

# House of Representatives

FRIDAY, JULY 1, 1960

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.  
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:  
Psalm 13: 6: *I will sing unto the Lord, because He hath dealt bountifully with me.*

Eternal and ever-blessed God, whose divine providence supplies all our needs, grant that in these strange and strenuous days we may appropriate by faith Thy revealing presence and sustaining power.

May the hearts of the citizens of our beloved country expand with pride as they see our leaders and chosen representatives maintaining their integrity in the face of the temptation to make expediency the standard and test of their action rather than truth and righteousness.

Give us courage and hope as we seek to bring about a closer fellowship and better understanding between all the nations. May we recognize our kinship and be conscious of how much we can do to minister to one another's welfare and happiness.

Together we penitently confess our sins and humbly beseech Thy pardoning mercy in the name of our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

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

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 7903. An act to amend chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, to extend the veterans' guaranteed and direct loan program for 2 years; and

H. Con. Res. 706. Concurrent resolution authorizing corrections in the engrossment of the bill H.R. 11602.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 5196. An act to increase the maximum rates of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 11666. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists on its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. HICKENLOOPER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3736. An act creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials; and

S. Con. Res. 112. Concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment of the two Houses from July 2, 1960, to August 8, 1960.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1509. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to provide "grandfather" rights for certain motor carriers and freight forwarders operating in interstate or foreign commerce within Alaska and between Alaska and the other States of the United States, and for certain water carriers operating within Alaska, and for other purposes;

S. 1965. An act to make uniform provisions of law with respect to the terms of office of the members of certain regulatory agencies;

S. 2197. An act to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to authorize the use of suitable color additives in or on foods, drugs, and cosmetics, in accordance with regulations prescribing the conditions (including maximum tolerances) under which such additives may be safely used;

S. 2857. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide for refunds of contributions in the case of annuitants whose length of service exceeds the amount necessary to provide the maximum annuity allowable under such act;

S. 3545. An act to amend section 4 of the act of January 21, 1929 (48 U.S.C. 345a(c)), and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 41. Joint resolution to establish a National Institute for International Health and Medical Research, to provide for international cooperation in health research, research training, and research planning, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 7593) entitled "An act to provide that the Civil Aeronautics Board may temporarily authorize certain air carriers to engage in supplemental air transportation, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. ENGLE, and Mr. COTTON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11993) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 26, 28, and 58, of the foregoing bill.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 8229) entitled "An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from income tax for supplemental unemployment benefit trusts," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. KERR, Mr. FREAR, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. CARLSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

## SALARY INCREASES FOR POSTAL AND OTHER FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is action on the veto message of the President on the bill (H.R. 9883) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, this vote must be determined by the yeas and nays.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 345, nays 69, answered "present" 1, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 171]

YEAS—345

Abbt	Bass, Tenn.	Brewster
Abernethy	Bates	Brook
Adair	Baumhart	Brooks, La.
Addonizio	Becker	Brooks, Tex.
Albert	Beckworth	Broomfield
Alexander	Belcher	Brown, Ga.
Andersen,	Bennett, Fla.	Brown, Mo.
Minn.	Bennett, Mich.	Brown, Ohio
Anderson,	Betts	Broyhill
Mont.	Blatnik	Burdick
Andrews	Boggs	Burke, Ky.
Anfuso	Boland	Burke, Mass.
Ashley	Bolling	Burleson
Ashmore	Bolton	Byrne, Pa.
Aspinall	Bonner	Cahill
Auchincloss	Bosch	Canfield
Balley	Bow	Cannon
Baldwin	Boykin	Carnahan
Baring	Brademas	Casey
Barr	Bray	Celler
Barrett	Breeding	Chelf

1960

14303

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, this resolution calls for the approval by the Senate for a member of the staff of the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field to testify in Kentland, Ind., in State court, concerning a criminal case growing out of the work of the committee in that State.

By Senate Resolution No. 255, section 5, the files of the select committee were placed in custody of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations. This situation demonstrates one of the reasons why I sought such a disposition of the select committee files.

There is pending in the Newton Circuit Court in Kentland, Ind., criminal action, alleging attempted bribery, against Tommy Morgano. Morgano appeared before the select committee and invoked the fifth amendment to all questions pertinent to the activities about which the committee inquired.

Charges have been brought against Morgano by local authorities, and one of the witnesses deemed necessary by the prosecuting attorney is Mr. Richard G. Sinclair, a staff member of the select

committee who has now returned to his permanent position at the General Accounting Office. In addition to Mr. Sinclair's testimony, the prosecuting attorney has requested certain evidence contained in the files relating to that investigation.

This resolution seeks authority from the Senate to permit Mr. Sinclair to testify and to present pertinent evidence from the select committee files now in the possession of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 349) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Whereas the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations has in its possession, by virtue of S. Res. 255, section 5, certain evidence pertaining to an investigation dealing with Tommy Morgano in the State of Indiana; which investigation was conducted by the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field under S. Res. 44; and,

Whereas the matter of the State of Indiana against Tommy Morgano, a criminal action now pending in the Newton Circuit Court at Kentland, Indiana, charges said Tommy Morgano with attempted bribery; and

Whereas the Prosecuting Attorney of the Sixty-seventh Judicial District of Indiana has requested the production of evidence in the possession of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations in this matter, and has requested that Richard G. Sinclair, formerly an investigator for the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field and presently an investigator for the U.S. General Accounting Office, to appear and testify in the above proceedings; and

Whereas by the privileges of the Senate, no member or Senate employee is authorized to produce Senate documents but by order of the Senate; therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations is granted leave to permit the copying and presentation of certain evidence for examination in connection with the aforementioned court case, the evidence thereupon to be returned to the possession of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations; and be it further

*Resolved*, That Richard G. Sinclair, an investigator formerly employed by the Senate, is authorized to appear and testify in the above mentioned proceedings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the preamble is agreed to.

(Senate proceedings continued after House proceedings of today's RECORD.)

July 1, 1960

Chenoweth	Huddleston	Ostertag
Chipperfield	Hull	Passman
Church	Ikard	Patman
Clark	Inouye	Pelly
Coad	Irwin	Perkins
Coffin	Jarman	Pfost
Cohelan	Jennings	Philbin
Collier	Jensen	Plrnie
Conte	Johnson, Calif.	Porter
Cook	Johnson, Colo.	Preston
Cooley	Johnson, Md.	Price
Corbett	Johnson, Wis.	Prokop
Cramer	Jonas	Pucinski
Cunningham	Jones, Ala.	Quigley
Curtin	Karsten	Rabaut
Daddario	Karth	Rains
Daniels	Kasem	Randall
Davis, Ga.	Kastenmeler	Reuss
Davis, Tenn.	Kearns	Rhodes, Pa.
Dawson	Kee	Riehlman
Delaney	Kelly	Riley
Dent	Kilday	Rivers, Alaska
Denton	Kilgore	Rivers, S.C.
Derounian	King, Calif.	Roberts
Derwinski	King, Utah	Rodino
Devine	Kirwan	Rogers, Colo.
Diggs	Kiuchin	Rogers, Fla.
Dingell	Kluczynski	Rogers, Mass.
Donohue	Knox	Rooney
Dorn, N.Y.	Kowalski	Roosevelt
Dowdy	Kyl	Rostenkowski
Downing	Landrum	Roush
Doyle	Lane	Rutherford
Dulski	Lankford	Santangelo
Durham	Latta	Saund
Dwyer	Lennon	Saylor
Edmondson	Lesinski	Schenck
Elliott	Levering	Scott
Everett	Libonati	Selden
Evins	Lindsay	Shelley
Fallon	Lipscomb	Sheppard
Farbstein	Loser	Shipley
Fascell	McCormack	Sikes
Feighan	McCulloch	Siler
Fenton	McDonough	Simpson
Fino	McDowell	Sisk
Fisher	McFall	Slack
Flood	McGovern	Smith, Calif.
Flynn	McMillan	Smith, Iowa
Fogarty	McSween	Smith, Miss.
Foley	Macdonald	Spence
Forand	Machrowicz	Springer
Forrester	Mack	Staggers
Fountain	Madden	Stratton
Frazier	Magnuson	Stubblefield
Friedel	Mahon	Sullivan
Fulton	Mailliard	Taylor
Gallagher	Marshall	Teague, Calif.
Garmatz	Martin	Teague, Tex.
Gary	Matthews	Teller
Gathings	Meador	Thomas
Gavin	Merrow	Thompson, La.
George	Metcalf	Thompson, N.J.
Glaime	Meyer	Thompson, Tex.
Gilbert	Michel	Thornberry
Glenn	Miller, Clem	Toll
Granahan	Miller,	Tollefson
Grant	George P.	Trimble
Gray	Miller, N.Y.	Udall
Green, Oreg.	Milliken	Ullman
Green, Pa.	Mills	Vanik
Griffiths	Mitchell	Van Pelt
Gubser	Moeller	Van Zandt
Hagen	Moegan	Wallhauser
Haley	Montoya	Walter
Halpern	Moore	Wampler
Hardy	Moorhead	Watts
Hargis	Morgan	Weaver
Harmon	Morris, N. Mex.	Weis
Harris	Morrison	Westland
Hays	Moss	Whitener
Healey	Moulder	Whitten
Hébert	Multer	Widnall
Hechler	Murphy	Wier
Hemphill	Natcher	Williams
Herlong	Nix	Willis
Hiestand	Norblad	Wilson
Hoffman, Ill.	O'Brien, Ill.	Winstead
Hogan	O'Brien, N.Y.	Withrow
Hollifield	O'Hara, Ill.	Wolf
Holland	O'Hara, Mich.	Wright
Holt	O'Konski	Yates
Holtzman	O'Neill	Young
Horan	Oliver	Zablocki
Hosmer	Osmers	Zelenko

## NAYS—69

Alger	Budge	Dixon
Allen	Byrnes, Wis.	Dooley
Arends	Cederberg	Dorn, S.C.
Ayres	Chamberlain	Flynt
Baker	Colmer	Ford
Barry	Curtis, Mass.	Frelinghuysen
Bass, N.H.	Curtis, Mo.	Goodell
Berry	Dague	Griffin

Gross	McKinley	Rhodes, Ariz.
Halleck	McIntire	Robison
Harrison	May	Rogers, Tex.
Henderson	Mumma	St. George
Hess	Murray	Scherer
Hoeven	Nelsen	Schneebell
Hoffman, Mich.	Norrell	Schwengel
Johansen	Pilcher	Short
Jones, Mo.	Pillion	Smith, Kans.
Judd	Poage	Smith, Va.
Keith	Poff	Taber
Kilburn	Quile	Thomson, Wyo.
Lafore	Ray	Tuck
Laird	Reece, Tenn.	Wainwright
Langen	Rees, Kans.	Wharton

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Avery

## NOT VOTING—16

Alford	Jackson	Steed
Barden	Keogh	Utt
Bentley	Mason	Vinson
Biltch	Minshall	Younger
Bowles	Morris, Okla.	
Buckley	Powell	

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the bill was passed, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The Clerk announced the following pairs.

On this vote:

Mr. Minshall and Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Jackson against.

Mr. Keogh and Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Avery against.

Mr. Younger and Mr. Morris of Oklahoma for, with Mr. Bentley against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Alford with Mr. Utt.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York [Mr. Keogh] and with the gentleman from New York [Mr. Buckley]. If they had been present they would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

(Mr. UTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record).

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained, and did not arrive on the floor of the House until the rollcall on the pay raise veto was concluded. Had I been present, I would have voted to override the President's veto.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in overriding the President's veto of this pay increase, we have capitulated to the political pressure of lobbyists, in this case representing the postal workers unions. We are guilty of permitting legislative dictation. If one pressure group can do it, so can others. Then, in the aggregate total our representative government will fail. No longer will we have judicious study of legislation, but roughshod political dictation. This course can only result in the disintegration of our form of government and our society of free people. I condemn this pay raise as factually wrong and financially unsound, though politically expedient. Therefore, I voted to uphold the veto. The President's statement contains the facts, including his recommendation that the temporary 2.5 percent raise already in effect be made permanent, and indicating

his willingness to go along with a further reasonable hike commensurate with increased living costs. That this bill goes far beyond those reasonable norms is manifest. To the extent that it does, we are simply rewarding one group—well organized Federal employees—at the expense of all other taxpayers. At this time, as much as ever, we legislators need to exercise self-discipline, letting November's votes fall where they may.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the action of this House to override the veto of the President on H.R. 9883 leads me to state my own convictions on the objective of providing an adequate salary increase for postal workers and maintaining attractive pay levels for all Federal public servants.

No one can dispute these objectives.

I have long recognized the fact that the salaries of postal employees have not kept pace with compensation for comparable work in private employment. I strongly feel that it is our duty to provide adequate salaries for Federal employees.

But at the same time it is evident to me that H.R. 9883 is not the means to achieve the desirable end.

I believe the President's position is strong when he points out that the bill is "manifestly unjust."

He adds:

Were this measure to become law, the already conspicuous unfairness and discrimination in our antiquated Federal pay system would be greatly intensified.

In addition, he cited the fact that—the money cost \* \* \* would impose an annual burden on the American taxpayer of three-quarters of a billion dollars and the money would not be wisely spent.

These are some of the reasons why I supported the President's stand.

Certainly another reason is that Congress itself has appropriated \$500,000 for a study of the entire Federal pay structure. The results of this study, available in September, will, presumably, pave the way for a sound system of compensation for Federal employees.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I want to say this about the representatives of the postal employees who have contacted me. Whenever I have met with these representatives I have found them to be able and courteous people—sincere in their desire to help those whom they represent.

Mr. Speaker, I believe my record will show that I have consistently supported and worked for the well-being of our Federal employees—especially the postal workers. Therefore, I can wholeheartedly say that I am happy to see the deserving employees receive a salary increase. I only regret that, due to the bill's many failings, I could not in conscience vote to override the President's decision as to the overall impact of the bill.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, after much study of H.R. 9883, the entire bill, not just of the portion dealing with pay raises for postal employees, I am compelled to vote to sustain the President's veto. I do not agree with two major reasons the President gives for his veto, but it seems

14306

to me the other reasons against the total bill outweigh the reasons for it, especially since it is not necessary for the Congress to accept the unjustified portions of this bill in order to obtain the salary increase which the evidence has convinced me the postal workers are clearly entitled to.

In a free society there is one sure test of whether a pay scale is proper. Is the number of high-grade persons seeking the jobs increasing or decreasing? If the number is decreasing, the pay scale obviously is too low. That is the case with postal jobs in my city today. The number of superior individuals seeking employment in the postal service is much lower than it has been. This can only mean that, in comparison with other jobs, the pay and other rewards in these jobs are not as attractive as formerly, and not as attractive as they must be to get the kind and quality of employees the post office must have to give our people the good service they want and need.

I do not agree with the suggestion in the veto message that postal salaries should be raised by only the same percentage as the general cost of living has increased since the last pay raise bill. Most other workers in the United States have obtained from private employers wage raises larger than the increase in cost of living. I believe the U.S. Government ought to treat its employees at least as well as private industry—and the Government will have to do so if it is to get its work done well.

Also, I cannot go along with the argument that the postal employees cannot be given a suitable pay raise because the Post Office has such a big deficit. The postal workers are not responsible for that deficit; the Congress is. Not enough Members are willing to vote for higher postal rates to pay for increased costs. When wages and prices in the steel industry go up, the Defense Department does not refuse to pay the higher price required for steel for its ships and missiles. It pays what it has to pay to get what it has to have. The same should be true of the Post Office.

These are the strong reasons for a pay raise for postal employees. What are the reasons against passage of this total bill?

First. The bill does upset differentials in the postal service by granting a higher rate of increase—up to 8.8 percent—to some employees than to others—7.5 percent—performing the same work. This creates inequities within the service itself as well as giving the lowest percentage increase to those who are, as the President stated, the most underpaid in relation to persons doing similar work in private industry.

Second. There is no justification for including in this bill the same 7½ percent pay raise for Federal civil service employees as for postal employees. The Congress itself authorized and appropriated \$500,000 for a comprehensive survey to guide it in determining just what adjustments ought to be made. It does not make sense for the Congress to act before it has the benefit of its own study, which is due to be finished by September.

Third. There is no justification for including in this bill a 7½ percent pay raise for salaries of our own congressional employees. No hearings were held or data gathered or even discussion by the committee on this matter.

Fourth. There is no justification for including in this bill a 7½ percent pay raise plus Federal retirement and life insurance benefits, for locally elected county stabilization and conservation committees. These are not Federal employees in any true sense. Doubtless they need and deserve adjustments in the terms of their employment, but again, no hearings were held or evidence presented. How can any one argue for the shot-in-the-dark effort which this bill makes?

Fifth. There is no justification for inclusion in this bill of a 7½ percent salary increase for all the employees in our Foreign Service, a quite separate body most of whose members are living and working under totally different conditions abroad. In fact, this section is the most incredible thing in the bill. Legislation regarding these employees is the responsibility of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. That committee has studied the matter and reported out a bill some time ago to make the salary adjustments which the testimony indicated are needed.

The House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, for no explained reason, and without any hearings or requests for it to do so, and utterly ignoring the recommendations of those who have studied the matter, threw into the omnibus bill now before us a 7½-percent salary raise. Maybe it was thought that by putting everybody in the bill, whether justified or not, more support could be mustered for the one portion of the bill which is has been shown is justified. That is no way for the Congress to legislate.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of these difficult situations in which one wants to vote for the good provisions and against the bad sections. Unfortunately, this is not possible. So the final question becomes, should one swallow so much that does not belong in this bill in order to achieve the part which is good? I do not believe this would be right.

Moreover, it is not necessary. To sustain the veto kills this particular omnibus bill—but it does not remove all possibility of a proper pay raise for postal workers. I have introduced a bill, H.R. 12929, to provide a 7-percent across-the-board salary increase for postal employees along with a commission to develop a better pay system for the entire Federal Government, and to report its recommendations by February 15, 1961.

I chose that 7-percent figure because, as I have told representatives of our Minneapolis postal employees on several occasions, I am certain a bill with that figure will become law. I have been ready to vote for a bill that would provide even a 9-percent increase for the postal workers, because the case has been made for them. It has not been made as yet for the others.

So, on balance, I cannot conscientiously vote for this total bill. It obviously is going to be passed by the

House over the veto. If it should fail in the other body, I shall press at once for action on my own bill and am sure the Congress will not finish this session without passing it or a similar bill.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States, in expressing his disapproval of the Federal pay legislation before us—H.R. 9883—has accused postal employees of exerting flagrantly and in concert intensive and unconcealed political pressure on Members of Congress.

Never before in my experience has a veto message contained such intemperate and abusive language. Never before in my experience has a veto message contained such a grotesque perversion of fact.

The implication of the President's message is a gross libel on the integrity and moral stamina of the Congress. I resent the implication, and I feel certain that every thoughtful Member of this body resents it.

What does the President mean by "intensive and unconcealed political pressure"? Postal employees have merely exercised their constitutional right of direct petition. They have come to us for help and support, as they have always come to use when they were in need. They have presented their arguments in a dignified and compelling manner. They have exhibited to us their need. They have proved to us that this administration has practiced economic discrimination against them. They have—in short—exercised effectively their rights and privileges as American citizens.

Have we come to such a pass in this democracy of ours that the exercise of the undisputed rights of American citizenship can be slandered as exerting "flagrant," "intensive and unconcealed political pressure"?

If any Member of this body is feeling political pressure today—where is that pressure coming from? I suggest it is not coming from the underpaid and economically desperate postal employees who are merely struggling to keep themselves and their families afloat on the rising sea of inflation.

No, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the political pressure is coming from the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue—from the large gray building at the corner of 12th Street and the Avenue where a bitter and overly aggressive Postmaster General is quarterbacking this fight to deny postal employees their economic rights. That is where the pressure is coming from, not from the beleaguered and underpaid postal employees.

And are we to yield to such unconscionable pressure? No, Mr. Speaker, I am confident that we shall not do so.

We have heard the arguments, pro and con. We have expressed our wishes by an overwhelming vote in favor of this legislation. We did not cast our votes because of any so-called pressure. We cast our votes because the salary increase is justified, long overdue and desperately needed. We cast our votes in the interest of equity and common decency. And, Mr. Speaker, equity and common decency demand that we rise up and pass this legislation today, the wishes

of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to legislation that would grant fair salary increases and other benefits for those employed in Government service. I have always supported legislation I thought was reasonable and fair for Federal workers. In fact, I have legislation pending at the present time for benefits on behalf of our Government workers. It should also be stated that more legislation for higher salaries and benefits was granted during the period that I was chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee than in any similar period in the past 30 years.

This legislation has not received the consideration to which it is entitled. It is inequitable. It is unfair to many of our Government employees. It was put through the House under a high pressure system. It was considered under a petition whereby Members were not even permitted to offer amendments.

We all approved the appropriation last Congress for an expenditure of \$500,000 to develop information for a new improved concept for compensation of Federal employees. That study is already in progress and is scheduled to be completed at the end of this year.

I repeat I am in favor of providing equitable treatment for Federal employees as compared with those in private industry. This bill will cost the taxpayers of this country three-quarters of a billion dollars. I just do not believe the people of this country want this legislation in its present form. Neither do I believe they want their money expended unnecessarily as is being done in this bill.

This bill includes 1,600,000 employees in various jobs and in all parts of the world. No consideration is given with respect to length of service or amount of salary they receive at the present time.

Even though you voted against the President, which every Member has a perfect right to do, I think it might be well to give the President's views some consideration with respect to what his employees should be paid.

Let me repeat, I am in favor of fair and equitable treatment to all Government employees. I just do not believe this legislation meets that standard.

#### MAKING TEMPORARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1961

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under a special order of the House I call up House Joint Resolution 778, making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1961, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the House joint resolution as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America*

*in Congress assembled*, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the several departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizational units of the Government, namely:

SEC. 101. (a) (1) Such amounts as may be necessary for continuing projects or activities (not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution) which were conducted in the fiscal year 1960 and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority would be available in the following appropriation Acts for the fiscal year 1961:

Legislative Branch Appropriation Act;  
General Government Matters Appropriation Act;

Independent Offices Appropriation Act;  
Department of Defense Appropriation Act;  
Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act;  
Military Construction Appropriation Act;  
Mutual Security and Related Agencies Appropriation Act;

Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act;

Public Works Appropriation Act; and the Supplemental Appropriation Act.

(2) Appropriations made by this subsection shall be available to the extent and in the manner which would be provided for by the pertinent appropriation Act.

(3) Whenever the amount which would be made available or the authority which would be granted under an Act listed in this subsection as passed by the House is different from that which would be made available or granted under such Act as passed by the Senate, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued under the lesser amount or the more restrictive authority.

(4) Whenever an Act listed in this subsection has been passed by only one House or where an item is included in only one version of an Act as passed by both Houses, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued under the appropriation, funds, or authority granted by the one House, but at a rate for operations not exceeding the current rate or the rate permitted by the action of the one House, whichever is lower: *Provided*, That no provision which is included in any appropriation Act enumerated in this subsection but which was not included in the applicable appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1960, and which by its terms is applicable to more than one appropriation, fund, or authority, shall be applicable to any appropriation, fund, or authority provided in this joint resolution unless such provision shall have been included in identical form in such bill as enacted by both the House and the Senate.

(b) Such amount as may be necessary for continuing projects or activities which were conducted in the fiscal year 1960 and listed in this subsection at a rate for operations not in excess of the current rate or the rate provided for in the budget estimate, whichever is lower:

Department of Commerce: Bureau of Public Roads: Forest highways (liquidation of contract authorization).

SEC. 102. Appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall remain available until (a) enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution, or (b) enactment of the applicable appropriation Act by both Houses without any provision for such project or activity, or (c) August 31, 1960, whichever first occurs.

SEC. 103. Appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution may be used without regard to the time limitations set forth in subsection (d) (2) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and expendi-

tures therefrom shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 104. No appropriation or fund made available or authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be used to initiate or resume any project or activity which was not being conducted during the fiscal year 1960. Appropriations made and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred for any project or activity during the period for which funds or authority for such project or activity are available under this joint resolution.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. This is the usual resolution providing for continuation of functions of Government during the fiscal year 1961 beginning today for which the annual supply bills have not been fully processed.

The House has adopted all 18 appropriation bills for the session.

The Senate has passed 15 of the bills.

Congressional action has been completed on 10 bills and conference reports on two more—the independent offices bill and the military construction bill—were filed last night and should be sent to the President by tomorrow.

Three bills are pending in the Senate. They are the public works bill, the mutual security bill, and the supplemental bill.

Two are in conference. Prospects for disposing of them are at the moment uncertain. In any event, we will have to adopt this resolution to provide for such functions as are not finally covered by the regular bills before the impending recess.

The resolution is in the usual stereotyped form adopted without controversy each year under similar circumstances. It does not appropriate beyond the provisions of the regular bills; all expenditures made under the resolution are chargeable to funds finally appropriated in the regular bills.

And following the custom of the past, no provision is made for starting any new project, function or activity. The key word in the resolution is "continue"—to merely continue activities and functions on an interim basis, and then only if proposed to be continued in the regular process as provided in the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, we would normally supply at this time for the information of Members a brief résumé of the appropriations and related data but are unable to do so before disposition of pending conference reports. We will insert tentative tabulations and abbreviated data on the matter tomorrow, and a more complete résumé at the conclusion of the session.

Mr. TABER. Yes. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, there are 10 bills on which final action has not been taken or are otherwise in such shape that it would not be safe to leave them out of this resolution. This resolution permits the Government to continue its operations, not on any advanced scale but on a scale not greater than last year's figures and not more than the lower figure as they have been passed by both Houses. It is something that we have to do this year and it

ought to be done today if the Govern- ment is to go on during the recess.

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

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

Mr. PELLY. I would like to ask the gentleman this question: If the House turns down a motion to recess, would this continuing resolution still be advisable?

Mr. TABER. It would have to be, because there would be no way to take care of the payrolls that accrue after the 30th of June.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Is the mutual security bill going to be forgotten this year, or do you think it will be called up after we return?

Mr. TABER. They tell me that the prospects are that it will not be called until after we return.

Mr. PASSMAN. It did not turn out to be such an "emergency" after all, did it?

Mr. TABER. The only expenditures that they will be able to make under this resolution will be at the House rate of the House bill or the current rate, whichever is lower.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. I am not opposed to this resolution, but I do rise to ask the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] a question. With the adoption of this resolution it will not be necessary, then, to rush conference reports through the House without adequate discussion of what has transpired in the other body with respect to appropriation bills and other matters; is that not correct?

Mr. CANNON. The House has passed all of the bills and the Senate has passed 15. Several bills have gone to conference. We have reported three more today, two of which are the independent offices bill and the military construction bill. But, the remainder, which have not yet been processed, will be continued. The present fiscal situation will be continued exactly as it is, and the money will, when it is finally appropriated, be taken from that part.

Mr. GROSS. With the adoption of this resolution, it will not be necessary to drive conference reports through the House under forced draft.

Mr. CANNON. It will not be necessary to perfect them now before we adjourn.

Mr. GROSS. I am pleased to have that statement, and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, there is one thing I wanted to say; this resolution expires August 31 or earlier if the bills are disposed of.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I think I might add that the House may be in-

terested to know that the prospects indicate that we will this year be under the budget on the total appropriations for the year.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WORK PLANS APPROVED—COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

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

JUNE 30, 1960.

HON. SAM RAYBURN, The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Public Works has approved the work plans transmitted to you which were referred to this committee. The work plans involved are:

State	Watershed	Executive communication No.	Committee approval
Alabama.....	Big Prairie and French Creeks.....	2,230	June 30, 1960
Pennsylvania.....	Mill Run.....	2,239	Do.
North Carolina.....	Town Fork Creek.....	2,307	Do.

Sincerely yours,  
CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,  
Member of Congress, Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

CORRECTION OF ROLLCALLS

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 170, I am not recorded as voting in the affirmative. I was present and voted "yea." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD and the Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I understand I am not recorded as having voted "yea" on overriding the veto of the President on the pay raise bill. I was present and voted "yea," and ask unanimous consent that the rollcall be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, our colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] is in the hospital in Boston due to an emergency operation. There was an error yesterday in connection with rollcall No. 169, where he was paired "nay" on final passage, instead of "yea." I am told by the Parliamentarian that the permanent RECORD cannot be corrected except by the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER], himself, when he returns. In the meantime, I am making this statement on his behalf as to how he would have voted.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, in the RECORD of June 29, 1960, at page 13901 in the last paragraph I am recorded as having said "assured." The word I intended to use was "assumed." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION BILL 1961

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 12231) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, 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 California?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I assume the gentleman intends to take ample time to explain the bill; is that correct?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is correct.

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

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

There was no objection.