

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALTER). Three hundred and seventy Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SALE OF U.S. OBLIGATIONS TO FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS

(Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, for many weeks certain lobby groups have been leveling a concerted drive against the passage of the Kennedy-Thompson "common situs" picketing bills—S. 2643 and H.R. 9070.

Latest in the series of attacks on the bill is a collection of editorials sent to Members of the House this week by the American Retail Federation. The cover reads "More Newspapers Reflect Mounting Public Indignation Over Efforts to Blast a Big Hole in the Landrum-Griffin Law With Common Situs Picketing Bill." The document reprints 52 articles and editorials in opposition to the bill from 22 States and the District of Columbia all appearing within a period of 3 weeks.

It is amazing to note in reading these clippings that the following identical editorial opposing the bill, and mentioning "a publication of the American Retail Federation," appeared word-for-word in no less than 12 newspapers within an 8-day period between May 17 and May 25 of this year:

All the evidence indicates that most Americans believe that the labor laws now on the books—including the Taft-Hartley Act and last year's Landrum-Griffin Act—are reasonable, necessary, and in no way punitive.

A great many believe that they don't go far enough to control the enormous powers of present-day unions. However, some of the labor leaders are adamantly opposed to even a minimum amount of regulation, and are determined to get rid of it.

Take, for instance, proposed legislation which would permit "common situs" picketing—a type of picketing which is presently regulated and controlled by the National Labor Relations Board, with the authority of existing law.

"Common situs" means any place—a factory, office building or building under construction—where more than one employer functions. If the legislation in question should be passed, in the words of Representative BARDEN of North Carolina, it would be possible for certain unions to shut down any construction project in its entirety, including national defense projects any time it suits their whim and fancy.

A publication of the American Retail Federation provides specific examples. If a retailer were building a new branch store, or remodeling or carrying on a major redecorating job to his present store, the bill would permit building trades unions to picket the store if any of the employees

doing any of the work were nonunion. Also if a retailer were supplying merchandise to new buildings, picketing permitted by this bill could slow down or stop the construction of buildings which he had contracted to furnish.

The legislation would bring back, in principle if not in name, the secondary boycott—one of the most vicious and indefensible of stratagems.

The papers carrying this identical editorial are: Watertown (S. Dak.) Public Opinion, May 19, 1960; Helena (Ark.) World and Record, May 22, 1960; Aiken (S.C.) Standard and Review, May 19, 1960; Sharon (Pa.) Herald, May 21, 1960; Charleston (S.C.) Post, May 25, 1960; Marion (Ind.) Chronicle, May 17, 1960; Dyersburg (Tenn.) State Gazette, May 21, 1960; El Dorado (Ark.) News, May 22, 1960; Kannapolis (N.C.) Independent, May 22, 1960; Greenville (S.C.) Piedmont, May 19, 1960; Corinth (Miss.) Corinthian, May 24, 1960; Wilson (N.C.) Times, May 25, 1960.

The following editorial opposing the bill appeared word for word in seven newspapers within a 2-week period between April 28 and May 12:

When the Landrum-Griffin labor bill came up in Congress last fall, union leaders kicked up such a fuss that they succeeded in having it well watered down before it was passed.

Apparently not satisfied with this, labor lobbyists in Washington are reportedly now trying to push through new legislation which would further weaken the labor law.

Unions in the building trades are said to be urging Congress to pass House Resolution 9070, amending the labor act to permit "situs picketing." The amendment is worded so that it would legalize the secondary boycott, so viciously misused in the construction industry prior to the Taft-Hartley law.

The amendment could conceivably increase costs on all types of construction. More dangerous, it would give the leader of any building union legal power to shut down any construction project any time it suits his whim.

The proposed amendment would permit a union which has a dispute with one building contractor to strike and picket all other contractors and subcontractors merely because they happen to be working on the same building project. The effect would be to stop all work on the project—even though it might be a vital defense project.

Let's hope our Congressmen realize what is under the surface of this legislative gem when they are called to vote on it.

The papers carrying this editorial are: Cedar Springs (Mich.) Clipper, April 28, 1960; Detroit (Mich.) Investor, May 6, 1960; New Hope (Pa.) News, May 12, 1960; Oneida (N.Y.) Dispatch, May 7, 1960; Westfield (N.J.) Leader, May 12, 1960; Hawthorne (N.J.) Press, May 5, 1960; Brooksville (Pa.) Jeffersonian Democrat, May 5, 1960.

Still another editorial in the American Retail Federation collection appeared word for word in three of the newspapers. They are: Wellington (Ohio) Enterprise, May 12, 1960; Mount Washington (Ohio) Press, April 28, 1960; Alexandria (La.) Town Talk, May 24, 1960.

This editorial is as follows:

BILL TO PROMOTE STRIKES

Labor's friends in Congress are about to operate on the still-new Landrum-Griffin Act—to cut out its very heart, if they can.

Under the terms of this hard-won reform legislation, it is an unfair labor practice to

picket, or strike, to force one employer to stop doing business with another employer. Such action, more commonly known as the secondary boycott, had been the chief organizing routine of the million-and-a-half-member Teamsters Union and the 18 building trades unions with a membership of 3 million.

The classic method was to threaten one employer, such as a general contractor, with a strike unless he stopped doing business with another—in most cases a nonunion subcontractor or supplier.

But the relief provided by the Landrum-Griffin Act against this unconscionable and disastrous abuse of the right to organize will be short lived if Congress can be bludgeoned into passing the Thompson bill (H.R. 9070). This sly, 18-line measure amends the section outlawing the secondary boycott by excluding its application to any "common situs" where the employees of more than one employer are engaged in the alternation, painting, repair, or other work at the place where the work, alteration, painting or repair is being performed.

Passage of the bill and its counterpart in the Senate would license the construction unions and the Teamsters to renew the "blackmail picketing" that proponents of the Landrum-Griffin measure fought to curb. No nonunion plumber, carpenter, electrician, painter, or other building craftsman or maintenance man could be hired to build, alter, repair, paint, or install equipment in a building without the neutral employer being subject to picketing—and the closing down of the entire operation if the employees respected the picket line. No company could safely employ a nonunion subcontractor.

The language of this amendment is so sweeping it would permit strikes or picketing relating to wages, hours, and working conditions of employees at any job site and stop every truck carrying ready-mix cement to the job. If houses were being constructed or repairs being made by nonunion workers at an air base, for instance, all of the gates could be picketed and every union man in every other job on the base stopped from doing his work.

Passage of the Thompson bill would make a mockery of the McClellan hearings and the public demands growing out of them, wreck the Landrum-Griffin Act and Taft-Hartley alike. It would initiate union power as never before. It would make Jimmy Hoffa a giant. It would promote a rash of strikes such as we have never seen before.

Will your Congressman have the nerve to vote for it—and ask for your vote later?

Another word-for-word editorial against the Kennedy-Thompson bill appeared in these papers: Elizabethton (Tenn.) Star May 12, 1960; Johnson City (Tenn.) Press Chronicle, May 13, 1960; Suffolk (Va.) News Herald, May 20, 1960—reprinted from The Dallas Morning News.

It follows:

SECONDARY BOYCOTT

With the civil rights bill out of the way, Congress is described as free to give its undivided attention to the Hoffa-sponsored "common situs" bill. It is to be hoped that the country will give its undivided attention to this proposed evil legislation. Clear away the cobwebs and this is what the bill (H.R. 9070 and Kennedy's S. 2643) would do:

It is a bold move to cut the guts out of the Landrum-Griffin labor reform law by giving an obnoxious form of secondary boycott free rein. If enacted, it will legalize work stoppage at any construction site. (For instance, where more than one employer functions, the operations of all contractors and neutral union workers can be halted either by a real or phony strike against a given contractor.)

The bill would scrap the careful regulations of the present law under which only applicable picketing is allowed. One possible result would be to halt construction essential to defense, if this type of blanket picketing is given a green light.

The secondary boycott would permit a union to eliminate from construction projects all nonunion groups engaged in them, whether contractors, subcontractors or their employes.

H.R. 9070 has been approved by the House Labor Committee, is before the Rules Committee. It is in the national interest to kill this partisan, unfair effort to reestablish the secondary boycott.

Mr. Speaker, this is either the most amazing example of clairvoyant editorial writing in history or the most remarkable example of coincidence ever seen by man. Of course, canned editorials to promote some special interest are nothing new in American journalism. Many times during recent years we have heard the phrase "the kept press." I call to the attention of my colleagues in the House the latest example of this journalistic phenomenon so that the phrase may have more significant meaning.

In attacking the Kennedy-Thompson bill the intemperate, canned editorial "writers" use such descriptive phrases as "the Hoffa-sponsored bill," "one of the most immoral bills ever present before the American Congress," "a bill to cut the heart out of the Landrum-Griffin Act," "the first step by Jimmy Hoffa to scuttle the Landrum-Griffin Act," "a sabotage proposal," and "this partisan, unfair effort to reestablish the secondary boycott."

All of these editorials make it appear that somehow this is Jimmy Hoffa's bill and that its enactment will scuttle the Landrum-Griffin Act. Of course, this is a misstatement of fact and is not based on a shred of evidence. No witness representing the Teamsters Union even appeared before our committee to testify in support of H.R. 9070. Moreover, it is well known that both sponsors of the bill are high on the Hoffa "purge list."

Mr. Speaker, not one editorial mentions the fact that President Eisenhower himself has requested this legislation in three separate messages to Congress in the past 6 years, nor that the bill is supported by Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell, and was reported by a lopsided 21-5 bipartisan vote by the Education and Labor Committee.

What amazes me most about this episode is that the American Retail Federation's lobbyists, supposedly clever and industrious, have attempted to foist this collection of canned editorials upon Members of Congress as being representative of the viewpoint of the legitimate press of the Nation. Perhaps the only explanation is that they are convinced that Members never read the material which comes into their offices anyway.

COMMUNICATIONS ACT AMENDMENTS RELATING TO BOOSTER OPERATIONS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1886) to amend the Communications

Act of 1934 with respect to certain rebroadcasting activities.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 318 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 318) is amended by striking out "(3) stations engaged in broadcasting, and" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "(3) stations engaged in broadcasting (other than those engaged solely in the function of rebroadcasting the signals of television broadcast stations), and".

Sec. 2. Section 319(d) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 319(d)) is amended by inserting after the period at the end thereof the following: "If the Commission finds that the public interest, convenience, and necessity would be served thereby, it may waive the requirement of a permit for construction of a station that is engaged solely in rebroadcasting television signals if such station was constructed on or before the date of enactment of this sentence."

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, S. 1886, as amended, is limited specifically to the rebroadcasting or booster problem.

EXTENT OF BOOSTER OPERATIONS

Boosters or repeaters have been used for some years as a means of extending television service to small communities remote from the metropolitan centers where television stations have been largely concentrated. They are technically the simplest and apparently the least expensive means of achieving that end.

Stripped to its barest essentials, a booster consists of an ordinary rooftop antenna strategically located to receive a usable, though normally weak signal from the distant station, a shielded cable connected to a small amplifier and running to a second rooftop antenna so situated as to beam the signal down into the community to be served, and an available power supply to feed the amplifier. Such an array receives the distant signal, amplifies it, and rebroadcasts it at low power on the same channel.

Booster installations now serve hundreds of landlocked areas, sparsely settled communities and sections that are distant from regular television stations which otherwise would be without television service. In most cases the installations are cooperatively financed. The contributions are solicited, in nearly all the cases, throughout the community or memberships are sold in a television club in order to finance maintenance and operation of the system.

HISTORY OF FCC ACTION ON BOOSTERS

The Commission had under active consideration a proceeding concerning the authorization of low-power television repeater operation—docket No. 12116.

On January 5, 1959, the FCC issued its report and order in docket 12116 in which a majority held that it would not adopt regulations authorizing the operation of a booster or repeater in the VHF band—and released a public notice indicating that it would institute necessary legal proceedings to bring a halt to the unlicensed operation of boost-

ers in the VHF band unless within 90 days the operating VHF boosters stated their intention to go to some other type of authorized television operation.

It has been estimated that there were more than 1,000 of these VHF boosters operating at that time, particularly in the western part of the United States, serving thousands of people in sparsely settled areas and distant from any regularly operated television station.

On January 27, 1959, the FCC by a public notice announced that it was giving further study to the legal and technical aspects of the problem and that such studies would include possible new legislation looking toward amending the Communications Act and provide more flexibility in administering section 319 and a possible relaxation of the operator requirements for broadcasting stations.

On April 14, 1959, the Federal Communications Commission issued its public notice No. 72034 and stated that it was recommending to Congress that amendments be made to the Communications Act so as to permit it to license qualifying television repeater or booster stations in the VHF band under certain conditions.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

Under the present provisions of section 318 of the Communications Act, all transmitting equipment in any station licensed under the act must be operated by persons holding an operator's license issued by the FCC. At present, the Commission is given discretion to waive that requirement except for certain named categories.

The bill, as amended, would grant the FCC discretion in waiving the operator requirement with respect to booster stations or other stations engaged solely in the function of rebroadcasting the signals of television broadcasting stations.

The second section of the bill concerns section 319 of the Communications Act. Under the present provisions of section 319 the FCC would be unable to issue licenses to those booster stations that are now on the air since those facilities were constructed before the Commission granted such facility licenses. The bill would amend section 319 so as to give the FCC sufficient discretion, if it finds that the public interest, convenience, and necessity would be served thereby, to waive the requirement of a construction permit for a booster station or any other station that is engaged solely in rebroadcasting television signals if such station was constructed on or before the enactment of this legislation.

All facilities that are now operating will be required to meet all the requirements which may be promulgated by the FCC.

These are very low-powered television stations which rebroadcast television programs on one of the 12 VHF channels allocated for television. These stations have been constructed on an illegal basis so far as the present provisions of the Communications Act are concerned in order to bring television service to persons residing in sparsely settled areas in mountainous regions located principally in the Far Western States. The Federal Communications Commission has on

three separate occasions refused to legalize these operations because of the interference they could cause, and because the Commission felt that there were other methods of effectively bringing television service to these areas without any interference problems being created thereby.

The hearings we have held have revealed that despite the repeated turn-downs of VHF boosters by the Federal Communications Commission, they have continued to multiply so that at the time of the hearing before your committee, the FCC reported that these stations are now in the vicinity of 1,000 in number. It appears that practically all of these VHF boosters are located in the Far Western States.

The Federal Communications Commission now feels that in view of the reliance by many people upon VHF boosters for television service and of the substantial investments that have been made by the public in VHF boosters, it is not practicable to close down these boosters. The Federal Communications Commission believes that some provision must be made for their continuance upon a legalized and regulated basis. However, the Commission assures us that if such operations are legalized the operation of these stations will be permitted only under suitable conditions that would keep to a minimum the potential for disruptive interference which inevitably results from booster operation.

The Federal Communications Commission has advised us that two provisions in the Communications Act as presently written impose difficulties in accomplishing the objective of legalizing boosters. The first is the provision of section 318 of the Communications Act requiring that all transmitting apparatus be operated by a person holding a radio operator's license. The Commission has no authority to waive this requirement so far as broadcast operations are concerned. The bill before you would give the Commission discretion to waive the operator requirement with respect to television rebroadcast stations if it is found that public interest, convenience, and necessity would be served thereby.

The second difficulty is found in section 319 which forbids the Commission to issue a license for a station where construction has been undertaken prior to the receipt of a construction permit from the Federal Communications Commission. All of the boosters which are presently in operation, of course, were constructed before a construction permit was received from the Commission and cannot be licensed under the present provision of the Communications Act. Under the bill before you, the Commission would be given discretion if it finds that public interest, convenience and necessity would be served thereby to waive the requirement of a permit for construction of a station that is engaged solely in rebroadcasting television signals if such station were constructed on or before the date of the enactment of the instant bill. In effect, this provision would authorize the Commission to establish "grandfather rights" for those VHF boosters which initiated operation

without authorization before the enactment of the instant bill.

In view of the testimony of the Federal Communications Commission and the showing that has been made as to the reliance which residents in sparsely settled areas of the West have placed on these VHF boosters, the committee has approved the bill now before you. In so doing we have relied upon assurances given by the Commission that appropriate regulations can and will be drawn to keep interference from such operations at a minimum.

I have already mentioned the fact that the Commission has shown great reluctance in the past to license VHF boosters. This reluctance has been based upon the twofold feeling that there was a great potentiality of serious interference resulting from such operation and also because of the availability of alternative means of bringing television service to the areas in question by means which involve no interference problems. Despite its change of position to recognize the practical need for enabling sparsely settled communities in mountainous regions, particularly in the West, to be able to continue to receive television service from VHF boosters, the Commission is under a duty to make sure that these operations are conducted in accordance with rules and regulations that provide maximum protection against disruptive interference and to encourage, wherever feasible, the use of alternative methods of bringing television service that do not entail interference problems. We are sure that the Commission in acting under the bill we are recommending for your adoption, will keep this in mind.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the legislation to make possible the continuance of low-power television booster stations. The legislation before us is in the public interest because it will enable many thousands of persons living in sparsely settled areas or in rugged terrain to receive the benefits of television.

The legislation would accomplish two purposes. First of all, with respect to stations engaged solely in the function of rebroadcasting the signals of television broadcast stations, the Federal Communications Commission is authorized to waive the statutory requirement that broadcast stations be operated only by licensed operators. Secondly, the legislation would authorize the FCC to waive the requirement of a construction permit for a station that is engaged solely in rebroadcasting television signals if such a station were constructed on or before the enactment of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, for many years, so-called booster or repeater units have been operated in small rural communities or in areas of mountainous terrain where high frequency television is prohibitive. A TV booster is a simple, inexpensive device ordinarily financed by cooperative community action. These devices pick up the signal from a nearby television sta-

tion and beam it on a short-range, low-power system to television sets within the immediate area. Such low-power operations do not interfere with normal high-frequency telecasts.

On December 31, 1958, the Federal Communications Commission threatened the continued operation of such booster stations by requiring that they must convert to high-frequency operation within 90 days. This order, had it been allowed to stand, would have meant that many communities would have lost their television reception entirely.

For that reason, I joined with a number of Members of Congress in sponsoring legislation to bring about a reversal of this unfortunate announcement by the Commission.

Since that time, the Commission has reconsidered its action and has requested legislation similar to the bill now pending before us. I am pleased that the FCC, the Federal Aviation Agency, the Department of the Air Force, the Department of Commerce, and the Bureau of the Budget are all in agreement as to the desirability of the proposed legislation.

Mr. Speaker, in the interest of the many thousands of citizens in western South Dakota and other similar areas, who depend upon TV booster units for television reception, I urge the speedy passage of this legislation.

(Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I urge favorable consideration of S. 1886. The action of the House of Representatives on this bill will at long last make it possible to legalize existing booster television operations which are so vital to the western States and have been invaluable in providing free television reception to remote sections of Wyoming.

I am pleased that we are able to take favorable action on this bill so that it may become law in this session of Congress. It is legislation that is most important and is, I am convinced, in the public interest.

As Wyoming's sole U.S. Representative, I have closely followed the actions on this bill—both in the House and the Senate. I appeared before both the House and Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees and presented detailed statements outlining why action on the bill is imperative.

The reason this bill will be of vast benefit to so many television viewers in the West is that so many small communities and rural areas can receive television signals by no other means than by television booster stations.

The primary objective in the public interest is to make available to the maximum possible number of our citizens the benefits of television.

In Wyoming, a large portion of our population is dependent on these television booster systems for television reception and cannot expect to receive a usable picture through any other means.

The impact of television boosters on Wyoming is pinpointed when one realizes that about 60 percent of Wyoming television viewers see TV over booster

systems and at least one-fourth of the people of Wyoming cannot expect to receive a suitable TV signal by any other means.

The Federal Communications Commission is now proceeding to formulate regulations for the licensing of new VHF booster stations and for the operation of these stations, in their proceeding which is known as docket No. 12116.

There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, of the FCC's authority to license and promulgate operating regulations, but I would point out that these regulations must be reasonable and in the public interest.

The Wyoming TV Repeater Association has submitted several recommendations for amendments to the regulations that the FCC has proposed, dealing with the operation of booster systems. I have joined in urging that the FCC give these recommendations of the Wyoming association careful and favorable consideration.

And, in this regard, unless action is taken to reasonably provide for the needs of these booster operations—which are so important for the entertaining and informing of so many Wyoming people—it may well be that additional legislation will be required.

In the meantime, however, this legislation would remove the obstacles to continued operation of booster stations already constructed.

I would also point out, Mr. Speaker, that all booster facilities that are now operating will be required to meet all of the requirements which may be promulgated by the Federal Communications Commission. This is pointed out by the House committee report on S. 1886, and must be borne in mind.

I have made a serious effort to identify the guiding principles which I think should control our efforts to solve problems which have come up with respect to the television industry and its impact upon my section of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely believe that the bill now before us, which will help solve the problems that the booster television systems in the West now face, should be approved.

I urge that the bill be passed.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker. I would like to thank the members of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for reporting out S. 1886 and thank the House for passing it today.

A major purpose of the Federal Communications Act has been to provide free radio and television to the citizens of the United States. However, failure to enact this law would have terminated that desirable objective for many of the rural people of the West.

For example, in Utah 80 percent of the area of the State is or could be served by boosters. The State of Utah has enacted a law permitting local governments to erect these booster stations in areas where television signals do not reach. These boosters are already in use in 19 of the 29 counties.

These boosters are infinitely less expensive than the ultra high-frequency systems. The boosters in Utah have not interfered with other signals and have provided educational and entertainment

values to our farmers who have been economically hard hit and therefore can less afford to pay for expensive television systems.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inform the Members of the House that the bill that has just been passed is what is referred to in the communications field as the "booster" bill. There are many Members of Congress, particularly from the west and northwest part of the country, who are tremendously interested in the program.

I will have a statement in the RECORD just prior to adoption of the bill explaining what it is. The bill's provisions have been carefully worked out and it was unanimously agreed to. On the Whip notice, unfortunately, it was referred to as the "community antenna television system." That is incorrect. This bill does not refer in any way to community antenna systems. A bill dealing with that problem will come up for separate consideration.

In view of the fact that there have been so many Members, probably 30 or 40 Members of the House, who have been inquiring about this matter, I wanted them to know that this is the bill they have been interested in.

TERMS OF OFFICE OF MEMBERS OF CERTAIN REGULATORY AGENCIES

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1965) to make uniform provisions of law with respect to the terms of office of the members of certain regulatory agencies.

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 the second sentence of the first section of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 792) is amended to read as follows: "Their successors shall be appointed each for a term of five years from the date of the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed and until his successor is appointed and has qualified, except that he shall not so continue to serve beyond the expiration of the next session of Congress subsequent to the expiration of said fixed term of office, and except that any person appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the unexpired term."

SEC. 2. The first sentence of subsection (c) of section 4 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 154(b)) is amended to read as follows: "The Commissioners first appointed under this Act shall continue in office for the terms of one, two, three, four, five, six, and seven years, respectively, from the date of the taking effect of this Act, the term of each to be designated by the President, but their successors shall be appointed for terms of seven years and until their successors are appointed and have qualified, except that they shall not continue to serve

beyond the expiration of the next session of Congress subsequent to the expiration of said fixed term of office; except that any person chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the Commissioner whom he succeeds.

SEC. 3. The fourth sentence of subsection (a) of section 4 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78 (d)) is amended to read as follows: "Each Commissioner shall receive a salary at the rate of \$20,000 a year and shall hold office for a term of five years and until his successor is appointed and has qualified, except that he shall not so continue to serve beyond the expiration of the next session of Congress subsequent to the expiration of said fixed term of office, and except (1) any Commissioner appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and (2) the terms of office of the Commissioners first taking office after the enactment of this title shall expire as designated by the President at the time of nomination, one at the end of one year, one at the end of two years, one at the end of three years, one at the end of four years, and one at the end of five years, after the date of the enactment of this title."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, this is a Senate bill and it has to do with the terms of office of certain Commissioners of major regulatory agencies. It deals with the members in reference to their term of office as follows: The Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Power Commission, and the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The bill would permit a member of one of these agencies or Commissions to continue to serve in office following the expiration of his term until his successor has been appointed and qualified, but not to exceed the end of the following session of Congress. It does no more than bring these agencies into line with the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Trade Commission and the Interstate Commerce Commission.

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

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

Mr. EVINS. I have been interested in legislation pending before the gentleman's committee which would place the Chairmen of these important regulatory Commissions on a rotating basis, on a basis of where they are elected by the Commissioners themselves for Chairman rather than being designated by the President. Legislation along this line has been introduced. It is very important, in my judgment, that this reform and change be made. Our independent agencies should be arms of the Congress rather than agencies of the Executive.

Would this bill also provide for the election of the Chairmen by the Commissioners, or would it continue the pro-