal calls "Halt!" That's where socialism, Marxism, and finally communism begin. There is the hidden rock on which true democracy founders, freedom dies, and our country is taken from us by forces that have made a failure everywhere else and will make a failure here if we permit it.

If President Kennedy and ex-President Eisenhower jointly announce their alarm over the increasing restlessness among our people accompanied by the growth of extremist rightwing groups, let them look precisely here for the explanation. These groups may have been prodded into saying impulsive and angry things, but they are expressing something of basic importance. They are not frustrated by the strain of the cold war, as the leftwingers would like us to believe. They are instinctively reacting against the moment when the leftwing pressure groups

in control of both our political parties moved us past the pivot-point in our social justice crusade—moved us into the area where the good we were trying to do for certain backward segments of our society was less than the wrong we were inflicting thereby on everyone else.

Most people, in the North at least, don't yet understand that the most glaring example of this wrong lies right here in the integration drive. You can make an argument, and you can confuse kindly people—up to a point—on the issue of taxing success to support failure. You can make an argument—up to a point—for social security and urban renewal and foreign aid and government favoritism to labor unions. But once you understand the facts, you can make no argument whatever for integration. Here at last, did our people only realize it, we've caught the Socialist, the Marxist, the Communist rehanding. This is the classic and unanswerable case—this destruction of the heritage of a thousand years to please the Congo.

So you can say with a clear conscience to every integrationist you meet: "You shall not pervert the word 'humanity' to cloak your effort to corrupt our civilization. You shall not masquerade under the banner of Christianity while you sap our strength at the roots and steal our birthright."

I may seem to be laboring the point, but it's very much a part of the total pattern I want to put before you. As you organize and begin your pilgrimage along the road to reversal, like Christian in "Pilgrim's Progress," you will encounter many challenges. In the scientific debate, which I am certain is of paramount importance, you will meet first Mr. Big Bluff and then the serpent of evasion. And as you drive the equalitarians back step by step, they'll slither from point to point until finally they seek refuge in the swamp of sentimentality—where you'll meet pseudohumanitarianism and bogus religion.

It is here that I'd like to offer the third warning which experience has taught me. The outstanding characteristic of all the equalitarian scientists is their political motivation. The truth is that these men are teaching that races are biologically equal because they want them to be—not that they want them treated as equal because they've found that they are. An example of what I mean is provided by Prof. Melville Herskovits, whom I quote in "Race and Reason": "Let us suppose it could be shown that the Negro is a man with a past and a reputable past; that in time the concept could be spread that the civilizations of Africa, like those of Europe, have contributed to American culture as we know it today; and that this idea might eventually be taken over into the canons of general thought. Would this not, as a practical measure, tend to undermine the assumptions that bolster racial prejudice?"

Now, I'm sure no one can object to a scientist having a declared wish to prove something in his research as long as the public and the courts are aware that such is the case. But normally we think of a scientist as a man seeking objectively for truth, and I want to advise you that you won't find him on the equalitarian side of this controversy. The whole movement is blatantly and transparently a political movement, saturated with the ideologies of the far left, employing many of its worst tactics of persecution and suppression, and drawing much of its impetus from Socialist and Marxist sources.

Remember, of course, that this fact alone will never win a court case or matter much to the well-meaning, uninformed liberal. I bring it to your attention solely as a factor in evaluating the validity of their scientific statements. Psychiatrists speak of wish-fulfilling dreams and here you will find many wish-fulfilling pronouncements calling themselves science.

Mind you, too, that there is enough scientific terminology and enough superficial cleverness to be very deceptive to the layman. Not long ago, for instance, one of these gentry put his position to me in this way. He said: "The Inca and Maya had at one time a great civilization in the Western Hemisphere, yet this civilization never spread to other tribes of the same race such as the Apache and the Navajo. This proves that a race may have the capacity for civilization yet never disclose it until some unknown, propitious circumstances occurs, and therefore we may say that the capacity of the Negro at this moment may be simply awaiting such a circumstance."

To this, counsel for the South must be prepared to answer: "We do not claim and have never claimed that the spark of civilization has always taken flame in Caucasoid or Mongoloid tinder. There have been frequent cases where it has not, and the receptivity has varied not only between races but between substocks. The point is that in the case of the Negro it has never caught fire. We will even quote you your liberal Toynbee: 'The only one of the primary races which has not made a creative contribution to any one of our 21 civilizations is the black race.'" Toynbee then went on to offer some excuses and some hopes which have no bearing on this controversy for reasons that I have set out in "Race and Reason." The quoted sentence is the complete and valid answer to the Inca and Maya case.

But I'm digressing. Let me return to this matter of political motivation. You will recall that it was the Franz Boas clique at Columbia that marked the beginning of equalitarian anthropology in America. Herskovits, whom I've already quoted, was a member of this clique. Another member was Gene Weltfish. In the issue of Newsweek for November 27 you will find an item which mentions Gene Weltfish as coauthor of a pamphlet called "The Races of Mankind" which Newsweek reports has sold a million copies under the auspices of the Public Affairs Committee. Newsweek places this sale, and the popularity of this equalitarian pamphlet, over against the position of Dr. George of the University of North Carolina in terms which make it clear that Newsweek is pretty strong for Gene Weltfish and not very strong for Dr. George.

What Newsweek doesn't tell the public is that Gene Weltfish once publicly announced that she had evidence to prove that the United States had used germ warfare in Korea. Nor does it mention the fact that she was listed by the Daily Worker as a sponsor of the American Peace Crusade and of the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born, both of which have been cited by the Attorney General of the United States as subversive.

To my mind, in evaluating the scientific detachment of a George versus a Weltfish, it would seem that the American people should be as aware of Weltfish's inclination of mind as they are of George being a southerner. After this, if they wish to accept Weltfish's views at face value, that is their affair. And I would feel the same way about the courts.

Let me give you one other illustration. I'm not going to mention the gentleman's name because he hasn't made public pronouncements like Weltfish's Korean charge, and I have no desire to embarrass him personally. This man was for several years chairman of the department of anthropology at a prominent eastern university. He has also been a visiting lecturer at Harvard. He has been an advisor on anthropology to one of the big broadcasting companies, he himself has appeared on television and he has in general been an influence in what I might call the popularization of anthropology.

Now here is this man's record: In 1931 he was a lecturer before the New School for Social Research which was classified as Communist by a New York State legislative investigating committee. In 1940 he signed an appeal for the release of a Brazilian Communist. In 1942 he was a lecturer before the School for Democracy which was classified as Communist by the New York Legislature and which merged to form the Jefferson School of Social Science, cited as Communist by the Attorney General in 1947 and by the California senate in 1948. In 1942 he published a book in which he stated that "Soviet Russia is the outstanding example of perfect management of ethnic group relations."

Then in 1943 he was a sponsor of the science congress, conducted by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, cited as Communist by the Attorney General in 1947 and 1948. In 1946 he was a sponsor of the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions which merged subsequently to form the Progressive Citizens of America, cited as Communist by the California senate in 1947 and 1948. In 1947 he was a contributor to *Interne*, official organ of the Association of Internes and Medical Students, listed on page 20 of the Guide to Subversive Organizations. In 1950 he signed a letter to President Truman from the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born, cited as Communist by the California senate in 1947 and 1948 and by the Attorney General in 1948, and in 1950 he was a sponsor of the Mid-Century Conference for Peace, listed on page 50 of the Guide to Subversive Organizations.

This gentleman was foreign born and when he came to the United States he used an assumed name for many years, finally legally changing his own name to his assumed name which he now bears. I don't know why he changed his name. The one he had was perfectly good, the one he chose was perhaps a bit more pretentious. His reasons remain his secret.

Nor do I mean to imply that this man was or is a Communist. I accept his disclaimer, filed with an investigating committee of Congress, to the effect he was misled. But I give it as my opinion that he was misled rather often and that his inclination of mind is far over on the left, far past the pivot point in the sense I used that term earlier this evening—the point beyond which social justice ceases to be in balance. And again I think it is quite as important for the public and the courts to know the orientation of equalitarian propagandists such as he, as it is for them to be deluged with denigration of Dr. George because of Dr. George's southern background.

I do not suggest that all professors of anthropology are in this gentleman's category. I think it improbable that you will find many situations like the case at Harvard where the FBI had to arrest a research associate in anthropology on a charge of perjury growing out of the Bureau's investigation of a Soviet spy ring. But it seems to me somewhat peculiar that Weifish and this gentleman who changed his name should be placed especially in the public eye.

You have been patient with a long recital and I now hasten to conclude. After you have met Mr. Big Bluff and survived the serpent of evasion, after you have passed through the slough of pseudohumanitarianism and bogus religion, after you have stripped the mask off the face of political motivation, you will come at long last to the gate of reversal. You may not get through the first time, but believe me, your journey will set such toxins sounding through hill and dale of this broad land that the true America, the sleeping giant, will awaken. He'll see you through in the end.

An acquaintance who has been very much on our side in this fight said to me recently, "We've become a nation of moral cowards, and that's worse than physical cowardice." I don't believe we're moral cowards, but let me emphasize that if ever there were a place where moral courage was called for, this fight is it. Let's be clear about it. You are not fighting just for the civilization of the South nor just for the protection of your children. This integration issue is the perfect ground for a greater battle. Here is the place not only to fight integration but to fight the ideology that spawned integration, the ideology of the far left, the over-drift beyond the pivot point, the leeching that would bleed us more and more. This time the sleeping, bemused North must be roused by the South. As I said earlier, these hard core leftists, striking at you, have betrayed themselves at last. You'll never have a better chance to beat them than you have right here, to save your own society and to save the American way of life for us all.

I tell you this because I've seen enough of these leftists to know their kind. The hard core realize that in justice they have no case. The ones that came to America in destitution—even the ones whose ancestors came as slaves—know in their hearts how much better off they are than if they'd stayed behind, they know whose heritage they've been privileged to share, they know whose traditions and whose laws set the framework for this Nation and what stocks set the tone of its character, so they know whose hand they're biting. And because they know, because they're guilty in their hearts, when you hit them with the truth they'll turn tail and run. I've seen them do it.

Recently Ashley Montagu, always a hard-core leftist, a member of the Boas clique and for 6 years head of anthropology at Rutgers, wrote a letter to "Perspectives in Biology and Medicine" which he accomplished an astonishing about-face with perfect composure. He said, "During more than 35 years of reading on the subject I have not more than once or twice encountered a writer who claimed the races were equal in mental ability." If you put that beside the 192-to-0 vote of the American Anthropological Association repudiating statements that Negroes are biologically and in innate mental ability inferior to whites, or if you put it against the trend and substance of the UNESCO resolutions which state that "scientific knowledge provides no basis for believing that the groups of mankind differ in their innate capacity for intellectual development," both of which Montagu himself signed—and, I believe, drafted—you'll have a picture of a man getting ready to run. And if you read the remainder of his letter to "Perspectives" you'll see he's going to start talking now about there being just a little bit of difference. Not enough to matter.

Well, my friends, take the little bit and continue the pursuit. You'll find that the little bit has made all the difference between the Congo and the United States.

As for the rest of these people, the majority who for the moment are blindly following the hard core, dreamy eyed and confused, how quickly they'll shift when they see the hard core turn. The conformist is really uncomfortable in his soul. Give him the leadership that rides like Paul Revere through every Middlesex village and farm, and he'll come awake.

My time is up. If there were any exhortation that I could give you as leaders I would give it now. I would urge you to put aside appeasement and defeatism and local politics and economic fears. More depends on your steadfastness than you may realize. Never forget how crucial this battle really is. Our forefathers, down the years, whose faith and valor gave us all we've got, knew how to act in a crisis. They were not easily dis-

couraged. They despised appeasement. So I'm not ashamed to leave with you some lines from a poet whom our English cousins loved when they manned the battlements:

"For all we have and are,
For all our children's fate,
Stand up and take the war.
The foe is at the gate!

"Though all we knew depart,
The old Commandments stand:
In courage keep your heart,
In strength lift up your hand."

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has amended H.R. 10904 to increase the funds for the National Institutes of Health \$60 million above the House allowance and \$120.4 million above the President's budget request. It is my belief that this additional money would not be spent efficiently and, if agreed to by the House, would, in fact, impede the efforts of the Committee on Government Operations to secure much needed management improvements in the NIH programs.

Mr. Speaker, in each of the past 5 years we have witnessed the curious phenomenon of the House authorizing substantially more money for NIH than the President has requested and the Senate voting an even larger increase over the House figure. This year, for example, the President requested \$780.4 million for NIH. The House increased the amount to \$840.8 million, and the Senate has added an additional \$60 million, for a total of more than \$900 million. In addition, \$50 million was requested and was allowed by both the House and Senate for health research facilities grants.

There may have been a time when such congressional stimulation was justified, but today we have an entirely different situation. The present administration is surely liberal in matters involving health, education, and welfare, and the President, personally and through a family foundation, has demonstrated a deep interest in medical research. This is borne out by the fact that the President's 1963 budget for NIH, including the health research facilities program, provides for an increase of more than \$62 million over last year's appropriation and an increase of approximately \$136 million over the amount actually spent in fiscal 1962. The President's recommendation represents an increase of almost 20 percent above the amount actually spent by NIH in 1962. This, I submit, would be a challenging rate of growth for even the best managed organization.

I have prepared two tables comparing the House and Senate increases of the 1963 NIH budget with 1962 budget

figures, and showing the history of NIH appropriations since 1950. Under unanimous consent, I include these tables at this point in the RECORD. The first of these tables shows, among other things,

that \$26.9 million was left unspent from NIH's 1962 appropriations in addition to the \$46.6 million held in reserve at the direction of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare:

TABLE 1.—House and Senate increases of National Institutes of Health budget, by institute

[In millions of dollars]

Institute or program	1962 appropriations	1962 operating budget ¹	1962 actual expenditures ²	1963 President's budget	1963 House allowance	1963 Senate allowance
General research and service.....	127.6	125.5	118.2	147.8	155.8	161.8
Cancer Institute.....	142.8	127.0	117.1	139.1	150.4	158.4
Mental Health.....	108.9	107.8	108.1	126.9	133.6	148.6
Heart Institute.....	132.9	113.3	110.7	126.9	143.4	149.4
Dental Research.....	17.3	15.3	15.1	17.2	19.2	22.2
Arthritis and Metabolic.....	81.8	81.0	78.9	91.9	98.7	105.7
Allergy and Infectious.....	56.1	55.9	54.6	59.3	62.1	68.1
Neurology and Blindness.....	70.8	65.8	62.1	71.2	77.5	86.5
Subtotal.....	738.3	691.7	664.8	780.4	840.8	900.8
Health research facilities.....	30.0	30.0	30.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
Total.....	768.3	721.7	694.8	830.4	890.8	950.8

¹ Represents amount available after \$46,600,000 was held in reserve at direction of Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

² Preliminary.

TABLE 2.—History of appropriations, National Institutes of Health, 1950–63¹

Fiscal year	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance	Appropriation
1950.....	\$41,246,000	\$46,371,000	\$60,563,000	\$52,146,000
1951.....	62,570,000	61,970,000	66,326,000	60,059,750
1952.....	59,034,000	57,301,885	58,431,058	57,675,291
1953.....	55,005,000	53,833,500	58,982,000	59,030,750
1954.....	56,340,000	61,586,200	72,153,000	71,153,000
1955.....	71,128,000	77,393,000	83,143,000	81,268,000
1956.....	90,314,800	89,773,000	113,416,800	98,458,000
1957.....	126,525,000	135,525,000	183,007,000	183,007,000
1958.....	190,183,000	190,183,000	226,783,000	211,183,000
1959.....	211,183,000	219,383,000	320,577,000	294,383,000
1960.....	294,279,000	344,279,000	480,604,000	400,000,000
1961.....	400,000,000	455,000,000	664,000,000	560,000,000
1962.....	583,000,000	641,000,000	835,670,000	738,335,000
1963.....	780,400,000	840,800,000	900,800,000	—

¹ Excludes funds for NIH construction and health research facilities grants.

I would remind my colleagues of the tremendous increases of appropriations for the National Institutes of Health in recent years. Between 1950 and 1962, appropriations for NIH have increased by approximately 15 times, while the appropriations for research and training grants to nongovernmental scientists alone have increased by more than 26 times. Few public programs have grown at such a rapid rate. Consequently, it is not surprising that officials of the agency have experienced organizational and management problems in administering these programs. In a letter dated July 6, 1962, the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service wrote me in this connection:

The rapid expansion of the Federal support programs for medical research, to which the report calls attention, has, indeed, created new organizational and management problems, and has made progressively more difficult the complex task of their administration. The difficulties incident to this expansion have for some time been a matter of growing concern.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Government Operations, through the subcommittee of which I am chairman, has intensively studied the NIH grant programs for the past 3 years. In April 1961, the committee issued a comprehensive report—"Health Research and

Training; the Administration of Grants and Awards by the National Institutes of Health," House Report No. 321, April 28, 1961—on the administration of these programs based on more than 2 years of investigation. In brief, the committee found that NIH is not adequately organized to administer the grant programs with maximum effectiveness. Among other weaknesses, NIH has failed to provide for a meaningful review of the financial requirements of research projects and NIH does not maintain sufficient direct and continuous contact with grantees for the purpose of determining appropriate levels of continuation support in relation to project accomplishments and needs.

I will not take the time of the House to describe in detail the deficiencies that exist in NIH management. These are spelled out and documented in our committee's two reports and two sets of hearings on the NIH grant programs. In the first of these reports, referred to above, the committee made 13 specific recommendations for the improvement of these programs. The Surgeon General and the Director of NIH have expressed agreement with most of the committee's recommendations and have stated their intentions to take corrective action. Unfortunately, NIH has taken relatively little action thus far

to back up its intentions. As I wrote the Surgeon General on July 13, in response to his letter of July 6 informing me of measures presently under consideration for improving the NIH programs, it is my hope that the administrative improvements being considered by NIH will not result in just another case of announced intentions without effective implementation. I will insert the text of my letter at this point in the RECORD for the information of the House:

JULY 13, 1962.

DR. LUTHER L. TERRY,
Surgeon General, Public Health Service,
Department of Health, Education, and
Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. TERRY: I want to thank you for your letter of July 6 and the copy of the July 3 internal report containing proposals for changes in the Public Health Service research grants programs made to you by your Interbureau Directing Committee. I appreciate your sending me this information on the measures presently under consideration for improving administration of the NIH and other Public Health Service grant programs. The specific recommendations contained in your Interbureau Committee report are consistent in many respects with recommendations made more than a year ago by this committee. If put into effect, these changes should greatly improve your present operations. However, I believe I speak for our entire committee when I express the hope that this will not become just another case of announced intentions without effective implementation.

Your letter details a number of changes in NIH policies and procedures, many of which you say have resulted from the recommendations and observations of this committee. Items 1 and 2, relating to serious management deficiencies to which the committee has called attention, refer to improved procedures for securing a more thorough examination of the budget requests of grantees, including provision for staff negotiation of the actual amounts required for research projects. I should like to remind you that the subcommittee's recent hearings showed these procedures to be essentially paper changes, rather than actual accomplishments. As a result of these and other administrative inadequacies found by the subcommittee, the full Committee on Government Operations, in a unanimous report issued June 30, expressed dissatisfaction with the slow progress being made by NIH to strengthen the management of its grant programs.

Item 7 in your letter refers to the new Public Health Service policy of using contracts in place of grants for the support of research in profitmaking firms. As the committee reported last month, substitution of one type of financial instrument for another does not in itself assure the effective and careful use of research funds. The committee took the position also that public funds intended to assist fundamental and other nondirected research, as distinguished from research performed at the request of a Government agency, should be made available to profitmaking companies only in exceptional circumstances.

I sincerely hope that you and your associates will act expeditiously to put the management of these very important health research grant programs on a sound footing. As you have stated so well in your letter, the rapid expansion of Federal support for medical research has indeed created new organizational and management problems, and has made progressively more difficult the complex task of administering these programs. Our committee also recognized this problem when it concluded last month that it "is inescapable, from a study of NIH's

loose administrative practices, that the pressure for spending increasingly large appropriations has kept NIH from giving adequate attention to basic management problems."

I sincerely believe it would be a disservice to your agency, to the cause of medical research, and to the taxpaying public if appropriations for the National Institutes of Health were increased beyond the amount the President has recommended before you have developed the ability to manage effectively these large and complex programs. I greatly appreciate your desire to keep me fully informed of the steps that are taken to achieve this objective.

With all good wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

L. H. FOUNTAIN,
Chairman, Intergovernmental
Relations Subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Government Operations, in a unanimous report issued June 30, 1962—"Administration of Grants by the National Institutes of Health, Reexamination of Management Deficiencies," House Report No. 1958, June 30, 1962—expressed dissatisfaction with the slow progress being made by NIH to strengthen the management of its research grant programs. While NIH has acted in several areas in response to the committee's recommendations, relatively little effort has been made to improve the overall management of these important health programs. In particular, the committee found no significant improvement in the inadequate fiscal review of project requirements on which it reported last year.

The adequacy of NIH policies and procedures for insuring the appropriate expenditure of research funds was tested earlier this year by means of a detailed audit of the grants awarded to Public Service Research, Inc., a company which has received about \$400,000 in NIH support for seven separate projects. The audit disclosed that the company misused and profited from grant funds and, in general, the company used the very broad discretion which NIH allows grantees in expending research money for its own advantage.

The audit findings, which I will summarize, demonstrate the extent to which NIH grants may be wastefully expended without NIH's knowledge or apparent concern.

The audit showed specifically:

First. Grant funds were used to finance capital and other costs associated with establishing a new corporation. During the first year and a half of its existence, Public Service Research, Inc., acquired practically all of its office equipment and furnishings from Federal research grants and contracts.

Second. The corporation, according to its records, claimed a depreciation allowance in its Federal income tax returns for equipment purchased from NIH grants.

Third. The corporation's rent, maintenance, and moving expenses, and the expense of remodeling its rented quarters, were charged as direct costs to individual Federal grants and contracts.

Fourth. The corporation derived a profit in excess of its actual indirect costs from the overhead allowance—15 percent of total direct costs—paid by NIH to cover indirect costs.

Fifth. Fees paid by the corporation to its affiliate, Clark, Channell, Inc., for hiring expenses included a profit to the affiliate. Such fees were improperly billed as direct costs to particular NIH projects; the persons for whom hiring fees were paid worked on several projects and, in one case, the employee performed no research on the project to which his fee was charged.

Sixth. Salary costs were improperly charged to NIH grants for (a) time spent by corporate officers in meetings of directors or stockholders and in the administration of corporation business; (b) time spent by a corporate officer as a consultant to NIH, for which he was also paid \$50 a day plus travel expenses; and (c) an employee who was hired to staff the company's Washington office and performed no research on the project to which his salary was charged.

Seventh. Various expense items were incorrectly classified as direct costs of particular grant projects, and in several instances entertainment expenses were improperly charged to NIH grants.

Eighth. Travel expenses were incurred in some instances for purposes which do not appear to have a direct relationship to the projects charged.

The audit also disclosed poor coordination between NIH and the Public Health Service, of which NIH is a part. NIH continued to pay Public Service Research, Inc., a 15-percent indirect cost allowance on grants after the Public Health Service had established an indirect cost rate of 6.66 percent for the same company in connection with a research contract. Following completion of the contract, the Public Health Service permitted the company to retain Government-owned equipment for use in connection with an NIH grant but made no effort to ascertain that the equipment was necessary for the NIH project. Shortly thereafter, NIH awarded a new grant to the company which included funds for the purchase of equipment similar to that which the company already had in its possession from the completed Public Health Service contract.

The suggestion has been made that the findings of this audit are not applicable to most NIH grants, since the grantee in this instance is a company operating for profit while most NIH grants are made to nonprofit institutions. This reasoning misses the essential point that under its present inadequate administrative arrangements NIH does not know whether or not grant funds are expended prudently and for the intended purposes and, consequently, NIH cannot provide reasonable assurance that the misuse of grants is not widespread.

While it is true that the bulk of NIH grants are made to investigators in educational institutions, this does not in itself assure that funds are spent prudently and for their intended purposes. In this connection, NIH says it relies upon the educational institutions for the effective management of grant funds, but NIH has conceded that adequate administrative machinery does not presently exist, either within NIH or in the grantee institutions, to insure that this responsibility is being met.

Mr. Speaker, it is apparent from the hearings held recently by our subcommittee that weaknesses in the NIH grant programs are due to causes more fundamental than staff inadequacies and faulty administrative procedures. It is the conclusion of the Committee on Government Operations that these weaknesses are due in large measure to the failure of NIH officials to understand the nature of their responsibility for the management of public funds. This lack of understanding is reflected in the statement of the Director of NIH that in making grants:

Selection of good men and good ideas—and rejection of the inferior—is the key. All subsequent administrative actions having to do with the adjustment of budgets, and so forth, are essentially trivial in relation to this basic selection process.

Our committee has, of course, strongly rejected this irresponsible view that administrative actions for the effective and economical expenditure of grant funds are "trivial" or are matters of little importance.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that the Committee on Government Operations stressed in its recent report that it is completely committed to the principle of allowing scientific investigators the greatest possible freedom of action in carrying out their research. The history of science clearly demonstrates that scientific achievement and progress have generally occurred under conditions which allow maximum freedom of inquiry for the investigator.

The committee concluded, however, that freedom for the scientist should not be confused with license or fiscal irresponsibility. One cannot condone waste and extravagance wherever it exists as being either in the public interest or in the interest of science. Grant money that is uneconomically or inefficiently spent deprives other scientists of support for their work. Moreover, the injudicious use of research funds is grossly unfair to the American public which is required to support this activity through taxation. What we must achieve is a harmonizing of freedom for the investigator with responsibility to the public in the expenditure of Government funds. NIH has the obligation to develop adequate policies and procedures for assuring that grant funds are prudently spent within this context.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make a brief comment on the matter of indirect costs. I note that the Senate has again this year struck the 15-percent limitation on the indirect expenses of research grants voted by the House. I hope the House conferees will stand firm on this item. The Committee on Government Operations has studied this problem and favors the adoption of a uniform Government-wide policy for indirect costs which will take into account the nature of the research supported and the benefits to the grantee institution. It should be kept in mind that under an NIH grant the scientist does not perform work for the Government; he undertakes a research project of his own choice with the assistance of Federal funds. Consequently, the Government's financial obligation is not the same in this case as it would be for

purchased research. It should be noted, however, that in certain instances research projects and facilities may possess a special national character which justifies their being supported wholly by Federal funds. But as a general rule, it is undesirable that the Federal Government assume the total cost of health research conducted in educational and other non-Federal institutions.

Even under the present 15-percent limitation, our committee has found it to be NIH's practice to pay the maximum rate for projects where indirect costs are nominal or nonexistent. For example, our audit of Public Service Research, Inc., disclosed that NIH paid the company a 15-percent indirect cost allowance, although the company's actual indirect costs were only 6.66 percent of direct costs—the rate negotiated by the Public Health Service for work purchased through a contract.

Mr. Speaker, when the House acted on May 27 to increase the NIH appropriation by \$60.4 million above the President's budget request, our subcommittee had not yet completed its review of the management of these programs. The subcommittee's hearings were held on March 28, 29, and 30. If the information obtained in those hearings had been available to me on March 27, I could not in good conscience have supported the sizable increase recommended by the Appropriations Committee. I am not an authority on how much money is needed to adequately support medical research. But it is obvious that to increase substantially the appropriations for these programs in the absence of effective management can only result in waste and inefficiency. It is also obvious that the funds which are spent unnecessarily as a result of the inadequate review of the budgetary requirements of projects would go a long way toward financing those new projects which are found to merit support during the fiscal year 1963. Surely, with the additional \$60.4 million already voted by the House, there will be more than enough money available for NIH support of all meritorious health research and training projects. I can see no possible justification for increasing the NIH appropriation still another \$60 million as proposed by the other body.

Last Friday, 32 of the 80 Members of the Senate present and voting supported the Proxmire amendment, which would have reduced the NIH appropriation to the level of the President's budget, or \$60.4 million below the House-approved amount. The Saltonstall amendment, which would have limited the NIH appropriation to the level approved by the House, failed to pass by only six votes. The closeness of the 36-to-41 vote on the Saltonstall amendment clearly demonstrates the reluctance with which the other body supported the recommendation of its Appropriations Committee to increase the appropriation for the National Institutes of Health \$60.4 million over the House amount and \$120.4 million above the liberal amounts recommended by the President.

Mr. Speaker, it took courage for those 36 Members of the other body to vote

against the recommendation of their Appropriations Committee. It is politically unpopular to give the appearance of not favoring better health for the American people, but better health is not the issue here. The real issue before us, shorn of emotional and irrelevant appeals to the need for eliminating dread diseases and increasing our life span, is the question of whether Federal support programs for health research shall be prudently administered so as to maximize the return from public funds, or whether these programs shall continue to be treated as a sacred cow, with officials of the National Institutes of Health exempt from the normal practices of sound public administration. It appears, Mr. Speaker, that the NIH officials have become so accustomed to a privileged position and to receiving appropriations far in excess of those the President requests that they are no longer responsive to congressional criticism. I would remind the House that the NIH Director has referred to administrative actions for the effective and economical expenditure of grant funds as essentially trivial considerations. In all fairness, however, I must add that we in the Congress have compounded NIH's management problems by our insistence on voting more money each year than the agency has programmed for careful and effective expenditure.

It is the conclusion of the Committee on Government Operations that the pressure for spending increasingly large appropriations has kept NIH from giving adequate attention to basic management problems. I sincerely believe, it would be a disservice to NIH, to the cause of medical research, and to the taxpaying public if these appropriations were increased beyond the amount approved by the House before NIH has developed the ability to effectively manage these large and complex programs. I, therefore, urge the House to firmly resist any effort to further increase these appropriations which the House has already increased \$60.4 million above the President's budget and \$196 million over NIH's actual expenditures for last year.

On Monday I asked the Director of the Bureau of the Budget whether there have been any developments since the transmittal of the budget last January which would cause the President to revise his recommendations today concerning the 1963 appropriations for the National Institutes of Health. Mr. Bell has written me that "the estimates contained in the President's budget for 1963 continue to represent his judgment of the funds needed to sustain the forward movement in the very important programs of the National Institutes of Health." I will place the Budget Director's letter in the RECORD here for the information of the House:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., July 24, 1962.

HON. L. H. FOUNTAIN,
Chairman, Intergovernmental Relations
Subcommittee, Committee on Govern-
ment Operations, House of Representa-
tives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FOUNTAIN: This is in response to your telephone inquiry of July 23, 1962, as

to whether there have been developments subsequent to the transmittal of the budget last January which would cause the President to revise his recommendations concerning the 1963 appropriations for the National Institutes of Health.

I would like to emphasize that the budget estimates for the National Institutes were considered very carefully last fall by the Bureau of the Budget and the President. The amounts which were recommended by the President in the budget were based on his belief that the support of medical research through NIH should continue to grow at an orderly rate consistent with the prudent and effective use of funds and trained manpower, and with due regard to other demands on the budget. On the basis of these considerations, the President recommended appropriations of \$830.4 million for 1963. In the light of recent data indicating that 1962 obligations amounted to \$694 million, the President's recommendation constitutes an increase of about 20 percent over 1962 obligations.

Since the submission of the budget in January, the President has sent additional messages to the Congress relating to health and education. However, the budget estimate anticipated these messages to the extent that the programs of the NIH were concerned. In addition, the NIH has completed its study of medical research manpower, which raises a number of important questions relating to the future manpower needs in this field. This report, however, has not been viewed by the President as requiring a revision of the estimates now before the Congress. Accordingly, the estimates contained in the President's budget for 1963 continue to represent his judgment of the funds needed to sustain the forward movement in the very important programs of the National Institutes of Health.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID E. BELL,
Director.

Mr. Speaker, I want to inform the House that our committee will closely watch the administration of the NIH grant programs, and that it is my intention to propose a reduction in the NIH appropriations for next year if the agency does not act vigorously to correct its management deficiencies and strengthen its capacity for the efficient and economical operation of these vital programs.

MASS MOVEMENT OF AMERICAN FAMILIES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter. The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the greatest mass movement of American families to new homes since the migration that brought about development of the West is recommended in a proposal prepared by the Committee for Economic Development. It seeks a comparatively quick solution to the Nation's farm problem by taking both human and Government resources out of agriculture over a 5-year period.

In recent years, the Committee for Economic Development has offered a number of worthwhile proposals for im-

provement of the general welfare. In the light of this fact, I find its attack on the farm problem not only disappointing, but downright frightening.

The purposely accelerated movement of millions of people from our rural communities is, in itself, questionable. Combined with failure to call for a comprehensive matching program in the fields of business and industry to create new job opportunities, it carries the prospect of economic and social chaos.

Mr. Speaker, simple disagreement with the CED plan does not, of course, provide a solution to the farm problem, and no one can quarrel with CED's desire to achieve solution. Certainly this Congress has given a substantial portion of its energies and time to the task, as have President Kennedy and the Secretary of Agriculture.

I do not believe, however, that rural America is ready to give up—that it is unwilling to seek new sources of social and economic strength which will maintain the free system of family farming that has wiped the threat of hunger from our society.

Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman has made an appraisal of the CED proposal in the light of alternatives that call for utilization rather than abandonment of our rural human and natural resources. I recommend his appraisal for study by my colleagues and all Americans concerned with a meaningful future for rural America, and under unanimous consent include it in the Record as part of my remarks.

The Secretary's statement follows:

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE
FREEMAN ON CED 5-YEAR PLAN FOR AGRICULTURE

I regard the CED 5-year plan for agriculture as the best thing that could possibly have happened to reawaken interest in the administration's food and agriculture program for the 1960's.

The CED, in its "Adaptive Program for Agriculture," has presented an ably and carefully prepared design leading to the abandonment of all farm programs at the end of 5 years.

For more than a year and a half I have pointed out that agriculture is at the crossroads—facing a choice between a sound program for managed abundance, on the one hand, and, on the other, the eventual abandonment of all farm programs. The only other alternatives that have been considered have been temporary or piecemeal or compromise attempts to postpone the day of decision—attempts that become more unsatisfactory and more costly with each passing year. It is my best judgment that each delay, each compromise, each attempt to further postpone the choice that we must eventually face pushes us in the direction of the abandonment of all farm programs and the disastrous consequences that would result.

Therefore I look at the CED presentation of its 5-year adaptive program to end farm programs as a welcome opportunity to study and evaluate its implications and to compare them with the goals set forth in the administration's program for the 1960's.

The following points, brought out by such a comparison and evaluation, are of utmost importance to every farmer and of real significance to every wage earner and every consumer.

First, the whole premise of the CED 5-year plan is based on the stated goal of doubling the expected exodus from farming, pushing it up to a level of 2 million farmworkers in the next 5 years, by means of an administered decline in farm income. This artificially accelerated dislocation of 2 million farmers seeking nonfarm jobs, together with the disruption of their families, plus the effects on the businessmen on Main Street and on those in rural towns and villages who provide professional and public services, all add up to a serious burden of adjustment and critically handicap the rest of the economy. A rate of economic growth sufficient to achieve satisfactory employment levels under normal conditions could be thrown out of balance by this additional load.

Second, the CED 5-year plan to end farm programs threatens to alter the basic character of American agriculture. If Government made good on its determination to stay out of the picture after 5 years, farmers would be faced with low and fluctuating farm prices. They would be left to deal with business firms in other sectors of the economy having monopolistic control over their markets. The result would be a disorganized agriculture where farmers were exploited by the large firms with whom they dealt in selling their products and buying farm supplies. Even the most efficient family farm would find it difficult to survive this type of economic pressure, and the control of agricultural resources would become increasingly concentrated into the hand of firms outside agriculture—firms which could and would begin to join together to raise prices to increase profits.

New forms of vertical integration and contract farming, such as have already developed in several fields, and would limit the freedom of the remaining farmers—would limit their freedom of access to results of research except under contract—would even limit their freedom of access to results of research and technological progress. And, should this occur, the limitations to the freedom of farmers would be in the hands of private corporations.

We already have illustrations of how vertical integration and contract farming take away from the farmer some or all of his managerial independence—even, in some instances, relegating him to little more than a piecework laborer's role. In the broiler industry, for example, the independent farmer cannot compete with the integrated industry because he cannot gain access to improved breeds and strains of poultry stock, he cannot secure financing on equal terms, he cannot keep up with the rate of technological and managerial advance where research information is available only through private channels controlled by the integrators, or where access to markets is controlled by the integrators.

The real threat to the independent family farm is not, in most cases, the giant factory-scale corporation-owned farm employing labor in large crews. Rather, it is through the imposition of a pattern of controls by centralized private authority over the existing family-farming pattern. It is a threat which would impose the domination of a few giant corporations over the farmer's independence as manager and entrepreneur. It is a pattern, the outlines of which are already clear, by which the farmer might remain on the farm, but would take orders from large business enterprise or a specialized management service in respect to what he should plant, when to plant it, how to grow it, from whom to borrow, and how much interest to pay, and to whom and when to sell.

Thus laissez faire could result—in agriculture as in other areas—in the development of a system of pricing as well as pro-

duction that would be administered by a powerful few. This is the threat to the American family farm, an institution that has given to this Nation the most efficient and productive agriculture the world has ever seen, as it has provided consumers with the best food bargain the world has ever known.

Third, the CED 5-year plan proposes to force human resources out of agriculture without considering basic human factors that would be involved. This is in sharp contrast with the administration's program to attack rural poverty by a rural areas development program designed to maximize total economic opportunities in rural areas.

Where the CED program would, by its massive shift of labor out of agriculture, shift a share of the problem of rural poverty from rural to urban areas and even threaten the very existence of towns and villages in those regions where millions of acres would be taken out of production, the administration program would seek to maintain the optimum farm population in rural areas and encourage diversified job opportunities to supplement part-time and part-retirement farming.

In planning to take millions of farmers off the farms the CED has not taken into account the fact that over two-thirds of the farmers who sell less than \$10,000 worth of farm products annually are over 45 years old. These farmers are at an age where vocational training and placement cannot help very much in getting nonfarm jobs in today's competitive market. They are at a time of life where roots are deep in their home communities.

Fourth, the CED program emphasizes the idling of land but ignores a basic philosophy of the administration program which emphasizes, instead, the wise use of resources. The CED proposes no plan for using our land for recreation or conservation—to provide facilities and services of which there is real scarcity and need rather than abundance.

These four points highlight major differences in approach, emphasis, and direction between the CED and the administration programs. Both programs recognize that farm incomes are too low. Both seek reduced Government costs. And both recognize the need for balance in agricultural production.

The administration proposes Government assistance to gear production to the amount that can be used, with price and income stabilization at fair levels.

The CED proposes an agriculture with no price or income protection, and a forced draft of people out of agriculture impelled by the hardship resulting from a sudden drop of prices to the free-market level.

It further proposes to cushion this hardship for a 5-year period of adaptation by three forms of payments:

1. Farmers in the plains area could receive cropland adjustment payments on 20 million acres (or more) now in wheat and feed grains, to accomplish its conversion to grass.

(After 5 years, farm income in this area would decline drastically. Relatively more farm people in these areas would have to seek nonfarm jobs. The adjustment hardship placed on small towns and communities in this area would be far greater than in other areas, yet no provision is proposed for assisting these communities in making adjustments.)

2. A 5-year, whole-farm, soil bank program would be inaugurated to hold feed grain production below 155 million tons—about the current level of total utilization.

3. Producers holding acreage allotments for wheat, rice, and cotton (but not tobacco or peanuts) would be eligible to receive temporary income protection payments starting at a level equal to the difference between the free market prices and 1960 prices, and

declining 20 percent each year to zero after the fifth year.

(Previous direct payment proposals of this type have not been well received by Congress, and there is no evidence of greater receptivity at this time. If a major exodus of people from agriculture did not occur while payments were being made, farmers would be left in an income void with the termination of payments. They would have little prospect of further assistance, and they would have abandoned the gains achieved under established programs.)

I should like to analyze this 5-year plan from the point of view of its probable cost to the Government, the probability of its achieving its goal of decreasing the farm-work force by 2 million in 5 years, and its potential effect on farm income.

1. COST TO THE GOVERNMENT OF PROPOSED PROGRAM

Program costs under the CED program in the years immediately ahead would be high. Approximately \$3 billion of current Agriculture budget expenditures (forestry, research, food for peace, etc.) would not be directly affected, and would continue to be incurred. In the first year, the CED program would involve expenditures of some \$1,200 to \$1,400 million for income protection payments on wheat, cotton, rice, tobacco, peanuts, and dairy products (the latter three were apparently overlooked by CED). In addition, there would be expenditures of \$200 to \$250 million per year to turn 20 million acres of plains land to grass. Some \$600 to \$700 million would be spent on a general cropland retirement program to hold feed grain production down to 150-155 million tons (from a potential 170 million tons with \$1 corn), so that stocks can be reduced. Current expenditures of around \$900 million to carry existing commodity carryovers, and \$250 to \$300 million for the present conservation reserve would continue in the first years of any new approach.

These expenditures would exceed \$3 billion and perhaps reach \$3.5 billion in the first year, and would replace expenditures of \$2.5 to \$3 billion actually made on price and income support operations in recent years. In addition, there would be substantial costs incurred for migration assistance, but these have not been estimated.

Only the income payments would be reduced according to a schedule, while the soil bank payments would be cut off abruptly in 5 years. The Great Plains program payments would need to be continued at a high level for 5 years because of lack of other income from the land.

By the end of 5 years, however, the CED report contemplates substantially lower Government costs, although carrying charges on commodity inventories would remain, since the plan includes no provision for reduction of these inventories. But the administration program is also directed toward reduction of Government costs, and would reduce price support expenditures sharply by 1967.

Thus, both the CED and administration programs share the key objective of reducing costs. But under the CED proposal agriculture would end up with far less total income, and if the movement off farms were not very rapid, with substantially less income per farm.

2. PROBABILITY OF DECREASING FARM WORK FORCE BY 2 MILLION IN 5 YEARS

This, as I have already indicated, is the central goal of the CED plan and is the basic premise on which its success depends. This unprecedented rate of exodus from farming is highly improbable of achievement. Moreover, the CED has apparently not been concerned with the class of farmers from which this outmigration would principally occur.

If, for example, we were to move out of agriculture and into improved nonfarm job opportunities the least productive 44 percent—grossing less than \$2,500 a year—we would go a long way toward solving the problem of rural poverty for this group. But we would reduce total farm marketings by only 5 percent, and the remaining 66 percent of the farmers would have to face the disastrously low level of unsupported prices on high unrestrained production level.

If 2 million farmers are moved out of commercial agriculture (grossing over \$2,500 per year) the decline in production would indeed be drastic, at least until science, technology and machinery could catch up.

Probably there would be some outmigration from all income classes of farmers. If trends of the past few years were to continue most of it would come from the \$2,500 to \$5,000 gross income class. It is our best judgment that this outmigration could be forced and accelerated somewhat—although not to the extent of 2 million in 5 years—if we wish to pay the price in increased competition for nonfarm employment, increased social and economic problems in urban areas, and the drastic decline in business on main street in small towns of rural America. It is also our best judgment that, even if we were to pay this price, the outmigration would not be sufficient to leave adequate incomes, under free market prices, to those who do remain.

3. EFFECT ON FARM INCOME

One of the principles of the CED program is the immediate reduction of prices of agricultural commodities to the prices at which these commodities would clear the market without further accumulation of surpluses. In planning on this basis the CED makes a serious error by accepting \$1 per bushel for corn as its so-called free market price. There is almost unanimous agreement among economists who have studied the program that this equilibrium level for corn would be between 70 and 80 cents. Since the corn price affects all feed grains, this one error seriously affects the whole 5-year adjustment program. By accepting this error the CED avoids having to face the problem of excessive production of meat and milk that would result if corn dropped to 75 cents. CED makes no provision for cushioning the effect of a possible billion dollar decline in net farm income for milk. The glut of livestock would lead to a drastic drop in meat prices to almost disaster levels and the farm income squeeze would consequently hit a group that, up to now has been comparatively well off.

SPECIFIC POTENTIAL INCOME RESULTS

The CED hopes for improving the profits of agriculture are based on the prospects for dividing a smaller total farm income among fewer farmers. The potential effect on farm income therefore would depend on (a) how many farmers were left, (b) how productive the remaining farmers would be, (c) the income that would result from the free-market prices at that level of production.

We are, therefore, presenting here preliminary estimates as to prospective income levels—after 5 years of the CED plan—based on three different assumptions ranging from A as the least probable, B as more likely, and C as most likely to result. Under A we assume the outmigration of 2 million farmers, all from the commercial economic class. Under B we assume 2 million outmigration from all classes. Under C we assume what would most likely result—a total outmigration of only 1 million, all from the commercial economic class. These estimates are preliminary, but based on our best judgment of what would happen in the light of farm history.

Farm labor force 1961 and projections 1966 based on CED proposal

Economic class (value of sales)	Farm labor force, 1961	CED for 1966		
		A	B	C
		\$5,000 and over.....	3.7	2.2
\$2,500 to \$4,999.....	.5	0	0	0
Under \$2,500.....	1.3	1.3	.8	1.3
Total.....	5.5	3.5	3.5	4.5

CASE A

We regard this situation as least likely to occur—but if it could be achieved it might result in favorable income results for the better farmers, with a deterioration in the income of the lower 1.3 million.

In this case the reduction of 2 million would be in the highly productive group of commercial farmers. All of the \$2,500 to \$4,999 group would move out, and 1.5 million would move out of the over \$5,000 group.

Production would be expected to decline close to 10 percent, but with population growth, the per capita supply of farm products would go down about 15 percent. Thus, prices would rise from the CED target prices to a level approximating the present.

Thus, total cash receipts would be reduced about 10 percent or some \$6.5 billion. The drop in Government payments would add another \$1.5 billion. Net income would decline about \$4.5 billion or 35 percent (lower production costs would save \$0.5 billion). Per worker net income would average about the same as in 1961—\$2,900.

CASE B

If the goal of transferring 2 million workers in 5 years could be reached at all, it would more probably happen as follows: Here, too, the \$2,500 to \$4,999 group would move out. Another half-million workers would be taken from the low income-low productive group and a million from the high productive group.

Production would rise about 5 percent, perhaps slightly less than the growth in population. CED target prices averaging about 25 percent below present might rise a little to a level about 20 percent below present. Cash receipts would drop about 17 percent or \$6 billion and Government payments to farmers in 1961 of \$1.5 billion would also disappear. Net income to farm operators would decline to about \$6 billion from \$12.8 billion in 1961. This plus hired farm wage bill would result in net income per worker in agriculture of \$2,350 compared with \$2,900 in 1961.

Thus, a decline instead of an increase in income per worker, even if 2 million should migrate out, from all classes.

CASE C

It is most likely, however, that the maximum exodus from farming that could be achieved under present circumstances in the next 5 years would be 1 million farmworkers, approximately the rate prevailing in recent years. The reduction involves one-half million in the \$5,000 and over class and one-half million in the \$2,500 to \$4,999 class.

Production would increase about 20 percent, with per capita supplies about 12 percent higher than at present. Prices would decline below CED target prices to a level perhaps 40 percent below the present. Cash receipts would drop about 25 percent or about \$8.8 billion and Government payments about \$1.5 billion. Net income would be reduced to perhaps \$3 billion, less than one-fourth of the 1961 level. Income per worker would be reduced to only a little above \$1,200 compared with \$2,900 in 1961.

SUMMARY

Our analysis of this CED 5-year plan to end farm programs leads to these conclusions:

1. Its most likely effect on farm income would be a drastic decline.

2. It would not be likely to succeed in its goal of a 2 million reduction in the farm labor force; but if it should succeed that very achievement would place a serious burden on our program for economic growth, would provide increased competition for nonfarm employment, increased social and economic problems in urban areas, and a drastic decline of small towns in rural America.

3. Its abandonment of all farm programs would alter the nature of the Nation's agriculture and seriously threaten the family farm system that has created the world's most successful agricultural productivity.

4. The national economy and general welfare would suffer from the absence, in the CED program, of some of the major constructive aspects of the administration's food and agriculture program such as rural area development and the wise use of land resources to meet growing needs for conservation, wildlife, and outdoor recreation.

I therefore urge a careful study of the CED 5-year plan, a careful evaluation of its methods and potential results, for farmers, for wage earners, for taxpayers, for our urban population—yes, and for the representatives of industry that developed it and placed it before the public. I urge its study in comparison with the administration's program for food and agriculture in the 1960's. This kind of study, evaluation, and comparison will enable the people of this Nation to make the wisest choice, a choice that will materially affect the well-being of every American.

As I said at the beginning, I believe that the presentation of this CED report is the best thing that could have happened to stimulate interest in and support for the administration's program.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

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

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. For the information of the gentleman from Iowa and just to point out that there is a funeral tomorrow to which many of us would like to go, there is a conference report on the Defense Department appropriation bill and then the reclamation bill that we had hoped could be disposed of tomorrow in time for those of us who want to go to the funeral of our late great friend and colleague, Senator Dworshak, might be able to do so. This is the reason I agreed with the majority leader to come in at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, may I advise the Members of the House that the

reclamation bill will be called first because the author of the bill is the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. Prostr] and she is going to the funeral. The conference report on the Defense appropriation bill will be called after the disposition of that bill.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963

Mr. MAHON submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 11289) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

GEORGE MCGOVERN COMPLETES SERVICE AS DIRECTOR OF FOOD FOR PEACE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this subject.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take a few minutes today to honor an outstanding public servant who has just completed a tour of duty in the highly responsible post of Director of Food for Peace. George McGovern, of South Dakota, the son of a Methodist minister, has served humanity unselfishly in accordance with his belief in man's responsibility to mankind. After a distinguished career in World War II, McGovern, who holds a doctor of philosophy in American history and government, was for several years a professor of political science at Dakota Wesleyan University. Gradually, he moved from the academic life into the political life, and in 1953 he became executive secretary of the Democratic Party in South Dakota. He strengthened his party for 3 years, and in 1956 was elected to the U.S. Congress. George McGovern served in this House for 4 years, during which time he gained the genuine respect and admiration of his colleagues. A representative of one of the Nation's most productive agricultural areas, McGovern fought vigorously and intelligently for the American farmer.

Early in 1961, President Kennedy called upon McGovern to head a program which was to be expanded and given greater emphasis by the new administration. George McGovern became Director of the new White House Food for Peace Office, created by Executive order on January 24, 1961. In setting forth the guidelines for the enlarged food-for-peace program, President Kennedy had this to say:

America's agricultural abundance offers a great opportunity for the United States to promote the interests of peace in a signifi-

cant way and to play an important role in helping to provide for a more adequate diet for peoples all around the world. We must make the most vigorous and constructive use possible of this opportunity. We must narrow the gap between abundance here at home and near starvation abroad. Humanity and prudence, alike, counsel a major effort on our part.

This was all the direction that George McGovern needed. He moved into his new job with characteristic dedication and enthusiasm. Working closely with the Secretaries of State and Agriculture, McGovern soon transformed the food-for-peace program from its formerly negative role of surplus disposal to one of active use of our natural agricultural abundance as a national asset to meet foreign policy objectives. He ordered a comprehensive study which produced the world food budget, a survey of current food resources and a projection of future food needs. McGovern has stated the new concept of food for peace with these words:

We see the food-for-peace program not only as a market development activity but also as an instrument of international health and nutrition, a tool of economic and social development, and a vital force for peace and freedom.

George McGovern has discovered that the giving of food has several distinct advantages over other types of foreign aid. If I may again borrow from his own eloquence:

It is difficult for a villager or peasant to appreciate a foreign development loan, or a hydroelectric dam and the benefits of which he won't feel until way into the future. A piece of bread or a glass of milk is different. This is something universal, something which every human being can appreciate and understand. Food is better than any banknote, any coin that was ever minted. Currencies are not always convertible, but no hungry man has ever refused a square meal. Food can be used instead of dollars to support foreign aid projects. Thus our surplus food could be converted into schools, clinics, hospitals, irrigation systems, roads and railways. To pile up vast quantities of food in a world of hunger is morally wrong, economically wasteful, and politically dangerous unless we show that we can share this food wisely. For hungry men are angry, desperate men.

In addition to the good which food for peace achieves abroad in reducing human misery, sickness, and premature death, in giving men the strength to work and students the energy to study, and in bringing nourishment and hope to millions, food for peace offers many direct benefits to us in the United States. First, it reduces our storage costs for our \$9 billion food stockpile by \$500 million per year. Also, by the widespread use of food to supplement our aid to the non-industrialized nations of the world, our annual foreign aid budgets are reduced. In addition, food for peace helps the United States by stimulating our shipping industry and our ports, by bolstering farm income, by developing future dollar markets overseas, by raising the purchasing power of other countries, and by strengthening U.S. foreign policy objectives. Finally, it is in agriculture above all else that the superiority of U.S.

technology over that of totalitarian governments is clearest. George McGovern has pointed out:

People all over the world may be impressed by space flights and orbital flights, but they're impressed too by our amazing agricultural production. Some of them might recall that the great cry of the Bolsheviks after their revolution was for peace, land, bread. And the Russians have a long way to go to catch us in food production.

In 1961, more than 60 billion pounds of food were distributed through the food-for-peace program. Of this, only 10 percent was given in direct donations; 90 percent was exchanged for foreign currency which, in turn, was granted or loaned to the countries for development programs.

In directing the food-for-peace program, McGovern amazed his coworkers with his energy and determination. He founded new projects, authored many reports and traveled to numerous countries to see for himself the need for and the result of food for peace. His journeys took him to India, Brazil, Hong Kong and Egypt. For 2 months he was quite ill with hepatitis, yet McGovern continued to direct the program from his sickbed. This was the same dedication to his job which gained for George McGovern the admiration and respect of his colleagues in the House when he was a Congressman from South Dakota.

I am sure that his fellow citizens of South Dakota share the high regard which George McGovern enjoys today in the Nation's Capital and in this great legislative body, and join in wishing him well in every endeavor as he returns to his native State.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would be glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted my colleague has taken this time to discuss the service of a great American. As one of his colleagues on the Committee on Agriculture I learned long ago that George McGovern was a man of high character and outstanding ability. He was a champion of the American farmer. He has also been outstanding as administrator of the food-for-peace program.

Under his creative leadership that program has found what may well be the most constructive use of America's food surplus. By using American food to provide nourishing lunches for children all over the world, food for peace improves health, school attendance, academic performance, local leadership—when the children who receive the food assume local responsibility—and that thing which we call the American image abroad.

In Peru, the food-for-peace school lunch program will be extended from 30,000 children to 1 million over the next 4 years. Local school officials noted that school attendance improved by 40 percent after the program began. Ultimately, of course, academic performance also improves. Today, school lunches provided by food for peace are distributed daily to 30 million children in 80 countries. In most cases, local govern-

ments and volunteer organizations—CARE, various religious relief programs, et cetera—now pay the cost of transporting and storing the food, and they supervise the lunches themselves.

The following statements about the school lunch program are taken from speeches and reports written by George McGovern:

It is difficult to imagine a more constructive use of surplus food than providing it to hungry children who are seeking education for the sake of improving the cultural and economic climates of their homelands. In most of the underdeveloped countries the most neglected resource is the minds of children. Education is a first imperative in the struggle for better living conditions, and schools find it impossible to operate effectively when their pupils are engaged in a long and dreary struggle against starvation.

It is my judgment that these programs are returning greater dividends than any other foreign assistance. We are ready to share our food resources so that more children can have food in their stomachs, and light in their eyes, and hope in their hearts.

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

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

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, one of the accomplishments of George McGovern as Director of Food for Peace is his program of food for wages.

A major project, begun by food for peace under the directorship of George McGovern, is the use of surplus American food for the partial payment of wages earned by foreign workmen on public works programs. This new project has achieved its highest development in Tunisia.

In Tunisia, nearly 200,000 workers are currently involved in 6,000 public works projects, ranging from digging a drainage ditch—employing 10 men—to constructing a hospital—employing 3,000 men. Other projects include reforestation, land clearing, the drilling and preparation of wells and cisterns, sanitation, housing, roads, and school construction. Most of these workers receive one-third of their wages in a cereal made of surplus American wheat, and the remaining two-thirds in Tunisian currency paid by the Tunisian Government. The Tunisian Government is permitted to sell some of the American food in order to purchase tools and to meet local expenses.

Food-for-peace operations in Tunisia have in this way reduced unemployment by 50 percent. In only 3 years food for peace has generated 60 million man-days of work. One million Tunisians—or one-fourth of the total population of the country—have benefited directly from the 400,000 tons of surplus American food which have been distributed through food for peace. Under this program the food serves as a stimulus to work, and is not merely doled out.

Today, approximately 5 million workers in 11 countries receive part of their wages in surplus American food. Furthermore, 20 other countries want similar programs. George McGovern has called this food-for-wages program a formula whereby we can transform Kansas wheat into classrooms, roadways, and hospitals throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, I am highly in favor of the food-for-peace program, and congratulate the Director, George McGovern, for a job well done.

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

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

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, coming from the State of Minnesota, a neighbor State to the State of South Dakota, I became quite well acquainted with George McGovern when he first came to the Congress. I was greatly impressed with his ability. Later when he served on the Committee on Agriculture I often used to go to him and talk with him about the problems before that committee. I always found him well informed. Certainly the background that he had in the House made it possible for him to fill his administrative post very capably.

It was a great pleasure for me to work with George McGovern. The people of South Dakota have a fine citizen in George McGovern, and certainly his service here in the Congress speaks for itself.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding to me on the occasion of his special order to pay tribute to a former colleague, George McGovern, who for the past 2 years has been serving as Director of the food-for-peace program, otherwise known as the Public Law 480 program.

This tribute to Mr. McGovern is especially timely. I am certain that my friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma, was unaware of the fact that the other body—the Senate—has today held memorial services for the late Senator Francis Case. Senator Case was co-author of Public Law 480 and was instrumental in helping to implement this great program.

The food-for-peace program is an outgrowth of the implementation of Public Law 480. He had been diligent in his efforts to see the program grow and expand. He was not only interested in seeing agricultural surpluses reduced, but he was even more interested in feeding hungry peoples around the world.

Senator Case had an abiding interest in people and their welfare. He was distressed by human suffering. During his many years in both the House and the Senate he gave much of his effort to the improvement of conditions in the Nation's Capital and on its many Indian reservations throughout the Nation. He was equally zealous of improving the standards of living in foreign countries.

I am sure that Senator Case worked with George McGovern in helping him to carry out the work of his position as food-for-peace director. This he did

because of his desire to see the program he had helped in authoring succeed and because of his nonpartisan attitude.

I am equally sure, however, that Senator Case was disturbed when George McGovern announced his intention to become a candidate against him and announced his intention to defeat him after his many years of faithful service in the Congress of the United States.

I am sure he was disturbed not so much because of Mr. McGovern's personal ambitions, but more particularly because of the philosophies of government espoused by the two men which were as far apart as the poles.

Francis Case had given the best years of his life in the preservation of constitutional government in this country, in the preservation of a democratic political system and a capitalistic or private enterprise economic system. He fought for the preservation of these basic principles because he realized that these principles and these foundation stones of our political and economic system were responsible for making this the greatest country in all history and that, if retained, would make it even greater.

Senator Francis Case feared and fought concentration of power in the hands of a few. He believed the Republic could survive only so long as the individual was free from Government regulation, domination, and control and so long as the individual was unfettered by the chains of bureaucracy and burdensome taxation.

Senator Case realized that the American economy and that system of political government which had made this Nation great is under attack from a philosophy which has been handed down to us from the Medieval Ages—a philosophy which teaches that the people are too stupid to make their own decisions, to spend their own money, and that therefore, it is the obligation of the central government to take their money away from them through taxation and then give it or loan it back to them to spend under government direction, at the same time placing their property under government control.

As a student of history Senator Case knew full well that in the Medieval Ages this system was known as the divine right of kings. That today it has more subtle titles. In its most extreme form it is known as communism, in its less extreme form it is known as socialism and in its less extreme form it is known as welfare-statism. But he also knew that all three systems are dedicated to one principle and that is the destruction of capitalism and private enterprise.

He realized, as do most students of government that communism, socialism, and welfare-statism are similar but are not synonymous. That communism is a socialist economy of government ownership of all property under a complete political dictatorship, and which denies the existence of God or a Supreme Being. That socialism is primarily an economic system which embraces government ownership of all basic industries—and theoretically, but only theoretically, could be democratic. That welfare-statism is one step behind social-

ism, where they permit the individual to believe that he owns his own property, but take the profits and the returns of that property away from the owner through taxation, and dominate the ownership through regulation and control.

Senator Case realized that welfare-statism is a trend toward increased bureaucracy—and a trend toward increased bureaucracy is a trend away from democracy and toward a dictatorship. He realized that the more the central government is put in the hands of bureaucrats, who are not elected by the people, the more the people are shut off from their government. He feared as many good Americans fear that welfare-statism leads to socialism and that socialism leads to communism. He felt that this is what the struggle is really all about.

George McGovern is a leading proponent of welfare-statism under the New Frontier. He has endorsed every move toward the centralization of power in the hands of the President. During his 4 years in the Congress his voting record was identical with the present philosophies of the New Frontier. His candidacy was espoused by the President and his brother Robert Kennedy of the Department of Justice. He has announced his support for the welfare-state programs espoused by the President.

During his 4 years in Congress George McGovern enjoyed a 100 percent voting record endorsement by the ADA organization, the leftwing fanatic group who were able to get 38 of their members on the staff as political or economic advisers to the President or on the President's Cabinet.

I said, Mr. Speaker, the beliefs of the late Senator Francis Case and those of George McGovern are as far apart as the poles. They are possibly even further apart.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the food-for-peace program is a leader in the campaign to help the peoples in the huts and villages of half the globe to break the bonds of mass misery.

Until very recently, the head of this vital program has been George McGovern of South Dakota. Upon this occasion, Mr. Speaker, I want to warmly commend him for his leadership in this responsible position.

I have known George McGovern for many years. It was my pleasure as it was the pleasure of others of my colleagues here today to serve with him while he was a member of this body. I am not surprised, therefore, at the outstanding job he performed while carrying out President Kennedy's mandate that the food-for-peace program share with the newly developing countries this Nation's agricultural abundance. However, Mr. McGovern did not see his task as merely one of disposing of surplus food. He saw that our surplus food could be used to aid the newly developing countries to provide a more adequate diet for their people and to promote the growth of their economies.

The food-for-peace program under George McGovern's direction has grown to manhood as one of the principal

peacemaking activities of the U.S. Government.

In 1961, for example, Food for Peace distributed more than 60 billion pounds of food. In Peru, the school lunch program supplied by Food for Peace will by 1966 provide nourishment for 1 million children from among whom will come some of that country's leaders.

Another imaginative project authored by George McGovern has been the use of surplus food for the partial payment of wages earned by foreign workmen on public works programs. In Tunisia, nearly tens of thousands of workmen on such projects receive one-third of their wages in a cereal made from surplus American wheat.

During his stewardship, George McGovern traveled widely and wisely. At one point in his journeys he was stricken with hepatitis, but he continued his valiant work anyway.

This, in brief, is a profile of George McGovern's work as Food for Peace administrator. I think upon recitation of these facts it can be agreed that he is a dedicated, able and outstanding administrator. I extend my warmest congratulations to Mr. McGovern for a job well done.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY—OPERATION BOOTSTRAP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate the 10th anniversary of a significant proclamation. On July 25, 1952, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, a unique experiment in the history of man's political development, was officially established.

On that day exactly one decade ago the people of the United States and the people of Puerto Rico set forth upon a new road, a road almost totally unexplored. We have traveled together along that road for 10 years. The road has carried the people of Puerto Rico to a future brighter than anyone dared foretell on that day 10 years ago when the proclamation was issued.

The record of those 10 years is extraordinary. If the proper lessons are learned from that record, much of mankind will be saved a great deal of grief.

All over the world people are striving for independence in a burst of nationalism unparalleled in history. New nations are being created out of the former colonial empires of the European powers. Most of these new nations are poor, agriculturally backward, industrially underdeveloped, and technologically untrained. Their standards of living are pitifully low; the economic problems they face are massive. They look with justifiable envy upon the higher standards of living of the older nations of the world. And they are determined to achieve those standards, not next year, or next month, but today.

We Americans sympathize with those aspirations. But no people can appreciate those desires with more awareness

and feeling than the Puerto Ricans. For they have experienced and overcome similar conditions.

The people of Puerto Rico have taught the world a lesson in what can be accomplished with patience, energy, and hard work. They started with a land that seemed to be hopelessly mired in economic catastrophe. Mineral resources are almost nonexistent. Population pressures were frightful. A one-crop economy held the country in economic bondage. Per capita income was unbelievably low—about \$121 per year. Infant mortality was high, and so was illiteracy.

Puerto Rico, in short, was an underdeveloped country with enormous problems and, superficially, little hope. But driven by a passion to better themselves, the Puerto Ricans were determined to use whatever resources they had to the fullest extent, to lift themselves into a better life by their own bootstraps.

Under the leadership of Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín and our distinguished colleague, Dr. ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN, a unique partnership between the people of the United States and the people of Puerto Rico was created. The island became an associated free state. Puerto Rico contracted with the United States for a relationship in which it maintains for itself a maximum of independence while still benefiting from an intimate connection with the United States. It is the equal in its local affairs to any State of the Union. It elects its own legislature and its own governing officials. It passes its own laws with no more hindrance than does New York or Alaska.

Its citizens are also citizens of the United States, entitled to all the rights and privileges that flow from that status and all the duties as well, except for three. Residents of the island are not subject to Federal taxation; they do not vote in national elections; and their representative to Congress is a Resident Commissioner who may speak but not vote.

No tariff or trade barriers exist between the island and the United States. Our Federal Government continues to act for Puerto Rico in foreign affairs, defense, customs, and postal services, as it does for the 50 States.

The aspirations of Puerto Rico are well summarized in the preamble to their constitution:

We consider as determining factors in our life our citizenship of the United States of America and our aspiration continually to enrich our democratic heritage in the individual and collective enjoyment of its rights and privileges; our loyalty to the principles of the Federal Constitution, the coexistence in Puerto Rico of the two great cultures of the American hemisphere, our fervor for education; our faith in justice; our devotion to the courageous, industrious, and peaceful way of life; our fidelity to individual human values above and beyond social position, racial differences, and economic interests; and our hope for a better world based on these principles.

The economic handmaiden to this devotion to democratic principles is appropriately called Operation Bootstrap. Under this program the islanders have intelligently diversified their agricultural

base and, at the same time, carefully fostered a rational and reasonable industrial buildup. The result is a series of solid achievements. Income, life expectancy, and literacy have soared; infant mortality, disease, and poverty have markedly decreased. Today Puerto Rico is probably the most prosperous land in the Caribbean, and its per capita income is the second highest in all of Latin America. Serious problems remain, but the record of the past 10 years assures us that Puerto Rico is on the right road.

I believe this record should be an inspiration to every underdeveloped country in the world. Indeed, every year thousands of leaders from those countries visit the island to see and to learn.

Puerto Rico is serving as a bridge between the United States and Latin America. Her statesmen are bringing their wisdom born of experience to the Agency for International Development and our State Department.

Teodoro Moscoso, former Administrator of the Economic Development Administration of Puerto Rico, is Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress. Arturo Morales-Carrion, former Under Secretary of State for Puerto Rico, is Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs. I believe that there are many more highly qualified Puerto Ricans who would serve the United States well in diplomatic posts in Latin America, as well as other parts of the world, in other key positions in the Alliance for Progress, and in the Peace Corps. I urge the President to take advantage of their background and training.

Mr. Speaker, the remarkable development of Puerto Rico through Operation Bootstrap under a democratic system of government is clear proof to the world that economic and social progress is not only completely compatible with freedom and democracy but is actually enhanced by it.

On this 10th anniversary of the Commonwealth I congratulate Puerto Rico on its past achievements and on its future promise.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK AND A SPECIAL HOUSE COMMITTEE ON CAPTIVE NATIONS

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, for 2 years now, one of the major themes of the Captive Nations Week observances has been the establishment of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations. During the 1961 observance and again in the 1962 observance, Americans in all sections of this country have voiced their support in favor of such a congressional committee. They recognize, if some of us do not, the necessity for a serious concentrated study of all the captive nations in Europe, Asia, and the one in Latin America.

The original measure to create a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations was submitted as early as March

1961 by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD. His proposal, House Resolution 211, was soon followed by three dozen similar resolutions. All of these have been bottled up in the House Rules Committee, primarily because of the fear of several parties that such a committee might do too effective a job. Popular demand for action on this vital project has, nevertheless, continued to express itself with undiminished fervor.

Mr. Speaker, our citizens are not blind to the several maneuvers that have been exercised to prevent the formation of this indispensable committee. The latest one of a sudden and haphazard series of hearings by the Subcommittee on Europe fools no one. This plug-up effort can scarcely be regarded as a serious implementation of the Captive Nations Week resolution which the 86th Congress passed and which frightens Khrushchev each time it is mentioned. If this flippant effort is supposed to help the captive nations and our own citizens, then I am afraid that the requirements for such aid in this cold war continue to elude some of us.

We, in this Congress, still have the opportunity to make a major contribution in this respect by forming a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. I join with many other Members in this body to call for immediate action on House Resolution 211 and the other resolutions by our Rules Committee. Let us put this to the test of a House vote, and let us be counted accordingly. I have no doubt of the outcome.

Mr. Speaker, to show only a few examples of popular interest in this major project and the week itself, I request that the following data be appended to my remarks at this point: A report on "Captive Nations Committee Urged" in the Binghamton-Sun Bulletin; the seventh way to overcome communism advocated in the Christopher News Notes; a memorandum on the 1962 Captive Nations Week issued by the National Captive Nations Committee on June 21, 1962; an article on captive nations in the Ionian of Iowa College; an article on a Special Captive Nations Committee in the Hoya of Georgetown University; July 15 editorial on Captive Nations Week in the New Bedford, Mass., Sunday Standard-Times; and a report in the June 12 issue of the China Post, "China Backs Proclamation of Captive Nations Week."

CAPTIVE NATIONS COMMITTEE URGED

The establishment of a special committee on the Captive Nations is one of the ways in which the United States can support the national aspirations of "enslaved people." Ignatius Billinsky told a gathering of Ukrainian-Americans yesterday.

Mr. Billinsky, general manager of the Philadelphia Ukrainian newspaper, America, spoke on "Ukraine: One of the Submerged Nationalities" at the Ukrainian Hall.

For the United States to deny the national aspirations of the 15 republics that comprise the Soviet Union is "detrimental to the best interests of the country," he said.

"The Ukraine, Albania, Slovakia, Latvia, Lithuania and the other countries overrun by the Bolsheviks cannot be considered traditionally part of the Soviet Union. These nations at one time had their independence and national governments. Their struggle to regain freedom must be recognized.

"The people of these countries should not be considered minority peoples of the U.S.S.R., either," he said. "They are the majority in the land that was once theirs.

"The Captive Nations Resolution was accepted by Congress several years ago," Mr. Billinsky said. "But Secretary Rusk would deny it. He would say that the anti-Bolshevik bloc of nations is a part of the Soviet Union. They are not; they are slave nations and should be given backing in their fight for independence." The resolution recognizes the captive status of the satellite nations.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk has said that a captive nations committee in the House of Representatives "would not be helpful."

Mr. Billinsky said:

"Mr. Khrushchev accuses Britain, France and the United States of colonialism, but he has the biggest colonial power in the world today.

"This discussion of colonialism should be brought before the United Nations. We should let the world decide who the colonialist is. Why shouldn't Mr. Stevenson bring this matter up in the U.N.? Why should we continue to take defensive when Mr. Khrushchev shouts, 'colonists?'" Adlai Stevenson heads the U.S. delegation to the United Nations.

Mr. Billinsky was a member of the Ukrainian insurgent army during World War II and also fought with the Ukrainian underground movement.

His talk here was sponsored by the Organization for the Defense of Four Freedoms for Ukraine, a liberation group, and the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America. Eugene Kurylo, 44 Winding Way, is president of the organization. Vladimir Fedankiw, 17 Berlin Street, is president of the congress committee.

CHAMPION THE RIGHTS OF SUBJUGATED PEOPLES—DO FOR THEM WHAT YOU WOULD WANT THEM TO DO FOR YOU IF YOU WERE UNDER COMMUNIST RULE

More than 1,000 farmers recently made a dash for freedom from Communist China. But only 100 managed to escape. Most of the other 900 were shot by Red border guards or mangled by police dogs.

These frantic souls, like the 3 million persons who fled from East Germany, prove dramatically that most people run away from the "people's paradise" whenever they get the chance.

Never-ending protests, such as these, are hopeful reminders that the Communist conspiracy is doomed to ultimate failure.

No one can estimate how long it will be before freedom will come to the enslaved peoples of the earth. Nor should the problem be oversimplified. However, it is highly important to keep alive in the hearts of the oppressed the ardent hope of one day enjoying their God-given right of self-determination.

1. Don't let them be forgotten. Nearly 1 billion human beings—more than one-third of the people of the earth—are dominated by communistic regimes, imposed by force.

The overwhelming majority of this vast portion of mankind yearn for the privilege that all totalitarians deny their subjects: the right to choose their own form of government.

2. Help them to help themselves. We must live up to our grave responsibility—in every way possible—to assist this great multitude to achieve self-determination.

Because the Communist leaders are keenly aware of what free elections would mean to their regimes, they quake at the very thought. The fact that this is a glaring weak spot in their setup was proven by how upset they became when the U.S. Congress passed the captive nations resolution in 1959.

3. Prevent war by keeping their cause alive. The more determined enslaved peoples are to

win back their legitimate self-expression, the more liabilities can be turned into assets. The Soviets would be reluctant to risk any major conflict so long as they have at their back millions of persons who will never be content with less than fulfillment of their God-given freedoms.

Through conversations, discussions, talks, letters to editors and Congressmen, keep alive the cause of subjugated countries in every way that does not make their position worse. You will not only be doing much to overcome communism but you may actually help to prevent the horrors of another world war.

DO MORE THAN TALK

Reflect frequently and prayerfully upon the final plea made over the Hungarian freedom radio station on Sunday, November 4, 1956. These are the closing words:

"People of the world, listen to our call. Help us not with advice, not with words, but with action, with soldiers and arms. Please do not forget that this wild attack of bolshevism will not stop. You may be the next victim. Save us.

"Our ship is sinking. The light vanishes. The shadows grow darker from hour to hour. Listen to our cry. Start moving. Extend to us brotherly hands. God be with you and us."

MEMORANDUM—NATIONAL CAPTIVE NATIONS COMMITTEE

(From Lev E. Dobriansky, chairman, National Captive Nations Committee)

Once again, Americans in all major cities of the Nation will be observing Captive Nations Week this July 15-21. This third anniversary promises to surpass the two previous successful observances. As before, the President is expected to issue a proclamation, and the Congress will observe the week in legislative session.

Actually, the story of the Captive Nations Week resolution, in all its ramifications, has yet to be told to the American people. It is a fascinating story that continues to have an ever-widening impact on the level of international affairs. Just consider these few examples:

1. From July 1959 to the present, Khrushchev and his puppets have violently been denouncing the resolution and the week. Why? Why has this event, more than any other, precipitated such sustained denunciation?

2. In his recent book, Mr. Nixon says the resolution was the "major Soviet irritant throughout my tour." Why? The former Vice President thinks Khrushchev wanted a pretext to lambast him personally. This specious explanation reveals that Nixon to this day does not grasp the "why" of all this.

3. Stewart Alsop, in a Saturday Evening Post article last December, wrote: "When I was in Moscow during the October party congress, Khrushchev once again violently denounced the innocuous Captive Nations Week resolution, which Congress passes every year to attract minority votes." Logic? If it is "innocuous," why the violent denunciation? Facts? Does Congress do this, and for the mythical purpose indicated?

4. Secretary of State Rusk, in a letter last August to House Rules Chairman SMITH, contradicts the contents of the resolution and is in turn contradicted by Ambassador Stevenson in the United Nations in November. Why the confused thinking?

These are only a few of many examples proving that the story has yet to be told. From the time I worked on the resolution in 1958 to the current undertaking of the week's observance, much material of public interest has been accumulated. If you feel as we do that, in the interests of factual truth and of our national security, the American people should know this story, please get in touch with me either at the

above address or telephone, or at Georgetown University. We shall be more than happy to cooperate with you.

CAPTIVE NATIONS (By Gerald Gasparri)

A little over 3 years ago, President Eisenhower declared Captive Nations Week. It was the first genuine gesture on the part of the United States that it had not forgotten the people throughout the world who had fallen victim to Communist totalitarianism. However, this could have been regarded as an empty gesture since Eisenhower's administration had failed to demonstrate a conviction and a willingness to help the freedom fighters in Hungary.

Nevertheless, the proclamation did have its effects upon Soviet Russia and when Richard Nixon visited the U.S.S.R. he was greeted by a belligerent Khrushchev who was openly disturbed about the Eisenhower declaration. Pravda, reflecting the Red dictator's distaste over Eisenhower's actions, declared that "elephants will roost in trees before your delirious ravings come true." It was quite obvious, however, that Eisenhower's act was a source of worry to the Reds for it might have been an indication of a new foreign policy that was designed to win the cold war, and it might have aroused the nationalistic tendencies of the members of the captive nations. These people have been subjected to the crudest form of colonialism ever devised. Khrushchev made it very plain what he has in mind for those who are held in confinement behind his Iron Curtain when he stated, "It is essential that we stress the education of the masses in the spirit of proletarian internationalism and Soviet patriotism. Even the slightest vestiges of nationalism should be eradicated with uncompromising Bolshevik determination."

There is obviously no room for self-determination for the captives of communism nor is there room for American intervention that might stir the nationalistic tendencies of these people. The Red leader is quite aware of the potential danger of these subjugated groups; thus, it would seem realistic to help utilize these silent allies and incorporate their desire for freedom in a realistic foreign policy that would enable the United States to combat the spread of communism and inflict upon it incalculable damage.

Under the present administration, there seems to be a desire on the part of the President to do what might be feasible to help the captive nations secure their freedom. However strong the desire of the President, his administration did not approve of a proposal before Congress that a Special Committee on the Captive Nations be established. When Representative HOWARD SMITH asked Secretary of State Dean Rusk for his position on this committee he replied, "I have carefully considered the possible role of such a committee in our continuing efforts to deal with the major foreign policy problem represented by the Soviet-dominated areas. I have reluctantly concluded that the formation of such a committee would not be helpful.

"As the U.S. Government seeks to deal with the threat posed by recent Soviet actions concerning Berlin, it is of utmost importance that we approach any consultations with our allies or with the Soviet Union in an atmosphere which best lends itself to an acceptable settlement. In this context, I believe the establishment of such a committee at this time would likely be a source of contention and might be taken as a pretext for actions by the Soviet Union which would interfere with the resolution of the crisis concerning Berlin." This is certainly a very strange policy in dealing with an enemy that has vowed to bury us. The Soviets hardly cared whom they disturbed when they erected the Berlin wall or,

lately, when they attempted to create hazardous conditions in the airlines to Berlin. It seems that the Secretary of State could use this committee as a powerful weapon to hold over the Russian heads since they do not cherish the loss of their colonial empire. He could make it quite clear that the United States does not recognize the holdings of the Soviets as permanent. It seems, however, he has chosen to permit Russian whims to dictate our foreign policy and has, for the present, written off the captive nations.

Another member of the administration has hardly been very courteous in creating that atmosphere which best lends itself to an acceptable settlement. Adlai Stevenson stated before the United Nations that "despite a Soviet declaration of the right of self-determination for nations, including the right to secede from the Soviet Union, Russia crushed Azerbaijan, Khiva, Bockhra, and Armenia in 1920, Georgia in 1921, and the Ukraine in 1923.

"The Soviets' territorial aggrandizement included the Karelian Province and other parts of Finland and the eastern provinces of Poland, the Romanian provinces of Bessarabia and Bukovine, the independent states of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

"Following the Second World War, whole nations and peoples were swallowed up behind the Iron Curtain in violation of agreements and without a free vote of the peoples concerned. These included Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, and then Czechoslovakia in more than one coup d'etat." He concluded with the statement that the Soviet colonial empire "is one of the most cruel and oppressive ever devised." It seems obvious that this speech was not designed to create an atmosphere that would generate friendly negotiations with the Soviets. It was, in fact, an honest and realistic appraisal of communism which Rusk seems unable to make.

It is all very fine to declare Captive Nations Week and in this way hope to keep the morale of those behind the Iron Curtain high. This yearly declaration by the President is but a feeble attempt to declare that we are strenuously opposed to communism. These declarations demonstrate a futility just as our vigorous protests reflect the inability of the West to find the moral courage to defy communism. A congressional committee to study ways to aid these people is certainly a step in the right direction and should be considered again by Congress. This is just one way to help these oppressed people. We should not hope to preserve the status quo or the myth of peaceful coexistence with the Reds. We must realize now that the nature of the Communist movement calls for continued expansion and eventual enslavement of the world. We can no longer sit back and tell the captive peoples of the world to wait for we are not ready to help them gain their freedom. We have a sacred duty as the custodians of freedom in this world and unless we are willing to bring it to others we are not worthy of freedom ourselves. If we are willing to abide by the slavery of other people it will not be long until our own freedom will be jeopardized. We have continually compromised with the freedom of the people of Eastern Europe and Asia. It seems only logical that if we are willing to be complacent about the freedom of others we will eventually arrive at this point when we will be willing to be Red rather than dead in order to avoid being brave instead of slave.

CAPITOL CROSSFIRE

(By T. Anthony Quinn)

The foreign policy of a nation must reflect the national will of its people. Since 1945 the national will of our people has called for a policy aimed at survival in the struggle against communism, but without a world war. But the harsh realities of Communist

dogma make survival for the West contingent on the eventual destruction of the driving Soviet will to conquer us. This, most assuredly, can be accomplished without war; but it will require the adoption by this Nation of a program embodying offensive action against Soviet power and a reaffirmation of our will to win, i.e., a positive policy.

The Communist successes of late testify that such a policy is not in effect. Indeed, our Nation's Department of State appears now to have placed fear of world conflict at the forefront so that programs of positive action to exploit Russian weaknesses are stymied out of respect for Soviet anger.

A recent and prime example of this surrounds the establishment in the House of Representatives of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations to investigate, publicize, and generally take advantage of the anti-Russian feelings of millions enslaved behind the Iron Curtain. Khrushchev's deep concern over Western exploitation of this weakness in his empire is eminently clear, as proven by his fearful reaction to the congressional Captive Nations Week resolutions.

The State Department's timidity in anti-Communist affairs was distinctly manifest in Secretary of State Dean Rusk's comment on this proposal in a letter of August 22, 1961, to HOWARD SMITH, chairman of the House Rules Committee. Mr. Rusk disapproves of such a committee because, he states, "it is of utmost importance that we approach any consultations with our allies or negotiations with the Soviet Union in an atmosphere which best lends itself to an acceptable settlement. In this context I believe, the establishment of such a committee would likely be a source of contention, and might be taken as a pretext for actions by the Soviet Union which would interfere with the resolution of the present crisis concerning Berlin."

This kind of fuzzy thinking reminds one of Prime Minister Chamberlain at Munich in 1938. Apparently Mr. Rusk feels that America must keep the Soviet Union happy, even at the cost of subverting the positive aspects of our own foreign policy. Such a show of pliancy may well encourage the Soviets to try for greater gains over Berlin. American attempts to placate them have not in the past, and show no sign in the future, of easing Russian antagonism on any question.

Mr. Rusk does not stop there. He further remarks, "the U.S. Government's position is weakened by any action which confuses the rights of formerly independent peoples or nations with the status of areas such as the Ukraine, Armenia, or Georgia, which are traditional parts of the Soviet Union." V. I. Lenin, himself, recognized these and other areas as independent in 1917, and forced them to become part of the Soviet Union only by 3 years of bloody civil war and betrayal of promises. These national areas long struggled against Russian domination, either czarist or Red; and Armenia, itself, was never fully a part of the old Russian Empire. The Soviet Constitution of 1936 recognizes them as "independent" Socialist republics, and Khrushchev today is hoarse from telling them they are independent states. Yet Mr. Rusk writes them off as "traditional parts of the Soviet Union," 44 years after conquest. Khrushchev, as Stalin before him, has long desired American de jure recognition of the long chain of Russian conquests, beginning in 1918 and extending through the Baltic States and Eastern Europe. It appears that from Mr. Rusk he is beginning to get it.

In a second letter to Representative SMITH, dated December 27, 1961, Mr. Rusk reaffirms his stand and the "U.S. Government's long-established policy toward the peoples of the U.S.S.R." If that policy entails full recognition of Soviet conquests, as Mr. Rusk infers, then this Special Committee on the Captive Nations becomes even more necessary to shed

public light on the limitations of such a policy. A national government which spends upward of \$50 billion yearly to halt Soviet advances but refuses to even look at chances for its own advancement, is not serving the national will. Billions for defense, but not 1 cent for offense is no policy for survival.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

From today through July 21, the United States is marking its third annual observance of Captive Nations Week.

Since the U.S. State Department has a tendency to soft-pedal American references to the captive nations, apparently for fear that Moscow will become more threatening, it is fair to ask why we should have such an observance.

Captive Nations Week remains significant because the cold war is a continuing fact of political life. There has been no change in Communist doctrine: The desire to bury our way of life, by whatever means, remains the admitted touchstone of Communist policy, no matter how mildly it is phrased.

For the captive people behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, the cold war continues, too. Famine in Red China has not made Mao Tse-tung relax his hold on the suffering Chinese people. Growing food shortages in Eastern Europe and in Russia itself have not caused the Communists to abandon their rigid program of forced collectivization of the peasants.

When Khrushchev convened the recent meeting of the satellite governments in Moscow, he made it clear that although the Communist bloc faced a severe economic crisis, no choice between guns and butter could be offered. Butter, he implied, was obsolete and would remain so for some time.

The captive nations hate their Communist masters as much as they did in East Berlin in 1953, and in Hungary and Poland in 1956, when hatred exploded into open revolt.

Proof of this, if proof is required, can be found in the mass exodus of more than 120,000 Chinese to Hong Kong and Macao and in the flight of hundreds of Eastern Berliners who have risked their lives to breach the Berlin wall since its erection nearly a year ago.

These people, whose firsthand experience with communism has continued for years, are our staunchest allies. As General Maxwell D. Taylor, President Kennedy's military adviser, has stated, the unwavering passive resistance of the captive peoples is one of the strongest deterrents to Soviet aggression. As long as Khrushchev is afraid of being stabbed in the back, he is less likely to launch an attack on the West.

But the captive peoples of Eastern Europe will not go on resisting their Soviet masters indefinitely unless we give them some reason to hope.

Our total failure to formulate any kind of a policy toward Eastern Europe seems to indicate the West's tacit acceptance of a world divided into two parts—one slave, one free. The recent U.S. proposal for an exchange of nonaggression pacts between NATO and the fictitious Warsaw Pact alliance—actually a group of puppets—has had an especially discouraging effect upon the captive peoples.

Captive Nations Week provides the American people with a chance to show the victims of Red slavery that they are not forgotten. It also provides our Government with a chance to take the initiative in the "cold war," which could be done by:

Insisting on inclusion of the Hungarian problem on the agenda of the U.N. General Assembly.

Remaining steadfast in refusing to help the Communists solve their problems by credits or expansion of trade.

Raising the question of Soviet treaty pledges to hold free elections in Eastern Europe.

Placing the question of the U.S.S.R.'s denial of self-determination rights to the peoples of east-central Europe on the agenda of every U.N. General Assembly session from now on.

CHINA BACKS PROCLAMATION OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Ku Cheng-kang, chairman of the Committee of Civic Organizations of Republic of China, yesterday welcomed a U.S. Senator's proposal that the third week in July be proclaimed the Captive Nations Week by the United States.

A news item datelined Washington, June 9 (CNA) said that U.S. Senator ROMAN HRUSKA introduced in the U.S. Senate a resolution, requesting U.S. President Kennedy to proclaim the third week in July of this year the Captive Nations Week and to bring the question of liberation of these nations and regions before the United Nations General Assembly.

Commenting on the item Ku said Senator HRUSKA's proposal was a thoughtful one to which he wished to pay his high tribute and enthusiastic response.

"Today," Ku added, "the unanimous desire of the oppressed peoples is to struggle for existence and freedom."

He voiced his conviction that this is the most opportune time for the United States, leader of the free world, to step up its liberation movement. "Agricultural failure is common to the Communist areas in both Europe and Asia, and particularly the people on the mainland are facing imminent starvation," he pointed out.

He said the fact that the East German people keep on fleeing to the West and the Chinese people risked their lives to flee to Hong Kong and Macao in batches after batches recently serve to provide a strong proof that they are all for freedom and against the tyrannical Communist rule.

He hoped that the resolution, when passed, could be accepted by President Kennedy so as to give the Communist-enslaved peoples a great encouragement.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

THE MOUNTING DEMAND FOR TAX CUTS BEFORE CONGRESS ADJOURNS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the need for an across-the-board tax cut is in a race with time. Unless the Congress provides some relief for the heavy tax burdens carried by corporations and individuals, in the 5 to 7 weeks remaining before adjournment, the sluggish economy may slip back into another recession.

As the new Congress will not convene until January 1963, we run the risk that a possible recession will deepen to the point where extreme measures would be required to meet the situation.

The warning signals are clear. There has been little reduction in the millions of unemployed. The profit squeeze is slowing down the rate of economic growth. The sharp and sudden decline in the value of securities traded on Wall Street, reflects the doubts and fears of investors.

Confiscatory taxes, patiently borne by corporations and individuals for many years to meet our domestic and international obligations, are exhausting the initiative and the confidence of our people.

On previous downswings in the economic cycle, we have waited to see what happens and have been forced into emergency spending programs to effect a partial recovery that simply postponed the day of reckoning. The root and cause of our sluggish economy is the drying up of incentives through excessive taxation.

Sooner or later this issue had to be faced, and I believe that the day of decision is near. Some measure of tax relief, to encourage enterprise and to restore investor and consumer confidence, is essential to produce the revenues that support the programs of the U.S. Government.

Apart from the first year's deficit, tax reduction will stimulate economic activity; soon compensate for the initial loss of revenue; and provide more freedom of action for corporations and individuals to do more for the progress of our people.

When two widely separated organizations like the AFL-CIO and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce—although their fiscal objectives may differ—unite in calling for a substantial and widespread tax cut by Congress before it adjourns, and are supported by an impressive list of authorities in other fields, we sense a national awareness of what must be done.

Present tax rates are the roadblock in the way of economic recovery and economic growth.

Although various formulas are proposed, I believe these differences can be bridged by the overriding necessity of a tax reduction, now, before we become bogged down in another recession that weakens our capacity for recovery.

Relief should be across the board, benefiting corporations and individual taxpayers.

The consensus of opinion in the U.S. community is that an immediate tax cut is both necessary and desirable: Necessary to halt the economic decline; desirable to renew confidence and provide incentives that will liberate the dynamic capacity for growth that is the very heart of freedom.

QUINNIPIAC COUNCIL, BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA, SCORES "FIRST" IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, the Boy Scouts of America have long been an object of admiration for many of us. Their record of accomplishment is matchless, and their ideals are worthy of emulation by every American.

I would like today to call to the attention of my colleagues a specific activity of the Quinniac Council of the Boy Scouts of America, located in Hamden, Conn., which is a magnificent example

of the principles of Scouting. The Quinniac Council is sponsoring an international camporee—the first of its kind. These boys and their farsighted leaders have brought boys from all over the world to Connecticut to live for a month with American Scouts and have a firsthand view of America. The boys have taken side trips to New York and Boston and just recently came to Washington.

It was my extreme privilege to meet these boys and their visitors. I spent several hours with them and came away convinced that this is the type of program that is extremely important and worth while. I am proud to represent these Scouts and their families.

Under unanimous consent, I would like to insert in the RECORD explanatory material on this unique and fruitful experiment in international living, and the names of the boys who participated. My especial commendations are extended to the Quinniac Council chief, Samuel D. Bogan, and the troop leaders, Mr. Auerhaan, Mr. Burger, Mr. Gagnon, and Mr. Magrath, for their wisdom, leadership, and immeasurable contribution to the cause of better international relations.

The material follows:

INTERNATIONAL CAMPOREE, 1962, QUINNIPIAC COUNCIL, BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA, HAMDEN, CONN.

During the entire month of July, the Quinniac Council is sponsoring an international camporee that is setting a precedence in international relationships. This camporee is a climax of more than 20 years of international exchanges instituted by Quinniac Council Chief Samuel D. Bogan. With the full support of the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, this is to be the pioneer effort for the establishment of this type of program by other local Scout councils through the United States. Participating will be Scout representatives from 14 nations.

The camporee consists of three phases:

1. Camporee Week from July 1-8, at Quinniac Council's Camp Squassen, Winsted, Conn., and a second week of regular camp activities during the week of July 8-15.

2. Our visiting Scouts will live in our homes so that each will get to know us better. The visit in our homes will include side trips of interest such as visits to local points of interest as well as nearby cities of New York and Boston.

3. A highlight trip to our Nation's Capital, Washington, D.C., from July 23-27. Headquarters for the group, which numbers approximately 180 Scouts and leaders, will be the Hotel Ambassador. A welcome to Washington is to be given by U.S. Representative from Connecticut, Congressman ROBERT A. GIAIMO, at dinner on Monday, July 23.

On Tuesday, July 24, the tour schedule in order, is as follows: Capitol Building, Washington Monument, Jefferson Memorial, Marine Corps Monument, Arlington National Memorial (including the laying of a laurel wreath on the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier), Lincoln Memorial, National Archives, and the Wax Museum.

On Wednesday, July 25, a tour of the White House, home of our President, will be followed by a visit to Mount Vernon, the home of our first President. There will also be a tour of the Smithsonian Institution area, including the National Gallery of Art and the Museum of Natural Sciences. This will be followed by a real highlight of the trip, a visit to each Embassy represented by our visiting Scouts, accompanied by their hosts.

On the return trip to Connecticut, Thursday, July 26, a luncheon stop will be made at the National Headquarters of the Boy Scouts of America, in New Brunswick, N.J. Our host for the visit will be Chief Scout Executive Joseph A. Brunton, Jr. Included will be a tour of the Johnston Scout Museum, located on the grounds of the national office.

Over 800 Scouts from the following nations are participating in the international camporee program: Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Great Britain, Greece, Iran, Italy, Mexico, Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United States.

The following is the statement used in placing a wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier:

"In placing this wreath to honor an unknown soldier, a casualty of war, we pray that the friendships we have formed during the past few weeks will in some measure help to build a world at peace. May we live to see the day when all mankind will cherish the wide earth, and give friendship to all men."

QUINNIPIAC COUNCIL, BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA, HAMDEN, CONN.—WASHINGTON TRIP ROSTER

TROOP 1

Troop leader: Mr. Auerhaan.

Patrol No. 1: Dennis Evans, leader; Gaylen Duncan (Canada); Edward Murphy; Richard Lawton (Canada); Robert Eaton; Ricky Innes; Robin Tetlow (Canada); Fred Landorf; and Kenneth Landorf.

Patrol No. 2: Stephen Lowrey, leader; Axel Conradi (Canada); Phil Lewis; Peter Conradi (Canada); Mark Moore; Randall Miller; Paul Robson (Canada); James Reveaux; and David Shiffrin.

Patrol No. 3: Craig Stahl, leader; Sten Ake Nilsson (Sweden); Alan Stahl; Carl Lewis; Sven Goran Nilsson (Sweden); Richard Schoenknecht; Gunther Hubmann (Germany); Carl Smith; Robert Lepper; Kurt Henle (Germany); Richard Kubeck; and William Edwards.

Patrol No. 4: Michael Cahoon, leader; Berut Karlsson (Sweden); Bill Cahoon; Hakan Laugseth (Sweden); Barry Berman; Jess Bloom; Percy Elling (Sweden); Peter Heyse; Lindsay Hulbert; Swen Jacobson (Sweden); Howard Finger; and Mark Fidler.

TROOP 2

Troop leader: Mr. Burger.

Patrol No. 5: Charles Floto, leader; John Tyrer (England); Paul Floto; John Ciastko; Giovanni Geddes (Italy); Alan Horwath; Mario Rampini (Italy); Bill Tinker; Barrie Drzen; Paqui Mauro (Italy); Phillip Paolella, Jr.; Joseph Paolella.

Patrol No. 6: Paul Ford, leader; Jolai (Iran); Michael King; Rodney W. Archer (England); John E. Barker, Jr.; John Blalock; Raymond Considine; Fred Langerman; Khosmnevisan (Iran); Peter Considine; Howard Rashba; Farzi (Iran).

Patrol No. 7: Robert Stockus, leader; Rene Rimada (Mexico); John Hall; Fernando Margain (Mexico); Robert Hunt; Russell Hotchkiss; Ruben Fernandez (Mexico); Peter Jessop; James Keating, Jr.; Fred Sussman; Ronald Hine.

Patrol No. 8: Bruce Hawley, leader; David W. Lankshear (England); Andrew Harvard; Diego Alonso Hinojosa (Mexico); Russ Scavelli; Bryan Sperry; Jorge H. Padilla (Mexico); David Gitlitz; Richard Greele.

TROOP 3

Troop leader: Mr. Gagnon.

Patrol No. 9: Robert Rathgeber, leader; James Stewart (Canada); Jeffrey Prager; Michael Daly (Canada); Donald Clock; Thomas Clock; Michael Oatway (Canada); David Tator; John Susman; Bruce Clark (Canada); John Golia; Richard Russell, Jr.

Patrol No. 10: David Novicki, leader; Hansjorg Hagmann (Switzerland); Erik

Olesen; Thomas Casparis (Switzerland); Michael Blanchard; William Wehrman; Wolf Siler (Switzerland); Roy Wilkinson; Lee Iwanski.

Patrol No. 11: Donald Galligan, leader; Dennis Galligan; Benedict Doif (Switzerland); Francis Calsie (Canada); Douglas Blowers; Alvin Blowers; David Moore (Canada); James P. McGovern, Jr.; William MacCalmon.

Patrol No. 12: Joseph Link, leader; Bradford Liff; Fortunat Busch (Switzerland); Robert Arnaud (France); Robert Bouley; David Waldron; Alain Roumy (France); Fred Schreiber; Richard Schwartz; Erik Hutse (Denmark); Vincent Gagnon; Robert Fletcher.

TROOP 4

Troop leader: Mr. Magrath.

Patrol No. 13: John Fallgren, leader; Peter DaRos; Anthony DaRos, Jr.; Cornelius van Tricht (Netherlands); William Meneely; Rusty Condon; Maurits van Tol (Netherlands); Robert White; Calvin Ward; Rudi Pen (Netherlands); Michael Franford; Martin Garber.

Patrol No. 14: William Richards, leader; Esko Pakkanen (Finland); Julian Lipsker; Kristian Seren (Finland); Richard Emmons; Richard Englehardt; Nicholas Athanassiou (Greece); Barton Hall; Paul Hancharyk.

Patrol No. 15: John Perry, leader; Kari T. Tossavainen (Finland); Robert Moore; Alexandros Michalopoulos (Greece); Michael Laurie; David Leeney; George Gripari (Greece); Peter Daniel; Donald Eaton, Jr.

Patrol No. 16: David Anderson, leader; Lianos Evangelos (Greece); Alan Bruce; Christos Petreas (Greece); Jerry Montlick; Harold Alderman; Constantinos Voulgaris (Greece); Alfred Clark; Robert Consiglio; Constantinos Papanastasiou (Greece); Stanley Schwartz; Doug Smith.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BARING (at the request of Mr. FRIEDEL), for 10 days, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. ZABLOCKI, for 20 minutes, on tomorrow.

Mr. LANE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. DWYER (at the request of Mr. HALPERN), for 20 minutes, on July 26.

Mr. CHAIMO (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 5 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. MASON to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the passing of a public servant.

Mr. ZELENKO, the remarks he made in the consideration of H.R. 11677 and to include tables and other documents.

Mr. PHILBIN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ALGER to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee on the Equal Pay Act and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon to revise and extend her remarks made in general debate on the equal pay bill and to include a table.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HALPERN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HALL.

Mr. TUPPER.

Mr. PELLY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROSENTHAL.

Mr. WRIGHT.

Mr. KEOGH.

Mr. CAREY.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 6967. An act to provide for the incorporation of certain nonprofit corporations in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2996. An act to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1700. An act for the relief of Jaime Abejuro;

H.R. 2187. An act for the relief of Augustin Ramirez-Trejo;

H.R. 2198. An act for the relief of Carlos Sepulveda Abarca;

H.R. 6374. An act to clarify the application of the Government Employees Training Act with respect to payment of expenses of attendance of Government employees at certain meetings, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10606. An act to extend and improve the public assistance and child welfare services programs of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 11038. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 26, 1962, at 11 o'clock a.m.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

July 13, 1962.

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, 1962, 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:		
John J. Heimbarger	Counsel	\$8,772.00
Francis M. LeMay	Staff consultant	8,051.46
Christine S. Gallagher	Clerk	8,051.46
Hyde H. Murray	Assistant clerk	7,172.76
Lydia Vacin	Staff assistant	4,727.28
Betty M. Prezioso	do	4,727.28
Peggy Jean Lamm	do	4,403.28
Gladys N. Ondarcho	Staff assistant (through Apr. 30, 1962)	2,665.48
Jane C. Wojcik	Staff assistant	3,593.16
Martha Hannah	Staff assistant (from Feb. 1, 1962)	3,247.45
John Mercer	Staff assistant (from June 1, 1962)	396.33
Investigating committee:		
Adele Downey Maynard	do	315.64
Haywood W. Taylor	Staff assistant (through Apr. 30, 1962)	1,687.92
Martha Hannah	Staff assistant (through Jan. 31, 1962)	649.49

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$50,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	33,061.17
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1962	10,685.90
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1961, to June 30, 1962	43,747.07
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1962	6,252.93

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1962.

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, 1962, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Kenneth Sprankle	Clerk and staff director	\$8,824.74
Paul M. Wilson	do	8,824.74
Carson W. Culp	Staff assistant	8,754.48
Samuel W. Crosby	do	8,754.48
Jay B. Howe	do	8,578.68
Ross P. Pope	do	8,578.68
Robert M. Moyer	do	8,578.68
Frank P. Sanders	do	8,578.68
Eugene B. Wilhelm	do	8,578.68
G. Homer Skarin	do	8,578.68
Robert L. Michaels	do	7,293.60
Robert P. Williams	Editor	7,293.60
George E. Evans	Staff assistant	4,781.84
Aubrey A. Gunnels	do	6,909.12
Francis G. Merrill	do	5,634.96
Earl C. Sillsby	do	5,634.96
Samuel R. Preston	do	5,066.08
Keith F. Mainland	do	3,273.04
Lawrence G. Miller	Assistant editor	4,605.78

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
George A. Urian	Clerical assistant	\$3,643.77
James E. Moore	do	3,390.63
Stephen B. Miller	do	3,188.10
Austin G. Smith	do	2,825.50
Randolph Thomas	Messenger	2,327.34
Nancy Hammack	Clerk-stenographer	2,842.39
George P. Cossar, Jr.	do	514.47
Viola W. Grubbs	do	3,086.82
Patrick M. Hayes	do	3,221.84
Rosaline E. McGovern	do	2,057.88
William J. Neary	do	3,086.82
Harry E. Reynolds	do	3,356.86
Jeanne C. Smith	do	3,356.86
Suzanne S. Thomas	do	3,086.82
Geraldine E. Rothwell	do	2,057.88
Mary F. Wilson	do	2,844.82
Sandra L. Percival	do	1,391.52
Grace W. Beirne	do	1,298.98
Mary L. Schwarzmann	do	1,298.98
Mary H. Smallwood	do	1,298.98
George S. Green	Clerk to the minority	8,051.46
James H. Bersie	Clerk-stenographer	3,086.82
Josephine Birdsell	do	3,356.86
Dorothy D. Borth	do	514.47
Robert Dunkel	do	514.47
Paul D. Quinn	do	2,795.29
Gayle C. Raver	do	3,086.82
Dorothy E. Sweeney	do	3,356.86
Silas Taber	do	3,086.82
John H. Murphy	do	2,019.02
Catherine L. Kennett	do	2,850.56
William B. Gunger	do	1,475.40
Allah F. Dickson	do	2,572.35
Laverne Roughsedge	do	1,492.80
Clara B. Posey	do	2,568.01
William J. Baroody, Jr.	do	1,298.98
Jessamine A. Falls	do	1,047.56
Virginia E. Stevens	do	256.38

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$
Amount of expenditures previously reported	211,689.49
Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1962, to June 30, 1962	231,056.67
Total amount expended from July 1, 1961, to June 30, 1962	442,746.16
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1962	

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1962.

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, 1962, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Kenneth T. Delavigne	Director, surveys and investigations staff, to May 1, 1962	\$4,802.32
William B. Soyars	Director, surveys and investigations staff	7,225.45
Leonard M. Walters	Assistant director, surveys and investigations staff	6,944.28
Rowland C. Halstead	do	2,273.74
Lillian M. Mackie	Stenographer	3,390.64
Helen C. Perrish	do	3,365.34
William T. Roy	Consultant	3,000.00

REIMBURSEMENTS TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Agency for International Development:		
Lapadula, Michael	Investigator	\$7,175.60
Agriculture, Department of:		
Baldauf, T. M.	do	3,416.80
Evans, George E.	Staff assistant	1,531.54
Wride, Charles H.	Editorial assistant	3,740.84
Air Force, Department of:		
Brown, Robert M.	Investigator	1,961.60
Atomic Energy Commission:		
Taylor, G. C.	do	4,247.83
Bureau of the Budget:		
Miller, C. J.	do	4,431.69
Civil Service Commission:		
Coltrin, Marion J.	do	1,801.16
Commerce, Department of:		
Jarvis, L. H.	do	3,442.95
Keister, R. H.	do	3,640.88
Shafer, W. S.	do	5,500.20
Shearer, Ross S.	do	2,435.20
Tiedemann, Hollie J.	do	3,455.69
Corps of Engineers:		
Klein, A. A.	do	3,722.83
Federal Aviation Agency:		
Fede, Frank J.	do	5,881.78
Federal Bureau of Investigation:		
Brent, A. S.	do	1,318.72
Bruninga, H. J.	do	3,131.52
Chisholm, L. B.	do	1,915.52
Cogan, J. P.	do	7,253.28
DeBuck, H. L.	do	6,943.44
Feuer, R. W.	do	274.08
Foley, F. B.	do	2,533.68
Franklin, R. M.	do	7,038.08
Halstead, R. C.	do	5,191.04
Harman, R. V.	do	7,658.72
Hayes, E. J.	do	1,863.36
Health benefits fund:		
Herrington, R. B.	Investigator	613.79
Law, W. C.	do	2,590.88
Lewis, P. H.	do	7,027.68
Life insurance fund:		
Lipscomb, W. P.	Investigator	3,030.48
McDowell, L. L.	do	300.90
McEliece, R. F.	do	7,558.88
Mabes, B. M.	do	7,215.28
Martinson, W. C.	do	2,558.08
Neale, A. W.	do	2,776.56
Retirement fund:		
Neale, A. W.	do	3,527.28
Roberts, A. J.	Investigator	7,658.72
Turner, P. A.	do	5,796.66
Wood, H. B.	do	3,775.68
Federal Communications Commission:		
Thelemann, E. C.	do	2,282.40
Federal Trade Commission:		
Wagner, Winfield K.	do	1,540.08
Health, Education, and Welfare, Department of:		
Bing, P. S.	do	5,481.87
Interior, Department of:		
Phillips, J. C.	do	5,396.38
Labor, Department of:		
Baill, Israel	do	1,167.87
Library of Congress:		
Rose, J. K.	do	5,881.83
Navy, Department of:		
Wilkenloh, C. E.	do	3,853.06
Post Office Department:		
Kopp, Robert	do	3,122.75
State, Department of:		
Steuart, G. H.	do	3,122.75
Veterans' Administration:		
Fulton, J. C.	do	1,154.55
Travel and miscellaneous expense		4,115.68
		7,593.00
		3,899.47
		58,650.74
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures		\$550,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported		215,800.33

Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1962, to June 30, 1962.....\$291,080.35

Total amount expended from July 1, 1961, to June 30, 1962.....506,880.68

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1962. 43,119.32

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman.

JULY 17, 1962.

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, 1962, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert W. Smart	Chief counsel	\$8,824.74
John R. Blandford	Counsel	8,798.40
Philip W. Kelleher	do	8,798.40
Frank M. Slatinshek	do	8,798.40
Oneta L. Stockstill	Committee secretary	4,676.70
Berniece Kalinowski	Secretary	4,676.70
L. Louise Ellis	do	4,676.70
M. Jane Binger	do	3,547.56
Edna E. Johnson	do	4,003.26
James A. Deakins	Bill clerk	3,547.56

OFFICE OF SPECIAL COUNSEL OPERATING PURSUANT TO H. RES. 78 AND 79, 87TH CONG.

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John J. Courtney	Special counsel	\$8,824.74
Sam A. Nunn, Jr.	Assistant counsel (since June 15, 1962)	326.59
Dorothy Britton	Secretary	4,403.28
Jane Wheelahan	do	3,456.42
Adele Tolerton	Clerk	3,248.82
James Joscy	Messenger	1,813.08

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (H. Res. 79).....\$150,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....60,852.19

Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1962 to June 30, 1962.....22,241.08

Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1961 to June 30, 1962.....83,093.27

Balance unexpended as of July 1, 1962. 66,906.73

CARL VINSON,
Chairman.

JULY 24, 1962.

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, 1962, 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 (resigned Jan. 14, 1962)	\$686.37

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
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
Thomas Graham, Jr.	Counsel (entry on duty, May 9, 1962)	2,549.37
Helen L. Rogers	Deputy clerk	5,204.16
Mary W. Layton	Assistant clerk	5,204.16
Marguerite Bean	Secretary to chairman	6,030.36
Mary Elizabeth Mehler	Secretary to minority (entry on duty, Apr. 1, 1962)	2,052.27
Roger J. Brown	Editor	6,004.02

EMPLOYEES PURSUANT TO H. RES. 504, SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Kenneth W. Burrows	Housing economist	\$8,249.16
Royal L. Coburn	Minority counsel (entry on duty, June 11, 1962)	917.07
Eleanor N. Hamilton	Research assistant	3,547.56
Robin H. Harbin	Clerk (entry on duty, June 1, 1962, off payroll, June 24, 1962)	360.27
John J. McEwan, Jr.	Deputy staff director	8,824.74
Grady Perry, Jr.	Clerk	5,854.62
Margaret E. Tucker	Secretary	3,307.04
Frances M. Yeakle	do	3,491.88

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....\$205,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....79,816.40

Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1962 to June 30, 1962.....40,396.04

Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1961 to June 30, 1962.....120,212.44

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1962. 84,787.56

BRENT SPENCE,
Chairman.

JULY 3, 1962.

COMMITTEE ON THE 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 January 1 to June 30, 1962, 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, Jr.	Clerk	\$8,754.48
Hayden S. Garber	Attorney	8,051.46
Leonard O. Hilder	Investigator	5,942.52
Donald J. Tubridy	Minority clerk	6,030.36
Clayton D. Gasque	Assistant clerk	5,397.48
James T. Clark	Assistant clerk (from Feb. 1, 1962 (5 months))	5,003.35
Ann R. Puryear	Assistant clerk	4,437.00
Ellen M. Coxeter	do	3,934.91
Patricia Ann Dempsey	Stenographer	2,580.54
Total		50,132.10

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (H. Res. 189, Mar. 15, 1961).....\$10,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....206.33

Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1962.....None

Total amount expended from July 1, 1961, to June 30, 1962.....\$206.33

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1962. 9,793.67

JOHN L. McMILLAN,
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1962.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

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, 1962, 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: Louise Maxienne Dargans	Chief clerk	\$8,824.74
Russell C. Derrickson	Staff director	8,824.74
Wray Smith	Education chief (ending Feb. 28, 1962)	2,941.58
Deborah P. Wolfe	Education chief	5,883.16
Howard G. Gamsler	Chief counsel for labor-management	8,824.74
Livingston L. Wingate	Associate counsel for labor-management	8,604.33
James E. Branigan	Counsel (ending May 14, 1962)	5,055.58
Marvin R. Fullmer	Chief, investigative task force (effective May 15, 1962)	2,255.21
Teresa Calabrese	Administrative assistant to the chairman (ending Feb. 15, 1962)	1,250.17
Richard T. Burress	Minority clerk	8,807.16
Melvin W. Sneed	Administrative assistant (ending Jan. 31, 1962)	1,417.34
Louise M. Wright	Administrative assistant	4,240.26
Cabell Walter Berge	do	4,251.26
Donald F. Berens	Administrative assistant (effective Feb. 16, 1962)	3,188.52

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....\$145,346.43

Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1962, to June 30, 1962.....74,368.89

Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1961, to June 30, 1962.....219,705.32

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1962.

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, 1962, 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 (chairman, Representative CLEVELAND M. BAILEY): Robert E. McCord, subcommittee clerk		\$7,502.28
Ted Ellsworth, special assistant (Mar. 1, 1962, to June 30, 1962)		5,001.62
Ruth P. Ebersole, assistant subcommittee clerk		3,000.78

General Subcommittee on Labor (chairman, Representative CARL D. PERKINS):	
Hartwell Duvall Reed, Jr., counsel.....	\$7,502.28
Gertrude L. Moser, secretary.....	3,000.78
Special Subcommittee on Education (chairman, Representative EDITH GREEN):	
John F. Morse, director (effective Mar. 1, 1962).....	5,883.16
Betty R. Pryor, subcommittee clerk.....	5,252.46
Mary June Wall, administrative assistant (effective Feb. 1, 1962).....	3,336.05
Muriel Greenhill, assistant director (effective Apr. 16, 1962).....	2,083.62
William O'Hara, counsel (effective Apr. 15, 1962).....	1,901.90
Joanne M. Clark, secretary (effective Apr. 22, 1962).....	1,074.61
James B. Harrison, counsel (Jan. 1 to 31, 1962).....	833.45
Special Subcommittee on Labor (chairman, Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT):	
Edmund D. Edelman, counsel (effective Feb. 19, 1962).....	5,501.67
Adrienne Fields, secretary.....	3,000.78
Don Lowe, director (ending Feb. 18, 1962).....	2,000.61
Select Subcommittee on Labor (chairman, Representative HERRERT ZELENKO):	
Harvey B. Cohen, counsel.....	5,000.70
Mollie D. Cohen, administrative assistant.....	5,000.70
Edmund Smythwick, staff assistant (Jan. 1 to 31, 1962).....	400.55
Select Subcommittee on Education (chairman, Representative FRANK THOMPSON):	
John D. Hawke, Jr., counsel.....	6,250.08
Mary E. Corbin, secretary.....	3,502.02
Carla Otten, assistant clerk (Jan. 1, to Feb. 14, 1962) effective June 25, 1962.....	166.40
Susan Liela Gordon, assistant clerk (effective June 13, 1962).....	155.03
Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Impact of Imports and Exports on American Unemployment (chairman, Representative JOHN H. DENT):	
James L. Gallagher, counsel (ending Feb. 28, 1962).....	2,001.34
Mary A. Orndoff, clerk (ending Feb. 28, 1962).....	1,000.26
Barbara Dash, secretary (Feb. 15 to Mar. 31, 1962).....	766.87
Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Integration of Federally Assisted Education (chairman, DOMINICK V. DANIELS):	
Aurora Harris, secretary (Mar. 1 to May 31, 1962).....	1,500.39
Barbara Freygang, secretary (Mar. 12 to May 31, 1962).....	1,317.01
Lillian M. Kelley, secretary (May 7 to 24, 1962).....	300.08
Carla Geraghty, secretary (Feb. 16 to Mar. 7, 1962).....	366.77
Full committee staff:	
Jeanne Thomson, administrative assistant.....	4,302.00
Tamara J. Wall, assistant counsel (effective Jan. 1, 1962).....	4,001.58
Johnnie L. Graves, administrative assistant (effective Feb. 22, 1962).....	2,687.59
Mary D. Pinkard, administrative assistant (ending Apr. 15, 1962).....	2,312.88
Deborah P. Wolfe, education chief.....	2,255.21
Corrine Annette Huff, receptionist.....	2,253.63
Donald F. Berens, administrative assistant (ending Feb. 15, 1962).....	1,062.84
Nancy L. H. Hastings, secretary (Jan. 1 to Mar. 8, 1962).....	680.36
Marcia Sue Nathanson, receptionist (Apr. 4 to 30, 1962).....	292.81
Patricia Bergman, secretary (ending Mar. 31, 1962).....	208.20
Judith Matheny, receptionist (Mar. 17 to Apr. 3, 1962).....	198.77
James Saxon, assistant clerk (effective June 18, 1962).....	94.09
Investigative task force:	
Leon Abramson, chief counsel.....	7,502.28
Odell Clark, chief investigator.....	6,250.08
Marvin R. Fullmer, chief investigator (ending May 14, 1962).....	5,585.03
Ludwig Teller, consultant (ending Mar. 31, 1962).....	3,751.14
Waldo Parrish, administrative assistant.....	3,167.86
Olive Gibbons, secretary.....	2,669.98
John Young, consultant (effective Apr. 1, 1962).....	2,500.35
Edward J. Drum, Jr., assistant investigator (Jan. 1 to Mar. 31, 1962).....	2,500.35
Alfredo Vidal, investigator (effective Apr. 1, 1962).....	2,500.35
Zelda E. McNeal, clerk (effective Apr. 1, 1962).....	1,500.39
James E. Branigan, counsel.....	1,458.34
Ida Bailey, secretary (ending Mar. 15, 1962).....	813.35
Arnold Block, investigator (effective May 1, 1962).....	650.68
Minority staff:	
Beverly Pearson, minority secretary.....	3,289.38
Travel and miscellaneous expenses.....	25,438.36
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	
	633,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	290,821.01

Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1962.....	\$174,532.03
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1961, to June 30, 1962.....	465,353.04
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1962	167,646.96

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman.

JULY 9, 1962.

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, 1962, 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
Robert F. Brandt.....	Investigator consultant.....	8,504.04
Harry C. Cromer.....	Staff consultant.....	8,306.28
Philip B. Billings.....	Special assistant.....	6,879.84
Marian A. Ozarnecki.....	Staff consultant.....	4,846.36
June Nigh.....	Senior staff assistant.....	7,001.40
Helen C. Mathias.....	Staff assistant.....	6,004.02
Helen L. Hashagen.....	do.....	5,876.58
Mary Louise O'Brien.....	do.....	5,784.36
Mary E. Medsger.....	do.....	3,533.23
Doris B. McCracken.....	do.....	3,542.80
Robert J. Bowen.....	Clerical assistant.....	3,937.44

¹ Effective Mar. 12, 1962.

² Effective Feb. 1, 1962.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$150,000.00
---	--------------

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	56,360.10
Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1962, to June 30, 1962.....	36,442.25

Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1961, to June 30, 1962.....	92,802.35
---	-----------

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1962.....	57,197.65
--	-----------

THOMAS E. MORGAN,
Chairman.

JULY 3, 1962.

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 1 to June 30, 1962, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Expenses, Jan. 1, 1962-June 30, 1962:	
Full committee.....	\$845.05
Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee.....	29,688.74
Military Operations Subcommittee.....	33,954.31
Government Activities Subcommittee.....	25,326.35
Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee.....	29,103.04
Foreign Operations and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee.....	39,838.95
Special Donable Property Subcommittee.....	15,869.97
Special Government Information Subcommittee.....	30,742.16
Special Subcommittee on Assigned Power and Land Problems.....	11,533.30
Special Subcommittee on the Home Loan Bank Board.....	15,132.30
Total.....	232,034.17

Salaries, full committee, Jan. 1-June 30, 1962:	
Christine Ray Davis, staff director.....	\$8,824.74
James A. Lanigan, general counsel.....	8,824.74
Miles C. Romney, associate general counsel.....	7,098.06
Earle J. Wade, staff member.....	6,294.00
Dolores Fel'Dotto, staff member.....	4,727.28
Ann E. McLachlan, staff member.....	4,504.50
Patricia Maheu, staff member.....	4,281.72
Charlotte C. Bickett, staff member (Feb. 1-June 30, 1962).....	3,125.10
Helen M. Boyer, minority professional staff.....	8,051.46
J. P. Carlson, minority counsel.....	7,401.18
Expenses, Jan. 1-June 30, 1962: Full committee, travel, publications, telephone, stationery supplies, etc.....	845.05
Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee, Hon. William L. Dawson, chairman:	
Elmer W. Henderson, counsel.....	8,301.90
Arthur Perlman, investigator.....	7,988.06
Daniel A. Kavanaugh, legal research analyst.....	3,750.12
Irene Manning, clerk-stenographer.....	3,750.12
Veronica B. Johnson, clerk-stenographer.....	3,750.12
Henry Coopersmith, staff member (Mar. 15-June 30, 1962).....	1,060.57
Expenses.....	1,977.85
Total.....	29,688.74

Military Operations Subcommittee, Hon. Chet Holifield, chairman:	
Herbert Roback, staff administrator.....	8,824.74
John Paul Ridgely, investigator.....	5,766.78
Douglas G. Dahlin, staff attorney.....	5,125.36
Robert J. McElroy, investigator.....	4,504.50
Mollie Jo Hughes, clerk-stenographer.....	3,998.22
Catherine L. Koeberlein, clerk-stenographer.....	3,998.22
Earl J. Morgan, investigator (Jan. 1-31, 1962).....	1,122.23
Expenses.....	614.26
Total.....	33,954.31

Government Activities Subcommittee, Hon. Jack Brooks, chairman:	
Edward C. Brooks, Jr., staff administrator.....	7,699.98
Phineas Indritz, counsel (Feb. 1-June 30, 1962).....	6,700.55
Ernest Cornish Baynard, associate counsel (June 1-30, 1962).....	1,000.67
Daniel L. Power, investigator.....	3,878.37
Irma Reel, clerk.....	3,758.56
Tanner T. Hunt, Jr., investigator (Mar. 26-June 30, 1962).....	1,583.75
L. Russell Harding II, investigator (Jan. 1-14, 1962).....	355.47
Expenses.....	340.00
Total.....	25,326.35

Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, Hon. L. H. Fountain, chairman:	
James R. Naughton, counsel.....	7,743.90
Delphis C. Goldberg, professional staff member.....	7,743.90
Herbert B. Warburton, minority counsel (June 18-30, 1962).....	534.53
William Donald Gray, research analyst.....	4,504.50
Eileen M. Anderson, clerk-stenographer.....	3,998.22
Bebe B. Terry, clerk-stenographer.....	3,795.66
Joan C. Montgomery, clerk-stenographer (June 25-30, 1962).....	96.14
Robert E. Manuel, minority counsel (June 1-9, 1962).....	370.06
Expenses.....	316.13
Total.....	29,103.04

Foreign Operations and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, Hon. Porter Hardy, Jr., chairman:	
John T. M. Reddan, chief counsel.....	7,800.00
Walton Woods, investigator.....	7,098.06
M. Joseph Matan, counsel.....	6,996.96
Charles Rothenberg, investigator.....	6,469.74
Phyllis Seymour, clerk.....	3,998.22
Yvonne J. Kurtak, stenographer (Jan. 1-May 31, 1962).....	2,825.50
R. D. Young Counsel (Jan. 1-Apr. 21, 1962).....	4,278.39
Expenses.....	372.08
Total.....	39,838.95

Special Donable Property Subcommittee, Hon. John S. Monagan, chairman:	
Ray Ward, staff administrator.....	8,492.04
Margaret B. O'Connor, clerk-stenographer.....	3,593.16
Clara Katherine Armstrong, clerical staff.....	3,608.34
Expenses.....	175.83
Total.....	15,869.97

Special Government Information Subcommittee, Hon. John E. Moss, chairman:

Samuel J. Archibald, staff administrator	\$8,051.46
Jack Howard, professional staff member	6,513.66
Harry S. Weidberg, assistant counsel	5,648.16
Helen Beasley, stenographer	3,998.22
Catherine L. Hartke, stenographer	3,998.22
Ethel B. Putterman, research analyst (Mar. 1-31, 1962)	500.13
Phineas Indritz, Counsel (Jan. 1-31, 1962)	1,341.91
Expenses	690.40
Total	30,742.16

Special Subcommittee on Assigned Power and Land Problems, Hon. John E. Moss, chairman:

Sidney McClellan, professional staff member	6,518.80
Francis J. Schwoerer, staff member	5,000.70
Expenses	13.80
Total	11,533.30

Special Subcommittee on the Home Loan Bank Board, Hon. John E. Moss, chairman:

David Glick, counsel	7,743.90
Marguerite A. Gleason, stenographer	3,300.60
Expenses	3,997.80
Total	15,132.30

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (H. Res. 70-592, 87th Cong.)	1,040,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	460,873.60
Amount expended from Jan. 4, to Dec. 31, 1961	460,873.60
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1962, to June 30, 1962	232,034.17
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1962	347,092.23

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman.

JULY 3, 1962.

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, 1962, 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	7,612.08
Mary F. Stolle	Assistant clerk	3,896.94

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$30,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	16,159.61
Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1962, to June 30, 1962	824.50
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1961, to June 30, 1962	16,984.11
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1962	13,015.89

OMAR BURLESON,
Chairman.

JULY 12, 1962.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE 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 em-

ployed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1962, 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 and consultant on national parks	8,051.46
John L. Taylor	Consultant on territorial and Indian affairs	8,051.46
Milton A. Pearl	Consultant on mining, minerals, and lands	8,051.46
Clerical staff:		
Nancy J. Arnold	Chief clerk	7,172.76
Dixie S. Duncan	Clerk	3,998.22
Penelope P. Harvison	do	3,998.22
Virginia E. Bedsole	do	3,795.66
Patricia B. Freeman	do	3,289.38
Susan A. Whitener	Clerk (from Jan. 22, 1962)	2,726.69

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$60,000.00
---	-------------

Amount of expenditures previously reported	23,715.03
Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1962, to June 30, 1962	15,816.74
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1961, to June 30, 1962	39,531.77
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1962	20,468.23

Includes payment of \$2,480 to Joseph B. Hoyt, special consultant on national cemetery legislation, under contract approved Jan. 24, 1962.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman.

JULY 9, 1962.

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, 1962, 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	\$8,824.75
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 C. Neuland	Clerical assistant	3,846.30
Mildred H. Lang	do	3,846.30
Mary Ryan	do	3,846.30
Roy P. Wilkinson	Assistant clerk	3,643.78
Professional staff:		
Andrew Stevenson	Expert	8,824.75
Kurt Borchardt	Legal counsel	8,824.75
Sam G. Spal	Research specialist	8,824.75
Martin W. Cunningham	Aviation consultant	8,824.75

Additional temporary employees under H. Res. 108 and H. Res. 165:		
Gladys Johnson	Clerical assistant	3,846.30
Margaret J. Robinson	Staff assistant	7,796.64
Elsie M. Karpowich	Clerical assistant	3,846.30
Catherine C. McLees	do	3,846.30
Thomas D. Conway	Special counsel (from Mar. 1, 1962, H. Res. 420 and H. Res. 439)	5,848.00

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Additional, etc.—Con. John Steven Wood	Messenger (from May 15 to June 15, 1962)	\$362.58
Patricia Ann Marsh	Clerical assistant (from June 1)	362.58
Robert Hughes Crank	Messenger (from June 16)	181.29
Special Subcommittee on Regulatory Agencies:		
Charles P. Howze, Jr.	Chief counsel	8,772.02
George W. Perry	Associate counsel	7,172.73
Herman Clay Beasley	Subcommittee clerk	7,187.99
Stuart C. Ross	Consultant	8,064.64
Rex Sparger	Special assistant	6,004.02
Robert E. L. Richardson	Staff attorney	5,025.33
Larlene Wilbert	Clerical assistant	4,438.69
Elizabeth G. Paola	do	3,643.77
Betty J. Lantrip	Stenographer-clerk	3,542.52

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$585,000.00
---	--------------

Amount of expenditures previously reported	139,378.63
Amount expended from Jan. 1, to June 30, 1962	93,596.56
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1961, to June 30, 1962	232,975.19
Balance unexpended as of July 1, 1962	352,024.81

OREN HARRIS,
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1962.

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, 1962, 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
Murray Drabkin	Counsel	8,504.04
Stuart H. Johnson, Jr.	do	8,504.04
Garner J. Cline	Assistant counsel	6,381.90
William H. Copenhaver	Associate counsel	5,278.44
Carrie Lou Allen	Clerical staff	3,998.22
Anne J. Berger	do	5,678.88
Jane C. Caldwell	do	4,099.50
Frances F. Christy	do	5,204.16
Helen Goldsmith	do	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, 1961	\$120,166.18
Expended Jan. 1-June 30, 1962	21,089.69
Balance June 30, 1962	99,076.49
B. Preparation of new edition of District of Columbia Code:	
Unexpended balance Dec. 31, 1961	54,301.68
Expended Jan. 1-June 30, 1962	8,403.04
Balance June 30, 1962	45,898.64
C. Revision of the laws, 1962:	
Unexpended balance Dec. 31, 1961	10,690.26
Expended Jan. 1-June 30, 1962	10,473.09
Balance June 30, 1962	217.17

SALARIES PAID JAN. 1 THROUGH JUNE 30, 1962, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 56, H. RES. 68, H. RES. 500, 87TH CONG.

Employee	Position	Salary
Appel, Leonard	Assistant counsel	\$7,275.24
Becker, Albert F.	Clerical staff (from June 4, 1962)	285.28
Beland, Lorraine W.	Clerical staff	2,985.60
Burak, Gertrude C.	do	4,605.78
Cors, Allan D.	Deputy associate counsel (from June 1, 1962)	646.11
Eisenberg, Roberta E.	Clerical staff	3,896.94
Finger, Alexander E.	Assistant counsel (to Mar. 1, 1962)	2,127.30
Greenwald, Andrew E.	Clerical staff (from June 5, 1962)	260.14
Hall, Patricia J.	Clerical staff (from Mar. 12, 1962)	1,878.43
Haardt, Alma B.	Clerical staff	2,934.96
Hyman, Joseph	Counsel	8,003.16
Jackson, Merrill T.	Messenger (Mar. 7-19, 1962)	146.63
Jett, R. Frederick	Assistant counsel	6,879.80
Kelemonick, Michael	Clerical staff	3,593.16
Levy, Joseph M.	Clerical staff (from Feb. 10, 1962)	3,917.21
Marcus, Philip	Associate counsel	7,906.50
Meekins, Elizabeth G.	Clerical staff	3,896.94
Pet, Richard C.	Associate counsel (to Mar. 1, 1962)	2,127.30
Rosenman, Louis	Associate counsel	6,953.04
Simms, Regina M.	Clerical staff	3,390.60
Sky, Theodore	Assistant counsel	5,066.08
Wass, Mary R.	Clerical staff (from Mar. 19, 1962)	1,757.80
Williams, Stephen L.	Messenger	2,479.26
Zelenko, Benjamin L.	Assistant counsel	4,752.60

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....\$400,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....155,843.00

Amount expended from Jan. 1 through June 30, 1962.....97,022.10

Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1961, through June 30, 1962.....252,865.10

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1962.....147,134.90

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON STATE TAXATION OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE—SALARIES PAID JAN. 1, 1962, THROUGH JUNE 30, 1962, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 204 AND H. RES. 663

Employee	Position	Salary
Ainsworth, Kenneth G.	Economist	\$5,000.70
Bankester, Claude E.	Counsel (to June 1, 1962)	4,586.50
Breslow, Jerome W.	Assistant counsel	3,750.12
Greess, Constance	Clerical staff	3,491.88
Hall, Patricia J.	Clerical staff (to Mar. 12, 1962)	1,223.57
Hammond, Martha G.	Clerical staff	3,102.00
Lehman, Leland C.	Economist (from Feb. 5, 1962)	4,666.79
Louria, Margot	Research assistant (to Mar. 2, 1962)	1,206.25
Melville, Robert F.	Senior economist	7,001.40
Partridge, Anthony	Counsel	7,001.40
Sutherland, David A.	do	6,500.52
Waggoner, Anne	Clerical staff (from Mar. 26, 1962)	1,637.17
Zelfman, Jerome M.	Counsel	5,503.80

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....\$250,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....58,941.81

Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1962, through June 30, 1962.....64,063.87

Total amount expended from Mar. 15, 1961, through June 30, 1962.....123,005.68

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1962.....126,994.32

EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman.

JUNE 30, 1962.

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, 1962, 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	\$8,824.74
Bernard J. Zinke	Counsel	8,227.20
Ned P. Everett	Assistant counsel	6,241.26
W. B. Winfield	Chief clerk	7,612.08
Francis P. Still	Assistant clerk	5,030.16
Ruth A. Brookshire	do	3,998.22
Edith W. Gordon	Secretary	3,998.22
Vera A. Barker	do	3,998.22
E. M. Tollefson	Minority clerk	4,808.28

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....\$75,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....22,700.81

Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1962.....8,371.75

Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1961, to June 30, 1962.....31,072.56

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1962.....43,927.44

HERBERT C. BONNER,
Chairman.

JULY 9, 1962.

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, 1962, 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
Clifton W. Enfield	Minority counsel	8,504.04
Joseph R. Brennan	Engineer-consultant	8,824.74
Stephen V. Feeley	Subcommittee clerk	6,294.00
Helen M. Dooley	Staff assistant	7,172.76
Helen A. Thompson	do	5,854.62
Dorothy A. Beam	do	5,204.16
S. Philip Cohen	do	4,505.20
Ester M. Saunders	Clerk-messenger	3,056.46

SALARIES PAID, JAN. 1 THROUGH JUNE 30, 1962, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 136, 87TH CONG.

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
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
Peter M. Gentilini	do	5,397.48
Agnes M. GaNum	Staff assistant	3,572.88
Mary C. Porter	Minority staff assistant (through Feb. 28, 1962)	1,467.76
Murray S. Pashkoff	Staff assistant	2,504.58
Flavil Q. Van Dyke, Jr.	Minority clerical assistant	3,289.38
Erla Youmans	Minority staff assistant (as of Apr. 1, 1962)	1,669.98
Sterlyn B. Carroll	Clerk-messenger	3,056.46
Milton Weil	Staff assistant	5,000.70

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....\$178,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....80,591.35

Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1962.....\$47,870.78

Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1961 to June 30, 1962.....128,462.13

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1962.....49,537.87

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM—SALARIES PAID, JAN. 1, 1962, THROUGH JUNE 30, 1962, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 136, 87TH CONG.

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Walter R. May	Chief counsel	\$8,024.74
John P. Constandy	Assistant chief counsel	8,152.50
Robert E. Manuel	Minority counsel (through May 31, 1962)	6,508.20
James J. Fitzpatrick	Associate counsel	6,996.96
Robert A. McElligott	do	6,996.96
George M. Kopecky	Chief investigator	7,761.48
George M. Martin	Administrative assistant	7,445.16
James P. Kelly	Investigator	6,469.74
John N. Dinsmore	do	6,601.56
Sherman S. Wilsee	do	6,381.90
Charles A. Gannon	Investigator (through Feb. 28, 1962)	2,166.84
Kathryn M. Keeney	Chief clerk	4,104.54
Mildred E. Rupert	Staff assistant	3,603.30
Jean N. Cameron	do	3,401.88
Erla S. Youmans	Minority staff assistant (through Mar. 18, 1962)	1,447.32
Sara L. Vollett	Clerical assistant	3,102.00
Salvatore D'Amico	Associate counsel	6,323.30
Dolores K. Dougherty	Staff assistant	3,333.24
Shirley R. Knights	File clerk	2,504.58
John P. O'Hara	Investigator (as of Apr. 14, 1962)	2,461.25
Harry A. Samberg	Research assistant	4,003.26
Joyce L. Terry	Minority staff assistant (as of Mar. 19, 1962)	1,218.42
Sylvia H. Reppert	Minority staff assistant (as of Apr. 1, 1962)	1,500.39
George E. Burgess	Investigator (as of Mar. 19, 1962)	1,342.50

Funds authorized or appropriated for special subcommittee expenditures.....\$772,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....292,443.79

Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1962.....149,655.32

Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1962.....442,099.11

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1962.....329,910.89

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON REAL PROPERTY ACQUISITION—SALARIES PAID, JAN. 1, 1962, THROUGH JUNE 30, 1962, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 433, 87TH CONG.

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Ruth M. Heritage	Chief clerk	\$6,557.64
Henry H. Krevor	Chief counsel	8,504.04
Robert L. May	Minority counsel	8,192.04
Joe W. Ingram	Assistant counsel (as of Apr. 6, 1962)	3,069.69
Dorothy S. Martin	Secretary	4,340.82
Ruth Butterworth	Minority staff assistant	4,087.64
Florence C. Waters	Research assistant (as of Mar. 1, 1962)	4,003.26
Meriam R. Buckley	Staff assistant (as of Mar. 1, 1962)	2,125.40

Funds authorized or appropriated for special subcommittee expenditures.....\$150,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....17,000.00

Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1962, to June 30, 1962.....42,645.49

Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1961, to June 30, 1962.....59,645.49

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1962.....90,354.51

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
Chairman.

JULY 11, 1962.

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, 1962, 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.	\$6,733.38
Mary S. Forrest	Assistant clerk	4,605.78
D. E. Lukens	Minority clerk	4,605.78

HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman.

JULY 10, 1962.

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, 1962, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Charles E. Johnson	Staff director	\$8,824.74
George M. Moore	Counsel	8,824.74
B. Benton Bray	Professional staff member.	8,139.36
John H. Martiny	do	7,919.64
William A. Irvine	Assistant clerk	7,414.38
Lillian L. Hopkins	do	4,909.56
John B. Price	do	4,504.50
Lucy K. Daley	do	4,504.50
Elsie K. Thornton	Secretary	3,998.22
Blanche M. Simons	do	3,643.80

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$100,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	53,029.06
Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1962 to June 30, 1962	30,153.28
Total amount expended from Feb. 28, 1961, to June 30, 1962	83,182.34
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1962	16,817.66

TOM MURRAY,
Chairman.

JULY 11, 1962.

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 1 to June 30, 1962, 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
Philip B. Yeager	Special consultant	8,824.74
Spencer M. Beresford	Special counsel	8,824.74
John A. Carstarphen, Jr.	Chief clerk	8,736.14
Emily Dodson	Secretary	3,658.98
Eva F. Lopez	do	3,658.98
Jane J. Zetty	do	3,658.98
Mary Ann Robert	do	3,658.98
Mary L. Myron	do	3,227.20
Carol F. Rodgers	do	525.30

INVESTIGATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

Raymond Wilcove	Staff consultant	\$8,293.14
Richard P. Hines	do	7,654.59
Frank R. Hammill, Jr.	Counsel	7,672.17
Katherine V. Flanagan	Assistant clerk	3,838.15
Mary Ann Temple	Secretary	3,460.67
Joseph Felton	Publications clerk	3,248.82
Denis Quigley	Assistant publications clerk.	1,901.88

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$300,000.00
---	--------------

Amount of expenditures previously reported	98,315.17
Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1962 to June 30, 1962	50,287.84

Total amount expended from Feb. 28, 1961, to June 30, 1962	148,603.01
--	------------

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1962	151,396.99
--	------------

GEORGE P. MILLER,
Chairman.

JULY 9, 1962.

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 1 to June 30, 1962, 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:		
Appell, Donald T.	Investigator	\$7,302.34
Joray, Juliette P.	Recording clerk	5,678.88
Lewis, Gwendolyn L.	Administrative assistant.	6,118.26
Nagel, Isabel B.	Secretary	3,896.94
Purdy, Rosella A.	do	4,686.78
Tavener, Frank, Jr.	General counsel	8,824.74
Turner, Anne D.	Chief of reference section.	5,722.80
Veley, Lorraine	Secretary	3,694.44
Watts, Vera	do	3,431.10
Wheeler, William A.	Investigator	7,084.86

Investigating committee:		
Alario, Robert J.	Clerk typist (appointed Apr. 17, 1962).	925.59
Arens, Margaret Ann.	Clerk typist (appointed June 18, 1962).	130.07
Armijo, Doris Joe	Clerk typist (appointed Mar. 12, 1962).	1,317.37

Baldwin, Beatrice P.	Clerk typist	2,681.76
Benedict, John R.	Research analyst	4,604.50
Brown, Frances Rosalyn.	Information analyst.	2,691.84
Burke, Gerard F.	Clerk-typist	2,175.48
Butler, Daniel	do	2,228.11
Carlson, Charlotte B.	Research analyst	3,466.56
Collins, Raymond T.	Investigator	5,010.84

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Investigating committee—Con.		
Cullen, Theresa J.	Clerk-typist (appointed Apr. 5, 1962).	\$1,039.40
Cunningham, Annie.	Information analyst.	3,719.70
Curl, Jean M.	Clerk-stenographer (appointed June 15, 1962).	266.74
Edinger, Elizabeth L.	Editor	3,744.22
Francis, Emily R.	Information analyst.	2,479.26
Fritz, Kathleen	File clerk	2,002.68
Gittings, Helen M.	Research analyst	4,605.78
Goldblatt, Herbert	Clerk-typist (appointed June 5, 1962).	260.14
Gredecky, Betty A.	Clerk-stenographer	2,641.29
Hagenbuch, Kathleen L.	do	3,998.22
Holton, Katherine R.	Research clerk	2,504.58
Huber, Walter B.	Consultant	7,172.76
Kelly, Maura Patricia.	Research analyst	2,965.32
King, Olive M.	Editor	4,453.86
Kocis, Evelyn M.	Clerk-stenographer	2,802.47
Lewis, Charlotte Ridgely.	Legal research clerk	3,253.92
McNamara, Francis J.	Director	7,436.34
Margetich, William	Investigator	3,562.80
Messina, Vincent J.	Research clerk (resigned Apr. 30, 1962).	1,188.99
Miller, Ashley M.	Clerk-typist (appointed June 14, 1962).	170.09
Muffley, David E., Jr.	Clerk-typist	2,334.98
Muller, Jane S.	Information analyst.	2,749.30
Nittle, Alfred M.	Counsel	7,001.40
Ontrich, Maureen Phillips.	Information analyst (resigned May 31, 1962).	2,521.75
Pfaff, Alma T.	Research clerk	2,531.58
Phillips, Katharine	Switchboard operator.	2,555.22
Randolph, Josephine S.	Clerk-typist	2,884.32
Russell, Louis J.	Investigator	5,854.62
Salathe, Doris	Clerk-typist (appointed Feb. 13, 1962).	1,726.10
Shaw, Doris P.	Information analyst	2,702.04
Stiles, Lela Mae	do	3,026.10
Sturtevant, Albert	Clerk-typist (appointed June 11, 1962).	200.11
Tredway, Sarah Ellen.	Clerk-typist (appointed June 6, 1962).	250.13
Unangst, Geraldine.	Clerk-stenographer	2,175.48
Valente, Mary Myers.	Secretary	3,574.58
Walsh, John C.	Cocounsel	5,378.16
Wetterman, Neil E.	Investigator	4,403.28
Wheeler, Billie	Clerk-stenographer	1,984.26
Wilt, Regina McCall.	Clerk-typist (resigned May 31, 1962).	1,812.90
Yohe, John A.	Staff member	5,097.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$681,000.00
---	--------------

Amount of expenditures previously reported	322,727.47
Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1962, to July 1, 1962	170,691.63

Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1961, to July 1, 1962	493,419.10
--	------------

Balance unexpended as of July 1, 1962	187,580.90
---------------------------------------	------------

FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman.

JULY 10, 1962.

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, 1962, 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
Jack Z. Anderson	Professional aide, minority (P)	8,824.74
George W. Fisher	Clerk (C)	8,824.74
Billy E. Kirby	Professional aide (P)	3,774.02
Paul K. Jones	Assistant clerk (C)	6,294.00
Helen A. Biondi	Assistant clerk (C)	5,160.66
Alice V. Matthews	Clerk-stenographer (C)	4,302.00
George J. Turner	Assistant clerk (C)	4,302.00
Joanne Doyle	Clerk-stenographer (C)	3,661.53
Investigative staff:		
Adin M. Downer	Staff member	6,720.18
Lillian B. Hamilton	Clerk-stenographer	221.29
Wilma Jean Johnson	do	3,661.53
Kay N. Small	do	2,742.53
Ruth E. Wilcox	do	2,433.97
Audrey J. Lyle	do	1,130.20
Michael J. Davis	Clerk-messenger	362.58

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$150,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported..... 48,147.28

Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1962, to June 30, 1962..... 29,857.77

Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1961, to June 30, 1962..... 78,005.05

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1962..... 71,994.95

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman.

JULY 2, 1962.

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, 1962, 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
William H. Quealy	Minority counsel (P)	8,824.74
John M. Martin, Jr.	Assistant chief counsel (P)	8,666.58
Gerard M. Brannon	Professional assistant (P)	8,666.58
Raymond F. Conkling	do	8,239.66
Alfred R. McCauley	do	8,175.97
Virginia Butler	Staff assistant (C)	4,648.80
William C. Byrd	Staff assistant (C)	2,062.75
	from Feb. 1, 1962	
Frances E. Donovan	Staff assistant (C)	4,546.73
Ann R. Fadeley	Staff assistant (C)	2,068.00
	from Mar. 1, 1962	
William R. Goodrich	Staff assistant (C)	5,000.70
Olga Kay Greene	Staff assistant (C)	3,020.88
	from Feb. 15, 1962	
Grace G. Kagan	Staff assistant (C)	4,648.80
June Kendall	do	4,954.26
Elizabeth Ruth	do	4,150.08
Eileen Sonnett	do	3,863.18
Susan Taylor	do	5,300.82
Irene Wade	do	4,383.00
David W. West	Staff assistant (C)	1,867.34
	from Mar. 14, 1962	
Hughlon Greene	Document clerk (C)	3,164.45
Walter Little	do	3,278.40

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$25,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported..... 2,710.68

Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1962..... 2,795.52

Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1961, to June 30, 1962..... 5,506.20

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1962..... 19,493.80

WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman.

JULY 1, 1962.

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 1 to June 30, 1962, 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	Counsel	\$7,001.40
Katherine C. Blackburn	Research analyst	4,048.86
Frances F. Crane	Secretary-stenographer	1,167.34
Victor P. Dalmas	Adviser to minority members	1,789.21
Miriam M. DeHaas	Secretary-stenographer	3,000.78
Jean W. Fender	Administrative assistant	4,418.46
Justinus Gould	Counsel	7,612.08
Helen C. Hitz	Secretary-stenographer	3,253.92
Harrison F. Houghton	Chief economist	8,051.46
Gertrude Jonson	Secretary-stenographer	3,253.92
Sylvia U. Keel	do	3,127.35
Barbara Wright McConnell	do	3,930.72
Margaret Fallon Palmer	Research analyst	3,584.94
Gregg R. Potvin	Counsel	8,051.46
Audrey Redwine	Secretary-stenographer	3,253.92
J. Brooks A. Robertson	Staff director	8,754.48
Joseph A. Seelye	Assistant counsel	7,001.40
Baron I. Shacklette	Consultant	6,996.96
J. Allan Sherier	General counsel	8,122.21
Lois B. Shupe	Secretary-stenographer	1,375.04
Audrey R. Smith	do	4,048.86
Vern Stephens	Assistant adviser to minority members	2,935.52
Marie M. Stewart	Clerk	4,418.46
Mildred Willingham	Secretary-stenographer	1,581.05
Carole M. Xander	do	2,651.39
Total		113,431.19

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$580,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported..... 238,788.56

Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1962, to June 30, 1962..... 157,971.98

Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1961, to June 30, 1962..... 396,760.54

Balance unexpended as of July 1, 1962..... 183,239.46

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

JULY 6, 1962.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON EXPORT CONTROL

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, 1962, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Charlotte Ann Halford	Stenographer (May 4, to June 4, 1962)	\$583.94
Fred Halford	Staff director	6,600.00
A. Courtney Hayden, Jr.	Staff investigator (Jan. 1 to May 26, 1962)	4,750.00
Rufus King	Consultant (Jan. 23 to Apr. 4, 1962)	1,500.00
Blanche R. Plant	Stenographer-clerk	3,593.16
James J. Ryan	Staff investigator (Jan. 1 to Apr. 26, 1962)	3,800.00
Total		20,827.10

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$40,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported..... 14,549.07

Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1962..... 21,288.48

Total amount expended from Sept. 7, 1961, to June 30, 1962..... 35,837.55

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1962..... 4,162.45

A. PAUL KITCHIN,
Chairman.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

2344. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, relative to an application for a loan of \$964,000 to the Banta-Carbona Irrigation District of Tracy, in San Joaquin County, Calif., pursuant to 71 Stat. 48, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular affairs.

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. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 704. Resolution to provide further funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 403; without amendment (Rept. No. 2029). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 705. Resolution to provide additional funds for the expenses of the investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 75 of the 87th Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 2030). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 728. Resolution to provide funds for the further expenses of studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 86; without amendment (Rept. No. 2031). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 735. Resolution providing an additional allowance for telephone and telegraph service for certain Members of the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 2032). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on House Administration. H.R. 12661. A bill to amend section 9(b) of the act entitled "An act to

prevent pernicious political activities" (the Hatch Political Activities Act) to eliminate the requirement that the Civil Service Commission impose no penalty less than 90 days' suspension for any violation of section 9 of the act; without amendment (Rept. No. 2033). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GALLAGHER: From the delegation of the U.S. House of Representatives of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group. Report of the sixth meeting of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group (Rept. No. 2034). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MACK: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 7283. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain World War II losses; with amendment (Rept. No. 2035). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MAHON: Committee of conference. H.R. 11289. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2036). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 12684. A bill to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Bostwick Park Federal reclamation project, Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 12685. A bill to authorize modification of local participation in flood control projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FARBSTAIN:

H.R. 12686. A bill to provide assistance in the field of special education to institutions of higher education, and to the States, for training personnel and undertaking research and demonstration projects, and to establish, for consultation in connection therewith, an advisory council and technical advisory committees; and to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to provide services to determine rehabilitation potential, to expand vocational rehabilitation services, and to make grants for construction of rehabilitation facilities and workshops; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 12687. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide for reform of personal and corporate income tax rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 12688. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage and assist the several States in carrying on a program of forestry research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H.R. 12689. A bill to repeal section 557 and to amend section 559 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 12690. A bill to permit investment of funds of insurance companies organized within the District of Columbia in obligations of the Inter-American Development Bank; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. NYGAARD:

H.R. 12691. A bill to provide for the use of lands in the Garrison Dam project by the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SHORT:

H.R. 12692. A bill to provide for the use of lands in the Garrison Dam project by the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 12693. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against the individual income tax for a portion of any amounts paid for accident or health insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 12694. A bill to facilitate the entry of alien skilled specialists and certain relatives of U.S. citizens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 12695. A bill to provide for payment for hospital services, skilled nursing facility services, and home health services furnished to aged beneficiaries under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MASON:

H.J. Res. 832. Joint resolution to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define, and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.J. Res. 833. Joint resolution to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define, and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DELANEY (by request):

H.J. Res. 834. Joint resolution establishing the Commission on Art and Antiquities of the Capitol, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.J. Res. 835. Joint resolution to amend the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.J. Res. 836. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the 7th day of August of each year as Purple Heart Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.J. Res. 837. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim May 15 of each year as Peace Officers Memorial Day and the calendar week of each year during which such May 15 occurs as Police Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.J. Res. 838. Joint resolution regarding Indian fishing rights; 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 Mrs. BOLTON:

H.R. 12696. A bill for the relief of Creste Ianro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 12697. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis Kallianioti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12698. A bill for the relief of Haralambos Sourbis, and Nikoleta Sourbis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 12699. A bill for the relief of Eva Baker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H.R. 12700. A bill for the relief of William Temes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 12701. A bill for the relief of Catalina Properties, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 12702. A bill for the relief of Felice Costantini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 12703. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Eugene Tognacci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 12704. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rosaria Minacapelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

391. Mr. DOOLEY presented a resolution of the New York State Association of Insurance Agents expressing concern over the constant encroachment of the Federal Government into private enterprise operations, and opposing enlargement of the social security program, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A Tribute to John B. Little

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1962

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, John B. Little, a faithful and devoted employee

of the House of Representatives for over 25 years, has, after a short illness, been called home by the good Lord. May his soul rest in peace in the arms of the God he served so faithfully and devotedly.

Little was his name and little was his stature, but great were his contributions to the membership of this body. John Little dedicated his life to the service of the Members of the House of Representatives. Those of us who knew him well affectionately called him vice president

in charge of operations of the House Document Room. He always had the time to give the very latest information on the status of any bill, report, or document before this body. Due to his remarkable memory he could cite references to previous bills, reports, and laws way back into legislative history. But above and beyond his unquestionable competence and ability was the graciousness and generosity of his service and the gentlemanly manner in which he