

economic revolution in history, brought about by the expanding knowledge from research in every field of endeavor. And the urge to explore the unknown is its stimulus.

A comedian has suggested a possible means of securing all-out public support for Project Apollo. He would put all the women on the Moon and leave the men on Earth. Then, he says, think how busy everybody would be building Moon rockets. And it would solve the unemployment problem.

Project Apollo is a serious, scientific undertaking. It is not an adventurous race to the Moon for dramatic propaganda purposes, although it will be crammed with adventure and drama such as we have never before witnessed. And there will be undeniable beneficial prestige effects when we demonstrate our ability to accomplish lunar exploration. It will reflect the heights which science and technology can reach in a society of free men.

But remember—Project Apollo is only a stepping stone in the effort to expand human knowledge of phenomena in Earth's atmosphere and in space. Beyond the Moon the planets beckon. Will we find life on Venus or Mars? What kind of life will it be? If we should meet with other creatures on another planet, let us hope that they will find us socially acceptable, understanding, tolerant—anything but delicious.

There are many unknowns in space, and many hazards. We are not even certain at this time about the surface of the Moon. Some scientists say it may consist of a coral reef-like structure, similar to cobwebs piled one on another to give it a porous, fairy castle appearance. Others fear that the dust may be so deep that it will swallow anything that lands there. Others say that the dust may be electrostatically charged, and will sweep out to meet the spacecraft, covering it like a cocoon. High-speed meteoroids may puncture the spacecraft, and heavy atomic particles from a solar flare could give the astronauts an excessive dose of radiation unless they are protected by appropriate shielding.

Whether these things are true or not remains to be seen. In spite of the hazards, I believe we can make it.

Whenever I need a bolstering of faith, I try to imagine the conditions at the time Wilbur

Wright climbed into his tiny plane with bicycle wheels at Kitty Hawk, N.C. A horse was considered suitable transportation at that time. What would he have thought if I had walked up to him and said: "You are opening a new era for man today. Fifty years from now a jet pilot will take off from New York in a giant mechanical bug and cross the Atlantic at 600 miles an hour over a raging storm with 100 helpless men, women, and children aboard. Yet they will ride in air-conditioned comfort, with steak, television, and beautiful stewardesses to ease the rigors of the trip." He would not have believed me.

The predictions we are making today of things to come may sound impossible—but they are just as realistic.

Why should we explore space?

First and foremost, man has always explored space. Even before he could read and write he was exploring the world about him, migrating across continents. Later he penetrated the depths of the jungles, climbed the great mountains, and fought his way through Antarctic blizzards to the South Pole. He built devices to explore the subminiature world, then theorized on what was too small to examine even with the most powerful of microscopes. He built larger and larger telescopes to penetrate the universe, and again theorized on that which was beyond his reach. In short, man was born with an insatiable curiosity to learn more about himself and the universe about him. He has always been an explorer, and he always will be.

Second, Sputnik I demonstrated that international preeminence in science and technology is synchronous in the eyes of the world with preeminence in space flight. This identification, whether well founded or not, is a fact that we dare not ignore. The prestige value alone of demonstrating America's technological and financial capability for manned lunar exploration is by no means something to be taken lightly.

Third, our national security demands that we insure that no hostile force will be permitted to use space as an unchallenged avenue of aggression against us. It is impossible to predict now what the military significance of peace will be. That space has

a military significance is amply demonstrated by the intercontinental ballistic missile, which must travel through space to reach its target. What we need now is the general NASA program to accumulate a body of knowledge, and to make the United States a spacefaring nation.

Fourth, the scientific knowledge gained from our space program will offer vast returns right here on earth for years to come. Scientific discoveries advance technology, and improved technology spurs the economy. New products are born, and jobs are created. As one observer put it, "We don't spend the money on the moon, you know; we spend it right here in the United States."

There are other indirect and intangible benefits of space exploration. Not the least of these is its stimulus to education. Space is fascinating to young minds. The space effort's use of practically all the scientific disciplines encourages their study and demands improved curricula and better teachers.

I hope that you share my conviction that we must sail on and on over this new ocean, and that you are eager to explore the mysteries about us. I hope that there is not a caterpillar among you.

DR. VON BRAUN WELCOMES CHOICE

The Charleston Chamber of Commerce has scored a small triumph in obtaining the service of Wernher von Braun tonight as speaker at its annual banquet.

In an age that is being profoundly altered by science and technology, Dr. von Braun is a towering figure. Through a combination of accomplishments and personal experience, his name is familiar to those who are otherwise oblivious to the impact the technological revolution is having on their world and their lives.

By choosing him as a speaker, the chamber has stressed the importance it places not only on his work but on the work of the countless scientists-technicians he has come to symbolize. In doing so, it is to be congratulated.

In accepting the chamber's invitation, Dr. von Braun is recognizing the responsibility of the scientists to share his knowledge and ideas. And, for a man who goes around with his mind in the clouds, he has an abundance of each.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 27, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, DD., offered the following prayer:

Judges 18: 5: *Ask counsel of God, that we may know whether our way, which we go, shall be prosperous.*

Eternal and ever-blessed God, today we are praying especially for Thy grace and favor upon Lyndon B. Johnson, who now occupies the exalted office of the Presidency of these United States.

Burdened with tremendous tasks and responsibilities, may he be blessed with those capacities and abilities which will enable him to help solve our many national and international problems.

Believing that all greatness and power begin with faith and humility, may he daily cultivate a great faith and walk humbly with the Lord and keep in step with Thine eternal will and purpose.

Grant that his wisdom and sound judgment may inspire our beloved country to reach the proportions of lofty moral and

spiritual idealism and leadership among the nations.

Although we are bending all our energies to shelter our Republic from the assaults of external enemies, may we realize more fully how absolutely necessary it is to guard our country against the temptation to allow the violent hands of irreligion and paganism, materialism and immorality, to lay hold upon us and undermine our character and corrupt our very soul, as a God-fearing people.

May we all have a glorious part in helping the President, our Speaker, and the Congress to steer the ship of state into deeper and wider and grander channels.

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

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced

that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3190. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901, relating to devises and bequests by will;

H.R. 3191. An act to exempt life insurance companies from the act of February 4, 1913, regulating loaning of money on securities in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 7497. An act to amend the Life Insurance Act for the District of Columbia relating to annual statements and for other purposes; and

H. Con. Res. 238. Concurrent resolution establishing that the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on November 27, 1963, at 12:30 o'clock postmeridian.

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

H.R. 5338. An act to enact the Uniform Commercial Code for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following

titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1024. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to pay relocation costs made necessary by actions of the District of Columbia government, and for other purposes;

S. 1406. An act to authorize the establishment of a Junior College Division within the District of Columbia Teachers College, and for other purposes;

S. 1533. An act to amend the act of July 24, 1956, granting a franchise to D.C. Transit System, Inc.;

S. 1540. An act to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the regulation of rates and practices of air carriers and foreign air carriers in foreign air transportation, and for other purposes; and

S. 1964. An act to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, to increase the fee charges for learners' permits.

THE HONORABLE ALBERT W. JOHNSON

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

HARRISBURG, PA., November 26, 1963.
The Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

The returns received in my office clearly show that Hon. ALBERT W. JOHNSON has been duly elected to be Representative in Congress from the 23d Congressional District of Pennsylvania.

The sad events of the past few days have delayed preparation of all official certifications. Our certification under signature and seal will follow within a day or two.

GEORGE I. BLOOM,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Mr. HALLECK. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. ALBERT W. JOHNSON, be permitted to take the oath of office today. His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest, and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the House in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 12 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE, HELD PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 238, TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER of the House presided. The Doorkeeper announced the Presi-

dent pro tempore and Members of the U.S. Senate who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the President pro tempore taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On the part of the Senate, the Chair appoints as members of the committee of escort the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

The Doorkeeper announced the ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments.

The ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper announced the Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court.

The Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 12 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m. the Doorkeeper announced the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, I have the high privilege and personal honor of presenting to you a former colleague, the President of the United States. [Applause, the Members rising.]

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 178)

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, Members of the House, Members of the Senate, my fellow Americans, all I have I would have given gladly not to be standing here today.

The greatest leader of our time has been struck down by the foulest deed of our time. Today John Fitzgerald Kennedy lives on in the immortal words and works that he left behind. He lives on in the mind and memories of mankind.

He lives on in the hearts of his countrymen.

No words are sad enough to express our sense of loss. No words are strong enough to express our determination to continue the forward thrust of America that he began. [Applause.]

The dream of conquering the vastness of space—the dream of partnership across the Atlantic, and across the Pacific as well—the dream of a Peace Corps in less developed nations—the dream of education for all of our children—the dream of jobs for all who seek them and need them—the dream of care for our elderly—the dream of an all-out attack on mental illness—and above all, the dream of equal rights for all Americans, whatever their race or color [applause]—these and other American dreams have been vitalized by his drive and by his dedication.

Now the ideas and the ideals which he so nobly represented must and will be translated into effective action. [Applause.]

Under John Kennedy's leadership, this Nation has demonstrated that it has the courage to seek peace, and it has the fortitude to risk war. We have proved that we are a good and reliable friend to those who seek peace and freedom. We have shown that we can also be a formidable foe to those who reject the path of peace and those who seek to impose upon us or our allies the yoke of tyranny.

This Nation will keep its commitments from South Vietnam to West Berlin. [Applause.] We will be unceasing in the search for peace; resourceful in our pursuit of areas of agreement, even with those with whom we differ—and generous and loyal to those who join with us in common cause.

In this age when there can be no losers in peace and no victors in war, we must recognize the obligation to match national strength with national restraint. [Applause.] We must be prepared at one and the same time for both the confrontation of power and the limitation of power. We must be ready to defend the national interest and to negotiate the common interest. This is the path that we shall continue to pursue. Those who test our courage will find it strong and those who seek our friendship will find it honorable. We will demonstrate anew that the strong can be just in the use of strength—and the just can be strong in the defense of justice. And let all know we will extend no special privilege and impose no persecution.

We will carry on the fight against poverty and misery, ignorance and disease—in other lands and in our own.

We will serve all of the Nation, not one section or one sector, or one group, but all Americans. [Applause.] These are the United States—a united people with a united purpose.

Our American unity does not depend upon unanimity. We have differences; but now, as in the past, we can derive from those differences strength, not weakness, wisdom, not despair. Both as a people and as a Government we can unite upon a program, a program which is wise, just, enlightened, and constructive.

For 32 years, Capitol Hill has been my home. I have shared many moments of pride with you—pride in the ability of the Congress of the United States to act; to meet any crisis; to distill from our differences strong programs of national action.

An assassin's bullet has thrust upon me the awesome burden of the Presidency. I am here today to say I need your help. I cannot bear this burden alone. I need the help of all Americans in all America. [Applause.] This Nation has experienced a profound shock and in this critical moment it is our duty—yours and mine—as the Government of the United States—to do away with uncertainty and doubt and delay and to show that we are capable of decisive action [applause]—that from the brutal loss of our leader we will derive not weakness but strength—that we can and will act and act now.

From this Chamber of representative government let all the world know, and none misunderstand, that I rededicate this Government to the unswerving support of the United Nations [applause]—to the honorable and determined execution of our commitments to our allies [applause]—to the maintenance of military strength second to none—to the defense of the strength and stability of the dollar [applause]—to the expansion of our foreign trade [applause]—to the reinforcement of our programs of mutual assistance and cooperation in Asia and Africa [applause]—and to our Alliance for Progress in this hemisphere. [Applause.]

On the 20th day of January, in 1961, John F. Kennedy told his countrymen that our national work would not be finished "in the first thousand days, nor in the life of this administration, nor even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet. But"—he said—"let us begin."

Today in this moment of new resolve, I would say to my fellow Americans, let us continue. [Applause.]

This is our challenge—not to hesitate, not to pause, not to turn about and linger over this evil moment but to continue on our course so that we may fulfill the destiny that history has set for us. Our most immediate tasks are here on this Hill.

First, no memorial oration or eulogy could more eloquently honor President Kennedy's memory than the earliest possible passage of the civil rights bill for which he fought so long. [Applause.] We have talked long enough in this country about equal rights. We have talked for 100 years or more. It is time now to write the next chapter—and to write it in the books of law. [Applause.]

I urge you again, as I did in 1957, and again in 1960, to enact a civil rights law so that we can move forward to eliminate from this Nation every trace of discrimination and oppression that is based upon race or color. [Applause.] There could be no greater source of strength to this Nation both at home and abroad.

And second, no act of ours could more fittingly continue the work of President Kennedy than the early passage of the tax bill for which he fought all this long

year. [Applause.] This is a bill designed to increase our national income and Federal revenues, and to provide insurance against recession. That bill, if passed without delay means more security for those now working, more jobs for those now without them, and more incentive for our economy.

In short, this is no time for delay. It is time for action [applause]—strong, forward-looking action on the pending education bills to help bring the light of learning to every home and hamlet in America, strong, forward-looking action on youth employment opportunities, strong, forward-looking action on the pending foreign aid bill, making clear that we are not forfeiting our responsibilities to this hemisphere or to the world, nor erasing executive flexibility in the conduct of our foreign affairs [applause]—and strong, prompt, and forward-looking action on the remaining appropriation bills. [Applause.]

In this new spirit of action the Congress can expect the full cooperation and support of the executive branch. And in particular I pledge that the expenditures of your Government will be administered with the utmost thrift and frugality. [Applause.] I ask your help. I will insist that the Government get a dollar's value for a dollar spent. The Government will set an example of prudence and economy. [Applause.] This does not mean that we will not meet our unfilled needs or that we will not honor our commitments. We will do both.

As one who has long served in both Houses of the Congress, I firmly believe in the independence and the integrity of the legislative branch. [Applause.] I promise you that I shall always respect this. It is deep in the marrow of my bones.

With equal firmness, I believe in the capacity and I believe in the ability of the Congress, despite the divisions of opinion which characterize our Nation, to act—to act wisely, to act vigorously, to act speedily when the need arises.

The need is here. The need is now.

We meet in grief; but let us also meet in renewed dedication and renewed vigor. Let us meet in action, in tolerance and in mutual understanding.

John Kennedy's death commands what his life conveyed—that America must move forward. [Applause.] The time has come for Americans of all races and creeds and political beliefs to understand and to respect one another. [Applause.] So let us put an end to the teaching and preaching of hate and evil and violence. [Applause.] Let us turn away from the fanatics of the far left and the far right, from the apostles of bitterness and bigotry, from those defiant of law, and those who pour venom into our Nation's bloodstream. [Applause.]

I profoundly hope that the tragedy and the torment of these terrible days will bind us together in new fellowship, making us one people in our hour of sorrow. So let us here highly resolve that John Fitzgerald Kennedy did not live—or die—in vain. [Applause.] And on this Thanksgiving eve, as we gather together to ask the Lord's blessing, and

give Him our thanks, let us unite in those familiar and cherished words:

America, America,
God shed His grace on thee,
And crown thy good
With brotherhood
From sea to shining sea.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

At 12 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m., the President, accompanied by the committee of escorts, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Doorkeeper escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The members of the President's Cabinet.

The Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court.

The ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments.

JOINT SESSION DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the joint session of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly, at 1 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m. the joint session of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

REFERENCE OF PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message of the President be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered printed.

The motion was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 29

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Friday next.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZATION TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE AND SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House, until Monday, December 2, 1963, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate, and the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

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

There was no objection.

A DETROIT MEMORIAL FOR JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RYAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill in Congress proposing that the Federal building heretofore authorized by Congress to be constructed at Detroit, Mich., be named the "John F. Kennedy Federal Building."

To have one of our most beautiful buildings in Detroit dedicated to the memory of our beloved President would be a special honor for the people of Detroit. It would be a fitting and appropriate memorial named after a most courageous, a most effective, and a most energetic American leader.

The House and Senate Public Works Committees authorized the construction of a new Federal office building on April 4, 1963.

The bill states:

Any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States in which such building is referred to shall be held to refer to such building as the "John F. Kennedy Federal Building."

SPACE PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, I have had a number of occasions to express my concern over the direction taken by our program in space.

Because of the staggering cost of all our space efforts, I have always maintained the position that our primary motivation must be military in scope. Heretofore, the emphasis has been unclear in definition. Perhaps, the haze which has surrounded our motives for a lunar landing, for instance, has been because of our uncertainty of Russian intent. That same uncertainty exists today and we must be ever mindful of it, but our purpose in space is solidifying in the posture all of us can support and promote: military superiority for this Nation over the Soviet Union.

A recent editorial in the Shreveport Times sums up the position I have taken since becoming a member of this committee and I ask unanimous consent to insert it here in the RECORD for the attention of all.

[From the Shreveport Times, Nov. 8, 1963]

CHANGING EMPHASIS ON SPACE

As Khrushchev continues to take himself out and put himself back into the moon

race, the American price tag for the trip has shrunk suddenly from \$20 billion to a tenth of that figure. Khrushchev must be given the credit for bringing the whole U.S. space effort into focus and making it clear that a lunar landing can be made only a culminating item in our plans. The Government is prepared to go military in space.

To say that it will cost only \$2 billion to put a man on the moon is just another way of saying that Project Apollo is the end aim of a broadly based intermediary space effort whose counterpart the Russians have no intention of giving up, whether they go to the moon or not. The U.S. effort can be viewed either as intermediary or as an end in itself. The moon landing gives it coherence and drive but a lunar landing isn't vital, and the program has important features that can be made to serve a military instead of a civilian end. It is already partly military.

The moon project is now worth the money; for the Government is now giving the space effort a military focus it has always lacked. It needs doing for the reason that the Russians are doing the same thing, and evidently have the edge on us.

The United States has planned a two-step program, ending in 1970 with an actual lunar landing. First comes Gemini, a two-astronaut near-earth project with controlled orbiting, space rendezvous, inspection of other space vehicles, and the ability of the space-men to leave and return to their ship as the aims. The Russians made a long stride toward achieving these things when they launched a maneuverable spacecraft last Friday. The emphasis was military as it has always been with the Russians. Now ours can and should be, too, Federal officials say.

Thus, Gemini, a planned forerunner of the Apollo mooncraft will, along with the huge upcoming Saturn rockets, and new launching and testing facilities, cost plenty, but it's not a "moondoggle." If we don't continue with it, the Russians will have a decided military advantage in near-earth space, an advantage they already have a start on because of more powerful rockets.

Officials of the National Aeronautics and Space Agency have in the past few months been trying to make clear that Gemini and Apollo are both needed, but when Khrushchev began talking equivocally, NASA went heavily over to the military tack where before it had talked only peaceful pursuits. It is well that the Agency is able to make the switch, however reluctant it may be, and however much the urgency of getting to the moon is diminished thereby. For the House, partly because of the purely civilian aspects of the space program, has already cut \$600 million off the 1965 NASA budget of \$5.6 billion. If the expected compromise comes, it will not be long before the intermediary stages of the U.S. moon plan will, after being converted to military focus, have priority over the lunar landing itself, which may well dim well past the 1970 target date.

One telling point NASA officials have made is that the United States should by no means slack off the urgency of the moon program to where it would affect delivery date of the huge Saturn rocket-booster, now scheduled for 1966. When Saturn reaches the pad it will be the most powerful booster in the world, and whatever advantage the Reds have enjoyed since 1957 will diminish; for we will be able to loft payloads far in excess of theirs—whether we're heading for the moon right away or not.

The U.S. space program from the start has been geared to catching up with Russia in rocket power. By 1966, we will have done that, perhaps permanently, for our intelligence reports do not show that the Russians are building the equivalent of the huge Saturn.

So, 2 years from now should be time enough in which to assess the American position in

space and to take our own initiatives so far as actual space travel goes. It will be the first time we will not have had to react to a Russian threat to do something or get somewhere first in space.

Meanwhile, we should let no word or deed of the Russians deter us from launching a military program in space to match theirs, regardless of U.N. compacts not to test or use space for warlike purposes.

THANKSGIVING TO A PRESIDENT, JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I believe there is no need to recount for the people of my State and my community, any part of the tribute, the funeral and requiem or the burial at Arlington. In the East Room of the White House, in the great hall of the people at the Capitol Rotunda, and finally at Arlington Cemetery, I was there humbly in person and all the world was there more vitally in spirit.

This message is simply to pledge the continuum of that spirit.

Thank you, thank you very much, Mr. President.

This is the day we press on. Twenty-four hours after the mortal part of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy was placed before the altar of God for his requiem, we resumed the business of the Congress in which he served so long and well.

Because he led us for a thousand days our aims are high, our goals clear. We have no time for the indulgence of self pity that he was with us so short a time or so swiftly departed. Rather let us reflect on our fortune that he was here in our dark and dangerous hours. In his name, let us be impatient with futility of the present and move to the high promise of the future. If his sacrifice is to have full meaning, our pace must be urgent, our steps determined.

We mourn and our memories of the moments we spent with him are precious to us no matter how brief. Because they are precious, I will share mine on another day and set them forth so they will not be lost to our children and my countrymen. But at this time as we approach the day set for Thanksgiving let us have one recollection.

As he walked among the people he loved with outstretched hand and his smile of friendship, he was not silent. While he had a special word of wit, of intimacy for some, these words he had to all:

"Thank you, thank you very much." "Thank you" was his constant expression to the children, the men and women, the crowds, the country, because his heart was full of gratitude for their high honor, for their support, but most of all for the opportunity to serve mankind which he had firmly sought and fully won.

Now as we press on in that same service, if we pause, let it be only for grati-

tude, for thanksgiving. Let us now respond.

Thank you, Mr. President.

For the faith in God and fellow man your life personified, we are grateful.

For the unity and strength you left us as a country, we are grateful.

For teaching us that there must be an end to venom as a means of vengeance and hurt for the sake of hate, we are thankful.

For the lesson that we measure mortality in the mystery of eternity not in days but in deeds, we are thankful.

For your interest in our children, your concern for their education, your determination that the handicapped among them who "had felt the hand of fate would never be victims of neglect," we are grateful.

For the path to peace you found amid the thicket of tension and threat of war, we are most grateful.

For your words and works, your "Profile in Courage," which you brought to life in your own sacrifice, we are most grateful.

For your judgment, that favorite word of yours which guided us toward well-being for all men, toward order and understanding in the whole world, we are most grateful.

For your heroism in war and peace which won you your rightful resting place among our brave departed you will be well remembered.

But above all, Mr. President, we give you thanks for the self you left to lead us in the person of your wife and family.

For Mrs. John F. Kennedy who raised us from despair and summoned up in all of us the spirit we needed and did not have, for her example, her calm, her love, and, hopefully, her forgiveness.

On Thanksgiving Day to you, Mr. President, Mrs. John F. Kennedy, and all your family, thank you, thank you very much. Thank you.

NAMING OF CULTURAL CENTER FOR JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer on Wednesday, November 27, 1963. I wholeheartedly endorse and subscribe naming the Cultural Center for John F. Kennedy. I think that this is a wonderful suggestion, and I will introduce a resolution in the House to have the new memorial named for John F. Kennedy.

The article follows:

A LIVING MEMORIAL TO JOHN F. KENNEDY

It was just 1 year ago this week—on November 29, 1962—that President and Mrs. John F. Kennedy inaugurated a nationwide fundraising campaign to erect a National Cultural Center in Washington.

The late President and First Lady were guiding spirits in the development of this

project to fulfill a longtime need in the Nation's Capital for facilities to accommodate the performing arts.

We propose that the Center be named in honor of John F. Kennedy and that it be dedicated as a national living memorial to him.

This would be fitting and appropriate. President Kennedy and Mrs. Kennedy, in addition to their devoted interest in the National Cultural Center itself, were intensely active in the encouragement of all things culturally and artistically worthwhile. No President and First Lady in the country's history have done more than they to promote the arts and to infuse the American people with a greater sense of appreciation for esthetic endeavor.

A John F. Kennedy Memorial Cultural Center overlooking the Potomac River—not far from the White House and the final resting place of President Kennedy at Arlington—would serve as a useful and enduring monument to honor John F. Kennedy and to perpetuate the priceless treasure of principles and ideals that are his legacy to the American people and all mankind.

GREAT NATIONAL FORUM FOR THE ARTS

The National Cultural Center in Washington has been planned as a national forum for the performing arts in the United States.

Designed by the noted American architect, Edward Durell Stone, the monumental building will be built on the east bank of the Potomac not far from the Lincoln Memorial. The Center will house 3 auditoriums: a 2,750-seat symphony hall; a 2,500-seat theater for opera, ballet and musical productions, and a 1,200-seat auditorium for theatrical performances.

On the roof will be an area for band concerts, art exhibits and festivals.

Sheathed in white marble, the building will be 600 feet long and 100 feet wide. Its roof will be 100 feet from the ground, 18 inches shorter than the Lincoln Memorial.

Plans call for the Center to play host to visiting artists and groups from throughout the United States and from foreign countries. Washington's own cultural institutions, like the National Symphony and the opera society, will be given preference in scheduling but will not be considered permanent tenants. The planners want to keep the Center a national enterprise.

The land on which the Center will be erected has been set aside for that purpose by Congress, which originally authorized the project in 1958. Congress provided that the funds be raised privately and set a deadline of September 1963.

The project languished for 3 years until President John F. Kennedy took an interest in it and appointed Roger L. Stevens, New York financier and theatrical producer, as chairman.

Fundraising got underway in earnest last November 29 in a cultural spectacular on closed-circuit television seen in five cities, including Philadelphia.

President and Mrs. Kennedy headed the cast of 100 notables which included former President and Mrs. Dwight D. Eisenhower; Pianist Van Cliburn, Singer Marian Anderson, Poet Robert Frost, and Cellist Pablo Casals. Leonard Bernstein, conductor and composer, was master of ceremonies.

Mrs. Kennedy and Mrs. Eisenhower have served as honorary cochairman of the Center.

President Kennedy put his support in these words: "A great cultural Center which expresses the interest of the people of this country in this most basic desire of mankind is a most important responsibility."

Since that kickoff event, some \$13 million has been raised toward construction of the Center. This includes a \$5 million gift the Ford Foundation has earmarked on a 3 to 1 matching basis.

Last August, Congress extended the deadline for fundraising by 3 years, to September 2, 1966. Chairman Stevens said he was confident the money could be raised in that time.

JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday last Mrs. Rooney and I attended holy mass at the hospital chapel at Walter Reed Army Hospital here in Washington. The celebrant of the mass was Rev. Eugene L. A. Fisher, C.S. Sp., chaplain—lieutenant colonel—AUS, retired. For his sermon during the sacrifice of this memorial mass, which was for the happy repose of the soul of the late President John F. Kennedy, Father Fisher read to the congregation the following beautiful prayer poem which he had written out in longhand the evening before:

JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

(By Eugene L. A. Fisher, C.S. Sp., chaplain (lieutenant colonel), AUS retired)

We know not track time or lone hour
When God will say, "Come see."
The great, the grand, with all their power
Can hardly set us free.

Within a triumphal parade
Mid shouts of joyous praise
The call may come in sudden raid
Or as explosive blaze.

Our President was jubilant
The crowds acclaimed with pride
Not knowing that the time was scant
Sad tragedy the ride.

Assassin's bullets turned the joy
To grim reality
It could have been his wife or boy
It hurt both you and me.

A great man, lover of world peace
Who kept our country strong
Given the time, would still increase
Our strength to right the wrong.

Cut down in virile prime of life
With aspirations high
To conquer in world's bitter strife
Keep flag safe in the sky.

A gifted man with talents rare
To help his fellow man,
He labored with that special care
As only masters can.

Our States have lost their greatest friend
The world a man most kind
Whose labors and great toll could lend
A key to freedom find.

He now rests in a hero's grave
Life's trials for him are o'er
A martyr's palm archangels wave
God blessed his latest chore.

His passing is our country's loss
God called him when ready,
Like you, we shall not shirk the cross—
John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

TURN TO HIM WITH CONFIDENCE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by the distinguished columnist Walter Lippmann, which appeared in the November 26, 1963, edition of the New York Herald Tribune. In spite of our tragic loss we, as Mr. Lippmann says, "have much hope in the healing art of Lyndon Johnson. We can turn to him with confidence."

The article follows:

MURDER MOST FOUL

(By Walter Lippmann)

The first need of the country is to take to heart the nature of this unspeakable crime. There is no public crisis at home or abroad which demands such instant attention that it cannot wait until we have collected ourselves and can proceed deliberately. But there is a searing internal crisis within the American spirit which we have first to realize and then to resolve.

The American future depends on it, and our capacity to govern ourselves. What we have to realize is that, though speech and gossip and rumor are free, the safety of the Republic is at stake when extremists go unrestrained. Extremists may profess any ideology. But what they all have in common is that they treat opponents as enemies, outside the laws and the community of their fellow men.

What happened in Dallas could, to be sure, have happened in another city. But it must be said that the murder of the President was not the first act of political violence in that city but one in a series. The man who is now the President of the United States was manhandled by his fellow Texans. The man who represents the United States at the United Nations was spat upon.

In this atmosphere of political violence lived the President's murderer, himself addicted to the fascination of violence in his futile and lonely and brooding existence. The salient fact about him was his alienation from humanity, from country, family, and friends. Nothing within him, it would seem, bound him to the President or to the Governor as human beings. No human feeling stayed his hand.

In his alienation Oswald turned to the left. But that was incidental. Those who spat on Mr. Johnson and on Mr. Stevenson had turned to the right. The common characteristic of all of them was their alienation, the loss of their ties, the rupture of the community.

An extremist is an outsider. For him the Government in Washington is a hated foreign power and the President in Washington is an invading conqueror. There is no limit, therefore, to his hatred, which feeds upon the venom of malice, slander, and hallucination. In Dallas today there is much search of conscience, and well there should be. For Dallas has long been conspicuous for its tolerance of extremists, and for the inability of its decent citizens, undoubtedly the great majority, to restrain the extremists and restore a condition of honest and temperate and reasonable discussion.

It was comforting, therefore, to read on Sunday that the mayor of Dallas, Earle Cabell, had said that "each of us, in prayerful reflection, must search his heart and determine if through intemperate word or deed we might have contributed in some fashion to the movement of this mind across the brink of insanity."

We must all follow the mayor of Dallas in that prayerful reflection. For it is only too easy to forget that in a free country there must be not only liberty and equality but also fraternity.

The only solace for the Nation's shame and grief can come from a purge, or at least the reduction of, the hatred and venom which lie so close to the surface of our national life. We have allowed the community of the American people to be rent with enmity. Only if and as we can find our way back into the American community will we find our way back to confidence in the American destiny.

We must stop the flow of the poison that when men differ, say about taxes or civil rights or Russia, they cannot be reconciled by persuasion and debate, and that those who take the other view are implacable enemies. In the light of this monstrous crime, we can see that in a free country, which we are and intend to be, unrestrained speech and thought are inherently subversive. Democracy can be made to work only when the bonds of the community are inviolate, and stronger than all the parties and factions and interests and sects.

I wish I felt certain that the self-realization into which grief has shocked us will endure when we go back about our business. The divisive forces of hatred and ungovernability are strong among us, and the habit of intemperate speech and thought has become deeply ingrained. It is deepened by the strains of war and the frustrations of this revolutionary age, by the exploitation of violence and cruelty in the mass media, by the profusion of weapons and by the presence of so many who know how to use them.

But I do have much hope in the healing art of Lyndon Johnson. We can turn to him with confidence. For his great gift is in finding the consensus without which the American system of government with its States and regions, its checks and balances, is unworkable.

To find the consensus among our divided and angry people is his historic opportunity. To restore the internal peace of the United States is his unique mission.

That done, all else will be manageable.

DEDICATION OF NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER AS MEMORIAL TO JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is seldom that an idea so catches the imagination of the American people as has the proposal to dedicate the National Cultural Center as a memorial to John F. Kennedy. All over the country the idea has spontaneously appeared. No better evidence could be asked to demonstrate the appropriateness of such a dedication; the identification of President Kennedy and his great First Lady with culture and the performing arts makes the naming of the Cultural Center in his honor a most fitting tribute.

I, therefore, have joined the gentleman from New Jersey, Representative FRANK THOMPSON, in introducing a bill changing the name of the National Cultural Center to John Fitzgerald Kennedy

Memorial Center, and authorizing funds not to exceed \$25 million to be expended on a matching basis with privately donated funds, and ask that it be referred to the appropriate committee. I also strongly urge its early adoption.

PRESS RELEASE BY MR. ULLMAN

AL ULLMAN, Democrat, of Oregon, and GEORGE F. SENNER, Democrat, of Arizona, today announced their intention of introducing a resolution dedicating the National Cultural Center as a memorial to John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and said they hoped it would receive early consideration by the Congress.

The two Congressmen also wrote Roger L. Stevens, Chairman of the National Cultural Center, asking his support of the resolution. In their letter to Mr. Stevens, the Members said:

"In the heart of every American today, there is a desire to honor the memory of John Fitzgerald Kennedy and a resolve to magnify the causes he so magnificently represented.

"As you know, no American President has done more to foster the development and the appreciation of the performing arts. Through the leadership of both the President and his wife, culture in our national life has taken on new meaning. We, therefore, intend to introduce a resolution dedicating the National Cultural Center as a memorial to John Fitzgerald Kennedy and will ask for its early adoption.

"We wish to urge you and the members of the Commission to support this effort as a fitting tribute to the man we all loved so well."

The two Representatives in a joint statement said: "President Kennedy brought to this Nation, and to this Capital, an intellectual and cultural reawakening that has made a profound impact on our national life. The Cultural Center is one of the most dramatic expressions of that reawakening. The Nation needs his continuing guiding spirit to insure that we do not lose the stimulus to a higher realization of our cultural heritage."

The sponsors of the resolution urged other Members of Congress and all people associated with the Cultural Center to unite behind their effort. They pointed out that the love of every American for President Kennedy would be of great value in bringing early fulfillment of the plan for the Center.

ASSASSINATION OF JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, last Friday on a sunlit thoroughfare in the city of Dallas, an assassin's bullets snuffed out the life of our President. Those malicious shots cannot be undone, but we have a solemn obligation to the memory of President Kennedy, to President Johnson, and to those who will follow in their places to do our best to prevent repetition of such cruel and senseless acts.

I am today introducing a House resolution to create a joint committee of seven Senators and seven Representatives to explore all facets of the problem and report back to the Congress.

Throughout the feverish and painful hours of investigation of the President's assassination, while Americans watched in suspenseful horror, it is shocking to know that our best Federal police authorities were participating only as invitees of the State of Texas and the city of Dallas. I repeat—as invitees. They might well have been treated as interlopers by local authorities. Fortunately, they were not so treated, but the FBI and the Secret Service were obviously not in charge of the situation. They should have been.

Federal criminal law today presents many unbelievable inconsistencies. The shooting of a game warden is a Federal crime—title 18, U.S.C. 1114. The assassination of a President is not. Assault upon a Federal judge, a U.S. attorney, or their assistants, is a Federal crime—18 U.S.C. 1114. The murder of a President is not. The murder of the lowest paid and newest employee of the Department of Agriculture is a Federal crime—18 U.S.C. 1114. The murder of John F. Kennedy was not. An assault on a Federal process server is a Federal crime—title 18, U.S.C., section 1501. Assault on the leader of our Republic is not. Indeed, under title 18 U.S.C., section 1951, it is a crime against the United States to interfere with interstate commerce by violence; section 1361-1364 of the same title makes it a Federal crime to injure or destroy Federal property. Yet, it is not a Federal crime to injure or destroy the President's life. Threats against the President or Vice President are offenses against the United States under section 871 of title 18. Even the utterance of contemptuous words about the President by commissioned officers of the armed services is punishable by court martial—title 10, U.S.C., section 888. But the devastating acts following upon mere threats or contemptuous words violate no Federal law.

Interestingly enough, U.S. Senators, U.S. Representatives, and Cabinet officials are completely unprotected by Federal law. Actions against the person or property of such high Federal officials do not violate any Federal criminal law.

President Johnson has rightly ordered a full investigation into the facts surrounding the assassination. It is shameful that such an investigation can only be justified under Federal law by stretching and straining Federal jurisdiction that does not directly apply to this kind of situation. The general powers of the FBI contained in title 5, U.S.C., section 556 do not deal specifically or by inference with this type of situation. Some sections of the Subversive Activities Control Act, involving investigation of plots to overthrow the Government of the United States by force, might be invoked to justify FBI involvement. Other less pertinent grants of authority may be cited, but the fact remains that the FBI and other Federal investigating agencies do not have the kind of direct and unambiguous jurisdiction that they should have in matters of this nature.

Mr. Speaker, the murder of a high Federal official has ramifications far beyond the personalities involved. The officials of Dallas found this out the hard

way. It is not fair to any local officials to place such a responsibility on their shoulders. How humiliated and ashamed we all would have been if the Supreme Court had been compelled to reverse the conviction of President Kennedy's assassin because the defendant's basic rights had been violated. This could well have happened. Denial of counsel for 48 hours places conviction in jeopardy. If they failed to explain to the defendant his right not to make any statement, and the fact that any statement he made could be used against him, a conviction could be reversed. Dallas officials were under fantastic pressure from the public to issue statements with reference to the guilt of the defendant. Trial and conviction by television could have forced a higher court to reverse a jury's verdict. Dallas officials were placed under unique and almost irresistible pressures from the public because the victim was not just an ordinary citizen. He was our national leader.

And then the final touch of shame to our country: a self-appointed executioner deprives the assassin of his basic rights. The guarantee of such rights, even to those we hate, is one of the proudest adornments of our civilization. Suddenly, the law of the jungle took charge and America looked no different to the world than the harshest tyranny of communism or fascism. And not the least of our concerns here is that the assassin carried with him to the grave information that could well be important to the security of our country.

Mr. Speaker, there is another area that a joint committee should explore. Congress wishes to cloak the President and other high officials with all the protection that can be provided by law. Are we doing that? Are there other ways that the incredible burdens of the Secret Service in protecting the President can be eased? These matters are so urgent and so vital to our Nation's interest that they alone justify the formation of a joint committee of the Congress.

Sunday afternoon, before the President's funeral on Monday, I shared the deep apprehensions of other Americans as I heard that President Johnson was going to march in the open streets of Washington from the White House to the church, a distance of seven blocks. I salute President Johnson for his courage. He obviously felt that the world's leaders must know that the President of the United States can still walk safely among a free people in our Nation's Capital. I am not sure the President's decision was wise and in the best long-run interests of our country. Thank God he came through safely.

But what of future decisions of this nature? The law gives the head of the Secret Service the right to overrule the President in such instances. Is this really workable? Can we expect a single individual to overrule the President? Is there another arrangement that either the President or the Congress could devise to meet this kind of circumstance?

The life of President Johnson carries with it an incalculable value to our country today. What would a second assas-

sination do to our country? Any actions that can be taken by the Congress to prevent another disaster should be taken. Let us not neglect our solemn responsibility in this serious situation.

Today there are many proposals for investigating the circumstances surrounding the assassination of President Kennedy. We must not compound confusion with a variety of uncoordinated investigations. This matter deserves the best that Congress can offer. I urge that we move immediately to create a joint committee of the Senate and House.

A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE GREATER PROTECTION OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, MEMBERS OF THE PRESIDENT'S CABINET, AND MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today making it a Federal offense to assault or assassinate the President, the Vice President, members of the President's Cabinet, or Members of Congress. The enactment of this measure would add the Nation's highest elective and appointive officers to a long list of Government positions already covered by criminal statutes.

The recent tragedy suffered by our country has revealed the unfortunate absence of Federal law to cover these situations. I found it difficult to believe that there is no statute permitting Federal jurisdiction over cases of assault or assassination of the President, Vice President, members of the President's Cabinet, or Members of Congress.

Since the law of Presidential succession provides that the Vice President is followed by the Speaker of the House, the President pro tempore of the Senate, and the members of the President's Cabinet, I think it is essential that they be included in the protection of these Federal criminal provisions.

Presently, we have laws providing Federal investigation, prosecution, trial, and imprisonment or execution of those responsible for the assault or death of a great number of Federal officials. These include U.S. judges, attorneys, and marshals; FBI, Secret Service, Internal Revenue Service, Post Office, and customs agents; and many other Government employees.

My bill would allow the legal processes of the Federal Government to begin immediately in the case of any future attack on our President, Vice President, members of the President's Cabinet, or Members of Congress.

Currently, Mr. Speaker, without Federal statutes, attacks on those holding the offices specified in my measure are dealt with solely under the local or State jurisdiction in which they occur.

The text of this bill is brief. I am including it with my remarks in the hope that all Members will read it and pledge their support to its enactment:

H.R. 9255

A bill to provide for the greater protection of the President and Vice President of the United States, members of the President's Cabinet, and Members of Congress

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after "Whoever kills" the following: "The President, the Vice President, members of the President's Cabinet, Members of Congress,".

PRESIDENT JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, John Fitzgerald Kennedy is now a part of history. The God that made him has taken him, and God's will be done.

No words can portray the shocking events of the last few days nor set forth the grief of our Nation. Each family in America feels a loss of a loved one, for the President belonged to us all. Let us measure our sorrow, however, by the agony of his brave wife and family who have lost a beloved husband, father, brother, and child. Our prayers should be for them.

President Kennedy was a man of intelligence and charm, a brave man and a dedicated one. His wit, his confidence, and his ability will be missed. We mourn him.

The Presidency, however, never dies. Our strength lies in the fact that we are a nation of laws, not men. The new President has assumed his full responsibilities. Our country is scarred but intact. Our hopes are high. Our faith is secure.

As we pray and mourn together, it is time for us to assume our full responsibility. Let our Nation draw closer together, more united, more dedicated.

The measure of a man is the effect he has on the lives of others. In life and death President Kennedy served us all. He told us we can do better, and I believe that history will show this Nation rose from its sorrow to stand taller than it ever did before.

INVESTIGATION OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT DEMANDED

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, without a doubt, almost everyone in this House recognizes that an investigation

of the Department of State is long overdue. The tragic events of the past weekend indicate that the Department of State was the vehicle through which the assassin, Lee Harvey Oswald, returned to the United States. Just think of this, Mr. Speaker. Here was a man who traveled to the Soviet Union not just to visit, but to live there, and who gave our Government an affidavit renouncing that most precious possession, his U.S. citizenship. After 3 years in this Communist country, he was not only allowed to return to the United States but received a loan of over \$400 to pay his way back here. What happened to him in the Soviet Union? Was he trained by the Soviet espionage butchers? We do know that immediately after his return to America he became a spokesman for a pro-Communist front and he then assassinated the President in Dallas, Tex.

This is but one of scores of examples of the Department of State's policies which show mismanagement, bad judgment, and even subversion. Now is the time to clean up this Department once and for all, and I am introducing the following resolution:

Whereas the State Department which had discretion, paid the way back to the United States of Lee Harvey Oswald who had given an affidavit renouncing U.S. citizenship, surrendered his passport to our Moscow Embassy and then spent 3 years being trained in Communist Russia and after repatriation returned to the United States and killed the President of the United States;

Whereas the dismissal of Otto Otepka signaled the end of effective security in the Department of State;

Whereas personnel of the Department of State have played a major role in engineering a series of miniature Munichs including nuclear agreements, grain deals, over 25 percent unilateral disarmament and a prospective nonaggression pact in evolving a policy of peace through appeasement;

Whereas people sympathetic to the Soviet Union have been put in office, supported or tolerated in nearby and other countries and anti-Communist governments have been destroyed, with the murder of their leaders tolerated;

And whereas the American people have lost confidence in the Department of State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the Department of State, its personnel and its security and other policies be investigated from top to bottom with the purpose of eliminating subversives and questionable personnel; and

That a special joint committee be named for an overall, extensive, and intensive investigation of the Department of State with orders to report back to the Congress not later than March 1, 1964.

JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY NATIONAL SEASHORE

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to redesignate

the Cape Cod National Seashore in Massachusetts as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy National Seashore.

It is heartwarming to note the number of proposals to perpetuate the name of our late beloved President. John Fitzgerald Kennedy needs no particular memorial to enshrine him in the hearts of our people or to assure him a lofty place in the history of our land. His magnificent leadership and deeds, the quality of his character and personality, have already done this. But, monuments and memorials serve an excellent purpose in constantly reminding us of the present and those of future generations of the activities with which John Fitzgerald Kennedy was so closely identified.

So, Mr. Speaker, I offer this proposal as one of the warmest ways to remember him. He loved Cape Cod and all of its overpowering beauty and enchantment. The cliffs, dunes, meadowlands, heath, marsh, lakes, and ocean were a constant source of enjoyment to him as he sailed, swam, and rambled its unspoiled beaches. At Cape Cod, John F. Kennedy found surcease from the awesome and arduous tasks of the presidency to spend some of his finest hours with his wonderful wife and children.

Mr. Speaker, the Cape Cod National Seashore is a reality today because of President Kennedy. When he was in the Senate, he filed, together with Senator SALTONSTALL, the bill that finally became law. He recognized that time was running out down Cape Cod way and it was essential to set aside, preserve, and protect the last of the "old" cape so that the inspiration of its surpassing beauty be kept intact and handed down to future generations of Americans. When he assumed the Presidency, he continued to press for this legislation. On August 7, 1961, he signed into law the bill that finally established Federal jurisdiction over this splendid seashore area. I was present, together with other Members of the Congress, at that ceremony and am one of the proud possessors of one of the pens with which he affixed his signature. I know that I can truthfully say that no other bill signing ceremony gave him any greater satisfaction than that which brought into being the Cape Cod National Seashore.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, I proudly present this bill to this Congress renaming this area as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy National Seashore.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and place in the RECORD an editorial from the News Tribune in Beaver Falls, Pa., in my congressional district by Mr. James March, editor.

Mr. Speaker, our hearts will be heavy for a long, long time in the loss of our

beloved President and friend. This editorial by Mr. March expresses the thoughts and feelings of all of us.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

We are all, like swimmers in the sea,
Poised on the top of a huge wave of fate,
Which hangs uncertain to which side to fall;

And whether it will heave us up to land,
Or whether it will roll us out to sea.

—MATTHEW ARNOLD.

The high and the low, Americans all, with any sense of responsibility at all are saddened by the heinous murder of the President of the United States.

No matter what one's political faith may be, the death of a President is a loss to the Nation and to the world and a personal tragedy to many.

John F. Kennedy along with his ability as an outstanding leader was endowed with great personal charm. On two occasions he visited Beaver County briefly. Everyone who heard him speak here will never forget his personal magnetism.

His New England "Ameriker" and "Cuber" and his stabbing finger to emphasize a point were another kind of charm.

Part of the personal popularity of the President and Mrs. Kennedy was that they brought gaiety and life to the White House. They were young, they were rearing children, they liked the theater, the arts, sports, were devoted to their parents—qualities with which millions of Americans could identify.

The Kennedy clan with all its wealth, prestige, and power knows only too well the anguish of grief in the loss of loved ones as do most families.

It is particularly hard to reconcile the death of a family man in the prime of life and the only salvation for those personally affected is to learn to accept and not to question.

Those who believe the words of Jesus who said that not one sparrow falls to the ground without the Father's notice, do not question the wisdom of God, no matter what the burden, or anguish they may have to bear.

The length of one's life is not the greatest factor. The use made of the time allotted man on earth is of utmost importance. The President did not squander his time or talents and will serve as an inspiration for generations to come.

We join the closely knit Kennedy family in their sorrow.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON ORDERS COMPLETE INVESTIGATION BY DEPARTMENTS OF JUSTICE AND TREASURY

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Congress has responsibilities to fulfill for itself and on behalf of the people of this country in expressing its interest in the circumstances surrounding the assassination of the late President Kennedy and the killing of the suspected assassin. There are too many unanswered questions, and every effort must be expended to answer those questions for the American people. This issue does not involve only the decisions of local law enforcement officials in Dallas, Tex., but com-

plications are grave for the national security.

The President has properly ordered a complete investigation by the Departments of Justice and Treasury. As chairman of the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations which has investigative jurisdiction of the Departments of Justice and Treasury, I concur wholeheartedly in the investigation which has been ordered. The Subcommittee on Legal and Monetary Affairs does not, at this time, intend to conduct an investigation duplicating that which has been ordered by the President. I am taking this action to aid in the investigation which has been ordered, since overlapping duplications by the executive branch and by the congressional committees having jurisdiction in the House and the other body, would probably make more difficult the job which has to be done.

However, we not only intend to fully cooperate with the investigation, but to be as fully informed as possible. The results of this investigation should be made available to this committee and others of appropriate jurisdiction for the purpose of review and evaluation to determine whether there is any need for congressional action. Congress shares in the responsibility of doing all that can be done in the future to lessen or eliminate the chain of events which reached such tragic proportions. Some committees will be concerned with the need for new legislation. Some committees will be concerned with the need for additional funds to provide for additional security measures. Some committees will be concerned with the internal operations and efficiencies of each of the departments, and the coordination and cooperation between the Secret Service and the FBI dealing with the security of the President and other high officials of our Government. Some committees will be concerned with the actual and factual determination of every event which took place, the motivation which inspired each act, and all the people who might be involved. While all of these interests are proper and reflect the responsibility which the Congress has, in my judgment, it would serve no useful purpose for each of the committees to conduct an independent investigation of its own. Consequently, speaking for the subcommittee of which I am chairman which does have jurisdiction and responsibility for part of the problem involved, I have made this statement. I have advised the leadership that I expect to contact both the Department of Justice and the Treasury Department, expressing the desire of the subcommittee to be fully informed and to receive all of the results of the investigation so that we, the Congress, and the American people, can benefit therefrom.

BEAUTIFUL TRIBUTE TO A MAJESTIC LADY

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, the terrible event of recent days has wantonly deprived this Nation and, indeed, the world, of one of its greatest citizens of all time. The senseless, cold-blooded murder of our young, dedicated, and talented President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, will forever sting in our hearts and minds.

As we dwell upon the loss of his unfulfilled promise, our thoughts turn constantly to his deeply bereaved but magnificently courageous widow.

The majesty, the saintliness, with which she has faced and endured her unspeakable ordeal have set standards to which all should aspire if we would have a better world.

Mr. Speaker, like everyone else here, this monstrous tragedy has affected me deeply, and I have read and listened to the outpoured words of disbelief, sorrow, and condolence that have been so much with us since that day of infamy, Friday, November 22, 1963.

Standing high among the writings inspired by Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy's hours of anguish is an editorial in the Washington, N.C., Daily News of November 25, 1963. I ask leave to insert the editorial entitled "True First Lady," in the RECORD at this point.

TRUE FIRST LADY

In the hour of great tragedy which has befallen America, we tend to place all the emphasis on the man who has fallen and on the man who has risen to take his place. Somehow we look upon the others involved with a sense of sorrow, but we seem not to pause and recognize the true greatness, courage, and devotion all of which have played such a vital part in the doings of the tragedy.

When Jacqueline Kennedy became America's First Lady, it was generally agreed that she was a woman of beauty, charm, grace, and youth. But somehow the feeling seems to have persisted that in her youth, she did not typify the true American First Lady.

In this tear stained hour of great tragedy, Mrs. Kennedy has lost a husband and the father of her children. Her loss is terrific and in truth she has lost more than any other American. But in her loss, she has gained the admiration of people all over the world. She has shown more courage than any woman of this era that we know about.

Holding the head of her mortally wounded husband and crying "no, no," standing in the emergency room and gently placing the wedding band on the finger of her still husband, walking to the ambulance that carried him to the plane, riding in the back of the ambulance beside the coffin, standing beside President Johnson on the plane as he took the oath of office, riding in the back of the plane that bore the remains back to Washington, D.C., walking off the ramp and opening the door of the ambulance that took the remains to Bethesda Naval Hospital, riding in that ambulance, still wearing the bloodstained clothing she was wearing when the fatal shot was fired, taking little Caroline in her arms to tell her that "Daddy has gone to live with God," and in her every move and action, Jacqueline Kennedy has shown the stuff which truly stamps her as a true First Lady.

It would have been so easy and so understandable had she become hysterical anywhere along the line. She did not. Somehow had her beloved husband have written the script for her to follow, he would

have written it as she lived it through each tragic second. If today there was ever any doubt about her role as America's First Lady, that doubt has been dispelled completely.

In an hour far more trying than most people ever know, she showed a courage and a bearing that shall forever stamp her as having earned the right to be known always as America's typical First Lady.

Our heart goes out to her in deep sympathy and in tremendous admiration for the beautiful demeanor with which she faced the ordeal.

She's a wonderful lady. She's lost something so very precious, but she has won the hearts of all the world.

What a woman.

THE ARMY ELECTRONICS COMMAND

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the Army Electronics Command has at long last drastically revised its policies in regard to obtaining procurement data that will allow competitive bidding on future contracts.

I am happy to report today that another battle has been won in the fight to give American industry a chance to work competitive bidding on our staggering defense budget.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I am constrained to report that the Army has not gone far enough. Those who in the past took advantage of shoddy regulations that have now been corrected, have been allowed to escape without so much as a reprimand. However, the Army has now admitted, and for all to see, that prior to my speech of May 28, 1963, on the floor of the House in regard to the purchase of the AN/ASM 61 test set for a gyro compass, and prior to an investigation that I demanded, faulty procedures were being used daily in securing competitive bidding information.

The Army has also reported to me that corrective action has been taken. I am told by industry that, to a degree, this is true. Performance to date has been far more satisfactory, however.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, the Army has reported to me that steps are being taken to get more competitive bidding. I even understand that a new command is being established within the Signal Corps to push the Army's procurement sections into more competitive purchases.

Mr. Speaker, on May 28, 1963, I protested the proposed sole-source purchase of the AN/ASM 61 test set. The Army said it could get no competition because it had no drawings. When I saw this certification on a bid set, I shortly picked up my phone and called Brig. Gen. Allen T. Stanwix-Hay, then commander of the U.S. Army Electronics Materiel Agency at Philadelphia. My information sources had told me in less than an hour that drawings existed for this equipment, and I conveyed this information

to General Stanwix-Hay before coming to the floor to inform Members of the impending atrocity on the tax dollar.

Late that same afternoon, I received a telegram from General Stanwix-Hay informing me he had canceled the procurement until he could study the background of the case. He also said:

Your interest in this matter is appreciated by the Army, and I personally thank you.

He also told me he was requesting a "full and unbiased investigation of the matter by the Army's Inspector General."

Mr. Speaker, although the "urgently needed" test has never been resolicited competitively or bought in any fashion, and while we cannot as yet count the savings that will surely come about, that investigation is complete and the report has been submitted.

In a letter to me dated October 25, 1963, Maj. Gen. Frank Moorman, commander of the U.S. Army Electronics Command, outlined what was found in the investigation. I shall quote only pertinent parts of his report.

To begin with, General Moorman said that he had uncovered an old directive under which drawings received from manufacturers were primarily used for maintenance information, purchase of spare parts and planning purposes.

Neither the Electronics Materiel Agency nor the Electronics Materiel Support Agency adhered to the practice or policy of using drawings received from a manufacturer for procurement purposes.

Mr. Speaker, that is word for word what General Moorman said. Imagine. Manufacturing drawings which could have allowed competition and saved billions each year were not used to get competitive bidding by the Army.

General Moorman also said, in effect, that in the ASM 61 procurement and scores of other cases, sloppy staff work was the order of the day. No attempt was made to determine whether drawings that existed were complete or contained proprietary data.

A complete review of the whole problem of getting adequate data grew out of my charges on the ASM 61. After completing this investigation, General Moorman informed me that at his specific direction:

1. All interested agencies are taking all possible steps to eliminate the problem of getting data insufficient to allow future competitive bidding.

Mr. Speaker, if this directive is prosecuted in procurement agencies around the country, the result will be revolutionary. There will be more procurements that are competitive than ever before, and the rising cost of defense will be cut back.

2. Directives have been issued to everyone concerned with the acceptance of such data to insure receipt of a complete and accurate set of data, together with a contractor's statement that what he submits as drawings are fully accurate.

Mr. Speaker, here is another far-reaching directive. In the past, drawings submitted have sometimes been full of errors, accidental and otherwise.

They have gone unnoticed and unchecked while someone blandly stated, "No drawings available," and sole-source producers continued to mop up. Now, someone is going to check the accuracy of this material. Again, here is another victory for competitive bidding.

3. Invitations to bid (IFB's) and requests for proposals (RFQ's)—the documents which inform industry of proposed purchases—"have been expanded to fully inform prospective bidders as to the extent of all manufacturing data."

Mr. Speaker, here is another victory for full disclosure of information if what General Moorman outlines is implemented at the middle-grade action level. It will also be a victory for industry which in the past has been denied the information necessary to bid intelligently.

4. Formal acceptance of drawings and payment for them is now contingent upon clearance by engineers of the Army Electronics Materiel Support Agency.

In the past, Mr. Speaker, this clearance has been slipshod to say the least. Now, a manufacturer will be paid for the drawings when he delivers a good product, and that is as it should be. This, too, will stimulate healthy competition if properly implemented.

General Moorman's report was one of two reports on this case, Mr. Speaker. Brig. Gen. F. W. Boye, Jr., also reported to me in October. His study dealt with my specific charges on the AN/ASM 61 and the full-scale probe that resulted. He summarized his findings as follows:

In summary, the investigation indicates that faulty procedures were employed. These old procedures have been brought to light and corrective action has been taken. The Army intends to procure the AN/ASM 61's competitively in the future.

Mr. Speaker, there has been no competitive procurement for the AN/ASM 61 test set as yet. When there is, it is my prediction the price will fall as much as 50 percent or more, and the savings will be passed on to the taxpayers.

The old Army policy that just about consigned manufacturing drawings to the scrap heap has now been exposed for what it was and has been scrapped.

It should be a source of satisfaction to every taxpayer that the Army has finally gotten around to modernizing its procedures. This modernization will mean a little lower defense cost if properly implemented. The much abused taxpayer should be elated that he has won another victory in the struggle to keep as much of his paycheck as possible. However, he has not won the war—just another battle—the third I have talked of here this week.

We in Congress, who are the soldiers on the tax front for John Q. Taxpayer, owe it to him to keep a close watch on how these new policies are implemented. If they are just tacked on the wall and forgotten, they will do little good. If they are properly used, they will, like a good razor, become sharper and do a better job for all of us.

That, Mr. Speaker, concludes my third presentation this week on procurement. Report No. 1 detailed GAO's criticism

of Navy waste of up to \$50,000 and a savings of \$108,000 through competition. There was no indication that Navy tried to correct the faults that were pointed out. Report No. 2 detailed waste of up to \$192,000 and savings of 69 percent under competitive bidding. Here, again, the Navy resisted and has failed to correct a messy situation. Report No. 3 concerns the Army and its attempt to get to the bottom of a mess. I ask you, Which service displayed cooperation and which displayed blind obstinacy? Which service showed a regard, to a degree, for good practices and which service shouted, in so many actions, "Dam the Taxpayers, Full Speed Ahead"? The answers are obvious.

The conclusion is just as obvious. There has to be a shakeup in Navy procurement, and it must start at the top. Kenneth E. BeLieu is the Assistant Secretary of Navy who simply gives lip service to efficiency and competency. He is the one man at whose doorstep must be laid most of the blame for Navy procurement shortcomings, since he really is not doing a thing about correcting them.

Mr. Speaker, BeLieu must go. Any other action will be a direct slap at the taxpaying American and an endorsement of wasteful, sloppy, inefficient management of the Government's business.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, John F. Kennedy was born when the world was in a time of heavy crisis. Later in life, in another crisis, he answered the call of his Nation to defend the principles and ideals upon which our Nation is founded. He served with honor.

His country again called upon him to serve when he was elected to represent the people of Massachusetts to the U.S. House of Representatives and later in the U.S. Senate.

The people of our Nation then deemed it right to honor him with the highest office and greatest responsibility of the land. To this challenge he gave his life.

It has been written:

No man is competent to judge in matters of a kingdom until first he has been tried; there are many things to be learned in the depths which we may never know in the heights.

During this time of tragedy we must measure these depths that we, in turn, may travel those heights. From this deep trial, perhaps we, too, shall be declared competent to judge a nation.

No greater love hath a man than to lay down his life for his brother. By this death we are challenged to live—to work for right and justice—to guard our heritage, and to provide continued leadership to a dark and searching world.

MUCH EXCESS CAPACITY IS OBSOLETE—SKILL SHORTAGES EXPECTED

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, two recent articles make an important contribution to the debate on the administration's tax cut proposal and the contention that inflation will not result from the expansionary fiscal program because of a large amount of idle plant and manpower in the economy.

A survey by the Wall Street Journal shows that the nearly unanimous consensus of top economists who follow capital investment trends is that a considerable increase in plant and equipment outlays will take place next year even if taxes are not cut at all during 1964. Capital spending is expected to be about 8 percent higher than in 1963 without the tax cut and, with a tax cut, the increase could go as high as 10 or 11 percent.

One of the most important reasons for the anticipated increase in capital spending is the fact that manufacturers are employing more and more of their productive facilities. According to the Federal Reserve Board Index, manufacturing in the third quarter was operating at a rate equal to the first quarter of 1955, just before the 1955-56 capital goods boom began. Government specialists are cited as saying that during the current quarter the operating rate will hit 88-89 percent, which would be larger than the level of any quarter in 7 years.

Aside from the fact that manufacturing has less excess capacity than in many years, it is also relevant that much of the excess capacity which exists is largely obsolete. The average age of the Nation's production equipment is now 9.6 years, up from 8.5 years in 1955. McGraw-Hill estimates that 64 percent of U.S. machine tools are at least 10 years old. At the start of the post-World War II period, the figure was only 38 percent. The current percentage, according to the Journal, is higher than for any other major industrial country.

These facts have led many economists to believe that industry really has far less excess capacity than the record indicates. Almarin Phillips, professor of economics at the University of Pennsylvania, is quoted as saying that a great deal of this productive capacity is obsolete and that for this reason, "an operating rate of 87 percent today is a lot closer to true capacity than was an 87-percent rate 6 or 7 years ago."

The steel industry illustrates the situation. Last year steel producers eliminated nearly 3 million tons of obsolete steelmaking capacity. The elimination rate will accelerate in the years just ahead. The high retirement rate helps to explain why, despite its low operat-

ing level of 63 percent of capacity, the steel industry will spend \$1.3 billion for new facilities next year.

An article from Steel magazine gives the results of an annual survey of 7,500 managers in the metalworking industries. Of the managers surveyed, 29.1 percent expect skilled personnel shortages in 1964. Only 23.3 percent expressed similar concern last year. These figures bear out the contention of many economists that as the economy expands under the stimulus of tax cuts and higher levels of Government spending, skill shortages and bottlenecks will occur that will lead to inflationary pressures in the economy. At the same time, many believe that a general economic expansion will have little effect in reducing hard-core unemployment.

Under unanimous consent, I insert the articles from the Wall Street Journal of November 20 and the Steel magazine of November 18 in the Record at the conclusion of these remarks:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Nov. 20, 1963]

SPENDING SPEEDUP: SHARP RISE IN OUTLAYS FOR PLANTS, EQUIPMENT FORECAST BY ECONOMISTS—SOME EXPECT 10 PERCENT RISE IN 1964 OVER 1963—CITE LESS EXCESS CAPACITY, AGING MACHINERY—BULLISH BUILDERS, TOOL FIRMS

(By Alfred L. Malabre, Jr.)

Business spending for new plants and machinery, now climbing at a leisurely pace, will mount sharply in coming months.

That's the nearly unanimous consensus of some 2 dozen economists who closely follow capital investment trends. Their view is buttressed by reports from plant builders and makers of machine tools. Because capital spending is such an important spur to overall economic growth, the forecast augurs well for continuing business expansion in 1964 and perhaps beyond.

"The clearest spot in my crystal ball, and the brightest, is capital spending—it should provide a very big plus for next year's economy," declares Albert T. Sommers, director of economic research at the National Industrial Conference Board, New York.

Plant and equipment spending is already on the rise. Government estimates put full-year 1963 outlays at a record \$39.1 billion, nearly 5 percent higher than last year. And a recent survey of businessmen by McGraw-Hill Publishing Co. places capital expenditures next year 4 percent above the estimated 1963 level.

SEES 8-PERCENT RISE

Now, however, many analysts forecast much steeper gains. "We're inclined to look for a rise of at least 8 percent in capital outlays in 1964," says Norris Johnson, senior vice president and economist of First National City Bank, New York.

"Business activity has moved up to the point where it can trip off a real acceleration of plant and equipment expenditures," adds Paul McCracken, an economics professor at the University of Michigan. "I don't think a 10-percent increase next year is out of line at all."

A gain of 10 percent would be sharper than any yearly rise since the 1955-56 capital spending boom, when outlays swelled 22 percent.

So sanguine is the mood of most economists that a considerable increase of outlays is anticipated even if taxes aren't cut at all during 1964. Typically, an analyst at the National Bureau of Economic Research, New York, says, "Without any tax cut, 1964 capital spending should still be at least 8 percent

higher than in 1963; with a cut, the rise will probably go as high as 10 or 11 percent."

Talks with companies that build plants and machinery give support to economists' predictions of sharply rising outlays.

BUSY BUILDERS

"Our bookings are running some 15 percent higher than a year ago and leave little doubt that 1964 will be a very big year for us," reports F. B. Warren, executive vice president of Turner Construction Co., New York. The company builds commercial structures ranging from factories to office buildings to stores.

E. P. Bullard, president of Bullard Co., a Bridgeport, Conn., machine toolmaker, is no less ebullient. "We've got our biggest order backlog in over 7 years," he says. "Orders already on our books will occupy our full production facilities through June, and new business is still pouring in." Among Bullard's most eager customers are auto and appliance manufacturers.

Generally, analysts who forecast a sharp capital spending rise base their estimates on several broad economic developments, rather than on any survey method of checking businessmen's spending plans. Many economists contend executives are habitually conservative about their spending plans and, in any case, often haven't decided upon their full programs when most polls about the year ahead are conducted.

Perhaps the key development leading many analysts to forecast a capital spending speedup is the fact that most manufacturers are using an increasing portion of their total production capacity. Heretofore, extensive "excess," or unused, capacity has been viewed as a major deterrent to any large increase of capital outlays.

As one Commerce Department economist puts it: "Who's going to rush out to buy a lot of new machines when half his existing equipment is standing around idle?"

USING MORE CAPACITY

No exact measure of production capacity exists. The prime guide of many economists, however, is an index issued by the Federal Reserve Board. It measures the percentage of production capacity used each quarter by manufacturers. According to this yardstick, manufacturers employed 87 percent of their full production potential in the third quarter, up from 85 percent at the year's start and from only 77 percent as recently as the first quarter of 1961, at the beginning of the current business expansion.

The latest rate, some analysts note, is equal to the rate in the first quarter of 1955, just before the 1955-56 capital goods boom.

A Government specialist who helps put together the quarterly estimates believes the rate in the current quarter will probably hit 88 or 89 percent. At 89 percent, it would exceed the level of any quarter in 7 years. "And unless companies begin to step up their expansion programs, we can expect 90 percent rates and above next year," he adds. Once their operating rates move much above 90 percent, most manufacturers say, production becomes less efficient and more costly.

Studies indicate that as the operating rate for manufacturers climbs so does the portion of capital outlays devoted to expansion, rather than modernization, of facilities. McGraw-Hill finds that 32 percent of this year's outlays are for expansion, up from 30 percent last year.

Expansion may become an even greater spur to capital spending in 1964, company reports suggest. Example: Some 75 percent of Scott Paper Co.'s increased 1964 capital outlays will be spent to expand plant facilities, up from only 25 percent for expansion this year.

Operations also appear to be gaining on capacity in some major industries not di-

rectly measured by the Federal Reserve's index. The Nation's railroads, in fact, have much more business than they can handle. One analyst recently estimated that shippers need 10,000 more freight cars daily than the railroads can supply.

AGING PRODUCTION FACILITIES

The increasing average age of U.S. production facilities is another key consideration of the many economists who believe businessmen are bound to accelerate their plant and equipment expenditures in coming months.

The Machinery and Allied Products Institute, a Washington-based trade group, places the average age of the Nation's production equipment now at 9.6 years, up from 9.4 years in 1962 and from 8.5 in 1955. And McGraw-Hill estimates 64 percent of U.S. machine tools are at least 10 years old, up from 60 percent in 1958 and only 38 percent at the start of the post-World War II period. The current percentage is considerably higher than for any other major industrial country; the Russian rate, for instance, is 50 percent. One of every five U.S. machine tools, in fact, is over 20 years old.

The age of U.S. machinery prompts many economists to believe industry really has far less excess capacity than the record indicates. "A great deal of today's production capacity is obsolete," says Almarin Phillips, a professor of economics at the University of Pennsylvania. "For this reason, an operating rate of 87 percent today is a lot closer to true capacity than was an 87 percent rate 6 or 7 years ago."

Steel probably provides the most dramatic illustration of an industry compelled to step up its capital spending because of obsolete equipment. Last year steel producers eliminated nearly 3 million tons of steelmaking capacity, a postwar record. The elimination rate, moreover, will accelerate in the years just ahead, a steel industry analyst predicts, because of the industry's competitive need for new equipment, such as oxygen-type furnaces.

BIG STEEL OUTLAYS

This high retirement rate helps explain why, despite its low operating level of about 63 percent of capacity, the steel industry is sharply increasing its 1964 capital outlays. Steel producers will spend \$1.8 billion for new facilities next year, McGraw-Hill forecasts. That's 50 percent more than the industry's estimated 1963 spending. It's a sharper gain than is predicted for any other U.S. industry.

The record accumulation of cash in corporate coffers is another consideration of analysts who forecast steeply higher business expenditures in 1964. Companies' so-called internal funds—earnings retained after dividend and tax payments, plus amounts set aside from pretax profits for depreciation—exceeded \$37 billion last year, a record, and some \$10 billion higher than a decade before. And, of course, the cash pileup may accelerate if corporate taxes are cut.

"The fact that many companies have a record amount of cash on hand, and therefore aren't faced with costly borrowing problems, certainly weighs on the side of increased capital spending," says the University of Michigan's Mr. McCracken.

Most economists also reason that the prospect of rising profit returns will induce many executives to proceed with projects that were previously in question. Profits of U.S. manufacturers amounted to 5 percent of sales in the second quarter, the latest period available. That's up sharply from 3.5 percent as recently as the start of this expansion.

"If profit margins continue to widen, and that seems quite likely, many projects that have been merely pending will be actually launched," says an economist for a large appliance manufacturer.

[From Steel magazine, Nov. 18, 1963]

ARE YOU FACING A SKILLED LABOR SHORTAGE?

"Skilled help is becoming a greater problem every year." While not yet a universal complaint, that comment appears more frequently in Steel's annual survey of metalworking managers this year than in the last 7 years.

Of the 7,500 managers surveyed, 29.1 percent of the respondents expect a skilled personnel shortage in 1964. Only 23.3 percent expressed similar concern last year, the 1962 Steel survey shows.

Machinists and tool and diemakers top metalworking's personnel demand list. More than 7 percent of the respondents say they will need topnotch, experienced machinists next year, while nearly 6 percent are looking for tool and diemakers. In contrast, less than 3 percent cite a shortage of engineering talent. Chief demand for machinists and tool and diemakers will come from the nonelectrical machinery industry, the survey shows.

While large firms (more than 500 employees) expressed greatest concern over lack of skilled labor last year, small companies (less than 100 employees) are crying the loudest this year. More than 31 percent of small firms replying cite skilled labor needs (up from 22.7 percent last year), while 28.5 percent of the large corporations voice similar concern (up from 24.9 percent last year).

Industry breakdown: All seven of the industry groups studied in the survey (S.I.C. 19, 25, and 39 were combined) show greater concern with the problem than last year.

Do you expect a shortage of employees in any trade or skill in 1964?

	Yes	
	1964	1963
	Percent	Percent
Primary metals.....	27.1	17.7
Fabricated metal products.....	26.4	24.6
Machinery.....	36.5	29.2
Electrical machinery.....	21.6	17.9
Transportation equipment.....	27.3	17.4
Instruments.....	38.0	26.7
Other metalworking ¹	26.5	22.0

¹ Includes manufacturers of furniture and fixtures, ordnance, and miscellaneous metalworking.

"We find we must train 70 percent of all skilled workers," says a Midwest machinery manufacturer. "Men just don't want to develop or improve their skills," adds a metal fabricator.

A particular area skilled labor shortage is cited by an East Moline, Ill., manufacturer. "There is a shortage of skilled factory workers in this area, and we expect the same condition to exist in 1964," he reports.

Investigation: At least two studies are in the works, geared to identifying areas and industries affected by the skilled manpower shortage.

Beginning in January, the U.S. Employment Service (USES) will issue monthly reports on skilled labor shortages in particular industries.

The information will appear in a new Government publication, Employment Service Review, and will include the missile, computer, motor vehicle, appliance, electronic, and steel industries, USES says.

George Rockwood, executive director, Tool & Die Institute (TDI), Chicago, says opinions on the shortage in the Chicago area differ depending on "which shop you talk to."

For that reason, TDI is planning a comprehensive survey of the skilled manpower status to be conducted within the next couple of months. Mr. Rockwood offers one encouraging sign: "We have a record attendance at our night schools this year—

better than 600, which is 27 percent ahead of a year ago. We graduated 63 in May, expect to graduate 80 next May, and 125 by 1966," he enthuses. "Instructors report a better caliber of young men entering, indicating that employers are doing a better job of screening apprentices," he adds.

APPRENTICE PROGRAM ENROLLMENTS LAG

Despite increasing demands for skilled labor, Labor Department figures show that apprentice programs can't be expected to offer much help. The Department's Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training (BAT) reports the number of registered apprentices in the United States has been steadily declining since 1957.

Currently, about 160,000 apprentices are registered with the Labor Department through State agencies. Another 50,000 are enrolled in unregistered programs, officials estimate. In contrast, registered apprentices at the end of World War II totaled about 260,000.

BAT researchers blame the drop on repeated recessions and rising unemployment. "We are having a tough time selling apprenticeship when people are out of work," says one source.

Approaches: The main force of the Nation's apprenticeship programs is concentrated in what BAT calls area joint programs—those where a union or a number of unions join with a group of employers. Such programs, representing every major trade, now total about 5,500, BAT says. In addition, some firms have their own programs, though "too many of them are limited to only one or two apprentices at a time," a BAT official tells Steel.

Technical institute apprenticeship programs for semiprofessional workers (such as electronic technicians and automatic machinery operators) are also criticized. "You can't duplicate plant facilities in a schoolroom. Of course, you can put a lathe into a school and teach a man how to run it, but the lathe might be 10 years old—surplus from some plant," says the BAT official. He believes industries which need modern skills should look at the possibility of more apprenticeship programs.

Despite an upswing in the number of registered apprentices in Ohio, Oscar Poole, Cleveland BAT representative, admits that there is "still a noticeable skilled labor shortage in the industrial trades." Most of the increased registrations have been in the building trades.

CHRYSLER LOCAL WINS U.S. TRAINING GRANT

Your union may be able to help you provide training designed to upgrade workers.

Local 412, a Chrysler Corp. white-collar unit of the United Auto Workers, was recently granted \$16,231 under the Manpower Development and Training Act to train 60 employees.

Plan: Ray Sullivan, president of the local, says that 20 persons will be trained in each of 3 trades—mechanical drafting, graphic illustrating, and clay modeling.

The union petitioned the Labor Department last March after a Detroit Board of Education survey showed increasing demand for these skills.

The UAW, with representatives from the international and the local on the board of administration, will provide the instructors, supervision, and facilities.

Aptitude tests will be given by the Michigan Employment Security Commission. These factors will count heavily in final selection:

1. Is the applicant employed but due to be displaced by automation?
2. Is he employed but in a nonskilled or lower skilled job?
3. Is he unemployed due to a lack of technical skill?

ECONOMISTS AGREE ON NEED TO IMPROVE STATISTICS FOR POLICYMAKING PURPOSES

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on October 15 I inserted in the RECORD—pages 19584-19588—an article by Dr. Oskar Morgenstern, of Princeton University, relating to the weaknesses in our economic statistics and the need of improving upon them. The subject is of crucial importance for sound economic policy and, in my view, Dr. Morgenstern has made a major contribution to this end.

As I indicated in my remarks accompanying the article, I sent copies of Dr. Morgenstern's article to a large number of outstanding economists, requesting any comments that they might have. I have now received a number of replies, all of which express general agreement with the major points of Dr. Morgenstern's article, particularly on the need to indicate the margin of error in our statistics whenever that is possible.

Because of the generally favorable character of these replies and my own conviction about the importance of the article, I have urged Senator WILLIAM PROXMIER, in a letter of November 18, to hold hearings by the Joint Economic Committee's Economic Statistics Subcommittee next year on some of the major points in the Morgenstern article. Under unanimous consent, I include a copy of my letter to Senator PROXMIER, who is chairman of the subcommittee, as well as copies of the letters from economists on the Morgenstern article, in the RECORD at this point:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., November 18, 1963.
Senator WILLIAM PROXMIER,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Economic
Statistics, Joint Economic Committee,
Congress of the United States, Wash-
ington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIER: On October 15 I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Dr. Oskar Morgenstern, of Princeton University, relating to the production and use of economic statistics. Attached is a copy of my remarks and the Morgenstern article from the RECORD.

As I said in my comments, I wrote to a large number of outstanding economists asking their opinion on the Morgenstern article. I have now received a number of replies, copies of which are attached for your information. As you will see, there is almost universal agreement about the major points raised in Dr. Morgenstern's article, particularly on the need to indicate the margin of error in our economic statistics whenever that is possible.

I think that the issues raised by Dr. Morgenstern are so important that it would be useful if the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics of the Joint Economic Committee were to schedule hearings next year to explore some of the major points which he has raised. The general agreement among

economists about the validity of Dr. Morgenstern's main contentions reinforces my opinion that hearings should be held. I hope you will give this suggestion your most careful consideration as you plan the subcommittee's program for next year.

With very best wishes.

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY,
SCHOOL OF LABOR AND INDUS-
TRIAL RELATIONS,

East Lansing, October 28, 1963.

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
U.S. House of Representatives,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CURTIS: Thank you for your letter of October 21. I was glad to have the opportunity to read the article by Dr. Morgenstern from Fortune magazine.

I find myself in agreement with some of the points that he makes, especially with regard to our unemployment statistics. I am enclosing herewith a copy of a speech which I gave here last week in elaboration of some of the points which I made in my testimony before Senator CLARK's subcommittee last month. You were kind enough to express an interest in my Senate testimony, and it occurred to me that you might also be interested in the further development of some of these points in the enclosed speech.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES C. KILLINGSWORTH,
University Professor of Labor and In-
dustrial Relations.

THE CHASE MANHATTAN BANK,
New York, N.Y., October 28, 1963.
The Honorable THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: I found Dr. Morgenstern's article fascinating. The main moral I drew from it was that greater attention needs to be paid to the quality of our statistics. I wonder sometimes if it might not be better to improve existing statistics rather than trying to develop a lot of new sources.

In the very nature of things, however, I doubt if it will ever be possible to achieve the degree of perfection sought by Dr. Morgenstern.

Cordially,

WILLIAM F. BUTLER,
Vice President.

BUCKNELL UNIVERSITY,
Lewisburg, Pa., October 28, 1963.
Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House of Representatives, Congress of the
United States, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CURTIS: I want to thank you for your thoughtfulness in sending me the copy of your insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Oskar Morgenstern's article on the margins of error present in the currently available statistics of national income and price levels.

I had already read Professor Morgenstern's article in Fortune and was impressed, as were you, with its salutary warning on the misuses of statistics, particularly where they are made the basis for formulating and applying economic, monetary, and fiscal policy.

The balance-of-payments problem of the United States, in particular, seems to be an area in which we have for too long allowed ourselves to be deluded by hopeful prognostications concerning fractional differences in rates of growth and fractional differences in price levels in the United States and in the rest of the world, particularly Europe. A case in point is the recently completed study of the U.S. balance of payments by

the Brookings Institution ("The U.S. Balance of Payments in 1968," by Walter Salant, et al.). This is a book which on the basis not only of existing statistics but statistics projected 5 years ahead argues that the deficit in the U.S. balance of payments will be eliminated by 1968. The highly questionable inference drawn by the authors from these statistical projections and manipulations is that the United States need take no significant internal action now to correct the deficit, since the balance of payments will be automatically in equilibrium in a few years anyhow.

The danger that the do-nothing policies recommended by the Brookings report will become guidelines for the present administration is great because of the almost cabalistic zeal with which the statistical numbers game is played by many and this in spite of the authors' own explicit warnings of the possibility of error in their findings. Unflinchingly, the report warns that its basic assumptions may be wrong, that the effects of assumed relative changes in prices and incomes in the United States and Western Europe may lie outside the range projected, and that numerous important variables, not considered, may seriously modify the hypothetical values of the variables which are considered.

Though the authors of the Brookings report give no numerical value to the margins of error they postulate, the legitimate inference which may be drawn from their repeated cautions on this point is that the margins are wide. Errors may enter not only into the projected trends but into the statistics which are the basis of such projections. As Morgenstern points out, errors of 30 percent and more are not uncommon in the computation of national income statistics. But a margin of only 5 percent may result in wide swings of estimated national income and even wider swings of variables dependent on national income. Assuming a gross national product of \$550 billion, a 5 percent error amounts to a plus or minus variation of roughly \$30 billion, or approximately the value of total U.S. exports (visible and invisible). If, as Morgenstern asserts, a reliable growth rate of two significant digits is "impossible to establish," it would be a foolhardy policymaker who would attach any particular significance to the Brookings report's estimates that U.S. growth will proceed at an annual rate of 4.8 percent a year for the next 6 years, whereas Europe will achieve only a 4.2 percent growth rate. But a major part of the Brookings report's conclusions are based on this fractional difference in growth rates and on its continuance from 1961 through 1968.

Given this indeterminate but probably large band of error in the calculations of the authors of the Brookings report, the so-called basic balance of payments of the United States could be in deficit in 1968 rather than in surplus, and in deficit by a substantially larger amount than the \$600 million yielded by the "pessimistic" assumptions of the authors. The concept of the "basic balance" is itself a source of errors and rests upon what seems to be a questionable methodology. The basic balance comprehends only transactions in goods and services and long-term capital transfers, private and official. Excluded from consideration as "transitory factors" whose movements allegedly do not lend themselves to long-term projection are short-term capital movements and errors and omissions. However, errors and omissions comprehend various unrecorded capital transactions which on occasion, as in the gold crisis of fall 1960, may be of significant size. Moreover, short-term capital tends to move sympathetically with the balance-of-payments position: such capital is likely to flow

out when the basic balance is in deficit and to flow in when the basic balance is in surplus. The "basic balance" is thus clearly an abstraction. What will be decisive in 1968, however, and indeed in all the years intervening to that point, will be the actual total net balance of payments, namely, the algebraic sum of all of the U.S. international credit and debit transactions except transactions in gold and changes in U.S. liquid liabilities abroad. If this total net balance were to continue negative until 1968, only further outflows of U.S. gold and/or additional increases in dollar holdings abroad would provide the necessary offsetting credits.

The authors of the Brookings report, in their preoccupation with the statistical projection of the basic balance of payments in 1968, ignore the psychological effects of further cumulative deficits in the actual balance of payments. If the gold base continues to shrink as it has been doing and the foreign claims on this dwindling reserve continue to increase as they have been doing, the hoped-for swing in the "basic balance" in 1968 may never occur because considerably before that date foreign dollar holders may have decided to cash in their chips, fearing devaluation. The projected statistical turn in the "basic" balance of payments in 1968 will be of little comfort where a worldwide collapse of confidence in the dollar will have destroyed the existing international monetary system.

In summary, I want to enter my strong endorsement of Professor Morgenstern's views and to express the hope that it will indeed be possible to schedule hearings before the Joint Economic Committee on the dangers that result from the excessively casual use or aggregative statistics in deciding issues of the gravest moment to the Nation's future.

"Economics by statistics" has become the modern abracadabra of policy; like magic in general, its aim is very often not to enlighten but to hoodwink. The possibility of manipulating numbers of questionable accuracy in directions which tend to support preconceived positions presents a constant temptation to economists anxious to avoid confrontation with unpleasant economic truths. Professor Morgenstern has performed an important and timely service in reminding us of these facts.

Very sincerely yours,

PATRICK M. BOARMAN,
Associate Professor of Economics.

YALE UNIVERSITY,
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS,
New Haven, Conn., October 28, 1963.
The Honorable THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: Thank you very much for your interesting letter of October 21. I very much appreciate your sending me that part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which contains Oskar Morgenstern's warnings concerning the inappropriate use of statistical data. The warning is, I think, justified and I am very glad it got into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

With repeated thanks.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM FELLNER,
Sterling Professor of Economics.

DARTMOUTH COLLEGE,
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS,
Hanover, N.H., October 28, 1963.
Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOM: Thank you for sending me pages from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD con-

taining Oskar Morgenstern's article of warning on the use of economic statistics. I am in complete agreement with Morgenstern that both economic concepts and economic data should be improved, and I have for many years deplored the spurious accuracy implied in many official statistics. Greater regard concerning the number of figures that are significant should be observed by compilers and publishers of data.

Furthermore, I also agree that the margin of error should be indicated whenever it is determinable, but this cannot be done for many statistical series. Generally, when the margin of error cannot be determined on a basis of mathematical probability it has little scientific meaning. In short, when error is due to vagaries other than observation and measurement, an estimate of the margin of error is itself subject to an uncertain margin of error. Professor Kuznets, who is second to none in his mastery of national income concepts and data, has had to resort to estimating the margins of error of national income components in an unscientific manner because they could only be measured subjectively. His subjective estimates of the margins of error are, of course, not necessarily cumulative, nor need they be entirely compensating, but they are probably partially compensating. This still leaves us with the likelihood, as Morgenstern notes, of a subjective margin of error that may be as large as 5 or 10 percent.

Nevertheless there is reason to suspect that such margins of error are apt to change relatively little from one year to the next and, therefore, probably do not seriously affect most comparisons over a relatively short span of years. The reason for this stability is that the basic concepts and the method of data collection itself do not change rapidly. Consequently, I believe Morgenstern tends to exaggerate the effect of such errors, perhaps to dramatize the shortcomings of economic data, when he assumes a shift in the margin of error in making short-run comparisons as he does in his discussion of the table reprinted from his article.

Elsewhere in the article Morgenstern suggests the use of qualitative information. I am not entirely certain what he means by this. There is some value in using business annals but they are fragmentary and usually not available in time for policy determination. In any case such qualitative information is prone to an even greater margin of error than the data previously complained of. However, if Morgenstern is suggesting the desirability of disaggregating composite statistics into smaller components, a procedure which has been vigorously proposed by Prof. Arthur Burns, I am convinced such data could be exceedingly helpful in many policy situations; e.g., statistics concerning structural unemployment and its location.

In conclusion, I feel that economists both inside and outside the Government should improve their concepts and the statistical data they use and furthermore that the margin of error should be measured whenever it is meaningful to do so and the results published along with the data to which the margins are applicable. Budget and time constraints as well as intellectual limitations will still leave us with imperfect statistics. In my view the Government therefore will still be compelled to act on imperfect knowledge, which is what businessmen do every day, or not act at all.

We certainly require far more sophistication on the part of the press, the public, the Government, and academic economists in the use of imperfect data much of which will continue to possess an unknowable margin of error. As a first step, it would perhaps be advisable for the Government to publish only the significant figures in their official

statistics. Didn't Aristotle say something to the effect that the mark of an educated man was not to expect more certainty than the subject permitted? We should strive for greater certainty and we must not be misled by spurious accuracy, but we cannot afford to be paralyzed for lack of certainty.

With best regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL MARX, Jr.,
Professor of Economics.

THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA,
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,
Athens, Ga., October 23, 1963.

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: I greatly appreciate your sending me Dr. Morgenstern's article which I think is eminently sound. It bears out one of my pet theories which is that the public today does not go wrong on esoteric points of economics but on pretty elementary ones.

Morgenstern's points are—or should be—well known within the profession. My "Key to Modern Economics," Macmillan 1954, has long sections on the vagueness of such concepts as unemployment, full employment, price indexes, gross national product, etc. I do not personally think shifts in most economic figures of less than 5 percent can be given any scientifically conclusive weight. In many cases even 5 percent is not enough.

The trouble is that a political lobby comes to have a vested interest in the idea that certain figures are conclusive. Also some macro-economists often do not like to think of the vagueness of their basic data. Thus the defects and unreliability of the data are not stressed. The point is a very serious one.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID MCCORD WRIGHT.

NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL CONFERENCE
BOARD, INC.,
New York, N.Y., October 24, 1963.

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: Thank you very much for your letter of October 21, and the enclosed excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Professor Morgenstern's fine article on the use of economic statistics, as well as your own interesting comments, serve an extremely useful function and, in my opinion, deserve wide circulation.

I find myself in general agreement with the warnings and proposals contained in the article and shall therefore limit myself to but a few brief comments.

1. Many of our statistical series are still very imperfect and should be improved over time. As a rule these imperfections are the result of serious conceptual problems, deficiencies and lack of uniformity in the accounts of the private economy and limitations of funds for gathering and digesting statistical information. Improvements are therefore dependent on conceptual refinements, better statistical resources and full cooperation between the agencies and the private economy.

2. An indication of the probable margins of error of statistical series is very desirable whenever such margins can be established with some degree of accuracy. In those instances where this is impossible, a general statement concerning the proper and legitimate uses of the data may be helpful.

3. There is great need for alerting and educating practicing economists as well as government officials, the press, and the general public on the subject of proper use, and the dangers of abuse, of the inexact statistical data that by necessity form the raw material of economic analysis.

On this count Professor Morgenstern's article, as well as your own valuable comments and past work, perform an important and timely service.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL E. LEVY,
Senior Economist,
Division of Economic Research.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., October 23, 1963.

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: Thank you for your letter of October 21, 1963, in which you enclosed copies of the article by Dr. Morgenstern, from the October issue of Fortune magazine and your own comments inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I do have some comments to make on Dr. Morgenstern's article and I will be happy to forward them to you as soon as they are completed.

Sincerely yours,

RAYMOND T. BOWMAN,
Assistant Director for Statistical
Standards.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY IN THE CITY
OF NEW YORK, DEPARTMENT OF
ECONOMICS,

New York, N.Y., October 23, 1963.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: It was indeed good of you to send the copy of Prof. Morgenstern's article. Just this week I had one of my seminar students report on it, but I realized that we should give it more time.

After I have myself studied it more carefully, I shall pass along any suggestions that may occur to me.

As a big consumer of statistics, I appreciate efforts, such as those of the Government's Division of the Census, to indicate confidence intervals.

Please be assured of my best wishes.

Your truly

C. LOWELL HARRISS,
Professor of Economics.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER,
November 4, 1963.

The Honorable THOMAS B. CURTIS,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOM: Thanks for sending me the reprint of Oskar Morgenstern's article.

A thesis on which I have expounded from time to time is that our economic policy of the fifties was seriously misled by poor statistics, and that our economic policy of the sixties will be seriously misled by good enough statistics badly interpreted.

For the fifties I am referring to the Consumer Price Index. As the studies in the Stigler volume (prepared by the National Bureau of Economic Research under contract with the Bureau of the Budget and first published by the Joint Economic Committee) show, the Consumer Price Index almost certainly overstated the amount of inflation in the fifties. As a result, the Federal Reserve Board spent a lot of time combating an inflation that wasn't there, and had an inhibiting effect on "growth." The unemployment figures are probably better, statistically, but they are terribly complicated to interpret, and the superficial interpretations given to them make the unemployment problem appear considerably worse than it is. That is why I say that good statistics poorly interpreted are likely to mislead our economic policy in the sixties.

While I was still working at the White House, Bud Fackler and I calculated that if unemployment stays the same in the sixties as it was in the fifties, the numbers published by the BLS will run about 10 percent higher. When I say to suppose that unem-

ployment in the sixties is the same as in the fifties, I mean to suppose that it is the same for each specific subgroup of the labor force, when the labor force is classified by age, sex, education, occupation, marital status, race, and all the other factors that are related to unemployment rates. The mix of the labor force of the sixties will change in a direction that will raise the overall unemployment rate by about 10 percent, even if the rates stay the same for the individual subgroups. For example, a new entrant to the labor force cannot become employed without first being defined as unemployed by the definition in use by the Bureau of the Census. The very fact, therefore, that there will be a great increase in the number of new entrants during the sixties means that the overall statistical figure on unemployment will rise, even if there is no real deterioration in the employment situation.

Another example relates to comparative economic growth of Russia and the United States. If the basic performances of the two economies stay the same in the sixties as they did in the fifties, we can expect to look a whole lot better statistically compared to the Russians in the sixties. The reason is that we will have tremendous additions to the labor force, and therefore additions to our GNP, whereas the Russian labor force will suffer greatly from failing to acquire all of the babies who should have been born during the period 1941-46. (Incidentally, this may have something to do with the Russians' realization that the moon is not in reach for them in this decade.)

Sincerely,

ALLEN.

NATIONAL BUREAU OF ECONOMIC
RESEARCH, INC.,
New York, N.Y., November 6, 1963.

The Honorable THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOM: Thanks for your letter and for the copy of Dr. Morgenstern's article.

I certainly agree that official agencies need to give far more attention than they do, first, to estimating or judging the margins of errors surrounding the statistics they compile; second, to informing the public of these margins of error; third, in laying plans before their superiors in the Executive and the Congress for reducing or eliminating statistical errors.

Cordially,

ARTHUR F. BURNS.

NATIONAL PLANNING ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., November 14, 1963.

The Honorable THOMAS CURTIS,
House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOM: I appreciate your sending me a copy of your speech in which you commented on Oskar Morgenstern's article in Fortune magazine. I had already read Morgenstern's article with great interest. I entirely agree with him that the agency providing statistics should pay more attention to the margin of error implied in the statistics.

I was very much interested when Professor Mehalanobis from India, who is the president of the Institute of Statistics in Calcutta, discussed "margins of error" at the United Nations Conference on Application of Science and Technology in Underdeveloped Countries in Geneva last February. If I remember correctly he proposed that we use besides a statistically and mathematically defined concept of margins of error also an operational criterion for determining tolerable limits of error. For some purposes it is most important to know whether a certain curve is going up or down (for instance sales expectations in various industries) even if

we have no confidence at all in the quantification. In other instances even small margins of error may make the statistics useless for policy or business purposes.

What I'm suggesting is that if the Joint Committee should deal with this topic both these aspects are considered.

With best regards,
Sincerely yours,

GERHARD COLM.

MEMORIAL TO THE LATE PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, our late President, John F. Kennedy, and Mrs. Kennedy in their 3 short years in the White House enriched the cultural life of our Nation beyond measure. Our appreciation for their vital interest in the arts should be expressed in a living tribute. Plans presently underway for a national center for the performing arts should be stepped up and the product of the encouragement of Mr. Kennedy and the labors of so many citizens should be rededicated as the John F. Kennedy Memorial Center. This will be the most appropriate memorial to a man who firmly believed that the extent of a nation's esteem for the arts is a reflection of the quality of its civilization. I am introducing legislation to this effect and ask that a fine editorial which appeared in this morning's Washington Post be included at this point in the RECORD:

A FITTING MEMORIAL

Of course, the National Cultural Center should be newly consecrated to the memory of John F. Kennedy. There could be few more fitting memorials to a President who enlivened the White House with music, drama and poetry. Mr. Kennedy, moreover, was the embodiment of life and vitality; a conventional monument would be false to his own spirit. Far better a place where people gather to hear and see works of beauty than a marble mausoleum which would seem to embalm rather than evoke his memory.

A John F. Kennedy Memorial Center—the name itself is an improvement over the present self-conscious name—would have an additional merit. It would enable the sponsors of the center to reexamine the design and location in the light of a changed purpose. Perhaps the present setting and architecture would in the end be found adaptable to a memorial function. But the objections raised about inaccessibility and structural limitations could be thoughtfully reconsidered.

No living memorial could catch all the qualities of a gifted President who was equally at home in the library and on the football field. But the best single suggestion so far is a memorial center for the performing arts—potentially, a place of splendor and grace that could be a proud addition to the Capital of the United States.

NATION'S GRATITUDE DUE BROADCASTING INDUSTRY

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of the atmosphere of shock, disbelief, and sadness many thoughts felt by each of us could not find expression in words. I would like, however, to attempt to put into words the debt of gratitude which this Nation owes to the broadcasting industry—both radio and television—for the magnificent way in which the members of that industry have permitted the American people to participate in their homes in the tragic events of the last few days.

In judging the performance of an industry on an overall basis it is necessary to balance significant contributions with trivial offerings. If a balance sheet were to be made up today, I certainly feel that the performance of the industry during the last few days in the minds of the American people tends to offset much of the criticism which more recently has been levied against the industry.

The achievement of the industry is all the more remarkable because it demonstrates the capacity for voluntary cooperation on the part of networks and stations in serving the American people at times when such service is most needed.

The decision of networks and individual broadcasters to cancel commercial programs and advertising is a clear demonstration that the industry can, if it so desires, live up to the highest standards of public service.

We have some appreciation of the cost to the industry of this unprecedented coverage, and the vast technical achievements which were accomplished in putting together the pieces of the story of one of our Nation's saddest periods. Never before has there been such a documentation of history in the making for the American public.

Having been a frequent critic of particular aspects of the broadcasting industry, I am particularly gratified that I can say to the industry today:

Thanks for a job well done. We can say truthfully today that we Americans have felt fused together as one people largely because of the outstanding contribution made by the broadcasting industry during these last few days in covering the tragic events which none of us will forget in our lifetimes.

Not only for myself, Mr. Speaker, but for the Congress and the American people I want express sincere thanks and appreciation for this tremendous public service rendered so magnificently by this great industry. To the management, the performers, newscasters, commentators, engineers, technicians, and everyone associated with the industry, we owe a debt of gratitude.

A TRIBUTE TO THE BROADCASTING MEDIA

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to commend and thank the broadcasting media for the excellent manner in which they undertook to inform the public of the tragic event that was thrust upon us last Friday. Immediately the industry dispensed with all regular programming and voluntarily prohibited commercials in order that the American people and the world could be kept informed of the subsequent events.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, to bring this matter to the attention of the House for I am sure that the manner in which the industry performed a public service from Friday last until after the interment of our beloved late President cost the industry untold millions of dollars. This act is of great significance at this time particularly since the Federal Communications Commission has recently proposed strict limitations on commercial time which I believe to be contrary to the intent of Congress at the time of the enactment of the Communications Act of 1934.

On November 7, 1963, Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Communications and Power under the chairmanship of my very good friend and colleague from Texas, the Honorable WALTER ROGERS, held hearings on H.R. 6697, and a companion bill, H.R. 8980, which I had the pleasure of introducing to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from prescribing standards with respect to the length and frequency of advertisements which may be broadcast by all or any class of stations in the broadcast service.

Mr. Speaker, we have been very vividly shown the value of the broadcasting media during the past sorrowful days. This has been accomplished through the desire of the media to provide a public service and, I say again, at considerable operating expense—not to mention the loss of revenue from prohibiting commercials.

I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will act favorably on H.R. 6697 in order that the House may consider it in the near future, at which time I urge all Members of this body to remember the commendable way in which this great media conducted itself during the events of the past few days.

JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, a bright and shining figure in the image of Plato's philosopher-rulers has been struck down. It is the essence of the image that the guardian of the state

possess vast disinterestedness, perceptive understanding, swift insight—that “divine madness” which reaches valid conclusions before the premises are fully stated. Power in President Kennedy’s hands was only a means to an end—and that end was the enrichment of human life. Born to privilege, inured to prestige, he was trained for service—to the Nation—to all people. He carried with him the sure knowledge that the blood in his veins was derived from the same almighty parent, and was no better than that of the humblest citizen. His intelligence recognized that simple fact, and he built his life to conform with it.

The President led us to an open window through which he pointed to the dawn of a new day, a day from which the clear light of reason and selflessness had burnt away the clouds of misery and injustice and oppression which have lain heavily over the human race through the centuries. That day could be approached only through a “long twilight” of toil and sacrifice and devotion. To reach it, new and untried paths would have to be hewn through seemingly insuperable difficulties. The bright spark of his unique personality had lit up the prospect, and we were almost persuaded that the end was worth the effort. And then he was cut down.

In our hour of anguish, two thoughts bring some little comfort. The first is that only a half-crazed individual could have perpetrated the foul deed. The act was the venom of a mind so egocentric that it could view the normal operation of economic and social laws as expressing a personal vindictiveness toward itself. Such a mind strikes out blindly, irrationally, with a demoniac futility. Its victim is simply the most conspicuous object in sight.

And yet there is a terrifying and half-expressed, half-suppressed, dread that we are all somehow involved in the act. We instinctively turn a searching eye on our own inner souls, and ask the troubling question: Have I, myself, by word or deed, whether intentionally or unintentionally contributed to the confusion and suspicion in this Nation, confusion and suspicion which seems to prefer contention to orderly progress?

Whence arises the second source of comfort in our distress. In the shock which removed this deed from the realm of the unbelievable to the fact of reality, there is opportunity to pause and think. This Republic was established by men who believed in the platonic tradition. The true questions which divide us today concern the public policies and procedures which are appropriate to the needs of the time. Prejudice and bias and selfishness will not discover the answers, nor will they put them into execution. We have a new opportunity to examine them all in the cold light of reason, and with an acute awareness of the practical potentialities which this age of enlightenment and of technical competence offers us to make what changes we will. Unanimity of agreement to rational examination is not a function of a free society. But, once decisions have been arrived at by rational processes, unanimity of action is. The thing that must

become unbelievable today is that while we loll in the luxury of plenty and power, we should permit “the bounty of heaven to be spilt” by fratricidal emotionalism.

On last Saturday, the heavens wept unrestrainedly as if in attempt to wash away all traces of bitterness and ugliness in our relations with one another. In the late evening, a cooling wind swept back the clouds, and along with them, we hope, the clouds of passion in men’s souls which obstruct their view of a beneficent infinity. Bright stars appeared, and a crescent moon hung in the western firmament. On Sunday morning a new day—a holy day—dawned in glory and brilliance. May it be a symbol.

On a gentle hillside, and in full view of the seats of the mighty on this continent, there flickers a glowing flame. It, too, is a symbol, a symbol of the indomitable spirit of our departed President and leader. May the thoughts and efforts of all of us be dedicated to the determination that the bright spark which our fallen President kindled shall never go out, but that it shall grow stronger and clearer until it leads us through the long twilight to a more perfect day.

It has always been an inspiring thought that out of evil may come good. The Judeo-Christian tradition assures us that sacrifice is never in vain, and that the ways of providence, however inscrutable, are righteous altogether. The last speech prepared by John Kennedy on that fatal November day contained the words:

Except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain.

If good comes out of his sacrifice, he would bow in humble submission. We trust in God.

SUMMARY OF NET BUDGET RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES (THE TRADITIONAL ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGET)—4 MONTHS OF FISCAL 1964 VERSUS 4 MONTHS OF FISCAL 1963, WITH COMPARISONS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a tabulation of the budget receipts and expenditures in the first 4 months, to October 31, 1963, for the fiscal year 1964, with pertinent comparisons.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, in conformity with previous practice, I include for the information of Members and others a tabulation of budget receipts and expenditures in the first 4 months—to October 31—of fiscal year 1964 with pertinent comparisons.

BUDGET RECEIPTS

In contrast to budget expenditures which tend to recur more evenly throughout the fiscal year, the normal pattern of budget receipts shows September, December, March, and June as peak months; and receipts in the first half—July–December—of the fiscal year are

usually lower than in the January–June second half.

Budget revenues were officially estimated at \$86,900,000,000 in last January’s budget for the current fiscal year 1964, which, if realized, would exceed actual fiscal 1963 revenues by \$543,000,000. That is the last official budget estimate; the Secretary of the Treasury updated the figure to \$88,800,000,000 in testimony on the last debt limit bill, which, if realized would mean a \$2,443,000,000 increase over actual fiscal 1963 revenues. In any event, in the first 4 months of the fiscal year—a relatively low collection period—actual budget revenues amounted to \$24,331,000,000, some \$593,000,000 higher than the corresponding 4 months of last year.

BUDGET EXPENDITURES

Budget expenditures were officially projected in the budget last January at \$98,802,000,000 for fiscal 1964 which, if held to, would represent an increase of \$6,212,000,000 over the fiscal 1963 actual budget expenditure. On a straight monthly basis, it would mean an average of \$8,233,000,000 per month, in contrast to which the expenditures in the first 4 months, July–October, averaged \$8,190,000,000 which in turn compares with \$7,911,000,000 in the corresponding 4 months last year; the national defense monthly average was up \$113,000,000 over a year ago and the monthly average for all other items—nondefense—was \$166,000,000 higher.

But in his recent testimony before the Ways and Means Committee, the Secretary of the Treasury informally presented a revised estimate of \$97,800,000,000 net budget expenditures for fiscal 1964, in contrast to the original estimate of \$98,802,000,000; supporting details are not available. This would represent an increase over fiscal 1963 of \$5,210,000,000; expenditures in the first 4 months, July–October, were \$1,116,000,000 higher than those for the same 4 months last year; both defense and nondefense were up. The revised estimate of \$97,800,000,000 translates into a straight monthly average of \$8,150,000,000, in contrast to which, as noted, the actual average for the first 4 months was \$8,190,000,000.

As in all past budgets, the original January budget expenditure (disbursements) estimate of \$98,802,000,000 for fiscal 1964 represented a composite of, first, estimated disbursements in fiscal 1964 from appropriations made in prior years—\$42,353,000,000, or approximately 43 percent, and therefore not directly affected by current congressional action on the 1964 appropriation bills; second, \$1,202,000,000 estimated first-year expenditure in fiscal 1964 associated with proposals for new legislation; third, roughly \$11,781,000,000 estimated to be expended from permanent appropriations recurring automatically under prior law and therefore not required to be voted on in the current session; fourth, thus leaving only about \$43,466,000,000 of the total \$98,802,000,000 original spending estimate for 1964 subject to direct action in the appropriation bills of the current session.

EXPENDITURES FOR DEFENSE, SPACE, AND INTEREST—AND ALL OTHER PROGRAMS

Messages and statements have emphasized that the expenditure estimates and programs for fiscal 1964 were so constructed that total proposed administrative budget expenditures for all programs other than national defense, space, and interest were slightly below the fiscal 1963 level—as originally forecast—for such programs. The original net budget estimate for fiscal 1964 for such other programs was \$29,066,000,000. In the meantime, actual expenditures in fiscal 1963 for comparable purposes did not go as high as forecast in last January's budget, with the result that the \$29,066,000,000 stands as an increase of \$1,747,000,000 over fiscal 1963 rather than being below that year. In the first 4 months—July–October for fiscal 1964—expenditures for such other programs were \$10,578,000,000, about \$94,000,000 below the corresponding expenditure in July–October of last year.

SURPLUS OR DEFICIT

Whether the budget deficit is the \$11,902,000,000 originally estimated, the \$9,000,000,000 informally projected only recently by the Secretary before the Ways and Means Committee, or some other amount, fiscal 1964 represents the 28th year of budget deficits in the last 34 years. And we were told that the next budget, for fiscal 1965, and probably the one following that, will also be in the red. In summary here are the official administrative budget deficit figures of the last 3 years:

	Administrative budget deficits	
	From July 1, 1961, to date	For 3 fiscal years, 1962–64
Fiscal 1962 (from July 1, 1961).....	\$6,378,000,000	\$6,378,000,000
Fiscal 1963.....	6,233,000,000	6,233,000,000
Fiscal 1964 (4 months to Oct. 31, 1963).....	8,428,000,000	-----
Fiscal 1964 (informal estimate to Ways and Means Committee on the last debt bill).....	-----	9,000,000,000
Total as above.....	21,039,000,000	21,611,000,000

And in total, actual budget expenditures in the fiscal year closed on June 30 last, and those now informally projected by the Secretary for the current fiscal year 1964, compare with certain earlier years as follows:

	Administrative budget spending	
	Over fiscal 1961	Over fiscal 1964
Fiscal 1963 actual:		
National defense.....	+\$5,249,000,000	+\$5,757,000,000
Other than national defense.....	+5,826,000,000	+19,296,000,000
Total, 1963 over.....	+11,075,000,000	+25,053,000,000
Federal 1964 current estimate:		
Total, 1964 current informal estimate over.....	+16,285,000,000	+30,263,000,000

THE PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. Speaker, after 4 months of budget operations in the current fiscal year

1964, the total public debt, both direct and guaranteed, stood at \$307,147,152,- 239.03 and compares with certain earlier dates as shown in the following table:

Federal public debt—Direct and guaranteed

	Fiscal 1964	Fiscal 1961	Fiscal 1962	Fiscal 1963	Fiscal 1964 (at Oct. 31, 1963)
1. The debt at end of period (in billions of dollars).....	271.3	289.2	298.6	306.5	307.1
2. Amount per capita (in dollars).....	1,670.0	1,575.0	1,600.0	1,619.0	1,614.0
3. Average for a family of 4 (in dollars).....	6,680.0	6,300.0	6,400.0	6,476.0	6,456.0

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the following table elaborates the receipt and expenditure situation more fully:

Net budget receipts and expenditures (the traditional administrative budget), 4 months of fiscal 1964 versus 4 months of fiscal 1963, and comparisons with full year estimates

[In millions of dollars]

	Actual for 4 months (to Oct. 31)			Budget estimates for all of fiscal 1964 compared to actual results for all of fiscal 1963			1964 estimates over 1963	
	Fiscal 1964	Fiscal 1963	1964 compared to 1963	Budget estimates for 1964 ¹	Informal Treasury revision ²	Actual, 1963	Original estimates over 1963	Informal Treasury revision over 1963
1. Budget receipts (net).....	24,331	23,738	+593	86,900	88,800	86,357	+543	+2,443
2. Budget expenditures (net):								
(a) National defense (per official budget classification).....	17,496	17,043	+453	55,433	(³)	52,743	+2,690	(³)
(b) Other than national defense.....	15,264	14,601	+663	43,369	(³)	39,847	+3,522	(³)
Total expenditures (net).....	32,760	31,644	+1,116	98,802	97,800	92,590	+6,212	+5,210
3. Net surplus (+) or deficit (-).....	-8,429	-7,906	-523	-11,902	-9,000	-6,233	+5,669	+2,767
4. Average monthly expenditure:								
(a) National defense.....	4,374	4,261	+113	4,619	(³)	4,395	+224	(³)
(b) Other than national defense.....	3,816	3,650	+166	3,614	(³)	3,320	+294	(³)
Total monthly average.....	8,190	7,911	+279	8,233	8,150	7,715	+518	+435
5. Dividing net budget expenditures on the basis emphasized by the budget message of January 1963:								
(a) National defense.....	17,496	17,043	+453	55,433	(³)	52,743	+2,690	(³)
(b) Space.....	1,184	650	+534	4,200	(³)	2,552	+1,648	(³)
(c) Interest.....	3,502	3,279	+223	10,103	(³)	9,976	+127	(³)
(d) All other expenditures.....	10,578	10,672	-94	29,066	(³)	27,319	+1,747	(³)
Total expenditures (net).....	32,760	31,644	+1,116	98,802	97,800	92,590	+6,212	+5,210

¹ As per original budget, Jan. 17, 1963.

² Given by Secretary of Treasury to Ways and Means Committee in connection with last public debt limit bill (H. Rept. 885, p. 4).

³ No breakdowns available.

⁴ That is to say, these 2 estimates represent a projected deficit in fiscal 1964 higher, by \$5,669,000,000 and \$2,967,000,000, respectively, than the deficit actually experienced in fiscal 1963.

Source: Monthly Treasury statement for Oct. 31, 1963; budget for 1964; and monthly Treasury statement for June 30, 1963.

INSPIRING MESSAGE OF PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the splendid address of President Lyndon B. Johnson at the joint session of the Congress this afternoon was a call for national unity in the solution of the unfinished

business before this Nation in both domestic and international affairs.

It is my hope that Congress will measure up to its share of the responsibility and stay on the job until the charted work has been done. In the spirit of President Johnson's message, it is my hope that the House of Representatives will act on the civil rights bill and complete action on it before Christmas. It is also my hope that the other body will complete its work on the tax bill within the same schedule.

There is indeed no more fitting tribute that could be paid to the memory of our late beloved President.

FAREWELL, MR. PRESIDENT

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, there is so deep a sense of loss, so great a sense of grief that I cannot yet find the words that will give a full measure of meaning to the tragedy we have suffered.

To what my colleagues are saying here today, and to what the world has already said I can now only add—Farewell, my beloved President, I will miss you.

A BRAVE STATEMENT

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, our President has spoken for the great majority of American citizens, in both the Democratic and Republican Parties, in calling for an end to the teaching and preaching of hate and evil and violence.

I am sure that the great body of our citizenry will follow his leadership in rejecting the fanatics of both the left and the right, and seeking a meeting ground of reason on which our Nation's most pressing problems may be solved.

In his decisive call for action on a broad legislative front, President Johnson has outlined a brave program that is faithful in its structure to the principles and policies of our late President.

It remains to be seen whether that brave program will survive the rocks and shoals of congressional action.

Certainly, no one can say our new President has failed to "lay it on the line," both as to his policy and his need for help from his fellow Americans.

PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, "We will keep our commitments." "I have come here to ask your help." "I believe in the integrity of the legislative branch." "In January 1961, President Kennedy stood in this place and said: 'Let us begin.' I stand here today and say: 'Let us continue.'" "There has been enough of talk; now is the time for action." "Let us put away all talking and preaching of prejudice and hate."

These are some of the striking phrases used by President Johnson in his first official address to the Congress, and

incidentally to the American people and an anxiously listening world. Their import is that the Ship of State is firmly set on the course laid out by his predecessor. The administration has changed, but not the policy.

The atmosphere in which the new President spoke was obviously tinged with the gloom and restraint imposed by the tragedy of the last few days, and Mr. Johnson made no effort to lighten it. Actually, he heightened it by saying that he would give everything he has if it had not been necessary for him to appear in that place on such an occasion. His phrases were reminiscent of, almost identical with, those phrases made so familiar by the late President. "Let the Nation know." "Let all the world know."

The crowd which thronged onto the floor of the House and the galleries was, of course, not unlike those which appear on all important State occasions. The significant thing was the number of foreign representatives, ambassadors, and all the rest, who crowded into the Chamber. The space reserved for them was inadequate, and they were forced to scatter wherever they could. Their presence indicates the enormous importance attached by the whole world to the first statements of the new President.

Mr. Johnson spelled out in some detail the points in the Kennedy program which he endorsed and which he meant to push. This was expected, of course. Each point met with an expression of approval from the audience, none more so than his commitment to strong national defense and his advocacy of an early civil rights bill.

What are the general impressions of the occasion? There stood an immensely strong man, deeply earnest, and positive in his convictions. No glamour, no boasting, no obsession with words. Only determination and inherent strength of character. This is not a man to cross. Both our friends and our foes must have been convinced of this as he spoke. Furthermore, it is evident that he thinks in terms of action.

So a new administration has been set on its way. We may be hopeful that a program outlined and initiated by a man of genius and consecration will be pressed to implementation and conclusion by a successor equally dedicated to the public good and equally equipped with the moral force to carry it through.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SHORT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SCHWENGEL.

Mr. SHORT.

Mr. GROVER.

Mr. GOODLING.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MORRIS.

Mr. POWELL.

Mr. ST. ONGE.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on November 26, 1963, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2837. An act to amend further section 11 of the Federal Register Act (44 U.S.C. 311); and

H.R. 8969. An act to provide, for the period ending June 30, 1964, temporary increases in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Friday, November 29, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

OATH OF OFFICE

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

"I A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 88th Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the 80th Congress entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (U.S.C., title 2, sec. 25), approved February 18, 1948: ALBERT W. JOHNSON, 23d District, Pennsylvania.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1393. A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the 30th Annual Report of the Farm Credit Administration on the work of the cooperative farm credit system (including the report of the Federal Farm Credit Board), covering the fiscal year ended June 30, 1963, in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended; paragraph 3, section 4, of the Agricultural Marketing Act, as amended; the Executive order of March 27, 1933, creating the Farm Credit Administration; and section 6 of the Farm

Credit Act of 1953 (H. Doc. No. 177); to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1394. A letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to reporting that the appropriation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for "Grants to States for public assistance" for the fiscal year 1964, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1395. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting the July-September 1963 report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms, pursuant to the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1396. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting copies of the Nobel Peace Prize award notice to the Congress of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1397. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on possibilities for reducing Federal expenditures under the electric loan program and other matters pertaining to the Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1398. A letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to plans for works of improvement relating to the following watersheds: Dry Creek, Ga.; Fishing Creek, Ga.; Little Cache, Ill.; Bachelor Run, Ind.; Grant-Shanghai Creeks, Kans.; Clam River, Mass.; Crane Creek, Minn.; Briar Creek, Pa.; and Glen Hills, Wis., pursuant to section 5 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1005), and Executive Order No. 10654 of January 20, 1956; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1399. A letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to plans for works of improvement relating to the following watersheds: Big Caney, Kans. and Okla.; Town Creek, Miss.; Rush Creek, Ohio; and North Fork of Powder River, Wyo., pursuant to section 5 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1005), and Executive Order No. 10654 of January 20, 1956; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 189. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain Federal land under the jurisdiction of the Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, Calif., to the county of Kern, State of California; with amendment (Rept. No. 927). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 393. A bill to make retrocession to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts of jurisdiction over certain land in the vicinity of Fort Devens, Mass.; with amendment (Rept. No. 928). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 7248. A bill to change the designated use of certain real property conveyed by the Department of the Air Force to the

city of Fort Walton Beach, Fla., under the terms of Public Law 86-194; with amendment (Rept. No. 929). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 7499. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force or his designee to convey 0.25 acre of land to the city of Oroville, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 930). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 9252. A bill to authorize an appropriation to carry out the purposes of the National Cultural Center Act and to designate the National Cultural Center, authorized to be constructed by such act, as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 9253. A bill to amend the National Cultural Center Act to designate the National Cultural Center authorized to be constructed by such act as the "John F. Kennedy Memorial Center," and to authorize the appropriation of \$25 million to provide matching of amounts contributed by the general public; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SENNER:

H.R. 9254. A bill to amend the National Cultural Center Act to designate the National Cultural Center authorized to be constructed by such act as the "John F. Kennedy Memorial Center," and to authorize the appropriation of \$25 million to provide matching of amounts contributed by the general public; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 9255. A bill to provide for the greater protection of the President and Vice President of the United States, members of the President's Cabinet, and Members of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 9256. A bill to redesignate the Cape Cod National Seashore, Mass., as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy National Seashore; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 9257. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army pay a fair share of the cost of certain highway improvements; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 9258. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to assure that adequate sites will be available in Arlington National Cemetery to provide for the interment there of recipients of certain decorations and awards; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 9259. A bill to authorize the appropriation of \$5 million to carry out the purposes of the National Cultural Center Act and to designate the National Cultural Center authorized to be constructed by such act as the "John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial National Cultural Center"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BROMWELL:

H.R. 9260. A bill to punish the killing, attempted killing, or assaulting of the President of the United States and other high officials; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 9261. A bill to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 9262. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to classify as third-class mail certain matter mailed by State motor vehicle authorities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 9263. A bill to designate the Museum of History and Technology of the Smithsonian Institution as the "John Fitzgerald Kennedy Museum of History and Technology"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H.R. 9264. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp as a tribute to the memory of President John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 9265. A bill to establish a program of awards for academic excellence in memory of our late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9266. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KORNEGAY:

H.R. 9267. A bill to provide that standard silver dollars shall hereafter bear on one side a likeness of our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 9268. A bill to designate the Peace Corps as the "Kennedy Peace Corps," and to provide for a suitable insignia for volunteers of the Kennedy Peace Corps; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 9269. A bill to authorize the appropriation of \$5 million to carry out the purpose of the National Cultural Center Act and to designate the National Cultural Center, authorized to be constructed by such act, as the "John Fitzgerald Kennedy Center of the Performing Arts"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 9270. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to impose additional duties on cattle, beef, and veal imported each year in excess of annual quotas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 9271. A bill to authorize the appropriation of \$5 million to carry out the purposes of the National Cultural Center Act and to designate the National Cultural Center authorized to be constructed by such act as the "John Fitzgerald Kennedy Cultural Center"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9272. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9273. A bill to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of Michigan:

H.R. 9274. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it a Federal crime to kill the President or Vice President of the United States, the head of any executive department, or any Member of the Congress of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9275. A bill to designate the authorized Federal building to be constructed at Detroit, Mich., as the "John F. Kennedy Federal Building"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 9276. A bill to authorize the appropriation of \$5 million to carry out the purposes of the National Cultural Center Act and to designate the National Cultural Center authorized to be constructed by such

act as the "John Fitzgerald Kennedy Cultural Center"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 9277. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make certain acts against the person of the President and Vice President of the United States and certain other Federal officers a Federal crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H.R. 9278. A bill to impose quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 9279. A bill to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.J. Res. 811. Joint resolution to establish the World War I Commemorative Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.J. Res. 812. Joint resolution directing an investigation of the Department of State; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.J. Res. 813. Joint resolution to redesignate the Cape Cod National Seashore as the "Kennedy Memorial Seashore," and to establish a commission to recommend a simple and fitting memorial to John Fitzgerald Kennedy within such seashore; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.J. Res. 814. Joint resolution establishing a joint committee to conduct an investigation and study of the recent assassination of the President of the United States and of certain other matters pertinent thereto; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.J. Res. 815. Joint resolution providing for the issuance of quarter dollars bearing the likeness of John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.J. Res. 816. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.J. Res. 817. Joint resolution establishing the John F. Kennedy National Memorial Conference; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. Res. 574. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill H.R. 7152; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 575. Resolution authorizing the printing of an additional 1,000 copies of the document entitled, "Study of Population and Immigration Problems; Population of the United States"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. Res. 576. Resolution to provide for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 73; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 9280. A bill for the relief of Donald J. Kent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H.R. 9281. A bill for the relief of Oro and Mayer Yahes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 9282. A bill for the relief of CWO Edward R. Kreiss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 9283. A bill for the relief of Pavlos Agos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 9284. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California to hear, determine, and render judgment on certain claims against the United States with respect to the title to certain real property situated in El Dorado County, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 9285. A bill for the relief of Mrs. J. D. Tippitt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 9286. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. John W. Cassell, U.S. Army; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACGREGOR:

H.R. 9287. A bill for the relief of Livia Sernini (Cucciat); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9288. A bill for the relief of Marianna V. Aguilar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 9289. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Colella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 9290. A bill for the relief of Danny Hiromi Oyama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

462. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Father Edward B. Geyer, Jr., and others, St. Luke's Church, New Haven, Conn., relative to requesting passage of the civil rights and other legislation for which the late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy asked for in his program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

463. Also, petition of Maurice R. Franks, Searcy, Ark., to enable and to require the Attorney General to enforce the Communist control legislation of the United States, and to cease the present policy of domestic co-existence with and toleration of the organized forces of evil, which present policy of non-enforcement has enabled the brutal assassination of our President by a known member of the international Communist conspiracy; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 27, 1963

(Legislative day of Tuesday,
November 26, 1963)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou changeless God of the changing years: In these so suddenly saddened days, we are conscious that a new page in the Republic's history is being turned and another form sits in the Presidential chair.

We especially pray the benediction of Thy grace upon Thy servant who, after a notable record of public service in this body, crowned by these past years as its President, faces now as Chief Executive

a maddening maze of problems tragic and thorny.

We beseech Thee to strengthen the heart and mind, the hands and lips of our colleague, Lyndon Johnson, as this day to a listening world he sounds the trumpet of his inaugural hope and purpose. As the ship of state plows on through perilous seas, in spite of rock and tempest roar, in spite of false lights on the shore, bring our national barque to the desired haven of peace with victory for truth and justice. Toward this goal, trusting in Thy mercy and might, we press on to meet the vast issues of this day of destiny as in the name of the Lord, our God, we set up our banners.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, November 25, and Tuesday, November 26, 1963, was dispensed with.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, it was ordered that there be a morning hour, with statements limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MONRONEY, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

THE SENATE AND ITS LEADERSHIP

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, minutes before the tragedy last Friday, I asked the Senate for unanimous consent that I might be recognized on the following Monday at the conclusion of the morning hour for the purpose of making a statement on the Senate and its leadership. The remarks which I had already prepared at that time were intended to set forth a few facts on the Congress, in order to set straight some of the generalizations and the illusions about the Senate which had been coming from a variety of informed quarters. It was a statement of what has been achieved, not by any genius of the leadership or by some Senate establishment but by the 100 Members of this body working in cooperation and in mutual respect. The statement is, I repeat, the record of 100 Senators. We all share in the responsibility for its achievements as well as for its shortcomings. There have been both achievements and shortcomings and both are recorded in the statement, I hope, in useful perspective and on the basis of fact. I have recorded on the basis of what is tangible in the legislative record not on the basis of what the Senate looks like at 8 at night or whether the Members are driven or