Do not those figures tend to support the Senator's thought in regard to the power and the political strength of a State in the Senate, as compared to its position in the House of Representatives? That is not an invidious comparison, at all; it arises merely because of the difference between the two legislative bodies. Does the Senator from South Carolina agree?

Mr. THURMOND. Yes, I am in hearty accord with the Senator's sound statements on that point.

Mr. STENNIS. Whereas if the Senate rule were to be changed, so that the will of a mere majority of the Members of the Senate could prevail, the Senate would become more or less an appendage of the House of Representatives. Is not that correct?

Mr. THURMOND. It seems to me that would be so; and it would be a terrible mistake.

Mr. STENNIS. I mean insofar as legislation is concerned.

Mr. THURMOND. As the Senator from Mississippi has said, there is no question that in that way the power of the Senate would be diluted, the power of a Senator would be diluted, and the power of the State he represented would be diluted; and the small or the medium size States would especially feel the effect of that development—because, as the Senator from Mississippi has ably pointed out, they have so few Members in the House of Representatives.

Mr. STENNIS. So the Senator from South Carolina has clearly expressed the fear that if a change in the rule were to be made, the representation of the smaller States in the Senate would be decreased to a great extent.

Mr. THURMOND. The Senator is entirely correct. I wish to commend him for bringing out those points. He has rendered the Nation a great service in doing so.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator and commend him for having made a fine speech.

Mr. THURMOND. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, in closing, I wish to say that the existing rule XXII is the most suppressive of debate which has ever existed in the Senate. If any change in the rule is to be made which prevents obstructions by any number of the Senators the wisest course would be to return to a requirement for a two-thirds vote of the membership of the Senate. Under no circumstances should cloture be made easy.

RECESS UNTIL TOMORROW AT 10 O'CLOCK A.M.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in keeping with the agreement heretofore entered into, I move that the Senate take a recess until 10 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.) under the order previously entered, the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 5, 1963, at 10 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

February 4, 1963 (legislative day of January 15, 1963):

U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency
Archibald S. Alexander, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

IN THE ARMS

The following-named officers under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President by subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:


National Mediation Board
Howard G. Gamser, of New York, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the term expiring February 1, 1966, vice Robert O. Boyd.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Part 5: Let's Keep the Record Straight—
A Selected Chronology of Cuba and Castro September 13—October 14, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, part 5 of my chronology of Cuba and Castro begins with a series of newspaper quotes on our U.S. policy for dealing with Cuba.

While the Monroe Doctrine and its application to the present situation was endlessly debated by our newspapers, our columnists, commentators, and newspapers in other countries—our Congress stubbornly went ahead adopting resolutions upholding the right of the United States to invoke the Monroe Doctrine, protect our country, and protect the entire hemisphere against an extension of the Marxist-Leninist Cuban Government.

Because of the reluctance of our NATO allies to cease shipments of materials and goods to Cuba which would cause, to our foreign aid appropriations bill which would cutoff aid to any country that permitted its ships to transport goods to Cuba, the Russians are. Doubtless, in a perfectly ordered world, the Monroe Doctrine would require the removal of these alien intruders. But in the imperfect real world, where the Americans keep troops along the border of the Communist block (in one case, within it; remember Berlin), and claim an unhindered right of access to these outposts, it is the awkward, to say the least, to expel or blockade the Russians in Cuba. Mr. Khrushchev has made the neatest of moves by the perfusions of the pawned in Cuba, he says, and you risk your castle in South Vietnam—or your Berlin queen. If Dr. Castro is one day replaced by a democratic government, it will not be as a result of the one threat against which Russian advisers can give his army any real help—a regular invasion, a la D-day, from over the sea. The United States learned its Cuban lesson in April last year. The United States can perhaps help to organize and supply a rebellion, as the Communists do elsewhere; it cannot import a rebellion, prepackaged. Given enough time, and enough rope, the Cuban regime may yet produce the internal disaffection that will be its downfall. If [Dr. Castro's] support in the outside begins to erode, the conditions of a successful revolt against him will have been established. And if the test ever came, it would be far harder for the Russians to keep an unpopular government in office in Cuba than it is for the Americans to do a similar job in other parts of the world which are better left unnamed. Mr. Khrushchev has no 6th or 7th Fleet to keep his supplies open. Whether [the Russians] are troops or technicians is at bottom immaterial... In the sense that the Americans cannot very well assert the right to intervene, whatever the
"In the hemisphere, in the United Nations, with the uncommitted nations, the reaction to it has been entirely unfavorable for us" (New York Times, Sept. 14, 1962). "The United States is, of course, able to blockade Cuba. But stoppage of all shipping would be an act of war not only against Cuba but against the Soviet Union. The United States could not be sure of doing is to prevent ships under threat of seizure or the grip of an unfriendly European power, we would have acted on the rule that we have course, able easily to blockade Let us not fool ourselves. the American military positions in Turkey, the United States has no such right to act against our mllitary position in that the United States has the the hemisphere. In the view of the world remains essentially un­altered. It is still thought that Mr. Khru­
tensions through disarmament and bans on nuclear tests is in Russia's interest as well as milled in Berlin before the first of the year, but after the November 6 elections [in the United States]. September 16, 1962: Former U.S. Vice Presid­ent Richard Nixon urges President Ken­nedy to take stronger action on Cuba and suggests a program including a naval block­ade of the island and the obtaining of com­mitments from U.S. allies that their vessels will not be used by the Soviet Union for ship­ments to Cuba. September 18, 1962: In a joint closed door session. "Rusk took pains to assert a direct relationship between events in Cuba and Berlin, particularly in the 1950s. A statement by Premier Khru­
the present state of the Monroe Doctrine in relation to Cuba: "The policy of the United States is guided by two main considerations: its own national security and the peace and se­curity of hemispheric neighbors. On the one hand, the United States has the tradit­ion of the Monroe Doctrine, enunciated more than a century ago as a warning to European powers that the United States would move against intrusions into the Western Hemisphere. If a State so pledges, under the Rio Treaty of 1948 which formed the OAS, and under the U.N. Charter, to abstain from unilateral military action. The United States, nevertheless, has affirmed that it would take whatever steps are necessary to move, unilaterally if necessary, against a clear and present threat to its security and that of its allies in Latin America. • • • There is a vocal body of opinion in the United States that Cuba is a clear threat to U.S. security and therefore a violation of the Monroe Doctrine demands action. The Administration holds that the Cuban buildup, in effect, constitutes the establishment of a military base by Russia in the Western Hemisphere. (New York Times, Sept. 18, 1962). The Monroe Doctrine has been modified to apply only to situations which directly endanger the security of the United States: 'The United States will consider any attempt by European powers to extend their system or to bring its ships to transport goods to Cuba. (New York Times, Sept. 20, 1962). A resolution endorsing the use of arms, if necessary, to prevent further shipment or subversion in the Western Hemisphere was adopted by the Senate; 86 to 1, after 3 hours of debate (New York Times, Sept. 20, 1962). September 21, 1962: President Kennedy issued a new warning that any U.S. attack on Cuba would precipitate a nuclear war. The President told the nation in a televised address that Soviet Gromyko in a tough and uncompromising policy statement to the United Nations General Assembly, Adal E. Stevenson replied that the threat to peace came from the Soviet Union, which is "stuffing Cuba" with planes, rockets, and other arms. September 24, 1962: Secretary of State Rusk met yesterday with the Norwegian Foreign Minister, Halvard Lofthus, in an effort to win cooperation in blocking shipments of strategic goods to Cuba. They conferred in the elegant room of the Foreign Minister's residence along the Karl Johansgate. September 25, 1962: Russian trawlers will be in the waters of the European powers in matters relat­ing to Cuba. The President, in a letter to the President Kennedy has evaluated it thus far as not endangering our peace and safety, thereby narrowing the original scope of the Monroe Doctrine. In the past, the only administration spokesman who has publicly conceded it is Senator Humphrey (Arthur Krock in the New York Times, Sept. 18, 1962). "It is true, of course, that the Soviet lodgment in Cuba is a gross violation of the Monroe Doctrine. Why not? The crucial point is that the American claim for the isolation of the hemisphere was coupled with a renunciation of any American in­terest in the Western Hemisphere: in the wars of the European powers in matters relat­ing to Cuba. The United States has not taken an part, nor does it comport with our policy so to do. • • • This basis of the Monroe Doc­trine disappeared in the 20th century, in the two World Wars, the Korean war and the cold war. We cannot invoke the Monroe Doctrine as a basis for re­sponding to that situation. We have to what we are doing all over Europe and Asia. Our right to put Cuba under surveillance, and if necessary to blockade an invader, rests now more on the Monroe Doctrine than on the ele­mentary right of a people to insure its own security. • • • This right can, however, be exercised more effectively in the Western Hemisphere than in any other region. The grip of an unfriendly power is our interests if we go to war. We would be saying that because Cuba is in the grip of an unfriendly European power, we have a right to blockade or occupy the island; we would be saying that the United States has no such right to act against the American military positions in Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, right on her own frontier. Let us not fool ourselves. An act of war against could not be sure of doing is to prevent ships under threat of seizure or the grip of an unfriendly European power, we would have acted on the rule that a possible act of war against Cuba but against the Soviet Union. But what we could not be sure of doing is to prevent ships under threat of seizure or the grip of an unfriendly European power, we would have acted on the rule that the United States has no such right to act against the American military positions in Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, right on her own frontier. Let us not fool ourselves. An act of war against could not be sure of doing is to prevent
TION AS ANGER AND CONCERN MOUNTED IN WASHINGTON OVER MOSCOW'S PLANS TO HELP BUILD A PORT IN CUBA FOR SOVIET FISHING TROUPERS, THE GOVERNMENT LABORED UNDER THE PRESSURE OF A ROUTINE AGREEMENT FOR AID TO THE CASTRO REGIME.

TRYING TO GUARD AGAINST CUBAN-BASED AGGRESSION AND SUBVERSION WERE DISCUSSED IN NEW YORK BY SECRETARY OF STATE Rusk AND FOREIGN MINISTERS OF THE LATIN-AMERICAN NATIONS. ONE PROPOSAL IS THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A CARIBBEAN MILITARY ORGANIZATION.

BUT AMONG THE STANDARDS OF GREATER DANGER OF ATTACK, PREMIER Pidel Castro asserted, were the U.S. politicians facing November elections who are "trying to push the country towards war in order to win the elections."

"In a television address last night, Premier Castro said that in the U.S. House of Representatives and Senate "there is a competition to see who can shout most. It doesn't matter to them that they play with the destiny of the world and play with war."

He said armed intervention in Cuba could lead to World War III.

"We know the Soviet forces are with us," Dr. Castro declared. "If the imperialists think the Soviet Government's words are merely words, they are wrong.""I EN successfully launched at a White House luncheon, the President and Britain's foreign secretary discussed ways to contain further Cuban expansion in the Caribbean. A joint communiqué suggested that Britain might have changed its initial thinking regarding the problem as a matter of concern only to Washington.

October 3, 1962: OAS meets today to discuss Cuba crisis.

October 2, 1962: Behind closed doors at the State Department, Secretary of State Rusk and members of the foreign ministers of the Latin-American nations were in consultation regarding the U.S. plan to invade Cuba. In a speech to the Senate, the bespectacled President had the rostrum, the bespectacled President had given the necessary leadership to efforts to defend Communist inroads in this hemisphere.

October 4, 1962: A U.S. program to penalize all shipowners who transport Soviet-bloc supplies to Cuba will be even tougher than expected. The four-point program, to be started within 2 weeks, will threaten foreign shipowners with the loss of all U.S. Government-owned or financed cargo if even one of the four is broken.

October 8, 1962: Amid the applause of some delegates, the crisis of hecklers, Cuban president Castor urged the United Nations to adopt a "definite" resolution in the U.N.'s "naval blockade" of his country. Gripping the rostrum, the bespectacled President had to rise and call for order. He was interrupted 4 times by hostile demonstrators, the various delegations in the visitors' gallery and about 12 times by applause, mainly from the Soviet bloc.

Havan sources predicted that the release of 1,113 captives held since last year's abortive invasion would be announced soon after the President's words are mush. The latest Dairy Situation published in September showed that the Administration, with the help of the cotton industry, the President has already rejected his 1964 corn program. Under the present program, cotton farmers face a cut in income in 1963, U.S. textile mills face an inequitable, 2-price cotton market, the U.S. price fixed at $1.55 per bale, the world price left free of government control, and many textile workers are continuing to take away cotton markets, many textile workers face the loss of their jobs, the burden on taxpayers continues.

We submit that this serious situation came into being primarily because of the administration actions taken by Mr. Freeman shortly after he became Secretary of Agriculture."

In reversing the progress that had been made under the Agriculture Act of 1959, Secretary Freeman's record shows these results between 1959-60 and 1961-62:

- Exports down from 6.9 to 4.7 million bales. Total disappearance down from 16.4 to 12.2 million bales.
- Domestic consumption down from 5.5 to 4.6 million bales.
- Carryover up from 7.1 million bales at the end of the 1962 marketing year to a now estimated 3.6 million bales for 1962-63.

Until and unless the cotton industry, the Kennedy administration, and the majority members of the committee on agriculture recognize their differences as to needed cotton legislation and put it into bill form, the minority members of the committee must of necessity withhold comment as to further legislation during this session of Congress.

1. Wheat: We deplore the threatening tone of the President's message applying to wheat farmers. We favor all programs which are already underway. It is not free of the country's own economic destiny in 1964 in choosing between the two programs. In this administration is presenting to him. We feel that he will express an intelligent answer in the wheat referendum if left free of intimidation. In the event of a "no" vote in the referendum, however, we pledge our support toward the enactment of sound and constructive legislation during this session of Congress.

2. Feed grains: We feel that the feed grain policies can be met within the framework of a voluntary program based on land conservation where program benefits are available only to cooperators operating in a market ecosystem. It is noteworthy that the"I EN have already rejected his 1964 corn program calling for 80-cent corn, (80 per cent of parity) even before it is scheduled to become effective.

3. Cotton: We recognize the very serious problems facing the cotton industry. Under the present program, cotton farmers face a cut in income in 1963, U.S. textile mills face an inequitable, 2-price cotton market structure, man-made fiber producers are continuing to take away cotton markets, many textile workers face the loss of their jobs, the burden on taxpayers continues. We submit that this serious situation came into being primarily because of the administration actions taken by Mr. Freeman shortly after he became Secretary of Agriculture."

In reversing the progress that had been made under the Agriculture Act of 1959, Secretary Freeman's record shows these results between 1959-60 and 1961-62:

- Exports down from 6.9 to 4.7 million bales. Total disappearance down from 16.4 to 12.2 million bales.
- Domestic consumption down from 5.5 to 4.6 million bales.
- Carryover up from 7.1 million bales at the end of the 1962 marketing year to a now estimated 3.6 million bales for 1962-63.

Until and unless the cotton industry, the Kennedy administration, and the majority members of the committee on agriculture recognize their differences as to needed cotton legislation and put it into bill form, the minority members of the committee must of necessity withhold comment as to further legislation during this session of Congress.

4. Dairy products: The President's recommendations on dairy products should be closely scrutinized in view of increasing signs that Cotton Credit Corporation programs should be rethought as the industry continues to suffer losses. The latest Dairy Situation published by

---

**Republican Views on Kennedy Farm Message**

**EXTENSION REMARKS OF HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN OF IOWA IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

**Monday, February 4, 1963**

Mr. Hoeven. Mr. Speaker, last week President Kennedy sent his annual farm message to the Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include a statement by the Republican members of the House Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development by members of our conference today covering our views on the President's recommendations:

**HOUSE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE REPUBLICANS COMMENT ON KENNEDY FARM MESSAGE**

I. GENERAL

By formally dropping his plea for the complete control of American agriculture, the President's farm message is, to some extent, sweet music to the ears of the American farmer. Its general tone is in sharp contrast to the radical request he submitted in 1961 for Congress to delegate its constitutional and legislative responsibilities to the Department of Agriculture to write and enforce strict farm controls on every commodity produced in the nation.

Fortunately, in regard to dairy products and feed grains, it is also a substantial reversal from the President's last year for stringent controls over producers of these vital commodities.

And, finally, it represents the complete repudiation by the Democratic Party of the concept of farm price supports at 90 percent of parity. The record of Secretary Freeman has for some time been abundantly clear in this regard, for he has at no time supported, nor is he now supporting, agricultural commodity at 90 percent of parity, even though on many commodities (including rice, peanuts, cotton, and wheat, among others), the farmer can be met with in the framework of a 'supply management' program he could do so with the stroke of his pen.

We applaud the President's repudiation of marketing quotas on producers of live-stock, feed grains, dairy products, and all other agricultural commodities and his happy discovery to see no mention of criminal penalties and penitentiary terms as was proposed last year for dairy farmers. We hope that now, at long last, the administration will give the cooperative with Congress in the formulation of sound and workable Government farm programs.

We will continue our efforts to strengthen the prosperity of rural America. We insist that the President give more concern to the problem of rising farm costs (which just 3 days ago reached another all-time record) in the conduct of the general fiscal policies of the Government which proposes to operate on a $11.9 billion deficit next year. We support a unified and bi-partisan effort to produce a strong and successful agricultural program for U.S. agricultural commodities in the European Common Market. We have already said and we say again that we are ready to work with the Administration in strengthening our full cooperation to the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture.
by the Department of Agriculture makes this appropriate comment:

"The milk equivalent of CCC purchases, after making an allowance for the early high April through July, slackened in August. From August through November CCC purchases were only 2.4 billion pounds of milk equivalent less than a year ago. This decline in milk equivalent of purchases is the result of a drop in butter purchases, since cheese deliveries during August through November were about the same as a year earlier."

"From August through November of this year, CCC purchases of butter were between 58 million pounds compared with the 72 million pounds a year before. This lower rate of purchases has been about three-quarters of the August-September movement of butter purchases, since cheese deliveries during August through November of this year were about the same as a year earlier."

In the spirit of his farm message, make every possible effort to prevent the spending will be some $8,481,700,000. This represents an increase of 121,583 jobs in fiscal year 1962, than has any previous year (fiscal year 1962) than has any previous year estimated that total USDA spending will be $8,481,700,000. This is nearly 10 billion; 1,283,882 jobs in fiscal year 1964, an increase of 45,007. In the 3-year period June 30, 1961, to June 30, 1964, this represents 5.1 billion; 19,659 people, the equivalent of a U.S. Army field division.

Unless the President places some realistic restrictions on transfer spending, the Department of Agriculture, we may indeed see the day that the number of employees in USDA exceeds the number of farmers in America.

**Independence Day of Ceylon**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. ADAM C. POWELL OF NEW YORK IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

*Monday, February 4, 1963*

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on February 4th, Ceylon will celebrate the 15th anniversary of her independence. On this memorable occasion, I wish to take this opportunity to extend warm felicitations to the Government of Ceylon, its friendly people, and to the representatives of Ceylon in the United States, Dr. Jan H. O. Paulius, Chargé d’Affaires ad interim.

Ceylon, a beautiful island situated south of India, has the heritage of a highly developed civilization dating back to the sixth century B.C., and the Ceylonese people justly possess a strong national consciousness. In social and economic development, Ceylon is proud to lead the way in the antiquity of their culture and the glory of the past.

In recent centuries, Ceylon has been dominated successfully by Portugal, the Netherlands, and Great Britain. The British, with their experience in the development of tea and rubber plantations in Ceylon, at the same time transferred their physical gifts to Ceylon by developing schools, a free press, legal institutions, and finally the representative principle of government. One measure of these benefits may be gained from the fact that Ceylon’s literacy rate is over 70 percent, among the highest in all of Asia.

But after World War I the winds of national self-determination swept around the world, thanks partly to the fervent eloquence with which President Woodrow Wilson had advocated the principle of self-determination. After World War II the time for Ceylon’s independence arrived, and she made a remarkably peaceful transition from a British colony to a dominion within the British Commonwealth. In spite of the existence of internal tensions based on ethnic, religious, and economic differences, there was no partition such as the Indian subcontinent, a republic such as in Burma, Malay, and Indonesia.

Since independence, Ceylon has had remarkable political stability, within a highly democratic framework, and made significant economic and social progress. General elections were held in 1952, 1956, and 1960, representing the free expression of the will of the people through universal adult suffrage. In the 1956 election, a coalition of political forces was peacefully replaced by a new coalition of political forces. The machinery of government has functioned smoothly. The country has experienced an economic expansion of 30 percent, a new constitution, transport, communications, health facilities, and finally the representative principle of government. One measure of these benefits may be gained from the fact that Ceylon’s literacy rate is over 70 percent, among the highest in all of Asia.

Nor has Ceylon enjoyed responsible government only in its internal affairs. In its foreign relations Ceylon has steadfastly pursued a policy of nonalignment in her political, economic, and military relations with the major powers of the world. Her foreign policy is aimed at the preservation of peace, the fostering of friendly and mutually beneficial relations with other nations, and the protection of her own freedom and independence. To achieve these aims, Ceylon feels she needs the freedom of action that a nonalignment policy provides.

This report needs to be put into the proper perspective because it is not the job of the Federal Government or others to tell a metropolitan area what modes of transportation it should have.

Future Urban Transportation Needs

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. VANCE HARTKE OF INDIANA IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES**

*Monday, February 4, 1963*

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, in the current issue of Metropolitan Transportation, a magazine published "for coordinated transportation and urban renewal", appears an article by our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from New Jersey, HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr., who is the chief sponsor of U.S. mass transportation legislation.

In the 3-year period June 30, 1961, to June 30, 1964, this represents 5.1 billion; 19,659 people, the equivalent of a U.S. Army field division.

Unless the President places some realistic restrictions on transfer spending, the Department of Agriculture, we may indeed see the day that the number of employees in USDA exceeds the number of farmers in America.

In the spirit of his farm message, make every possible effort to prevent the spending will be some $8,481,700,000. This represents an increase of 121,583 jobs in fiscal year 1962, than has any previous year estimated that total USDA spending will be $8,481,700,000. This is nearly 10 billion; 1,283,882 jobs in fiscal year 1964, an increase of 45,007. In the 3-year period June 30, 1961, to June 30, 1964, this represents 5.1 billion; 19,659 people, the equivalent of a U.S. Army field division.

Unless the President places some realistic restrictions on transfer spending, the Department of Agriculture, we may indeed see the day that the number of employees in USDA exceeds the number of farmers in America.

In the spirit of his farm message, make every possible effort to prevent the spending will be some $8,481,700,000. This represents an increase of 121,583 jobs in fiscal year 1962, than has any previous year estimated that total USDA spending will be $8,481,700,000. This is nearly 10 billion; 1,283,882 jobs in fiscal year 1964, an increase of 45,007. In the 3-year period June 30, 1961, to June 30, 1964, this represents 5.1 billion; 19,659 people, the equivalent of a U.S. Army field division.

Unless the President places some realistic restrictions on transfer spending, the Department of Agriculture, we may indeed see the day that the number of employees in USDA exceeds the number of farmers in America.

In the spirit of his farm message, make every possible effort to prevent the spending will be some $8,481,700,000. This represents an increase of 121,583 jobs in fiscal year 1962, than has any previous year estimated that total USDA spending will be $8,481,700,000. This is nearly 10 billion; 1,283,882 jobs in fiscal year 1964, an increase of 45,007. In the 3-year period June 30, 1961, to June 30, 1964, this represents 5.1 billion; 19,659 people, the equivalent of a U.S. Army field division.

Unless the President places some realistic restrictions on transfer spending, the Department of Agriculture, we may indeed see the day that the number of employees in USDA exceeds the number of farmers in America.

In the spirit of his farm message, make every possible effort to prevent the spending will be some $8,481,700,000. This represents an increase of 121,583 jobs in fiscal year 1962, than has any previous year estimated that total USDA spending will be $8,481,700,000. This is nearly 10 billion; 1,283,882 jobs in fiscal year 1964, an increase of 45,007. In the 3-year period June 30, 1961, to June 30, 1964, this represents 5.1 billion; 19,659 people, the equivalent of a U.S. Army field division.

Unless the President places some realistic restrictions on transfer spending, the Department of Agriculture, we may indeed see the day that the number of employees in USDA exceeds the number of farmers in America.
My first newsletter for the 88th Congress has been prepared. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks into the record, I am sending the newsletter so that it will be available to those who may not be on my mailing list.

The newsletter follows:

THE 88TH CONGRESS CONVEYED

Congress, as usual, has gotten off to a slow start. Focusing on its first two days, the house rules and the House has been waiting for committee assignments. But, like everything else, the Congress will get on with its real business.

I'm still on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which is important to Washington State and the Pacific Northwest.

Also, I shall remain on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, an extremely critical assignment.

Since Congress convened, I have introduced several bills which I hope will become law. Some are bills I've introduced before, but as you know, the process of getting laws enacted can be pretty slow. One bill I've reintroduced would permit students at the college level or parents of students in college to deduct up to $1,000 when they file their tax returns. I believe, is a grassroots approach which would encourage many persons to obtain higher education and could be more effective than direct assistance.

Another bill I've introduced would give a preference to industry of the Pacific Northwest over California public utilities in the use of hydropower produced in the Columbia Basin.

Also, I've asked Congress to reaffirm the right of a State to regulate the time and method of taking fish in our rivers. As you know, there has been some doubt in Olympia about this right as it concerns Indians who fish illegally.

I'm sure this bill will interest everyone who is a sports fisherman like myself.

The problems of commercial fishing also are important to everyone in the Second Congressional District. America has lagged behind many nations in fisheries research, particularly Japan and Russia which compete directly with our fishermen. This is one reason I've introduced a bill to authorize construction of a stern trawler to be used for fisheries and oceanographic research.

A bill of particular interest to dairy farmers is H.R. 360, which I introduced. It would make it possible for a milk producer to deliver his milk to the market and receive the price related to the class to which it is allotted.

My colleagues from the Pacific Northwest are pleased to submit for inclusion in the Congressional Record an excellent editorial on this subject which appeared last month in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Note that both Houses of Congress last year passed such legislation, but that the bill was not enacted into law in the 87th Congress, the Post-Dispatch expresses the hope that the 88th Congress will finally write this proposition into Federal law, adding:

The strength of the equal-pay principle is perhaps best indicated by the weakness of the arguments used against it.

Mr. Speaker, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch editorial referred to is as follows:

Equal Pay for Equal Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, as a strong supporter—and a sponsor—of equal legislation to provide for equal pay for persons doing the same work, I am pleased to submit for inclusion in the Congressional Record an excellent editorial on this subject which appeared last month in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Equal Pay for Equal Work.
The remaining objection is that Federal Proponents pretty antediluvian. More than 24 million of them. Yet in almost every business, industry, and profession in which they are employed they are discriminated against in pay—and many occupations are virtually barred to them. This is not a situation of which the country can be proud. It is rooted, not in rationality, but in habit—and not a good habit. Nine hundred and sixty-three is a good year to change it.

Mr. Speaker, I now submit for inclusion in the Record the bill which I have introduced or for which I am the sponsor, subject of equal pay, H.R. 1151, as follows:

A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in operations affecting commerce of wages differentials based on sex—

(1) depresses wages and living standards of employees necessary for their health and efficiency;
(2) prevents the maximum utilization of the available labor resources;
(3) tends to cause labor disputes, thereby burdening, affecting, and obstructing commerce;
(4) burdens commerce and the free flow of goods in commerce; and
(5) constitutes an unfair method of competition.

DEFINITIONS

Sec. 3. When used in this Act—
(a) "Person" means an individual, partnership, association, corporation, business trust, legal representatives, or any organized group of persons.
(b) "Commerce" means trade, commerce, transportation, transmission, or communication among the several States or between any State and any other country.
(c) "Affecting commerce" means in commerce, or burdening or obstructing commerce, or having led to or tending to lead to a labor dispute burdening or obstructing commerce or the free flow of commerce.
(d) "Any person acting directly or indirectly in the interest of any employer in relation to an employee subject to this Act with respect to an employee, or to remove such discrimination, and to pay to such employee a sum equal to the aggregate amount or value of the wages which such employee has been deprived by reason of such violation plus an additional equal amount as liquidated damage.
(b) Unless the Secretary of Labor shall by order otherwise determine and permit, no contract shall be awarded to the United States or any agency thereof to any person who has been determined to be liable under any provisions of the Act or of any stipulation entered into in compliance with subsection (a) of this section, or to any firm, corporation, partnership, or other organization in which such person has a controlling interest, until three years have elapsed after the date of final judgment that such violation occurred. The Comptroller General is authorized and directed to distribute to all agencies of the United States a list containing the names of such persons.

POSTING

Sec. 9. Every employer subject to this Act shall keep a copy of this Act posted in a conspicuous place in such manner and with such effect as provided by section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41, 45, adopted and issued thereunder by the Federal Trade Commission, except that in any proceeding before any court for the review of any order issued thereunder by the Federal Trade Commission under section 5(a) of this Act the findings of the Federal Trade Commission as to the facts shall be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

WAGE RESTITUTION

Sec. 6. (a) The Secretary of Labor is authorized to supervise the payment of any amounts for which any employer has been finally determined to be liable under any order for payment under clause (A) of paragraph (a) or paragraph (3) or paragraph (4) of section 5(a) of this Act. Any sum so recovered by the Secretary on behalf of any employee under this subsection shall be held in a special deposit account and shall be paid, on order of the Secretary, directly to the employee. Any such sum not paid to an employee before such a period of three years shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.
(b) No wage restitution shall be made with respect to any violation of the Act which period which preceded by more than four years the date of commencement by the Secretary of Labor of the proceeding in which such restitution is ordered.

INJUNCTIONS

Sec. 7. The district courts, together with the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, or any corporation of such States or any agency thereof to any person who has been determined to be liable under any provisions of the Act or of any stipulation entered into in compliance with subsection (a) of this section, or to any firm, corporation, partnership, or other organization in which such person has a controlling interest, until three years have elapsed after the date of final judgment that such violation occurred. The Comptroller General is authorized and directed to distribute to all agencies of the United States a list containing the names of such persons.
splendid place in or about the premises where any employee is employed. Employers shall be furnished copies of this Act by the United States Department of Labor on request without charge.

Sec. 10. There are authorized to be appropriated necessary funds to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Sec. 11. This Act shall take effect one hundred and twenty days after the date of its enactment.
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INVESTIGATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

House Resolution 210, which I introduced this week, calls for an investigation by the Committee of Conference of Commerce, Industry, and Labor. It is necessary that we find out, once and for all, who are the policy-makers in the State Department and why so many of their decisions prove to be wrong in perspective. At some later time, the list of fatal decisions could be recited from our failure in China which made possible the taking of the Manhattan Project by the Communists, to the confused and questionable policy in Cuba which has allowed the Soviet Union to establish a firm base in this hemisphere. Congress must know, and the American people are entitled to know, just who is responsible for these weak, or total lack of a firm foreign policy.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

The President's fourth message to the 88th Congress is replete with comprehensive and progressive elements of a grand policy of Federal aid to education. Everyone is for education, the best for the most; in quality second to none; in quantity, all that our economic power will provide. We all agree with the President when he says, "Education is the keystone in the arch of freedom and the cornerstone of the American system of government." But the President stems from this statement of his: "The program here proposed is reasonable and offers Federal assistance without Federal control." This cannot be. Federal aid requires Federal control else it fails to do its socially responsive, socially just, and Federal control contradicts the local control the President eulogizes. The best and only maximum tribute, as he has always contributed, to the President's own language shows most pitilessly his misunderstanding of the President's proposals. The President's own language shows most pitilessly his misunderstanding of the President's proposals. The President's own language shows most pitilessly his misunderstanding of the President's proposals. The President's own language shows most pitilessly his misunderstanding of the President's proposals.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the rules of the House I introduce the following letter of February 2, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT

By Congressman Bruce Alges, Fifth District, Texas, February 4, 1963)

Tax changes, the year's most important legislative issue according to the President, are quite uncertain. Not only is there no specific legislative language yet available, but there is legitimate doubt whether the total effect will be up or down to many individuals. Corporate taxes will be lowered, yet the speed-up of pay-in will more than offset the tax cut for the first 2 or 3 years so that there cannot be reduced prices, increased investment, jobs, and production, in short, the economic stimulus envisioned by the President. As to individuals, while rates are cut, some deductions being eliminated might balance out or even increase future taxes over present taxes.
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Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave of the rules in certain the record, I introduce the following letter of February 2, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT
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on business progress and prosperity: what we are putting into science and technology today is what we are getting out of it for the consumer.

With all that has happened since World War II, we and our large industrial companies lost many, if not most, of how much our scientific and engineering capability has to do with our world position, our military effectiveness, and, certainly, our hopes for the kind of man's conquest of space.

I think, too, there is general recognition of how much research and development mean change, and that improved skill, as well as the lever of rising standards and economic growth.

We now know, for instance, that less than half the rise in this country's output since 1950 can be accounted for by increased amounts of labor and capital. The rest, it appears, has come largely from improved skills and the education of the labor force and from advances in management and technology.

Because we have had a great surge of research and development activity in the past decade, this figure has been accepted a third "truth," one that, unfortunately, is as faulted as it is well rounded. This is the assumption that we are well equipped for research and development and that only our military security and space supremacy can produce the improvements in productivity and a cornucopia of new products and processes to invigorate and expand the economy.

As anyone can see, research and development has become big business. The total of a century and a half of research and development spending—that is $18 billion—has been matched in just 5 years, from 1950 to 1955. And it was almost equaled in 1 year, fiscal 1957, with an estimated $20 billion, or about 3 percent of our gross national product, on research and development. Today, about three-tenths of all research and development in the United States is being done by corporations. If Government now finances some 60 percent of this work—versus 40 percent in 1953—it is nonetheless true that business has doubled its aggregate outlays for research and development in the last 8 years and has largely validated the prophecy of "a new industry of discovery."

The trouble is that relatively few people have the faintest idea exactly what sort of discovery industry this is.

By wrongly assuming in the first place that research and development for any purpose—space or otherwise—automatically fosters economic growth, they have completely missed the point that this is a highly concentrated business conducted by a few journals by geography, by company. Of the total effort, overwhelmingly oriented to defense, relatively little is directed to the creation of new consumer products, or to improved machines to make the products, or to improved processes to use in the machines. Although the national research and development effort is not the incubator of demand and productivity in the long run, it is clear to many people that the problem is the creation of a growing, healthy economy.

Actually, only a little over a quarter of our huge research and development expenditures—or an estimated $4 billion—is being spent by industry for civilian purposes. And only about $1.5 billion of this is aimed at work that is likely to increase productivity.

In many companies and industries that are important to growth—such products—textiles and construction, for example—are there relatively little research and development activity. And although business is becoming aware of the needs and conditions of our urbanized society. Transportation, air pollution, water resources—all require research and interested technical people, but they are attracting relatively little of either.

What is disturbing is that we are not being very competitive in the world. Other modern nations, free from a burden of large military and space commitments, are able to devote almost all their emphasis to developing the civilian economy and their social welfare. West Germany, for instance, spends a far larger portion of its total research budget on peaceful economic development than we do. The speed with which other nations adapt scientific advances to their productive processes, which explains, in part, why they are able to compete against us today in both price and quality.

Given the fact that good ideas won't keep—that all nations today share each other's discoveries and that it's mainly a matter of which one applies them first—it seems to me that if we don't want to spend the next decade just talking about competition and inadequate economic growth, we are going to have to do something to strengthen our military and space capability and correct the imbalance in our social contributions.

Now what are we up against in doing this?

The crux of the matter is people—technically educated people. Even if we were to expand the output of our civilian research and development next year, we could not double our effort. There just would not be enough technically educated people to do the job. And, unfortunately, we can't increase the supply of brains on an assembly-line basis.

Consider what's happened to technical manpower in the past few years: since 1945, engineering and science graduates doing research and development in industry has risen by 160,000. But all but 50,000 of these have been absorbed by projects for Government. The demands for personal doing research and development for Government purposes jumped more than 500 percent, 10 times the increase for industry-oriented research and development.

In 1963, the supply of scientists and engineers doing R. & D. was expected to enlarge by about 50,000. But the increase in space R. & D. alone this year will require almost the entire new supply.

With new manpower enrollments dropping—and engineers, remember, are the people we count on to apply technology—the manpower situation is likely to get even worse. But development is, obviously, beyond short-run solution. This fact makes it all the more urgent, that we take steps now to conserve and expand our scientific resources, while at the same time working toward improving the supply of personnel for improving industrial technology in the future.

What steps, specifically?

At the direction of the President, the Department of Commerce has started a civilan industrial technology program to be guided by the new Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Industrial Technology. Initially, it will rely on Federal funds. But its continuation and expansion, as well as the rate and extent of diffusion of technology, will depend directly on the extent to which Federal funds are matched by State and local governments, and by industry associations.

Let me emphasize that this program will be to stimulate and invigorate, not to control industrial or university work.

We have asked the Congress to provide funds for:

1. Attracting personnel at universities to work on the industrial problem. Through the award of research contracts, we hope to provide incentives and training for research workers and educators in specific industrial fields and, at the same time, develop new knowledge on which to base industrial innovation.

2. Stimulating research in industry institutions. The idea is here to generate technical innovation, not to control it, but not normally undertaken through simple profit incentives. We want also to provide research services and facilities for those firms that lack a broad enough line of products and services to support an efficient R. & D. program. Federal funds in this area will be awarded primarily to stimulate industry and local initiative. And the selection of particular industries and kinds of work will be left to the advice of industrial leaders, educators, and others.

3. Developing an industry-university extension service. This service, I think, can be extremely important in increasing the rate and extent of diffusion of technology throughout the country.

Just 100 years ago, we took a giant step in this country by establishing land-grant colleges to provide broad education for rural Americans. Out of these colleges grew agricultural extension service and research activities which fostered farm productivity. Much of the technology was developed and made available to the American farmer. The resources thus open to agriculture have been immeasurable to America's progress and to the rise of U.S. farm productivity.

Through an industry extension service, we would be in a position to provide similar services for civilian technology.

Working with the business community, the universities, and the public, we hope to define technical problems affecting local industries and seek solutions for them. In many cases it may be possible for research teams may initiate the studies. Or industrial leaders, or government, may bring problems, bearing on an industry or the local economy, to the centers.

Here, as elsewhere, the key element will be the encouragement of local grassroots initiative, and specialised attention to the problem of developing technology to fit specific local needs.

Fourth, and finally, we have asked for funds to support technical information services that meet industry's specific needs for knowledge about technological activities and developments. With enough informed investigators, we would collect, abstract, review, and disseminate pertinent information from Government, industry, and research sources in forms that industry can use. The information would also enable workers at universities and in industry to remain up-to-date on the state of the art in their respective fields. In addition, these services would alert technical people to existing developments and thereby reduce duplication of effort.

The initial effort of the civilian industrial technology program will be applied to industries that are major contributors to our gross national product and our export trade. These include food, metals, paper and pulp, and the heavy industries that depend on specialized technological resources. Among them, we envisage, will be textiles, construction, machine tools, metal fabrication, lumber, foundries, and castings.

But even with a more far-reaching program, which may evolve, our main hope for increasing technological productivity to improve our own productivity lies with the small matters, as in small, there is much that Government can do to help solve the problems that stand between us and a higher rate of technical development. But unless industry itself recognizes the importance of such things as making engineering education possible for everyone capable of it and desiring it, and that we must put more of science to prac-
Let me make it perfectly clear, too, that how much we increase productivity will have great bearing on our effort to expand American exports and to ease our continuing balance-of-payments problem.

If American goods are to remain competitive in world markets, we have no choice but to accelerate the productivity rise. Nor is this simply a matter of productivity—and costs—in export commodities and services. It goes, rather, to the whole of the domestic cost structure and, therefore, to productivity in fields such as energy, construction, and transport, all of which affect substantially the cost of the goods we sell abroad.

World War II and our postwar commitments taught us that we must be economically strong to repel threats to freedom and help strengthen the other democracies of the world. Our ability to defend ourselves, to assist underdeveloped areas, to absorb the disposable incomes of consumers we will be able to achieve, on a target of maximum employment, maximum production, and maximum purchasing power. It’s a big order, but this is not the first time that this country has faced, and met, a challenge of this magnitude.


EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. FRED SCHWENGEI OF IOWA IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEI. Mr. Speaker, of very special interest to me was the recent speech of our able colleague from Florida, the Honorable William C. Cramer, who addressed the 18th Annual Convention of the National Limestone Institute at Washington’s Statler Hotel, January 23, 1963.

As a member of the Public Works Committee on which Congressman Cramer serves with distinction, I can attest to the vital interest the entire Nation has in our highway system. This is one of the reasons why Congressman Cramer’s remarks should be read by all of us.

Congressman Cramer is currently the ranking Republican member of both the Subcommittee on Roads and the Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Programs. He is, indeed, qualified to discuss the topic, "The 88th Congress and Our Highway Future." I know my friends in the Limestone Institute enjoyed the privilege of hearing his address and I know my colleagues will find it as informative as I did.

Under heavy to extend my remarks, I request that the Clerk of the House in Cramer’s remarks appear in the Record.

THE 88TH CONGRESS AND OUR HIGHWAY FUTURE

"The 88th Congress and Our Highway Future"—this title could imply that the future of our highway program depends upon the 88th Congress. In one sense, of course, this is true. During the 88th Congress, careful attention will be devoted to the highway program, its progress, the laws pertaining to it, and related matters. I am sure that during the session the Congress will consider legislation which could imply that the future of our highway program depends upon the 88th Congress. The present Federal-aid highway program is the result of a series of legislative acts and of the efforts of many successive Sessions of Congress, beginning at least with the 64th Congress which, in 1916, enacted the original Federal-Aid Highway Act. The Federal-aid highway program is a continuing program, and, although each session of the Congress provides for the amendment of existing Federal legislation, the basic concept has remained substantially the same: an essential, State-Federal partnership program, which must grow with the Nation and without which the Nation cannot grow. I am confident that, if we take the first step, this Congress will consider and enact legislation of considerable importance to the program.

OUTLOOK AT THE BEGINNING OF THE SESSION

Two years ago, at the beginning of the 1st session of the 87th Congress, the problems confronting the highway program were varied, difficult, and, in some cases, highly controversial. First, it had become obvious that the revenues deposited in the Highway Trust Fund would not be sufficient to continue the program on a orderly basis under existing and anticipated authorizations. Second, the estimates of cost of completing the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways made it clear that additional funds would have to be provided in order to complete the Interstate System as originally planned. Third, the Special Subcommittee on Federal-aid Highway Programs had disclosed serious deficiencies and irregularities in the highway program, including construction practices in Oklahoma, and intolerably close relationships between contractors in my own State of Florida.

In a fine display of bipartisan effort, the 87th Congress enacted the Federal-Aid Highway Acts of 1961 and 1962, which provided solutions to several of the financial problems, continued the highway program on an orderly basis, and added certain modifications and revisions to the Federal-aid highway laws.

However, the 87th Congress did not solve all of the problems, and the 88th Congress will have much to do on the subject of highways.

AUTHORIZATIONS FOR THE A-B-C SYSTEMS

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966, with subsections, has already authorized the appropriation of funds adequate, on the basis of present estimates, to complete the 41,000-mile Interstate System in 1972. The current authorization is an estimate of the cost of completing the Interstate System is not required until 1966, so the 88th Congress will not be confronted with the problem of authorizations for that system.

However, authorizations for continuation of the construction of Federal-aid primary and secondary highways, and their extensions-known as the A-B-C program, has been on a biennial basis. These authorizations bills traditionally have been considered in the first session of each Congress, and I expect the same practice will be followed by the 88th Congress.

The 87th Congress authorized the appropriation of $950 and $975 million, respectively, for fiscal years 1964 and 1965, for the A-B-C program. In doing so, the Congress reaffirmed the original plan (which had been temporarily abandoned by the 86th Congress) to progressively increase authorizations for the A-B-C program until an annual authorization of $1 billion is reached.

In light of this, I expect that the 88th Congress will authorize $1 billion for each of the fiscal years 1966 and 1967, and I can assure you that this will have my full support.

The 88th Congress will also give attention to the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966. The Congress will give attention to legislation to strengthen and expand the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966. The Congress has repeatedly demonstrated its confidence in the highway program.

The 88th Congress will have before it the Federal-Aid Highway Act. The Congress will authorize $1 billion for each of the fiscal years 1966 and 1967, and I can assure you that this will have my full support.
During recent years—particularly since enactment of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956—there has been a noticeable tendency for some States and many local governments to use Federal-aid funds to promote projects which increase the costs of highway construction. Examples are taxes on sales of highway construction materials, and other taxes, including such items as salaries, school construction, relief and welfare programs, and the like.

Nobody questions the need for the imposition of taxes to pay the cost of such necessary governmental expenses. However, a question does exist as to the extent to which Federal-aid highway funds—which are derived from highway user revenues—should be used to pay such taxes, and this is particularly true on Interstate System projects, where Federal funds pay 90 percent or more of the costs.

REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 required the Secretary of Commerce to undertake certain studies and make reports to the Congress, concerning taxation and motor vehicle sizes and weights. Much information on these studies was derived from data obtained from the Illinois test road project, with which you people are familiar because it utilized considerable quantities of limestone and limestone byproducts.

The Secretary of Commerce has not yet submitted his final findings and recommendations, but it is expected that he will do so during the 86th Congress. Thus, the 86th Congress will have for consideration two important reports. One will be the final report concerning adequate and equitable taxation for highway purposes, based upon needs, burdens, and benefits. The other will deal with the question of maximum sizes and weights of motor vehicles on the Federal-aid highway system, and whether Federal laws should be amended.

I cannot forecast the results of congressional consideration of these subjects, but I do think you should follow their progress with considerable care.

PROGRESS OF THE INTERSTATE HIGHWAY PROGRAM

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 provided for the completion of the Interstate System, simultaneously in all of the States, by 1972. At the beginning of the year 1956—61% years after the act—about 10 years before the expected end of the program—the program is on schedule, if average annual construction rates and expenditures have been maintained, this record has been attained only by accepting averages. A few States are well ahead of schedule, while others are falling behind. I believe the objective of completing the Interstate System simultaneously in all States should be continued, if only all the States maintain comparable and acceptable progress.

CONCLUSION

Most of the Members of Congress approve the conduct and purpose of the Federal-aid highway program, but their obligations as representatives of the citizens of their districts require them to give objective and impartial attention to all matters subject to legislative consideration. As mentioned at the outset, I believe the Federal-aid highway program will be preserved and promoted by the 86th Congress. But some legislation and important legislative proposals will be considered.

Questions asked of Congressman Cramer and his answers following his speech to the National Limestone Institute 18th Annual Convention.

Question. Congressman, is there a problem of any State losing their Federal money because of slow construction—how can we find out the status of our State, the money, mileagewise, and so forth, compared to others and what can be done so we won't lose our money?

Answer. Well, the Bureau of Public Roads issues a quarterly report on the progress of each State and I am sure that any of you interested could get a copy by requesting it from the Bureau of Public Roads. This report shows, by State, the mileage of Interstate and other Federal-aid road projects on which work is now in progress, and the mileage on which no work has yet been done. In this way you can see how far advanced are projects, classified by Congress, for which they are authorized and the States lose those funds. So, it is essential that projects be accelerated, the cost of projects underway be reduced, and the estimated cost of projects authorized be reduced.

Question. Is it possible to know whether there is danger of any State losing Federal funds, I can say that no State has lost Interstate funds, and no States have had Federal-aid funds held back since the 1920's, when two States (Montana and Hawaii) lost funds. Of course, if a State does not use available Federal funds within the time allowed (2 years after the fiscal year for which they are authorized) the State would lose those funds. So, it is essential that the Interstate Highway System, for instance, in urban areas and downgraded construction in rural areas; the result being that less mileage is constructed as compared to other States, but an equal amount of dollars is spent because it obviously costs more money to build in urban areas.

So there are a lot of factors that enter into it. We have Congressmen in the shortest Congresses, in the shortest House, in the shortest Senate, where they see these things. I think if the House and Senate get together on this, and look at these matters, all these would obviously have to be taken into consideration. I will do my best; however, there are cases where States have lost Federal-aid funds for time delays, and again, I think the House and Senate should take steps to make these funds available to States where the delays are not excessive.

Question. Congressman, what is the current thinking as to what will happen with our road program after 1972?

Answer. That's very interesting. I intended to project my thinking just a little bit by suggesting that unquestionably before 1972, I think Congress is going to have the duty to sit down and consider that very question. Should the mileage on the Interstate System be increased, should additional connecting links be authorized, and if so, on what basis or should an entirely new program be initiated??
SENATE
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1963
(LEGISLATIVE DAY OF TUESDAY, JANUARY 15, 1963)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Vice President. The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, at the day's beginning in this hushed and hallowed moment, we pause to proclaim our faith that Thy truth, against which the gates of hell cannot prevail, is marching on to its coronation, even amid the perplexities and bafflements of these terrific days.

In the midst of events so colossal on the confused world's stage, O God, who sittest above the flood of man's insanity, lift us into the only greatness we shall ever know by using us as the channels of Thy purpose and intent.

Solemnize us with the consciousness that beyond the appraisals of men, regarding what we do and say here, there falls upon our record the searching light of Thy judgment.

In these days of great peril and of critical decisions, as Thy servants here regarding what we do and say here, there falls upon our record the searching light of Thy judgment.

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

THE JOURNAL
Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT
Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MENTAL HEALTH PROGRAMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 58)
Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the President's message on mental health, sent to the Congress today, has been read in the House of Representatives. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the message be waived by the Senate, and that it be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. (For President's message, see House proceedings of today.)

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED
As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE
A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 212. An act to amend section 904, title 38, United States Code, so that burial allowances might be paid in cases where discharges were changed by competent authority after death of the veteran from dishonorable to conditions other than dishonorable; and

H.R. 2439. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and provide certain services to the Boy Scouts of America for use in the 1964 National Jamboree, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED
The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 212. An act to amend section 904, title 38, United States Code, so that burial allowances might be paid in cases where discharges were changed by competent authority after death of the veteran from dishonorable to conditions other than dishonorable; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 2439. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and provide certain services to the Boy Scouts of America for use in the 1964 National Jamboree, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS
Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a morning hour for the introduction of bills and the transaction of routine business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I did not hear the request.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is a request for a morning hour.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OBJECTION TO MEETINGS OF SENATE COMMITTEES TODAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I will object to any meetings of Senate committees during the day.

APPOINTMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT
The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] to be an observer on the part of the Senate at the United Nations Cultural and Scientific Technical Conference, to be held in Geneva from February 4 to 20, 1963.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.
The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

MAP ON PRINCIPAL ELECTRIC FACILITIES IN THE UNITED STATES, 1962
A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of the map "Principal Electric Facilities in the United States, 1962" (with an accompanying map); to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL ACT
A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN SERVICE BUILDINGS ACT, 1926, TO AUTHORIZE ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS
A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.