

A7738

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

September 4

The idea of starting all over again to whittle the items down to a point that Ike would accept will be utterly repellent. So they will try for an override first. And it may go over.

If it does, Ike will be happy because he still will have made his point and stuck by his non-inflationary guns. Congress will be happy because their constituents will still each get their little helpings of pork.

And several million citizens will be happy as they see their pet projects get just a little closer to reality.

Could it be that this is what Ike had in mind all along?

Settlement of Bethlehem Steel Co. Dispute With Shipbuilding Workers Is Vital to Our Country's Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL B. BREWSTER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BURKE] has done the Members of the House of Representatives and the public a signal service by forcefully calling to our attention the present stalemate in contract negotiations between the Bethlehem Steel Co. and the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, AFL-CIO.

It has been pointed out that the Bethlehem Steel Co. operates 8 shipyards along the Atlantic coast employing some 17,000 men who represent the core of shipbuilding know-how in the eastern United States. One of these yards is located in my district at Sparrows Point, Md., and I, personally, know many of the men employed there who have devoted their entire lives to the shipbuilding industry. The Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, AFL-CIO, is one of the country's most highly respected unions. Its members have proved time and again that they are willing to place our country's strength and well-being above their own economic interest.

The union's contract with Bethlehem Steel expired on July 31, 1959. Prior to that time the union's representatives had begun efforts to negotiate a new collective bargaining agreement with the company. The company has presented the union with demands that the union simply could not accept. Principal among these demands is the threatened elimination of the seniority rights of many highly skilled craftsmen.

I believe that the shipyard workers have given strong evidence of their desire to bargain in good faith. They have proposed that the expired agreement be extended for a brief period in order that negotiations could continue. This offer was refused by the company. The union then offered to submit both the company's demands and the union's proposals to arbitration. This offer was also rejected by the company. The union members have further shown

their good faith by continuing on the job despite the fact they do not have a contract.

This is particularly significant because in many of its yards Bethlehem shipbuilding is engaged in vitally important work for the U.S. Navy. At this time Bethlehem shipyards are building the nuclear missile carrier *Long Beach* and the nuclear frigate *Bainbridge*. At the same time one of its yards is converting the missile firing cruiser *Springfield*. We simply cannot afford to lose any more ground in our efforts to match and surpass the growing Soviet military machine.

I call upon both labor and management to join in full and open collective bargaining in keeping with our established tradition of fair play. It has been suggested that the House Armed Services Committee's subcommittee on defense activities conduct an immediate factfinding investigation. There is ample precedent for this step because the same subcommittee investigated a similar situation in 1954. The previous investigation produced favorable results and should the present situation continue, I, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, will support the request for committee action.

I am further concerned by this situation because recently two of our Atlantic coast shipbuilding concerns lost sizable contracts to California shipbuilders. These contracts were lost because of an unfair and artificial 6 percent advantage given California firms by an archaic section of the National Maritime Act. I have introduced H.R. 8176, which will repeal this unfair clause. If the east coast firms are to compete successfully with other areas, with or without this unfair advantage presently enjoyed by some, we must have fair and stable labor-management relations.

We must also consider the absolute necessity of maintaining our pool of highly skilled and experienced shipyard workers. The collective know-how of these men is vital to our national security. The dissipation and eventual loss of these special skills could have a far-reaching effect on our country's ability to produce today's nuclear vessels.

Walter Lee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that we learned of the upcoming retirement of Walter Lee, of the Judiciary Committee staff, as we feel the Capitol will lose the services of one of its most able and dedicated aides.

By his friendly and sympathetic handling of every request, Walter Lee has established a guide of service for many to follow. He has always been most

helpful to everyone who has found the need for information and advice from the Judiciary Committee.

I am sure that Walter will enjoy some time for rest and leisure, well earned by his many years of fine service here at the House of Representatives, but we will all miss his prompt and helpful assistance which has often been taken for granted because of his consistent efforts to give his full attention to every case and request to him.

American Legion Supports White Fleet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, support continues to mount for the proposal to establish a Great White Fleet of mercy ships to carry American surplus foods, medical aid, and supplies to disaster and distress areas throughout the world. This bold new concept for peace, which is the idea of an Oklahoma naval officer, Comdr. Frank A. Manson who is now stationed in London, has received overwhelming endorsement from thousands of people and many varied organizations in the United States. I also have received in my office letters from persons in other countries commenting favorably on this Manson plan.

Another strong and powerful voice in the United States which recently has endorsed this plan is the American Legion, which at its national convention assembled at Minneapolis, Minn., August 24 to 27, 1959, adopted a resolution in support of the Great White Fleet proposal. The Legion not only endorsed the principle of enacting legislation for this Great White Fleet in the Congress of the United States, but it also recommended public support of this proposal by the people of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert in the RECORD a copy of this resolution:

RESOLUTION 641

Resolution in support of the Great White Fleet proposal

Whereas, a fundamental principle of the American Legion, as set forth in the preamble to the constitution is "to promote peace and good will on earth"; and

Whereas a proposal recently made at the War College by Comdr. Frank Manson, U.S.N. to create and maintain a new Great White Fleet; an unarmed mercy task force under the American flag, manned by Navy personnel, to pursue a definite itinerary around the world; and

Whereas this Great White Fleet during its stops of 2 or 3 weeks each at major ports (particularly in underprivileged countries) would place its hospital, medical and educational facilities at the disposal of the people of that country; demonstrating and training the doctors and nurses of that nation in our most advanced medical techniques; and

Whereas this Great White Fleet would be available at all times for immediate diversion to any major disaster area about the

1959

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A7739

world where its facilities might be helpful; and

Whereas the estimated cost of \$30 million for the operation and maintenance of this Great White Fleet would be far less than has been demonstrably wasted in abortive foreign aid projects; and

Whereas such a Great White Fleet would be a living, daily symbol throughout the world of the sincere desire of the people and the Government of these United States of American for peace, good will and mutual understanding among all men: Therefore be it

Resolved; That the national convention of the American Legion assembled in Minneapolis, Minn., August 24-27, 1959, endorses the principle of enabling legislation for this Great White Fleet in the Congress of these United States; and be it further

Resolved; That the American Legion recommends public support of this proposal by the people of this Nation.

Sustaining the Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Evening Star of September 3, 1959, there appeared an editorial and an article by David Lawrence on the Presidential veto of the public works appropriation which are deserving of being preserved in connection with this historic vote wherein the veto was sustained:

WINNING THE BIG ONE

The 1-vote margin by which the House has upheld the President's veto of the public works bill constitutes the closest of close calls. Nonetheless, it was a big win for Mr. Eisenhower in his touch-and-go battle to curb inflation by clamping down on unnecessary Federal spending.

It was a big win because nothing is dearer to a Congressman's heart than a public works bill—sometimes known as a pork barrel bill. There is something in it for the folks back home in almost every Congressman's district, and in this circumstance it is no easy thing to vote to sustain a veto. But the essential votes were there when the showdown came, and the logical inference is that the President, having won this fight, will be able to use his veto power successfully against any other unwise spending bills which may come before him. If this proves to be the case, there will be renewed hope for the future buying power of the dollar.

Mr. Eisenhower's objection to the bill centered on the fact that it carried 67 unbudgeted projects—projects which the administration had not recommended and for which no provision had been made in the budget. It is true that these projects would have cost only \$50 million, a relatively small sum, in this fiscal year. But their ultimate cost would have been more than \$800 million.

It will be said, we suppose, that the President's attitude is shortsighted, that long-range national development is being sacrificed in the interests of a misguided short-term economy. We do not believe that this is true. Without any of the unbudgeted items, fiscal 1960 expenditures for public works will total \$1.1 billion—an all-time high. Furthermore, according to the President, Congress in the past 4 years has writ-

ten 200 unbudgeted projects into public works bills, and these, in the end, will cost nearly \$3.8 billion. Why add 67 more when they are not essential and when they would boost the ultimate unbudgeted costs by another \$800 million?

As Mr. Eisenhower indicated in his veto message, these 67 unbudgeted projects represent desirable, as distinguished from necessary, undertakings. At the proper time provision can be made for them in the budget and Congress can begin appropriating the necessary funds. But these things should be planned in a responsible and orderly way. It is time to put a stop to the willy-nilly approach, and we are glad the President has been able to do it.

SUSTAINING THE VETO: REPUBLICANS IN CONGRESS ARE SEEN DEVOTED TO PRESIDENT'S LEADERSHIP

(By David Lawrence)

It's a good thing that, in the midst of his fateful trip to European capitals, President Eisenhower has not been confronted with unfavorable news from Congress. For, had the President's veto of the \$1 billion public works bill been overridden, the people of Europe, accustomed as they are to a parliamentary system of government, might have construed the rollcall as a formal vote of lack of confidence in Mr. Eisenhower. This could have had a frustrating effect on the President's mission abroad, where majority vote against the party in power customarily means a change in executive leadership.

Little consideration, on the other hand, was given here to this point by most members of Congress in their voting on the merits of the public works bill that the President had vetoed. Since none of Mr. Eisenhower's previous 143 vetoes have been overridden by the necessary two-thirds vote of both Houses, dramatic attention was centered on the final rollcall.

The margin of one vote by which the veto was sustained may or may not reflect the maneuvers that went on inside both parties. For the issue really turned on what the folks back home would say in those districts where waterpower projects and other Federal construction proposals had been promoted.

Every Member of Congress who had urged Federal appropriations that would bring about the building of public works projects in his own district naturally was on the spot. If he voted against the bill, there was the chance that political capital would be made out of this in the next election by a rival candidate. If the Member happened to be a Republican, he had to consider the effect on his constituency, especially on the Republican voters, if he deserted the leadership of the President.

Some Republicans, but only a handful, did vote to override the veto. Only a small group of Democrats deserted their party leadership in siding with the President. The issue was decided primarily by a straight party vote of Republicans and Democrats, respectively. The small number who crossed party lines really wielded the balance of power. Maybe if there had been any way to determine in advance exactly how the voting would go, the defenders of the bill might have won out. The last-minute changes indicated that nobody was quite sure of the outcome.

As it was, there were all sorts of stories being circulated among the Members to put them in a quandary. Thus, the vetoed bill contained appropriations for 67 new projects which the President said had not been provided for by the Budget Bureau or checked on by the Army engineers, who have for the most part the responsibility for their construction. One rumor was that, if the measure became law, the administration might

have to cut down or delay some of the projects begun in previous years in order to hold down the total sum spent. This touched off a wave of apprehension among those Members of Congress who have a deep-seated interest in projects already authorized but not yet completed. It seemed to many Members that it would be better to have new legislation passed that would specifically take care of projects already underway without initiating additional projects. This was the main point in the President's policy in his veto.

Mr. Eisenhower has adhered to basic principles in his relations with Congress, and he is getting the support of the country because of the sound approach he has taken. He is not opposed to necessary construction of public works projects. But he feels that due consideration must be given to overall budget requirements. Usually local projects are enthusiastically recommended by the people in a given district, and a Congressman feels he has to go along with the community's wishes. But the President has to look at things from a national viewpoint.

The fact that nearly two-thirds of the membership of the House of Representatives wanted to override the veto indicates how intense is the pressure for what has often been called the pork barrel legislation. As the projects emerge from committee, a Congressman often feels he has to support the projects in another Member's district in order to get support for his own.

It was surprising, indeed, to find the veto sustained, but it was largely due to the devotion of the Republican Party in Congress to the President's leadership. Had the Republicans given way to selfish local interests, the veto would easily have been overridden.

The final test, sustaining the President's leadership, cannot but have a favorable effect on the Republican Party's position in the country, enhancing its prestige as a responsible party which is anxious to keep the budget in balance and to maintain the Nation's finances on a sound basis, as against extravagant spending and other inflationary policies.

Opposes Display of Russian Flag During Khrushchev Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following letter from Mr. John Ayre, secretary, Luzerne County (Pa.) Executive Association of the Junior Order United American Mechanics, which organization goes on record as opposing the displaying, in any form, the Russian communistic flag during the upcoming visit to this country of Nikita Khrushchev:

JUNIOR O.U.A.M. EXECUTIVE ASSOCIATION,

Wilkes-Barre, Pa., September 2, 1959.
Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: The Junior Order United American Mechanics being opposed to communism, in any form, in the United States; the Luzerne County Executive Association of the Junior Order United American Mechanics, strenuously oppose the displaying, in any form, the Russian communistic flag