

Annual Report
Waterfront Commission of
New York Harbor



New Jersey State Library

1956-1957



Waterfront Commission of
New York Harbor



ANNUAL REPORT

FOR THE YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1957

Annual Report

The Waterfront Commission of New York Harbor

FOR THE YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1957

o o o

To the HONORABLE AVERELL HARRIMAN, *Governor*,
and the Legislature of the State of New York:

To the HONORABLE ROBERT B. MEYNER, *Governor*,
and the Legislature of the State of New Jersey:

The Waterfront Commission of New York Harbor was created in 1953 by compact between the States of New York and New Jersey, with the approval of Congress. The Compact was adopted following lengthy public hearings which disclosed the existence of racketeering and evil conditions along the New York waterfront. Two generations of abuses by management and labor alike had resulted in the degradation of waterfront labor, illegal exactions on individuals as well as the general public, and a disregard for law and order on the docks. The Commission was established to combat and eradicate these conditions which threatened the welfare of the Port of New York, the center of world shipping, and the millions whose livelihood depended on its prosperity.

The Compact decreed that operating stevedores and their supervisory, hiring and guard personnel be licensed and that dock workers be registered by the Commission. The

Commission was required to reduce the over-supply of labor on the piers and to regularize employment. The "shape-up" system for hiring dock labor was banned. Public loading was outlawed. Licenses were to be issued on proof of good character and integrity and registration denied upon proof that the individual represented a danger to the public peace and safety. No license or registration was to be issued to persons who advocated the overthrow of the government by force or who knowingly participated in an organization engaging in such activities. It was made a crime for anyone to collect union dues from registered or licensed persons if the union included as an officer or agent a person who had been convicted of a felony or high misdemeanor.

The Compact authorized the Commission to investigate any matter pertaining to the waterfront and to take disciplinary action against licensees or registrants who violated the law.

The Commission was charged with re-establishing the dignity of longshoremen by freeing them from discrimination in hiring and from kickbacks, usury, and other forms of oppression; with restoring ethical practices on the part of both management and labor representatives by eliminating bribery and extortion; and with protecting the general public from the abuses and extra costs resulting from racketeering, pilferage and public loading. To achieve these goals, the Commission was vested with the powers referred to, coupled with an obligation to report annually to the Governors and the Legislatures of New York and New Jersey on whether a public necessity existed for the continuation of these powers.

Accordingly, in addition to detailing the work of the Commission during the past year, this report will reflect the way in which these powers have been exercised and the progress which has been achieved toward the Commission's goals.

In its fourth fiscal year, ended June 30, 1957, the Commission has continued to enforce and carry out the purposes of the Compact. It has continued to limit the size of the labor pool. Removed from the Longshoremen's Register were 3,240 men who did not depend on the waterfront for their livelihood and were apparently drifting from one casual employment to another, thus impairing the opportunity of the bona fide dock workers to earn a decent living wage. Since the inception of the Commission this program of decasualization has reduced by some 18,000 the number of men who share in the total waterfront payroll.

The resulting balance between supply and demand for labor has increased the average earnings of longshoremen since 1954 by more than \$1,700 annually. More than one-third of these employees are now earning over \$5,000 per year. While higher wage scales account for some of this increase, it is chiefly due to limitation of the work force by the Commission. The public generally, as well as the individual longshoreman, has benefited; the economically solvent dock worker is less likely to fall prey to the loanshark and the pressures of the lawless.

Continued enforcement of the hiring regulations promulgated in 1955 has contributed greatly to the regularization of employment by making a public record of those whose status as regular dock labor and members of regular gangs entitles them to preference under the contract between labor and management. There are some 19,000 regular dock workers in all categories who, by reason of these procedures, now enjoy a measure of job security unheard of on the waterfront in the past.

Unfortunately, however, there are an additional 11,000 or 12,000 men on the waterfront, most of whom, while purportedly entitled to some preference in hiring under the collective bargaining agreement, are not fully protected largely because the agreement is vague in this respect.

The Commission believes it essential that management and labor amplify the collective bargaining agreement by clarifying each man's right to preference in hiring. Preference and seniority rights of every man on the waterfront should be set forth clearly and in writing, under a system based on objective standards, whose operations are open and public so that all concerned can see that the preference and seniority rights of each worker are honored at all times. The Commission has conferred with and urged such action by management and labor. It is to be hoped that they will act expeditiously. The Commission stands ready to take appropriate action to make such a program effective.

With hiring agents continuing to have broad discretion in selection of dock workers, it is important that they and all supervisory personnel be the agents of the employer, free of influence from any other source. Regulations permit only the employer to select hiring agents. During the past year, the Commission has had to act vigorously to thwart violations of these regulations in cases where employers permitted union officials and others to control the selection of their supervisory personnel.

During the year the Commission has also dealt with evasions of the ban on the "shape-up", a system of hiring in front of the piers which had contributed to the oppression of the dock worker in pre-compact days. The hatch foremen and hiring agents responsible were disciplined, and the Commission adopted a specific regulation designed to eradicate the pierside "shape-up" in any form. Copies of the regulation have been served on every hiring agent and hatch foreman in the port.

A substantial number of men with serious criminal records, likely to use the docks to further illegal operations, have been excluded from the Longshoremen's Register. In several cases, by action of local prosecutors on the basis of evidence furnished by the Commission, ex-felons were pre-

cluded from acting as union officers or agents. Included were cases where such persons, though ostensibly no longer in office, in fact continued to act as union officials.

Hundreds of cases of alleged misconduct by licensees and registrants have been investigated during the year. In over 400 cases, sufficient evidence was developed to warrant disciplinary action by the Commission. In several cases, criminal proceedings by local prosecutors followed. These cases included offenses such as loansharking, exaction of kickbacks, waterfront assaults, payroll padding, larceny, pilferage, and other misconduct, the effect of which was to oppress the worker and mulct the general public.

The Commission has been scrupulous in protecting the individual's right to counsel and to cross-examination at hearings. Charges are specified, and respondents are given ample time to prepare their cases. The Commissioners themselves decide each case after careful examination of the record, including the hearing officer's report, transcripts of testimony, and exceptions, if any.

With the cooperation of members of the clergy of various denominations, a system of probationary registration has been evolved. In serious cases where the Commission has been reluctant to grant registration but where there has been evidence of rehabilitation, temporary registration on probation to clergymen has been granted. The cooperation of these members of the clergy in undertaking this supervisory responsibility is appreciated not only by the men benefited but also by the Commission. Final registration is not granted until a detailed investigation has been made and the Commission is satisfied of the rehabilitation of the individual. Experience under this plan has been good.

A major step has been taken in the past year to improve port security by the adoption of regulations which estab-

lished minimum physical and maximum age requirements for port watchmen. Physical qualifications are verified through medical examinations by doctors retained by the Commission. In the cases of men long established in the industry, age and health requirements may be waived by the Commission where justice warrants such relief. The regulations also require the completion of an approved course of training in the duties of a port watchman. Although these innovations should develop a more effective force for the protection of waterfront property and a consequent reduction in larceny and pilferage, they are not a complete solution. Additional methods of improving the watching force are being studied.

Legislation which strengthened the original Compact was adopted by the Legislatures and Governors of the States of New York and New Jersey and became effective within recent months. This legislation provided higher licensing standards for clerks, checkers and timekeepers, who occupy positions on the docks of particular importance in preventing larceny, pilferage and payroll padding. It closed loopholes in the Compact by requiring registration for various longshore occupations not originally covered, in which occupations numbers of men who had been denied registration as longshoremen on the basis of misconduct or serious criminal records had been able to return to the docks. It conferred the status of peace officers on Commission investigators. It authorized the Commission to grant immunity to witnesses testifying in its investigations. It empowered the Commission to impose fines on stevedores for violations or offenses in lieu of suspension of license.

The new legislation and regulations implementing it have been put into operation promptly, without interference with the work in the port. Conferences between the Commission's staff and representatives of management and labor were successful in preventing misunderstanding and confusion.

Respect for law and order on the docks has unquestionably increased since the establishment of the Commission. Most longshoremen are hardworking and in pursuit of an honest living. That they appreciate the improvement of working conditions on the waterfront is indicated in letters many have written to the Commission.

During the past year, election of a collective bargaining representative, under the auspices of the National Labor Relations Board, and a strike against management to secure collective bargaining objectives were conducted in a peaceful atmosphere. The intimidation and violence that marked elections and strikes in past years were happily absent.

The "quickie" strike, although sometimes representing expression of a legitimate grievance, was often used in the past as a means of intimidation and extortion. The number of "quickie" strikes has been materially reduced. Grievance procedures established in the collective bargaining agreement and the activities of the Labor Relations Committee of the N.Y.S.A.-I.L.A. have helped to eliminate unauthorized work stoppages.

The presence of the Commission is undoubtedly the primary cause of the relative peace which has prevailed on the waterfront during the past year. It is noteworthy that this is the first year in which there has been no work stoppage directed at preventing the Commission from enforcing the law.

There have been a number of legal actions during the past year challenging the Commission's authority, jurisdiction, and decisions in various areas. The Commission has been sustained by the courts in every case.

On March 31, 1957, Mr. John P. McGrath, who had been Commissioner for New York since December 1, 1955, resigned, and was succeeded by Mr. Carl J. Rubino.

Preparation of each annual report necessarily includes an appraisal by the Commission of its activities during the year and its accomplishments and failures on the road toward realization of the objectives of the Compact. Recognizing that, Article IV, Section 13, of the Compact requires the Commission, in making its annual report, to state whether the Commission finds and determines that public necessity still exists for (a) the continued registration of longshoremen, (b) the continued licensing of any occupation or employment required to be licensed under the Compact, (c) the continued public operation of the employment information centers provided for in Article XII.

A fair appraisal of the existing situation on the waterfront leads inescapably to the conclusion, and the Commission finds and determines, that public necessity still exists for the continued registration of longshoremen and the continued licensing of occupations and employments required to be licensed under the Compact. With respect to the third item, the continued public operation of the employment information centers, through which the waterfront hiring system operates, much will depend on what develops as the result of the negotiations still going on between the New York Shipping Association and the I.L.A. The contracting parties have agreed in principle on the recognition of seniority and preference rights. If they could work out objective standards which would permit the Commission and each man employed on the waterfront to know exactly what his rights are, and if the system were operated in the open for all to see, the Commission could give thought to developing a system for its withdrawal from the operation of employment information centers. Unfortunately, although the principle had been agreed upon months ago, negotiations have not as yet produced any results. Under the circumstances, the Commission must and does find and determine that public necessity still exists at this time for the continued

public operation of the employment information centers provided for in Article XII of the Compact.

REGULARIZATION OF LONGSHOREMEN'S EMPLOYMENT

There has been a dramatic increase in the average annual earnings of individual longshoremen since the Commission undertook the task of registering longshore labor and regularizing employment in accordance with the Compact. There has been a continuing upward trend in earnings. In 1954, 33,551 men shared an annual payroll of \$75,675,580.58; in 1956, the longshore payroll of \$100,114,899 was shared by 24,595 men. In 1954, longshoremen earning over \$5,000 per year totalled 1,865. Today, their numbers have increased to 9,885.

Reduction of the number of men sharing the earnings has been achieved by periodically culling from the Longshoremen's Register the names of men who do not regularly work or seek work on the docks, and by adopting regulations to encourage employment on a permanent basis.

The removal of inactive registrants, or decasualization, is done at regular intervals of six months. To date there have been five rounds of decasualization. The standards applied in the first two rounds required that after a longshoreman had been registered for nine months, his employment record must show that he had worked as a longshoreman, or applied for such work at an Employment Information Center, for a minimum of forty-eight days distributed eight days to each month over the preceding six months. In the last three rounds, the standards were modified to a minimum of forty-eight days distributed eight days to each month during at least five of the six months under consideration.

The surplus of longshore labor prior to the establishment of the Commission on December 1, 1953 contributed in many ways to conditions which were seriously detrimental to the worker, the industry and the general economy of the port. The effect of the decasualization program indicates that the application of standards fixed by the Commission for retention on the Register has resulted in a sensible balance in demand and supply of longshore labor.

In conjunction with the reduction of the labor pool, every effort has been exerted to encourage regular employment. Hiring regulations adopted in 1955 have been an incentive to employers to regularize employment of dock labor under a system of validating "regular employees". The employer is able to file at the Information Center a roster of his regular checkers, clerks and other dock and terminal employees, certifying that these men have received twelve days' employment during the preceding three-month period, and that it is planned to hire them as regular employees. In order to hire these men, the employer simply indicates, on a copy of the roster posted at the entrance to the pier, the names and starting times of those he wishes to have work the next day. The information Center is notified, and the men thus hired go directly to the pier at the time ordered.

For retention on the roster, the Commission requires the employee to have worked at the pier for twelve days during the preceding month, or eighty per cent of the days worked by men in his classification during the same month, whichever is less.

Hatch gangs must be ordered for work on the day before the employment is to start; and, under the collective bargaining agreement, notification to the men and to the Information Centers constitutes an order.

Regulations require hiring agents to go personally to Information Centers when extra gangs are required. The

Center manager knows the availability and identity of extra gangs in the area which are able to meet the requirements. Exchange of information between Centers makes it possible for an employer to draw on all available labor, and the longshoreman seeking work is not restricted to any one section of the port.

It is unlikely that the longshore industry will ever completely eliminate the use of casual labor. Absenteeism due to illness off the job, injury on the job, and vacations are circumstances which will always exist and which to some degree may be anticipated. Moreover, the very nature of the industry, depending as it does on tides, seasons and trade cycles, is such that fluctuation in demand for labor is normal.

In determining the proper relation between the size of the Longshoremen's Register and the number of men the port could sustain in daily employment, the Commission sought the views of both labor and industry. Neither would commit itself to an answer, and the Commission was left to arrive at an empirical solution. Statistics were scanty, based only on the results of the initial rounds of decasualization. Questions were posed, such as: "Will this process cut too deeply into the labor resources of the port?" Or, "Will this process cut deeply enough to protect the regular longshoreman from a surplus of labor, reducing him to a part-time employee?" Employers feared that the process would leave them without an adequate supply of labor. Daily studies of the Register and work loads indicated that there must be kept a margin of labor to compensate for those who retired, went into other kinds of work, or died.

With the emergence of statistics from each successive round, the answers to these questions become increasingly apparent. The figures below set forth the effect of decasualization on the total number of men possessing valid registra-

tions after the peak registration of May 22, 1955, just before the first round became effective:

		VALID REGIS- TRATIONS	NUMBER DECAS- UALIZED
Peak Registration	May 22, 1955	38,693	—
After 1st Decasualization	June 1, 1955	31,574	7,141
“ 2nd “	Oct. 27, 1955	27,284	5,115
“ 3rd “	Apr. 19, 1956	26,486	2,938
“ 4th “	Oct. 19, 1956	26,746	1,545
“ 5th “	May 3, 1957	28,928	1,695

These figures show a consistent decline in number of registrants through the first three rounds, a slight increase after the fourth round, and a somewhat larger increase after the fifth round of decasualization.

Statistics on the earnings of longshoremen, during the shipping industry's last fiscal year, which ended September 30, 1956, considered in relation to earnings for the last fiscal year before the decasualization program began, illustrate the improvement brought about by the introduction of decasualization and sound hiring regulations, as set forth in the following tabulations:

	1954	1956	Percentage of Increase or Decrease
Total Wages	\$75,675,580.58	\$100,114,899.92	+ 24%
% of Overtime	26.8%	29.4%	+ 10%
Over \$4,000	6,741 men	14,497 men	+ 115%
\$3,000-4,000	5,966 men	2,555 men	- 57%
Under \$3,000	20,844 men	7,543 men	- 63%
TOTALS	33,551 men	24,595 men	- 26%

Of the men earning over \$4,000, the breakdown is as follows:

Above \$7,000	67 men	1,474 men	+2,100%
\$6,000-7,000	275 men	2,992 men	+ 990%
\$5,000-6,000	1,523 men	5,419 men	+ 236%
\$4,000-5,000	4,876 men	4,612 men	- 5%

These figures in simple terms mean that 33,551 men divided a total payroll of \$75,675,580.58 in 1954 for an average of \$2,255.54, and that 24,595 men (8,856 fewer) divided a total payroll of \$100,114,899.92 in 1956 for an average of \$4,029.88, an improvement of \$1,774.34 a year per man.

LEGISLATION

In its annual report for the fiscal year ended 1956, the Commission reported that experience in enforcing the Compact during the three preceding years had indicated that additional legislation was necessary to achieve the purposes of the States in establishing controls over the waterfront industry. Detailed reasons were set forth in support of the proposed legislation, which included the following:

1. The establishment of higher qualifications for clerks, checkers and timekeepers.
2. The broadening of the definition of "longshoremen" to include other categories of waterfront employees, such as carpenters, coopers, sweepers, and maintenance men.
3. The designation of Commission personnel as peace officers in the States of New York and New Jersey.
4. The power to grant immunity to persons testifying under oath at Commission proceedings.
5. The power to deny license to an applicant refusing to answer questions relating to his qualifications for license or registration, including questions concerning loyalty.
6. The power to impose fines on a licensed stevedore for violations not serious enough to warrant outright revocation or suspension of his license.
7. The extension of the waterfront area in which loitering was prohibited by the Compact from the actual

dock or warehouse facility to the extent of the area within 500 feet of the pier and on vessels berthed at a pier.

In Governor Robert B. Meyner's special message of September 17, 1956 to the New Jersey Legislature, the Commission's proposals were outlined and the Governor urged adoption of the bill broadening the Commission's powers. When the New York State Legislature met in January, 1957, Governor Averell Harriman in a special message also urged passage of the proposed legislation. The District Attorneys of New York and Kings Counties, New York, the New York Board of Trade, the Commerce and Industry Association, and the Port of New York Authority all gave their hearty support to the Commission's proposals.

The amendments were adopted in New Jersey on December 28, 1956, and in New York on March 27, 1957. Provisions for granting police power to Commission investigators became effective upon executive approval in each state. Those amendments requiring extension of licensing and registration became effective on May 27, 1957.

REGISTRATION OF NEW CRAFTS AND CHECKERS

The Compact as originally drawn did not define longshoremen to include such waterfront occupations as carpenters, coopers, sweepers, maintenance men and grain ceilers, though all these workers have as ready access to the docks, and some of them more access to cargo, than do longshoremen. The Commission found that in a number of cases, men whose registration as longshoremen had been denied or revoked had secured employment in uncovered occupations on the very piers from which they had been excluded as longshoremen. In unregistered jobs, their presence on the piers was equally dangerous to the public peace and safety. To remedy this situation, the amendments to the

Compact enacted during the past fiscal year broadened the definition of the term "longshoreman." The crafts thus brought into the category of longshoremen included, but are not limited to, cargo repairmen, mechanical workers, coopers, carpenters, grain ceilers, and horse and cattle fitters.

Clerks and checkers, responsible for tallying cargo and accounting for incoming and outgoing shipments, have a strategic position on any dock. The security of waterborne freight depends on the honesty and vigilance of the checker or clerk whose duty it is to detect and report shortages and discrepancies. Investigation of pilferage has shown that in such cases there is often conspiracy between unscrupulous checkers, truck drivers and longshoremen. The timekeeper, too, is in a strategic position, as investigations of cases of payroll padding have disclosed. Clerks, checkers and timekeepers were originally registered as longshoremen. The recent amendments to the Compact included the positions of checkers, clerks and timekeepers in the Longshoremen's Register in a separate category and provided that the standards required for granting registration to them include demonstrated good character and integrity.

During the sixty-day period between the date the amendments became law and May 27, 1957, when they were to become effective, the Commission proceeded speedily to take action to implement them.

Within a few days after the amendments became law, all shipping and stevedoring companies were notified of the impending requirements. Provision was made for the processing of applications for registration from some 6,000 men. The requirements for registration were not confined to employees of steamship and stevedoring companies but covered personnel employed by marine carpenter, cargo repair, and marine maintenance companies.

Conferences were arranged with the employers and labor unions thus affected, including marine carpentry companies,

marine carpenter locals, cargo repair companies, the cooperative business, and general maintenance, mechanical and miscellaneous workers. Their problems were fully discussed with respect to developing procedures for validating and hiring personnel to be registered as longshoremen. Both management and labor participated fully in these conferences, and their cooperation was demonstrated by the efforts of both groups to complete registration and to impress the men concerned with the necessity for applying for registration by the effective date.

Temporary registrations, pending investigation of their applications, were granted to those in the newly covered crafts and in the new class of clerks, checkers and time-keepers.

Difficulties of interpretation, arising out of the employment of many persons in occupations on the periphery of those clearly outlined by the Compact, and questions raised by the fluidity of terminology used on the waterfront had to be resolved. In many instances the same job title was used to describe one type of employment for one company and a different type of employment for another company. The problem in each case was to determine whether the individual employee was engaged in employment covered by the law. In order to resolve the numerous problems confronting the Commission, a committee of specialists was organized. This committee, in considering each case, conferred with company representatives and Commission staff personnel from all divisions, and in some cases made individual job studies at the piers.

To assist in the task of processing applications and issuing registrations, in order that an adequate labor force in the affected categories would be available on the 27th of May, the Division of Employment Information Centers and Licensing called for volunteers from each of the other divisions of the Commission to work on an overtime basis. Like-

wise, the entire staff of Employment Information Centers and Licensing was scheduled for overtime work.

During the two months intervening between the final signing of the amendments to the Compact and the effective date of May 27, temporary registrations were issued to 4,003 checkers and 2,345 temporary longshoremen's registrations were issued to craftsmen. As a result of careful planning, there was no confusion or disruption in the shipping industry on the effective date. Not a single qualified applicant for a checker's or a longshoreman's registration lost a day of employment because of failure by the Commission to process applications and issue registrations.

PORT WATCHMEN

The problem of the security of waterfront facilities and cargo against theft, fire and crime is one of the most vexatious facing the Port. Piers are private property or, if publicly owned, are leased to private interests. Responsibility for policing the piers is that of the owners or lessees, who contract for the services of port watchmen.

In its Annual Report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956, the Commission dealt at length with this problem and reported that it was in process of revising the requirements for physical and mental fitness of the men it licensed as port watchmen.

Such revised standards of physical and mental fitness were adopted by amendments to the regulations which became effective as of December 1, 1956, when all licenses theretofore issued expired.

The new regulations recognized the equity of those who had been working as port watchmen and therefore distinguished between persons who had held licenses or temporary permits as port watchmen prior to December 1, 1956, and those who sought licenses for the first time after December

1, 1956. New applicants had to be between the ages of 21 and 55 years, had to meet the standards of physical and mental fitness detailed in the regulations, and could not continue to act as port watchmen after attaining the age of 65. The regulations do not permit a waiver of any of these requirements in the case of new applicants.

Renewal applicants, that is, persons who had held licenses or temporary permits as port watchmen prior to December 1, 1956, had to be between the ages of 21 and 65 and had to meet the standards of physical and mental fitness set forth in the regulations, unless an order waiving a specific ground of ineligibility was obtained from the Commission.

To insure uniformity, the regulations required that examinations of the applicants be made by physicians retained by the Commission. With the cooperation of the New York County Medical Society, and St. Vincent's Hospital, facilities were made available.

Under the regulations, the Commission may grant an order waiving ineligibility in the case of renewal applicants if the petitioner's employers join in the request and if it appears that the petitioner has been employed for a minimum of 700 hours during the preceding year, that his employment will be continued, that his services as a port watchman have been satisfactory in every way, that petitioner is physically and mentally capable of carrying out the duties assigned him as a port watchman, that the purpose of the Compact would thereby be furthered, and that the petitioner is not more than 70 years of age. Further, the regulations permit waiver of ineligibility by reason of renewal applicant's being over 70 years of age, if, in addition to meeting the other requirements for a waiver, it appears that the petitioner has an equity in a bona fide pension plan for port watchmen and that a termination of his license would result in undue impairment of his pension rights. With that exception, licenses of port watchmen expire when they reach the age of 70 years.

By the end of the present fiscal year, 2,401 physical examinations had been given. These and the information furnished by the applicants disclosed that some 1,062 did not meet the age, physical and mental standards of the regulations. It is of interest to note that in approximately 225 cases the examining physicians recommended that the applicants secure further attention from their personal physicians for correction and treatment of conditions discovered during examination. In each case, with the applicant's consent, the Commission forwarded the result of the examination to the applicant's own physician, who then advised his patient of the nature of the defect and the treatment required. These physical defects included ocular and auricular deficiencies, cancer, hernia, hemorrhoids, varicose veins, tuberculosis, coronary diseases, and neurological ailments.

Petitions for waivers of ineligibility by reason of physical defects, age or illiterateness were requested by 1,012 renewal applicants. Where employers did not join in the petition or where the application showed that the applicant had not been employed for at least 700 hours in the preceding year, regulations do not permit a waiver and the applications were automatically denied. The remaining cases were given thorough reviews in an attempt to see that justice was done to the individuals concerned and to the public. As of June 30, 1957, the Commission had granted 442 orders waiving ineligibility for physical defects, age or illiterateness; and 570 applications for waivers were still pending.

The new regulations require that before a permanent license is issued to a new applicant, he must satisfactorily complete a course of training for port watchmen which has been approved by the Commission. Such course must be completed within one year after the temporary permit is issued to the new applicant or else no further temporary permit will issue to him.

These new regulations recognize that the duties of a pier guard are essentially similar to those of a policeman or fireman and that an effective police or fire service demands men who are alert and physically able to meet any emergency that may arise on the property they patrol, and who have been trained to do the job they are supposed to do.

Further, the Commission has sought to insure that the port watchman is respected by other personnel on the piers. Crime Commission reports had revealed that many port watchmen were ineffectual because they were intimidated by the dock workers on their piers. Such intimidation is not now countenanced; witness three cases during the past year involving assaults upon port watchmen, in which appropriate disciplinary action was taken by the Commission against the offenders.

The security of property and cargo has always been a major problem in the port. The cost in salaries of port watchmen alone is \$8,000,000 annually. There has been some improvement during the past year in the watching service, some of it resulting from the impact of the new regulations, although not enough time has yet elapsed to evaluate fully their effect.

Nevertheless, it is apparent that the new regulations will result in an improvement over the haphazard situation of the past and will produce a more efficient force of port watchmen — and may require the industry to consider whether its present wage scale is sufficient to attract the needed calibre of men. But the regulations are not the final answer to this important and complicated problem.

Continued study will be necessary before a fully effective solution can be found. There have been a number of suggestions from within the Commission, from the steamship industry and from other sources as to how best to organize an effective security force that would provide the protection

for which the industry is spending so much money. Among these is a proposal that the New York Shipping Association set up a single unified port watchman organization under professional supervision, similar to those existing in the case of railroad police.

The merits of this proposal, as well as the merits of other suggestions which have been made from time to time, are under study. The Commission is considering the desirability of convening a public hearing on the problems of port security, at which the opinions of those expert in the field may be developed.

ENFORCEMENT OF THE COMPACT

One of the principal objectives of the Waterfront Commission Compact is the restoration of respect for law and order on the New York-New Jersey waterfront. To accomplish this, the Commission has been given broad disciplinary powers. It is empowered to suspend or revoke any license or registration, to conduct investigations and issue subpoenae; its designated officers and agents have full and free access to all vessels, piers, and other waterfront terminals. Its investigators have been vested with the powers of peace officers in the States of New York and New Jersey. The Division of Investigation and the Division of Law and Enforcement are the two instruments through which the Commission works to accomplish this objective of the Compact.

In the Division of Investigation the Commission employs fifty-one experienced investigators. During the fiscal year it has carried out numerous investigations of applicants for licenses or registration, and gathered evidence for use in Commission proceedings. It has investigated pilferage, baggage shakedowns, hiring violations, public loading, and other violations of the Compact. Recently, because of the newly granted peace officer powers, all Commission investigators

were given a special refresher course of instruction on the principles of arrest in the States of New York and New Jersey. Through the courtesy of the Police Commissioner of the City of New York, Stephen P. Kennedy, arrangements were made for that course to be given at the New York City Police Academy. Members of the Academy staff and a representative of the New Jersey State Police acted as instructors. Every investigator is required to submit to a physical examination prescribed by the Commission.

The Division of Law and Enforcement, during the year, received from other law enforcement agencies 673 reports of arrests of persons licensed or registered by the Commission. In active status were 323 cases; 139 of these were ordered for public hearing by the Commission. The remaining 350 concerned registrants whose names, for one reason or another, had been removed from the Longshoremen's Register and were no longer under the jurisdiction of the Waterfront Commission. In addition to conducting these investigations, the staff of the Division presented evidence at 379 hearings involving applications or revocations of licenses or registrations and kindred matters.

Kickbacks

The vicious practice of paying kickbacks—tribute for the right to work—in years past was so common as to be accepted without protest in certain areas of the port. Corrupt hiring agents and union officials perpetuated this system of controlling labor. Jobs went only to those men who were willing to pay for them. That instances of this practice still exist under other guises is indicated by the following cases uncovered by the Commission during the past year which underscore the necessity for constant vigilance in this area.

The hatch boss of an extra gang, himself a waterfront worker for forty years, was found to have extorted money

from his gang members for a period of eight years. Payments were made more or less regularly in sums of from one to ten dollars; and when individual longshoremen refused or were unable to make payments, they were dropped from the gang. The hatch boss sometimes disguised his demands for money by distributing envelopes to his subordinates, requesting them to return the envelopes together with a contribution for his church. On other occasions he demanded payment on the pretense that the money was used to pay telephone expenses incurred by him in notifying the men for work. One longshoreman testified that in order to keep his job, he had to chauffeur the hatch boss between Harlem and Brooklyn at a cost to himself of approximately nine dollars per week. The respondent paid nothing toward the automobile operating expenses, but demanded no cash in tribute for giving longshore work to the driver. However, when the driver discontinued the taxi service, he was dropped from the hatch gang. Testimony clearly indicated that the hatch boss had for years systematically exacted money from longshoremen under his supervision by threatening that they would be deprived of work if they did not pay. The Commission ordered his name removed from the Longshoremen's Register.

In another case, a hiring agent at a sugar pier in Yonkers let it be known that the only way to secure regular employment on his pier was by kicking back wages to him. Evidence gathered by the Commission staff established that for nearly ten years longshoremen and warehousemen at that pier had paid kickbacks in varying amounts of from five to ten dollars. In one instance, the kickback took the form of providing entertainment for the hiring agent and his guests. In lieu of paying cash, a longshoreman was required to play host at several parties, at considerable expense to himself, in order to retain employment. A hearing into this matter was ordered by the Commission to determine whether the hiring agent's license should be continued or revoked.

Over twenty-five witnesses were produced, and 1,500 pages of testimony were taken. At the conclusion of the hearing, the Commission ordered the revocation of the hiring agent's license and his removal from longshore employment.

Phantoms

During the past year the Commission has also uncovered instances of a racket once common in which "phantoms" were carried on payrolls, thus defrauding the employer who paid wages to these phantoms although they had done no work. Illustrative of these cases is the following:

A Commission investigator, inspecting the payroll of a stevedoring firm, discovered that a person not actually employed by the firm was being paid regularly as a longshoreman. Further investigation revealed that the man was employed in a factory located in another community, but that he had registered as a longshoreman, and—through the connivance of his father-in-law and two timekeepers—had been receiving pay checks from the stevedore totalling over \$9,000 during a period of nearly three years although he had never performed a day's work at the pier. The pay checks were cashed by the phantom, who kept one-third for himself and returned the balance to his father-in-law for delivery to the two confederates, the timekeepers. Evidence gathered by the Commission was turned over to the District Attorney of Kings County; the longshoreman and the timekeepers, whose registrations were suspended by the Commission, were indicted. Two have admitted their complicity in the matter, and all are awaiting trial.

The key to the solution of this case was the Commission's records of validated employment, on which the daily employment of every registered longshoreman is recorded. These, when checked against the timekeepers' falsified entries, established the fact that the phantom was being paid for work he never performed.

The Commission is presently engaged in another investigation concerning payroll padding on the North River. Comparison of employment records of the pier operator and of the Waterfront Commission indicates that fifty-six longshoremen who did not actually work on the pier were credited with, but did not receive, wages totalling approximately \$7,200 which they had not earned. The identity of the persons who did collect the wages is still unestablished. Investigation continues in this case.

Pilferage

Pilferage on the docks appears to have diminished in recent years, but the need for constant watchfulness remains. Charges were found proven in forty-one of the pilferage cases which came before the Commission in the past twelve months. Thirty-eight involved longshoremen who, depending on the gravity of the individual case and past record of offenses, have suffered revocation of their registrations or suspension from the Register for periods ranging from ten days to six months. Three of these cases involved port watchmen, and their licenses were revoked.

The cost of pilferage is borne by the general public. The carrier pays increased insurance premiums, the importer and exporter suffer loss of business, and the consumer pays increased commodity prices. The Commission has dealt severely with these cases in its drive to make pilferage unprofitable.

Pilferers usually work alone and take only what they can carry, though some contrive ingenious devices for removing their loot. One, in fact, had re-designed the interior of his automobile from trunk to hood to accommodate lengths of lumber with the minimum likelihood of detection. Occasional bottles of whiskey or wine, hats, a carton of chewing gum, a mechanical mixing machine, a cigarette lighter, are easy to conceal; they are usually for the thief's

own use. Stealing dresses and woolen sweaters in lots of five and thirty or more, coffee in sacks weighing 132 pounds, and cases of whiskey or other goods requires more elaborate organization, with or without the connivance of others, and the purpose is usually re-sale. But whether the articles stolen are for home use or for re-sale, pilferage remains a serious drain on the business of the port.

On April 11, 1957, five longshoremen, all members of the same gang, were apprehended by U. S. Customs agents at 4:30 A.M., each carrying a case of whiskey from a North River pier at which whiskey shipments normally arrive from the United Kingdom. One of the five men was scheduled on the following day to be suspended from the Longshoremen's Register for a period of six months in consequence of a prior pilferage from cargo. Investigation revealed that there had been other larcenies committed at the pier in question, many of them when the gang that included the thieves was working. The Commission ordered the immediate suspension of the five accomplices pending determination of their cases.

Loansharking

A longshoreman who does not work regularly, or who is in serious financial trouble, has difficulty in obtaining loans from recognized lending institutions and is an easy prey for the "6 for 5 boys" who lend money at twenty per cent interest per week or more. Pitiful is the situation of the longshoreman who has become enslaved by a loanshark and is unable to free himself from financial bondage. And, grave as the presence of a loanshark is, the situation becomes even more serious when the usurer is a person in authority, such as a hiring agent who determines which men shall be employed. Such a man either hires unqualified persons to make sure that they receive money in order to pay

him his tribute, or he makes borrowing a prerequisite to being hired.

The most notable of loansharking cases developed during the year arose from an investigation of an application for a hiring agent's license. The would-be hiring agent was revealed to have banked far more money than he could have earned on the piers, having deposited more than \$65,000 in some fifteen banks in New York and New Jersey. Investigation over a period of months showed that he was doing a large-scale loanshark business with longshoremen employed on his pier and, through contacts in the underworld, was lending money to big-time gamblers. The New York City Police Department, the District Attorney of New York County, the Prosecutor of Bergen County, New Jersey, and the Waterfront Commission jointly investigated all the activities of this hiring agent and his confederates. When summoned to the District Attorney's office in New York and confronted with the evidence, they confessed their loansharking operations. They were indicted by the Grand Jury, pleaded guilty to the charges, and are presently awaiting sentence. The Commission suspended the license of the hiring agent.

Baggage Shakedown

The luxury liner piers on the upper North River were for many years rich in opportunity for exacting money from passengers arriving in the United States. Travelers in haste to get on with their journeys to distant places in the country and those unfamiliar with the language and customs of the country were easy victims for baggage porters. Crude and abusive treatment to the point of intimidation was used to "shake down", or exact fat tips, from these hapless people. Sometimes the tips demanded were so large that they were in effect ransom for baggage.

On many occasions passengers complained that their luggage was not delivered to the transfer agent designated, but rather was turned over to an agent, not of their choosing and unknown to them, doing business near the pier.

The Commission assigns investigators to all arriving and departing passenger ships and stands ready at all times to investigate complaints from passengers who feel that they have been abused. Hearings rising out of these complaints have resulted in a number of disciplinary actions by the Commission, and such reprehensible practices have diminished. Although the steamship companies display signs on piers informing passengers that tipping is not required, such signs do not fulfill their obligation to protect passengers against gouging. The knowledge that the Commission is constantly alert to the possibility of pressure on passengers and the presence of Commission investigators at debarkation of incoming vessels have contributed much to discourage the shakedown artist.

Hiring Violations

The Commission is charged by the Compact to eliminate oppressive and evil hiring practices which affect longshoremen and waterborne commerce in the Port of New York. Accordingly, regulations were established for the selection of hiring agents and the hiring of longshoremen so as to insure the free choice of personnel by the employer. Infractions of these regulations have been investigated, and hearings ordered when appropriate. Where it was shown that there had been a deliberate attempt to violate regulations, the Commission suspended or revoked registrations and licenses or took other disciplinary action.

In one case, it was disclosed that a stevedoring company had applied for hiring agents' licenses for three persons who

were actually selected by union representatives. Although Commission regulations required that a hiring agent be freely selected by the employer, without unauthorized participation or interference of others, the company had never seen or talked with the applicants until the moment their applications were filed. These three hiring agents then hired longshoremen, who were actually designated by union delegates. Evidence revealed that lists had been submitted to the hiring agents, and that they in turn had chosen persons whose identities, capabilities and characters they did not know.

The Commission denied the stevedore's applications for licenses for the three hiring agents and imposed a reprimand on the stevedore. The opinion of the Commission in this matter stated that the suspension of the stevedore's license would result in destruction of the company and closing of the pier, causing loss of employment to many people. It was felt that such a severe penalty was not warranted. The opinion concluded that a more appropriate discipline would have been the imposition of a monetary penalty in lieu of suspension of license, a power which the Commission did not have at that time. This case pointed up the need for such power, which was later granted by the Legislatures of New York and New Jersey by way of amendment to the Compact.

Subversion

Any indication of a subversive background of an applicant for license or registration is thoroughly investigated. Two members of the Commission staff—one an assistant counsel, the other an investigator—are detailed to investigate all matters of possible subversion as well as applications of persons suspected of subversive activities.

In one such case, an applicant for registration as a longshoreman was revealed to be president of a Russian lan-

guage daily newspaper and an active participant for sixteen years in various organizations and political parties with the knowledge that they advocated the overthrow of the government by force. He was an officer of at least two of these organizations and participated fully in their activities. After a hearing on February 1, 1957, the Commission determined that the applicant was a member of subversive organizations advocating the overthrow of the government by force and denied his application for registration as a longshoreman.

In another case, an applicant for the renewal of his temporary registration refused to answer 100 questions concerning his association with subversive organizations. He likewise refused to state whether or not he knowingly or willfully advocated the desirability of overthrowing or destroying the government of the United States by force. Since he refused to give the information necessary for completing his application, his name was removed from the Longshoremen's Register.

Loitering

The extension of the prohibition on loitering to an area of within 500 feet of a pier or waterfront terminal has had a marked effect upon the habits of known waterfront racketeers. Characters who had been barred from the docks but continued to frequent the immediate vicinity have since the enactment of the 500 foot prohibition been noticeably absent.

The accomplishments of the Division of Investigation and of the Division of Law and Enforcement cannot be fully evaluated or appreciated by merely citing cases and showing the number of disciplinary proceedings undertaken by the Commission. As in all fields of law enforcement, prevention of violations of the law is more important than detection of violations after they have occurred; and the results of

such preventive activities are not measurable on a graph. Small as the Commission's investigative staff may be, its presence on the piers and at waterfront terminals daily, including Saturdays, Sundays, holidays, and nights, has had a deterrent effect on those who would violate the law. Moreover, it is evident that many an incipient racket has been broken up as a result of prompt summoning and questioning of suspects by the Division of Law and Enforcement, even in cases where well-grounded suspicions of violations were not supported by sufficient legal evidence to warrant prosecution.

LITIGATION

Since its inception the Commission has been a party to over forty lawsuits challenging the validity of the Compact or the Commission's activities. In all these cases the Commission has been upheld. During the past year there were seven such actions which are of interest.

Constitutionality

Two cases involved challenges to the constitutionality of provisions of the Waterfront Commission Act.

The I.L.A. objected to Section 8 of the Act, which had been invoked to oust an international organizer of the union who had a recent federal felony conviction involving the federal tax laws. The I.L.A. claimed that the section as a whole was unconstitutional and, further, that it did not apply either to an agent of the international or to such a federal felony. The court overruled these contentions and sustained the Commission's position in *I.L.A. et al. v. Hogan and Waterfront Commission*, 156 N.Y.S. 2d 512 (Sup. Ct., N.Y. Co., 1956).

A group of port watchmen attacked the Commission's new regulations fixing age and physical standards and requiring an examination by physicians retained by the Commission, asserting that they involved an unconstitutional search of

the person and were not reasonably related to the duties of port watchmen. The court decided in favor of the Commission in *O'Connor et al. v. Waterfront Commission*, Docket No. 1198 N.Y.L.J., May 31, 1957, p. 7, col. 3 (Sup. Ct., N.Y. Co., 1957).

Review of Discretion

In two cases, Commission decisions disciplining longshoremen were sustained.

The Commission had revoked the registration of a longshoreman who, in addition to an earlier conviction for extortion, was found to have taken a passenger's baggage while acting as a baggage porter, and to have attempted to "steer" it to a particular transfer agency against the passenger's instructions, and later to have lied under oath about the incident. The decision of the Commission was sustained by the court. [*Matter of Archer v. Waterfront Commission*, 160 N.Y.S. 2d 614 (App. Div., 1st Dept., 1957), leave to appeal denied, N.Y.L.J., April 15, 1957, p. 5, col. 4.]

The Commission's suspension of a longshoreman's registration for six months for a second policy conviction was challenged as giving an ex post facto effect to the second conviction. This suit was promptly dismissed by the court. [*Piazza v. McGrath*, N.Y.L.J., February 25, 1957, p. 11, col. 4 (Sup. Ct., Kings Co., 1957).]

Commission Regulations

In one case an attempt was made to limit the scope of the Commission's regulatory power.

The longshoreman who had been removed from the register for misconduct while working as a baggage porter sought, in a separate action, to set aside the Commission's regulation classifying baggage porters as longshoremen on the ground that the Compact described a longshoreman as

one who moves freight, not baggage. This contention was rejected by the court and the Commission's interpretation upheld. [*Archer v. Waterfront Commission*, 155 N.Y.S. 2d 694 (Sup. Ct., N.Y. Co., 1956), affd. 160 N.Y.S. 2d 623 (App. Div., 1st Dept., 1957).] It may be noted that the recent amendments to the Compact specifically included baggage in the definition of waterborne freight.

Subpoena Power

Two lawsuits involved the Commission's subpoena power. After the general organizer for the I.L.A.-Ind. refused to answer questions in a Commission investigation to ascertain whether the Commission should deny certain applications for hiring agents' licenses, on the ground that union officials had unlawfully participated in the selection of the hiring agents, the Commission made a motion in court to punish him for contempt. His defense was that the questions sought to pry into collective bargaining discussions and thus exceeded the Commission's authority and amounted to a violation of a privilege against disclosure of such talks. The court rejected this defense and fined the general organizer \$250. [*Matter of Waterfront Commission v. Gleason*, Docket No. 9726, N.Y.L.J., September 17, 1956, p. 6, col. 5 (Sup. Ct., N.Y. Co., 1956).]

A witness in New Jersey who refused to come to New York to answer questions in an inquiry into whether there had been a usurpation of the hiring function by another union officer was likewise cited for contempt and found guilty. [*Matter of Waterfront Commission v. Loori*, Docket No. 2455 (Super. Ct., Monmouth Co., N.J., 1956).]

Miscellaneous

In two cases the Commission lent its aid to prosecutors who were involved in litigation. One case involved another challenge to Section 8 brought in Staten Island. The sole

new point was that the union officer's conviction resulted in a suspended rather than a jail sentence. The other, in Brooklyn, sought dismissal of an indictment which included a misdemeanor charge against three union officials who, in violation of Commission regulations, had allegedly sought to interfere in the hiring of longshoremen. In each case the court sustained the Commission's contentions.

COOPERATION WITH OTHER LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

The Commission greatly appreciates the substantial assistance it has received, in New York from the Police Department of New York City (particularly the Bureau of Criminal Identification, the Bureau of Special Services and the Riverfront Squads of Manhattan and Brooklyn), the District Attorneys of New York and Kings Counties, the U. S. Attorneys for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York, the U. S. Treasury Department, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization, the National Labor Relations Board, the New York State Police, the Department of Correction of the State of New York, the New York State Division of Parole; and, in New Jersey, from the Attorney General, the New Jersey State Police, The County Prosecutors in Bergen, Essex, Hudson and Monmouth Counties, the U. S. Attorney for the District of New Jersey, the New Jersey Law Enforcement Council, the Police Departments of the Cities of Hoboken, Jersey City and Newark; and, the Chiefs of Police of cities in Puerto Rico.

The Commission has accumulated, over the few years of its existence, a fund of information which is of value not only to itself but to all law enforcement agencies. This information is made available to such agencies as requested, from day to day, to assist them in their own work.

The Commission has brought to the attention of the appropriate prosecutors evidence which it obtained of violations

of the criminal law. Included were cases in which persons convicted of felonies were acting as officers or agents of the longshoremen's union or its locals. Under Section VIII of the Waterfront Commission Act, it is a misdemeanor to collect or receive dues on behalf of a union which has such a person as an officer or agent.

Officials of governmental agencies, both foreign and domestic, have requested and received information concerning waterfront problems and the organization and functioning of the Commission. Among visitors who have been received at the Commission during the past year were various officials of foreign governments and representatives of labor and industry from abroad. Among these were officials of the Indonesian and Burmese governments, a party of labor union leaders from Brazil, and the Chairman of the Australian Stevedoring Industry Authority.

ADMINISTRATION

The Commission operates on a fiscal year commencing July 1 and ending June 30. Its revenues are derived from an assessment upon employers of persons registered and licensed under the Compact, computed upon the gross payroll payments made by such employers to such registered or licensed personnel.

On May 7, 1956, the Commission adopted a budget of expenses amounting to \$1,984,093 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957. Based on the estimated assessable payroll of \$125,000,000 for the year, the rate of assessment was fixed at one and one-half per cent.

In December, 1956, a review of the Commission's financial condition showed that a reduction in the rate of assessment was feasible and accordingly, the rate was reduced to one and one-fourth per cent for the last three quarters of the fiscal year.

On May 7, 1957, the Commission adopted a budget of expenses amounting to \$2,105,074 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958. Prior to the adoption of this budget and as required by the Compact, a meeting was held with representatives of the New York Shipping Association, representing the employers. No objection was raised to the proposed budget.

After review by the budget staffs of the States of New York and New Jersey, the budget was approved by the Governors of both states.

The estimated assessable payroll for the fiscal year 1957-58 amounts to \$150,000,000. The increase in the estimate over that of the preceding year is due to increased wage scales as well as to the registration of a number of additional waterfront workers brought about by the 1957 amendments to the Compact.

The expense budget for 1957-58 shows an increase of \$120,981 over the budget for 1956-57. Of this increase, \$93,859 is in Personal Service and is principally due to an increase of five per cent in salaries given to all employees earning less than \$10,000 a year and to increments occasioned by the salary schedule adopted in March, 1956. The rate of assessment for the ensuing year has been fixed at one and-fourth per cent.

A statement of the receipts and disbursements for this year, together with a report of the independent auditors, forms a part of this report.

During the past year, at the request of the Commission, experts from the Budget Bureau of the State of New York have made surveys of the Investigation Division, the Division of Law and Enforcement, and the filing section of the Licensing Division. Similar surveys of the operations of the Managing Clerk's office and the office of the Secretary were made

by members of the Commission's staff. As a result of the surveys, organizational changes have been made to simplify the flow of work in the Division of Law and Enforcement, to eliminate duplication of effort between the offices of the Managing Clerk and the Secretary, to streamline the filing activities in the Licensing Division and to provide for the increased volume of filing which will be occasioned by the recent amendments to the Compact. New equipment is being installed to make possible more filing space without an increase in floor space. These improvements in internal organization and operations will increase efficiency during the coming year.

Respectfully submitted,

HAROLD KOLOVSKY

CARL J. RUBINO

Commissioners

PRICE WATERHOUSE & Co.

56 PINE STREET
NEW YORK 5

July 17, 1957..

Waterfront Commission of New York Harbor
New York, New York

We have made an examination of the appended statement of cash receipts and disbursements of the Waterfront Commission of New York Harbor for the year ended June 30, 1957.

Our examination comprised such tests of the accounting records and such other auditing procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances, including (1) reconciliation of cash in banks as shown by the books with balances reported direct to us by the depositaries; (2) a count of cash on hand; (3) appropriate tests of disbursements through examination of canceled checks, invoices, contracts, leases and other supporting data; (4) test confirmation with employers of persons registered or licensed by the Commission as to the amount of assessments paid to the Commission and (5) comparison of cash receipts as recorded in the cashbook with related deposit totals appearing on bank statements for a selected period.

In our opinion, the appended statement sets forth fairly the cash receipts and disbursements of the Waterfront Commission of New York Harbor for the year ended June 30, 1957.

PRICE WATERHOUSE & Co.

WATERFRONT COMMISSION OF NEW YORK HARBOR

Statement of Cash Receipts and Disbursements for the Year ended June 30, 1957

RECEIPTS:

Assessments on employers of persons registered or licensed by the Commission.....	\$1,858,116.55
Interest received on United States Treasury Bills....	8,650.72
Deposits on badges issued to watchmen (net)	477.00
	1,867,244.27

DISBURSEMENTS:—

Salaries	\$1,429,162.04
Rentals	180,073.12
Retirement and group insurance.....	52,417.80
Special supplies and expenses.....	42,531.04
Telephone, telegraph and postage.....	37,741.95
Traveling expenses	35,903.40
General office supplies and expenses	27,183.85
Printing and advertising	20,437.64
Repairs and maintenance	15,034.92
Overtime meal allowances	13,552.38
Furniture, fixtures and equipment.....	11,502.63
Insurance	9,188.44
Leasehold alterations	8,476.50
Light and power	7,278.31
Legal and consultant fees, etc.....	7,200.00
	1,897,684.02

Excess of disbursements over receipts for the year	(30,439.75)
--	-------------

Cash balance, June 30, 1956.....	158,018.61
----------------------------------	------------

U. S. Treasury Bills, at cost, June 30, 1956.....	248,288.00
---	------------

Excess of receipts over disbursements to June 30, 1957, represented by balances as below.....	\$ 375,866.86
---	---------------

Cash	\$ 23,846.86
------------	--------------

U. S. Treasury Bills, at cost....	347,397.00
-----------------------------------	------------

	371,243.86
--	------------

Special badge deposit account	4,623.00
-------------------------------------	----------

	\$ 375,866.86
--	---------------

**THE WATERFRONT COMMISSION OF
NEW YORK HARBOR**

HAROLD KOLOVSKY CARL J. RUBINO
Commissioner for New Jersey *Commissioner for New York*

MICHAEL J. MURPHY
Executive Director

IRVING SLONIM
General Counsel

WILLIAM P. SIRIGNANO
Director of Law and Enforcement

PERCY A. MILLER, JR.
Director, Employment Information Centers and Licensing

PAUL A. ALFIERI
Director of Investigation

HYMAN S. LIPMAN
Director of Administration

ERWIN W. SMITH
Director of Public Relations

GEORGE A. MERRILL, JR.
Secretary to the Commission



