

self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 4909. A bill to exempt from income tax, annuities and pensions paid by the United States to its employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIBAL:

H.R. 4910. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer to deduct (as trade or business expenses) the expenses of travel, meals, and lodging while employed away from his regular place of abode; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4911. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the costs of education or training shall be deductible as trade or business expenses when incurred in order to obtain a new or better job, as well as when incurred in order to maintain existing skills, status, salary, or employment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 4912. A bill to amend section 33 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act so as to provide a system of safety rules, regulations, and safety inspection and training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4913. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 4914. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 to provide for the use of counterpart funds for international agricultural conferences; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STINSON:

H.R. 4915. A bill to establish a Commission to enforce antidiscrimination provisions in Government contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 4916. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON (by request):

H.R. 4917. A bill to provide members of the Yakima Tribes with full citizenship rights by extinguishing the tribal entity and vesting each tribal member with his equal cash share of the fair market value of all reservation assets of the Yakima Tribes in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4918. A bill to provide members of the Colville Confederated Tribes with full citizenship rights by extinguishing the tribal entity and vesting each tribal member with his equal cash share of the fair market value of all reservation assets of the Colville Confederated Tribes in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 4919. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 4920. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.J. Res. 328. Joint resolution designating the 6-day period beginning April 15, 1963, as "National Harmony Week," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HARRISON: Memorial of the House of Representatives, 37th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States with reference to the granting of the fee or such lesser interest in land to the State of Wyoming for the purpose of establishing a county or State youth training camp; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide for the payment of the bonded indebtedness and the special assessments of any property which the Federal Government acquires by condemnation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to immediately take the necessary steps to give the citizens of this Nation an opportunity by constitutional amendment to determine whether or not prayer shall be permitted in the public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to the provision of assurances to the Government of the United States of the payment of non-Federal costs by the State and its political subdivisions in federally approved water projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to favoring early development of the Pipestem Creek, near Jamestown, N. Dak., and urging the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to expedite completion of its investigations, and develop a favorable report, thereon; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 4921. A bill for the relief of Anis Butros Sakhleh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 4922. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose Munoz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.R. 4923. A bill for the relief of David Gottlieb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.R. 4924. A bill for the relief of Gordon W. Heritage, Sr., and Sara Martha Heritage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 4925. A bill for the relief of Ng Yee Fee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 14, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rev. Kenneth J. Sharp, canon, the Washington Cathedral, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

O gracious Father, since it is of Thy mercy that another day is added to our

lives, we here dedicate both our souls and bodies to Thee and Thy service. Grant, we beseech Thee, that this day may be to us one of healthful work and progress. Guide, we pray Thee, all those to whom Thou hast committed the government of this Nation. Grant at this time to the President of these United States, the Senate, and all others who are engaged in government, special gifts of wisdom and understanding, of counsel and strength, that, upholding what is right and following what is true, they may in their wisdom follow Thy holy will.

Kindle, we pray Thee, in the hearts of all men the true love of peace; and guide with Thy strong and peaceful wisdom those who take counsel for the nations of the earth. Guide them, we pray, into the way of justice and truth, and establish among them the peace which is the fruit of righteousness.

O blessed Lord God, who didst reveal Thyself to bring abundant life to all mankind, we pray Thee that all who here on earth possess the abundance of this world may desire it so keenly for others, that unjust conditions may become intolerable, and that all who love Thee may become rich in their concern for justice and equality toward all men. O Thou who hast created man in Thine own image, give all in authority the strength fearlessly to contend against evil, and to make no peace with oppression; and that we may reverently use our freedom, help us to employ it in the maintenance of justice among men in our country and all nations.

Grant us, O Lord, to pass this day in gladness and peace, without stumbling and without stain; that, reaching the eventide victorious over all temptation, we may praise Thee, the eternal God, who art blessed, and dost govern all things, world without end. Amen.

The grace of our Lord, Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost be with us all, evermore. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 11, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

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. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86-420, the Speaker had appointed Mr. NIX, Chairman, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. McDOWELL, Mr. ZABLOCKI, Mr. MACDONALD, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. WHALLEY, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. NORBLAD, and Mr. SPRINGER as members of the U.S. delegation of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group on the part of the House, for the meeting to be held in Guanajuato, Republic of Mexico, beginning on Monday, March 18, 1963.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86-420, the Speaker had appointed Mr. REIFEL of South Dakota, Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts, and Mr. CAMERON of California as members of the U.S. delegation of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group, on the part of the House, for the meeting to be held in the Republic of Mexico, beginning on Monday, March 18, 1963, to fill the existing vacancies thereon.

The message announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 39. An act to amend the act of June 4, 1948, as it relates to the appointment of the District of Columbia Armory Board;

H.R. 682. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901, to permit the appointment of new trustees in deeds of trust in the District of Columbia by agreement of the parties;

H.R. 1933. An act to amend the act of February 9, 1907, entitled "An act to define the term 'registered nurse' and to provide for the registration of nurses in the District of Columbia," as amended, with respect to the minimum age limitation for registration;

H.R. 1935. An act to authorize the acquisition, training, and maintenance of dogs to be used in law enforcement in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 1937. An act to amend the act known as the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia, approved June 19, 1934, and the act known as the Fire and Casualty Act of the District of Columbia, approved October 3, 1940;

H.R. 1982. An act to amend section 10 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, so as to require reports of collisions in which motor vehicles are involved;

H.R. 2438. An act to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2440. An act to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2485. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations to prevent and control the spread of communicable and preventable diseases," approved August 11, 1939, as amended; and

H.R. 3537. An act to increase the jurisdiction of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia in civil actions, to change the names of the court, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 39. An act to amend the act of June 4, 1948, as it relates to the appointment of the District of Columbia Armory Board;

H.R. 682. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901, to permit the appointment of new trustees in deeds of trust in the District of Columbia by agreement of the parties;

H.R. 1933. An act to amend the act of February 9, 1907, entitled "An act to define the term 'registered nurse' and to provide for the registration of nurses in the District of Columbia," as amended, with respect to the minimum age limitation for registration;

H.R. 1935. An act to authorize the acquisition, training, and maintenance of dogs to be used in law enforcement in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 1937. An act to amend the act known as the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia, approved June 19, 1934, and the act known as the Fire and Casualty Act of the District of Columbia, approved October 3, 1940;

H.R. 1982. An act to amend section 10 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, so as to require reports of collisions in which motor vehicles are involved;

H.R. 2485. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations to prevent and control the spread of communicable and preventable diseases," approved August 11, 1939, as amended; and

H.R. 3537. An act to increase the jurisdiction of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia in civil actions; to change the names of the court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 2438. An act to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 2440. An act to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Upon request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Senate Judiciary Committee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair announces the appointment of Senator TALMADGE, of Georgia, and Senator WIL-

LIAMS, of Delaware, as negotiators under the Trade Expansion Act, pursuant to recommendations by the leadership and the chairman of the Finance Committee.

The Chair also announces the appointment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN] as a member of the delegation on the part of the Senate, of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group for the meeting to be held in Guanajuato, Republic of Mexico, beginning on Monday, March 18, 1963, vice Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, excused.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT OF U.S. SOLDIERS' HOME

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the U.S. Soldiers' Home, for the fiscal year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF LAW RELATING TO MATERIAL AND NECESSARY WITNESSES TO CRIMES COMMITTED IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the law relating to material and necessary witnesses to crimes committed in the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AUDIT REPORT ON OUTDOOR RECREATION RESOURCES REVIEW COMMISSION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, for the period June 28, 1958, through September 1, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF UNNECESSARY COSTS INCURRED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY IN THE PROCUREMENT OF AIRBORNE EARLY WARNING SEARCH RADARS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the examination of unnecessary costs incurred by the Department of the Navy in the procurement of airborne early warning search radars, dated March 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

LAWS ENACTED BY LEGISLATURE OF GUAM

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Sixth Guam Legislature 1962 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Library of Congress, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1962 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, and so forth, were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 12

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States to establish a 'National Flag Week.'

"Whereas the flag of the United States is symbolic of that which is most cherished and desired by man—freedom; and

"Whereas the freedom represented by the American flag was hard won by our forefathers, and thus far preserved; and

"Whereas this symbol of freedom has been the inspiration and hope of the oppressed and persecuted of the world; and

"Whereas in these times of complacency, the people of the State, as well as of the Nation, would do well to pause and consider the meaning of the now taken for granted freedom symbolized by our flag: Now therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to do whatever is necessary to establish the 7-day period commencing with the first day of July of each year as National Flag Week, wherein the people of the Nation will be urged to display the American flag annually, each of these 7 days; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 11

"Joint resolution relative to a commemorative stamp honoring Hollywood's entertainment industry

"Whereas, for over half a century Hollywood has been famous as the center of the motion picture industry and, in more recent years, the center of the television, radio, and recording industries; and

"Whereas, film production, of which Hollywood is the world center, is not only a means of entertainment, but serves for the recordation of significant events, for the propagation of ideas, as a social medium of considerable importance, as a valid art form in its own right, and preserves the colorful history of the United States; and

"Whereas, the Hollywood Museum, as the archive of momentous films of national and international scope and the exhibition hall for modern, as well as historic, picture filming techniques, will be dedicated in Hollywood in June of 1964: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Postmaster General of the United States to provide for the issuance in June of 1964 of a commemorative stamp honoring Hollywood the "center of the entertainment industry"; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Postmaster General of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to each Senator and Representative from

California in the Congress of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Government Operations:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION W

"Concurrent resolution urging the U.S. Congress to provide for the payment of the bonded indebtedness and the special assessments of any property which the Federal Government acquires by condemnation

"Whereas when either the Federal Government or the State of North Dakota or any of its political subdivisions, exercises the power of eminent domain the bonded indebtedness and special assessments of the condemned property are assumed by the remaining property within the political subdivisions of which such condemned property is a part; and

"Whereas this imposes an inequitable and oftentimes burdensome financial obligation upon the remaining property; and

"Whereas North Dakota's 38th Legislative Assembly is presently considering legislation which would require the State agencies condemning property to pay the proportionate share of the bonded indebtedness and special assessments of any property acquired by condemnation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the 38th Legislative Assembly hereby respectfully urges and requests the Congress of the United States to enact legislation whereby the U.S. Government would pay the proportionate share of the bonded indebtedness and special assessments of any property which it acquires pursuant to its powers of eminent domain; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state is hereby directed to forward copies of this resolution to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of the U.S. Congress, and to each member of the North Dakota congressional delegation.

"FRANK A. WENSTROM,

"President of the Senate.

"HOWARD F. DOHERTY,

"Secretary of the Senate.

"STANLEY SAUGSTAD,

"Speaker of the House.

"GERALD F. STAIR,

"Chief Clerk of the House."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 1

"Concurrent resolution relating to the provision of assurances to the Government of the United States of the payment of non-Federal costs by the State and its political subdivisions in federally approved water projects

"Whereas the Federal Water Supply Act of 1958 authorizes the inclusion of water supply storage in reservoirs constructed by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation for present or anticipated future demand or need for municipal or industrial water, provided the Federal Government is reasonably assured by the States, political subdivisions, or local interests, that the water will be needed and that the non-Federal financial obligation for the water supply features will be fulfilled; and

"Whereas the State of North Dakota through the State water conservation commission is authorized to participate in works for the conservation, development, distribution, and utilization of its water resources; and

"Whereas affected local interests have requested and the State water conservation commission has recommended the inclusion

of not less than 2,900 acre-feet of water supply storage in the Bowman-Haley Reservoir on the north fork of the Grand River in North Dakota: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That in view of the ever-increasing demand and anticipated future need for water, the legislature hereby declares as its policy that conservation and storage of water supplies should be provided wherever and whenever feasible and practicable, and that it concurs in the request of local interests and the recommendation of the State water conservation commission for inclusion of the maximum water supply storage in the Bowman-Haley Reservoir project; and be it further

"Resolved, That the legislature recognizes the non-Federal repayment obligations required in connection with providing water supply features in federally financed projects and hereby directs the State water conservation commission to make and supply such assurances relative thereto as may be required by and satisfactory to the Chief of Engineers; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state is directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the Chief of Engineers of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, each member of the North Dakota congressional delegation, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, the chairmen of the U.S. Senate and House Appropriations Committees, and the Governor of North Dakota.

"FRANK A. WENSTROM,

"President of the Senate.

"HOWARD F. DOHERTY,

"Secretary of the Senate.

"STANLEY SAUGSTAD,

"Speaker of the House.

"GERALD F. STAIR,

"Chief Clerk of the House."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Public Works:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION R

"Concurrent resolution favoring early development of the Pipestem Creek, near Jamestown, N. Dak., and urging the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to expedite completion of its investigations, and develop a favorable report thereon

"Whereas increased public demand for more and improved water management requires the optimum development of our precious water resources for controlling floods, providing water supplies for municipal, industrial, agricultural, recreational, fish and wildlife and other purposes; and

"Whereas the Pipestem Creek, the major tributary of the James River in North Dakota, contributes up to 45 percent of the water during flooding of the James River below their confluence, offers an excellent opportunity for multiple-purpose use if properly developed and it will thereby enhance instead of impair property values in affected urban and rural areas; and

"Whereas further surveys and investigations for construction of a proposed dam and reservoir thereon, about 5 miles upstream from Jamestown, are continuing under the direction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in cooperation with other agencies: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the 38th Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota does hereby express its keen interest in, and endorsement of, the proposed development on the Pipestem Creek for the many beneficial purposes aforesaid, and urges the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to complete its work as expeditiously as possible in the hope that a favorable report thereon can be

developed and authorizing legislation enacted in the near future; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state transmit copies hereof to the Chief of Engineers, the Riverdale Area Office of Corps of Engineers, the President of the U.S. Senate and Speaker of U.S. House of Representatives, and the North Dakota congressional delegation.

"FRANK A. WENSTROM,
"President of the Senate."
"HOWARD F. DOHERTY,
"Secretary of the Senate."
"STANLEY SAUGSTAD,
"Speaker of the House."
"GERALD F. STAIR,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Public Works:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 18

"Whereas it is for the economic and industrial good of the State of Indiana that its land be used for productive purposes wherever feasible; and

"Whereas it appears that certain forces are inimical to the economic betterment of the State of Indiana in its proposed development; and

"Whereas the construction of a deep-water port on Lake Michigan within the territorial limits of the State of Indiana will benefit the economy and development of Indiana; and

"Whereas there are certain insidious elements at work to prevent the development of such deepwater port by the acquisition of land for the admirable but spurious purpose of creating a national park: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives, That it is the expressed policy of the State of Indiana, by the House of Representatives of the 93d General Assembly of said State, that land of said sovereign State situate within 25 miles of Lake Michigan shall not be ceded or surrendered to the United States of America or any other sovereign power whose intentions do not coincide with the best interests of the State of Indiana in the construction and development of a deep-water port on the shores of Lake Michigan in the area of Burns ditch.

"CHARLES W. EDWARDS,
"Representative."

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS OF NORTH DAKOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred, three resolutions adopted by the North Dakota State Legislature.

These resolutions are on subjects on which the North Dakota people have very strong views. These views, I believe, are very ably expressed in these resolutions.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolutions were appropriately referred, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on Commerce:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION H

"Concurrent resolution urging the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to establish reasonable regulations in respect to the number and species of ducks that may be shot in North Dakota and also urging the United States to enter into an agreement with Mexico to prevent the wholesale slaughter of ducks in Mexico

"Whereas North Dakota raises and feeds more ducks than any other State, and several

times more than are shot by State-licensed hunters; and

"Whereas the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior has imposed unreasonable restrictions respecting the number and species of ducks that may be taken during the hunting season, such restrictions in effect requiring the hunters to carry a duck identification book and field glasses in one hand and a gun in the other; and

"Whereas ducks migrating from Canada, and from North Dakota and other States of the United States, are being slaughtered in wholesale numbers in Mexico due to an absence of restrictions respecting duck hunting and the allowance of commercial duck hunting and trapping: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior establish reasonable regulations which would allow North Dakota hunters to take a greater number of species and ducks during the forthcoming hunting seasons; and be it further

Resolved, That the United States enter into negotiations with Mexico in order to prevent the unreasonable slaughter in Mexico of ducks raised in Canada, and in North Dakota and other States of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to the North Dakota State game and fish commissioner, the North Dakota delegation in Congress, and the Director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior at Washington, D.C.

"FRANK A. WENSTROM,
"President of the Senate."
"HOWARD F. DOHERTY,
"Secretary of the Senate."
"STANLEY SAUGSTAD,
"Speaker of the House."
"GERALD F. STAIR,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION R.R.

"Concurrent resolution to memorialize the Congress of the United States to immediately take the necessary steps to give to the citizens of this Nation an opportunity by constitutional amendment to determine whether or not prayer shall be permitted in the public schools.

"Whereas no civilization, no government, and no nation has ever existed, nor could they be possible, without a fundamental and profound recognition of and reverence for some authority, some ideal, some being, superior to the individual, which in our national heritage we have expressed as a belief in and dependence upon Almighty God; and

"Whereas our national tradition and heritage of public and civic prayer give purpose and meaning to our Union as a Nation, without which we could only suffer the anarchy or tyranny of the oppressed peoples in less enlightened parts of the world; and

"Whereas education may be a worthless thing if limited to merely the dissemination of factual information without the expression and understanding of ideas, ideals, theories, customs, and beliefs of other men, whether designated as being of a religious nature or by some other appellation; and

"Whereas none of the constitutional safeguards of individual rights and civil liberties of the citizens of these United States were designed or intended to prohibit prayer in the schools or in any other public place, so long as no citizen is coerced into a participation therein inconsistent with his own beliefs; and

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has had occasion upon June 25, 1962,

in its decision rendered in the case of *Engel et al. v. Vitale et al.*, No. 468 upon the docket of its 1961 October term, to so construe our Constitution as to prohibit public prayer in public schools: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to immediately take the necessary steps to provide the citizens of this great Nation an opportunity to amend the U.S. Constitution to determine whether or not public prayer shall be permitted in the public schools of the several States; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state shall forward copies of this resolution to the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to each member of the North Dakota congressional delegation.

"FRANK A. WENSTROM,
"President of the Senate."
"HOWARD F. DOHERTY,
"Secretary of the Senate."
"STANLEY SAUGSTAD,
"Speaker of the House."
"GERALD F. STAIR,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the North Dakota Legislature, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.)

To the Committee on Public Works:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION L

"Concurrent resolution endorsing and supporting the construction of the proposed Pemblier Dam and Reservoir project and commending the agencies participating in its investigation and planning

"Whereas the proposed Pemblier Dam and Reservoir on the Pembina River, near Wall-halla, N. Dak., is progressing to the point where a report thereon by the investigating agencies of both Canada and the United States can be expected before another session of the legislature; and

"Whereas the surveys, investigations, and studies so far made all indicate economic feasibility, that the construction thereof would insure control of flooding on the Pembina River, adequate municipal and industrial water supplies for several communities in both countries, also supplemental water for potential irrigable areas, and for other beneficial purposes; and

"Whereas the International Joint Commission has developed much time and study to this proposal and has individually and collectively toured the Pembina River Basin and inspected the various sites and areas involved in the proposed project: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein), That the 38th Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota hereby reaffirms its wholehearted endorsement and support of the Pemblier Dam and Reservoir project aforesaid, commends the International Joint Commission and all the agencies of both Canada and the United States participating in the important investigative and planning activities for their faithful and conscientious devotion to their task and trusts that the definite report thereon will become available sometime during the next fiscal year; and be it further

Resolved, That copies hereof be transmitted by the secretary of state to the President of the United States; Secretary of the Department of State; President of the U.S. Senate; Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; district engineer, St. Paul office of U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation; Chairmen of the Canadian and United States Sections, In-

ternational Joint Commission; Members of the North Dakota delegation in Congress; and the Governor of North Dakota.

"STANLEY SAUGSTAD,
"Speaker of the House.
"GERALD F. STAIR,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"FRANK A. WENSTROM,
"President of the Senate.
"HOWARD F. DOHERTY,
"Secretary of the Senate."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the State of North Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.)

APPOINTMENT OF VETERANS TO CIVIL SERVICE POSITIONS—RESOLUTION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, on February 28, 1963, a resolution was unanimously approved by Frank Stull Post No. 152, the American Legion, Department of Kansas, Ness City, Kans., in regard to the appointment of veterans to civil service positions.

During the past few months I have received many letters and resolutions from veterans and veteran organizations stating that veterans' preference was not followed in making appointments to positions in the Post Office Department, and it is my hope that this situation will be corrected.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be made a part of these remarks and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States has developed a point preference system for veterans taking civil service examinations; and

Whereas this would indicate that the Congress intended to favor said veterans when applying for jobs in the field of civil service; and

Whereas the Post Office Department and other agencies coming under the civil service regulations have followed this policy; and

Whereas a situation has arisen in this community that would indicate appointments covered under civil service regulations are being made without considering the applicants' service in the Armed Forces of the United States; and

Whereas it is the belief of this post that such appointments should be made on the basis of ability and veterans' preferences and not on the basis of previous or current political activity: Be it therefore

Resolved, That this post take all necessary action to inform the citizens of the community as to the situation as pertains to the appointment of applicants in the field of civil service; and be it further

Resolved That this action be brought to the attention of all county committee members of all political parties in this area; and be it further

Resolved, That this action be brought to the attention of the U.S. Congressman from this district, the U.S. Senators from this State, and the district, State, and national levels of this organization.

VERN E. CRANSTON,
Commander.

Attest:

WILLIAM D. BRACKNEY,
Adjutant.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 2438. An act to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 64).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution to print with illustrations "A Report on U.S. Foreign Operations in Africa," by Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER (Rept. No. 65);

S. Con. Res. 14. Concurrent resolution to print as a Senate document, with illustrations, a pamphlet entitled "Our Capitol," and to print additional copies thereof (Rept. No. 73);

S. Res. 72. Resolution to print as a Senate document a report on Colorado River storage project and participating projects, etc. (Rept. No. 74);

S. Res. 99. Resolution to print as a document, with additional copies, a compilation of materials relating to the history of the Committee on Banking and Currency (Rept. No. 77);

S. Res. 105. Resolution to print as a document a compilation of materials entitled "Summer Employment by College Students in the Federal Government—1961" (Rept. No. 75); and

S. Res. 106. Resolution to print additional copies of Senate Document No. 117, 84th Congress, relating to the Communist Party of the United States (Rept. No. 76).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments:

S. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing as a House document the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government. What Is It? How Does It Function?" (Rept. No. 70); and

S. Res. 56. Resolution to investigate anti-trust and monopoly laws of the United States (Rept. No. 87).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without additional amendments:

S. Res. 29. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Commerce to make a study of certain matters under its jurisdiction (Rept. No. 71).

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

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 (Rept. No. 68); and

H.R. 2085. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the deduction for child care expenses shall be available to a wife who has been deserted by and cannot locate her husband on the same basis as a single woman (Rept. No. 69).

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:

H.R. 1597. An act relating to the tax treatment of redeemable ground rents (Rept. No. 72).

AUTHORIZATION FOR SALE OF CERTAIN CADMIUM—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. SYMINGTON, from the Committee on Armed Services, reported an original bill (S. 1089) to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of cadmium proposed

to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, and submitted a report (No. 66); which bill was read twice by its title, and placed on the calendar.

PERMISSION FOR CERTAIN FORMER EMPLOYEES OF THE SENATE TO TESTIFY IN THE CASE OF PENNSYLVANIA AGAINST BERMAN ET AL.—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, at the request of the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] I report from the Committee on Government Operations an original resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 108) as follows:

Whereas, in the case of the *Commonwealth of Pennsylvania v. Abraham Berman, Edward Walker, Joseph Hartsough, Joseph Grace, John Joseph Elco, Raymond Cohen, and Ben Lapensohn*, Bill of Indictment No. 520 of the September 1959 Session of the Court of Oyer and Terminer of Philadelphia County of said Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, subpoenas ad testificandum and duces tecum were issued upon the application of the District Attorney of Philadelphia County and addressed as follows:

"To George Kopecky, Joseph Unger, Herbert J. Rose, Jr., Edgar C. Parkhurst, Charles Wolfe, and George Martin, all of whom are former employees of the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field; and directing them to bring with them all of their notes, memoranda, workpapers, and records compiled by them in connection with the above-named defendants and Local 107 of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America, which subpoenas are returnable on March 25, 1963, at 10 o'clock ante meridian"; and

Whereas said material is in the possession of and under the control of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, by virtue of section 5 of Senate Resolution 255 of the 86th Congress; and

Whereas by the privileges of the Senate of the United States, no document under the control and in the possession of the Senate of the United States can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession, but by its permission; and

Whereas by the privilege of the Senate and by Rule XXX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no document shall be withdrawn from its files except by the order of the Senate; and

Whereas information secured by staff employees of the Senate pursuant to their official duties as employees may not be revealed without the consent of the Senate: Therefore be it

Resolved, That George Kopecky, Joseph Unger, Herbert J. Rose, Jr., Edgar C. Parkhurst, Charles Wolfe, and George Martin, former employees of the United States Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field, are authorized to appear and testify at the time and place, and before the court named in the subpoenas ad testificandum and duces tecum before mentioned, or at any continued and subsequent proceedings thereof, and to take with them such documents and papers called for in said subpoenas for production

before said court where determined by the judge thereof to be material and relevant to the issues before him.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, there is presently pending in the court of quarter sessions, county of Philadelphia, Pa., a criminal action involving several individuals which is an outgrowth of an investigation conducted by the former Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field. This criminal action relates to persons identified with local No. 107 of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters which is located in Philadelphia, Pa. As you know, under Senate Resolution 255 of the 86th Congress, the files of that select committee were transferred to the custody of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

The court in Philadelphia has issued subpoenas requiring the testimony of several former employees of the Senate select committee and calling for the production of certain documents which are now part of the files of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. Under the privileges of the Senate, no document under the control and in the possession of the Senate can be taken from its possession except by its consent and no information secured by staff employees of the Senate pursuant to their official duties as employees may be revealed except by consent of the Senate.

Accordingly, the purpose of this resolution is to permit these several employees of the former select committee to testify before the court in Philadelphia County and in connection therewith to present certain documentary evidence now in the files of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

The resolution (S. Res. 108) was considered and agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

PERMISSION FOR A CERTAIN EMPLOYEE TO TESTIFY IN CERTAIN PROCEEDINGS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, at the request of the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], I report from the Committee on Government Operations an original resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 109) as follows:

Whereas the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations has in its possession, by virtue of Senate Resolution 250, certain evidence pertaining to an investigation of operations of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and its relationship with various individuals and corporations, which investigation was conducted by the Subcommittee under authority granted in said Senate Resolution 250; and

Whereas the action of the Department of Agriculture in cancelling cotton allotments transferred from the State of Oklahoma to the State of Texas by Walker Roman Nose, Erma Calf Bearhead, Ada L. Davis and other persons is now under appeal and is pending before the Review Committee for Area of Venue XXXIV, State of Texas, in re application for review by Agriculture Incorporated, farm No. 5519, Pecos County, Tex., Fort Stockton, Tex.; and

Whereas the Department of Agriculture has requested the production of evidence in the possession of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations concerning this matter and has requested that Arthur G. Kaplan, Assistant Counsel of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, appear and testify; and

Whereas by the privileges of the Senate, no Member or Senate employee is authorized to produce Senate documents or to testify but by order of the Senate: Therefore be it Resolved, That the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations is granted leave to permit the copying and presentation of certain evidence for examination in connection with the aforementioned proceedings, the evidence thereupon to be returned to the possession of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations; and be it further

Resolved, That Arthur G. Kaplan, an Assistant Counsel employed by the Senate, is authorized to appear and testify in the aforementioned proceedings.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, there is presently pending in Fort Stockton, Tex., a proceeding by the U.S. Department of Agriculture before the review committee for area of venue XXXIV of the State of Texas in regard to the application for review by Agriculture, Inc., Farm 5519, Pecos County, Tex.

This action relates to an appeal by several persons who transferred cotton allotments from the State of Oklahoma to the State of Texas by virtue of what has been ruled by the Department as a scheme or device. These allotments were canceled by the Department for these reasons and the action of the Department is now being contested before the review committee.

In connection with a recent investigation by the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, certain documents came into the possession of the subcommittee. The Department of Agriculture has requested that these documents be made available for the review proceedings to be conducted in Fort Stockton, Tex., and that Mr. Arthur G. Kaplan, assistant counsel, who acquired information during the course of his duties, germane to the review proceedings, be available to provide testimony.

By the privileges of the Senate no documents within control and possession of the Senate can be taken from the Senate without its consent. Likewise, information secured by staff employees of the Senate pursuant to their official duties as employees may not be revealed without the consent of the Senate.

The purpose of this resolution is to permit Mr. Arthur G. Kaplan to appear in Fort Stockton, Tex., before the re-

view committee and to provide testimony, as well as to furnish documents in the possession of the subcommittee germane to the subject under review.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 109) was considered and agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

THE MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent that the committee have until midnight, March 28, to file its report on the bill, and that then the report be printed, together with minority and individual views. This bill will be under consideration by the Commerce Committee until midnight March 28.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Jersey? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REPORT ENTITLED "1963 JOINT ECONOMIC REPORT"—MINORITY AND ADDITIONAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 78)

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, from the Joint Economic Committee, I submit a report entitled "1963 Joint Economic Report," which I ask may be printed, with illustrations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. HUMPHREY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint economic report submitted by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] may be printed together with minority views, and the additional views of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER].

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

UTILIZATION OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND U.S. DOLLARS BY COMMITTEES IN CONNECTION WITH FOREIGN TRAVEL

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in accordance with the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the reports of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Committee on

Armed Services, the Select Committee on Small Business, and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy concerning the

foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by these committees in 1962 in connection with foreign travel.

There being no objection, the reports were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Eugene J. McCarthy:											
Germany	Deutsche mark			358	89.50	442	110.50			800	200.00
Italy	Lira	306,605	493.64	174,469	281.09	597,070	961.42	127,129	204.70	1,205,273	1,940.85
Spain	Peseta	5,240	87.42	2,761	46.05	935	15.60	364	6.09	9,300	155.16
Switzerland	Franc	548.90	126.88	351	81.13	1295.20	299.38	304.90	70.48	2,500	577.87
Total			707.94		497.77		1,386.90		281.27		2,873.88

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent) Amount 2,873.8

MARCH 14, 1963.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Armed Services, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Richard B. Russell:											
France	New franc	235	47.96	201	41.02	5	1.02	193	39.38	634	129.38
Do	Dollar				7.93				10.58		18.51
Italy	Lira	34,410	55.41	10,755	17.32			8,853	13.93	54,018	86.66
Do	Dollar				5.48				.40		5.88
Lebanon	Lebanese pound	124.10	39.03	53.80	16.92			98	30.82	275.90	86.77
Do	Dollar				11.67				10.78		22.45
Egypt	Egyptian pound	2.5	5.75	6	13.80			3.5	8.05	12	27.60
Do	Dollar				2.72				3.22		5.94
Cyprus	Cyprus pound	6.5	18.29	2.8	7.90	1	2.81	2.4	6.76	12.7	35.76
Israel	Israeli pound	101.47	33.82	54.40	18.13	130.50	43.50	30	10.00	316.37	105.45
Do	Dollar				2.13				2.78		4.91
Jordan	Jordanian dinar					7.75	22.10			7.75	22.10
Spain	Peseta	4,078	67.96	2,297	38.28			950	15.83	7,325	122.07
Do	Dollar				10.70				1.63		12.33
United States							103.00				103.00
Senator E. L. Bartlett:											
Japan	Yen	28,000	80.00	39,297	109.16	(1)		26,800	78.78	94,300	267.94
Do	Dollar				15.93	(1)	221.47		14.26		251.66
William H. Darden:											
France	New franc	212	43.26	201	41.02	5	1.02	186	37.96	604	123.26
Do	Dollar				7.93				10.58		18.51
Italy	Lira	24,250	39.05	10,755	17.32			8,278	13.33	43,283	69.70
Do	Dollar				5.48				.40		5.88
Lebanon	Lebanese pound	87.35	27.45	53.80	16.92			32	10.07	173.15	54.44
Do	Dollar				11.67				10.78		22.45
Egypt	Egyptian pound	2.5	5.75	6	13.80			1.5	3.45	10	23.00
Do	Dollar				2.72				3.22		5.94
Cyprus	Cyprus pound	6.7	18.86	2.7	7.61	1	2.81	2.4	6.76	12.8	36.04
Israel	Israeli pound	63.37	21.12	54.5	18.13	130.5	43.50	5	1.67	253.27	84.42
Do	Dollar				2.13				2.78		4.91
Jordan	Jordanian dinars					7.75	22.10			7.75	22.10
Spain	Peseta	2,859	47.65	2,322	38.70			679	11.32	5,860	97.67
Do	Dollar				10.70				1.63		12.33
United States	do						103.00				103.00
Total			551.36		513.22		566.33		361.15		1,992.06

¹ State Department purchased ticket and to date amount not reported to Washington, Mar. 8, 1963.

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent) Amount 1,394.36
 Appropriated funds:
 Government department:
 Navy 346.04
 Air Force 251.66
Total 1,992.06

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Armed Services, Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Ronald Friedenberg:											
Canada	U.S. dollar								5.50		5.50
England	do		23.27		30.18		3.33		16.17		72.95
Norway	do		11.24		16.25				5.78		33.27
Germany	do		10.05		23.05		3.69		16.14		52.93
Italy	do		6.08		7.75				8.44		22.27
France	do		23.07		27.83		.22		15.05		66.17
Ben J. Gilles:											
England	do		31.50		50.00		4.00		30.50		116.00
Germany	do		7.50		23.22				41.22		71.94
Denmark	do		8.40		26.00		3.70		21.00		59.10
Italy	do		9.00		14.00		2.55		31.00		56.55
Spain	do		14.00		11.00				10.00		35.00
France	do		28.50		21.00		9.00		25.00		83.50
James T. Kendall:											
England	do		31.50		50.00		4.00		30.50		116.00
Germany	do		7.50		23.22				41.22		71.94
Denmark	do		8.40		26.00		3.70		21.00		59.10
Italy	do		9.00		14.00		2.55		31.00		56.55
Spain	do		14.00		11.00				10.00		35.00
France	do		28.50		21.00		9.00		25.00		83.50
Total			271.51		395.50		45.74		384.52		1,097.27

RECAPITULATION

Appropriated funds: Government department: Air Force..... Amount \$1,097.27

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Select Committee on Small Business, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Richard J. Dasehbach:											
Belgium	Franc	600	12.06	720	14.49					1,320	26.55
England	Pound	25.8	72.40	36.8	103.00	2.9	8.00	1.9	5.44	67	188.84
France	Franc	346.77	70.77	558.60	114.00	5,608	1,144.49	40.72	8.31	6,554.10	1,337.57
Germany	Mark	128	32.17	164	41.00	308	77.01			600	160.18
Italy	Lira	32,404	52.18	43,470	70.00	7,452	12.00	2,174	3.50	85,500	137.68
Netherlands	Guilder	34.8	9.69	50.3	14.00			15	4.17	100	27.86
Sweden	Krona	159.8	30.98	283.7	55.00	36.1	7.00	11.3	2.20	490	95.18
Daniel T. Coughlin:											
England	Pound	26/14	74.76	18	50.40	31	86.80	15	43.03	90/14	1,254.99
Belgium	Pound converted to franc			4	11.20	18	50.40			22	61.60
Germany	Mark	202.44	50.61	192.48	48.00	383.24	95.81	330.04	82.50	1,013.68	276.92
Italy	Lira	84,672	141.12	43,200	72.00	31,200	52.00	20,926	24.74	180,000	286.86
France	New franc	555.85	111.17	180	36.00	50	10.00	154.15	30.83	940	188.00
William T. McInarnay:											
England	Pound	£31/2	88.24	£25	70.00	£62	173.74	£12	33.60	130/2	436.58
Germany	Deutsche mark	202.44	50.61	188.00	47.00	299.80	74.95	9.76	2.44	700.00	175.00
Italy	Lira	84,674	136.35	39,528	63.65	63,223	101.81	16,272	26.20	203,697	328.01
France	New franc	555.85	111.17	205	41.00	75	15.00	170	34.00	1,010.85	201.17
Neal D. Peterson:¹											
Japan	Yen	40,320	112.00	30,240	84.00	720	2.00	1,835	5.10	73,115	203.10
Formosa	New Taiwan dollar	2,400	60.00	1,040	26.00	160	4.00			3,600	90.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar	229.40	40.00	97.50	17.00	23.10	4.03			350.00	61.03
Bangkok	Baht	1,146.75	55.00	364.88	17.50	44.87	2.14			1,556.50	74.64
Lebanon	Pound	143.28	48.00	41.79	14.00	5.98	2.00	10.20	3.44	201.25	67.44
Germany	Deutsche mark	576	144.00	180	45.00	64	16.00	15	3.75	835	208.75
Total			1,503.28		1,054.24		1,939.18		313.25		4,809.95

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)..... Amount 4,809.95

MARCH 1, 1963.

JOHN SPARKMAN,
Chairman, Select Committee on Small Business.

¹ Refunded: 13 pounds—\$36.40. Have receipt from State Department.

² Refunded: 93 deutsche marks—\$23. Have receipt from State Department.

³ Refunded: 60 new francs—\$12. Have receipt from State Department.

⁴ Includes pounds converted to francs in Belgium. Have receipt for 20 pounds returned to State Department.

⁵ Have receipt for 100 marks returned to State Department.

⁶ Have receipt for 25,000 lire returned to State Department.

⁷ Air travel purchased by the State Department from Pan American, payable in Dutch Guilders, American Dollar equivalent: \$1,220.90.

⁸ Mr. Peterson has receipt from State Department for 2,885 yen turned in upon his return to Washington, which amount has not yet been deducted from State Department figures.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
C. Holifield, ¹ New Zealand	Pound	8	22.66	5	13.60	3	9.08			16	45.34
C. Hosmer, ¹ New Zealand	do	8	22.66	5	13.60	3	9.07			16	45.33
J. Westland, ¹											
Italy	Lira	92,100	148.31	55,256	88.98	27,628	44.49	9,215	14.84	184,199	296.62
Spain	Peseta	5,000	83.36	3,000	50.01	1,500	25.00	500	8.33	10,000	166.70
Switzerland	Swiss franc	556	128.56	334	77.14	445	102.83	55	12.86	1,390	321.39
W. F. Bennett:											
Greece	Drachma	754.70	25.15	600	20.00	470	15.65	700	23.35	2,524.70	84.15
Turkey	Turkish lira	242	26.87	160	17.77	180	20.00	93	10.30	675	74.94
Switzerland	Swiss franc	104	26.00	200	49.70	136	34.25	56	15.75	496	125.70
Italy	Lira	48,748	78.50	57,287	92.25	44,556	71.75	44,432	71.55	195,023	314.05
	Dutch guilder					3,048	846.60			3,048	846.60
	French franc					1,799	363.00			1,799	363.00
J. T. Conway:											
Greece	Drachma	2,925	97.42	1,755	58.50	877	29.33	293	9.75	5,850	195.00
Turkey	Turkish pound	125	13.88	75	8.35	38	4.18	12	1.38	250	27.77
Italy	Lira	31,050	50.00	18,630	30.00	9,315	15.00	3,105	5.00	62,100	100.00
France	French franc	472.04	96.34	283.21	57.80	141.60	28.90	47.20	9.65	944.05	192.69
Germany	Deutsche mark	400.00	100.20	240.00	60.10	120.00	30.05	40.00	10.00	800.00	200.35
	do					2,219.64	556.30			2,219.64	556.30
J. R. Newman, Belgium	Franc	2,667	53.34	3,900	78.00	750	15.00	458	9.16	7,775	155.50
	Deutsche mark					2,219.62	556.35			2,219.62	556.35
Total			973.25		715.78		2,776.83		201.92		4,667.78

¹ Military air transportation.

² Commercial air transportation.

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)..... Amount 4,667.78

JOHN O. PASTORE,

Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

MARCH 8, 1963.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY,
March 12, 1963.

HON. CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: In accordance with the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, there is submitted herewith an itemized report showing the amounts in dollar equivalent values of foreign currencies expended by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in connection with official visits by members and staff to various installations abroad during the period from January 1, 1962, to December 31, 1962.

Transportation by commercial aircraft was used by the members and staff from the United States abroad and return. Counterpart funds were used in each of these cases as indicated on the attached form A. Military Air Transport was also used where indicated. The miscellaneous column in the report includes funds expended for diplomatic and protocol functions. It also includes telephone charges for committee purposes.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN O. PASTORE,
Chairman.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session, The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

William J. Hartigan, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

By Mr. CANNON, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Edmund T. Pratt, Jr., of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Ray H. Hemenway, of Minnesota, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Minnesota; and

Jack T. Stuart, of Mississippi, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of Mississippi.

By Mr. LONG of Missouri, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Richard D. Fitzgibbon, Jr., of Missouri, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Missouri.

By Mr. KEATING, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Robert M. Morgenthau, of New York, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of New York.

By Mr. SCOTT, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

William J. Nealon, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. district judge for the middle district of Pennsylvania.

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Carl E. McGowan, of Illinois, to be U.S. circuit judge for the District of Columbia circuit; and

John W. Douglas, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

By Mr. BEALL, from the Committee on Commerce:

Paul J. Tierney, of Maryland, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner.

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce:

Capt. James D. Clark, and Capt. Louis M. Thayer, Jr., for promotion to the permanent rank of rear admiral in the U.S. Coast Guard;

Frank S. Kapral, to be a member of the permanent commissioned teaching staff of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy;

Kenneth A. Cox, of Washington, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission; and

James H. Blumer, and sundry other persons, for permanent appointment in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

By Mr. PASTORE, from the Committee on Commerce:

Edgar F. Kaiser, of California, and sundry other persons, to be incorporators of the Communications Satellite Corp.; and

Leo D. Welch, of New York, and Joseph V. Charyk, of California, to be incorporators of the Communications Satellite Corporation.

By Mr. McNAMARA, from the Committee on Public Works:

Brig. Gen. Robert F. Seedlock, U.S. Army, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission.

Mr. ANDERSON subsequently said: Mr. President, under the provisions of section 302 of the Communications Satellite Act of 1962, the President has nominated 14 men to be incorporators of that Corporation for which the Senate confirmation is required. The Commerce Committee has held hearings on this matter and has unanimously favorably reported these men to the Senate.

As in executive session, in accordance with the wishes of the members of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, of which I am chairman, and as previously discussed with the chairman and members of the Commerce Committee, I ask unanimous consent that these 14 nominees be referred to the Space Committee for further consideration.

I can assure the Senate that it is not the intention of the Space Committee to cause an undue delay in the confirmation of these nominations. The committee will consider and dispose of this matter in the quickest possible time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, I understand the nominations will go before the Space Committee for consideration.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. They go to both committees. This time they went to the Commerce Committee.

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

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1061. A bill to exempt certain carriers from minimum rate regulation in the transportation of bulk commodities, agricultural and fishery products, and passengers, and for other purposes; and

S. 1062. A bill to provide for strengthening and improving the national transportation system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. FONG, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. McGEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MECHEM, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUNDT, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PEARSON, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SYMINGTON, and Mr. YARBOROUGH):

S. 1063. A bill to amend section 1(14) (a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1064. A bill to amend the act redefining the units and establishing the standards of electrical and photometric measurements to provide that the candela shall be the unit of luminous intensity; and

S. 1065. A bill to amend section 20b of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. McGEE:

S. 1066. A bill for the relief of the E. L. K. Oil Co.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1067. A bill to amend section 9(b) (3) of the National Labor Relations Act in order to permit labor organizations representing guards to be admitted to certain affiliations of labor organizations; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 1068. A bill to make feed available at reduced prices for foundation herds of hogs in disaster areas; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1069. A bill for the relief of Angelos Michael Patelis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. TALMADGE when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. EASTLAND (for himself, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota):

S. 1070. A bill to assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. EASTLAND when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BOGGS:

S. 1071. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove the excise tax

on table tennis tables, balls, nets, and paddles; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

S. 1072. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to assist States and communities in preventing and combating mental retardation through expansion and improvement of the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs, through provision of prenatal, maternity, and infant care for individuals with conditions associated with childbearing which may lead to mental retardation, and through planning for comprehensive action to combat mental retardation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. RIBICOFF when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BAYH (for himself and Mr. HARTKE):

S. 1073. A bill to authorize the construction of the Lafayette Reservoir in the State of Indiana for flood control, recreation, and related purposes; and

S. 1074. A bill to authorize the construction of the Big Pine Reservoir in the State of Indiana for flood control, recreation, and related purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. BAYH when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DODD (for himself, Mr. HART, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 1075. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment in the District of Columbia because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. DODD when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 1076. A bill to amend the act of September 13, 1961, entitled "An act for the relief of Benjamin Schoenfeld"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1077. A bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act with respect to the compensation of hearing examiners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 1078. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act; S. 1079. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1901, relating to divorce, legal separation, and annulment of marriage in the District of Columbia;

S. 1080. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906, as amended;

S. 1081. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 4, 1925; and

S. 1082. A bill to establish in the Treasury a Correctional Industries Fund for the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1083. A bill to amend section 274 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to disallowance of deduction for certain travel and entertainment expenses; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMATHERS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. SMATHERS):

S. 1084. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a form of averaging for recovery of amounts received as dam-

ages for injury to crops through pollution of air, water or soil; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 1085. A bill for the relief of Haralambos Fofas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 1086. A bill to provide for the acquisition of certain lands by the U.S. Government that have been flooded by the Ableman Dam and Whitewater Reservoir; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1087. A bill to provide for the establishment of cooperative outdoor recreation research centers; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1088. A bill to provide the office of General of the Armies of the United States and to authorize the President to appoint General of the Army Douglas MacArthur to such office; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 1089. A bill to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of cadmium proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act; placed on the calendar.

(See the reference to the above bill, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

By Mr. CASE (for himself and Mr. HART):

S. 1090. A bill to authorize the disposal of the property known as Ellis Island for purposes consistent with the public interest and welfare; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BEALL (by request):

S. 1091. A bill to enable the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to aid the arts in ways similar to those in which the arts are aided by other cities of the United States, to provide competitions to encourage young Americans in the pursuit of excellence in the fine arts and to acquaint them with the best of our national cultural heritage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1092. A bill to provide retirement benefits for certain U.S. Army officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. TOWER, Mr. MILLER, and Mr. DIRKSEN):

S. 1093. A bill to establish a Federal policy concerning the termination, limitation, or establishment of business-type operations of the Government which may be conducted in competition with private enterprise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. BENNETT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

S. 1094. A bill to amend section 105(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the tax treatment of school teachers under wage continuation plans; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1095. A bill for the relief of Florentina Nuguld De Haberer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 1096. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Susanna Grum (Susanne Roth); and

S. 1097. A bill for the relief of Despina J. Santos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1098. A bill for the relief of Fun Wat Hoy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 1099. A bill relating to rate of postage on publications designed specifically for religious instruction classes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1100. A bill to prevent the importation of flat glass which is the product of any country or area dominated or controlled by communism; to the Committee on Finance. (See the remarks of Mr. SCOTT when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request)):

S. 1101. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S.J. Res. 59. Joint resolution to authorize the city of Galena, Ill., or an appropriate association or organization of the citizens thereof, to remove to Galena, Ill., the statue of Gen. John A. Rawlins located at Rawlins Park, Washington, District of Columbia; to the Committee on Rules and Administration. (See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S.J. Res. 60. Joint resolution providing for acceptance by the United States of America of an instrument for the amendment of the constitution of the International Labor Organization; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. (See the remarks of Mr. McNAMARA when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

S.J. Res. 61. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

TO EXPRESS THE SENSE OF CONGRESS ON CLOSING THE PANAMA CANAL TO CERTAIN TYPES OF CARGO

Mr. SCOTT submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 31), which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that passage through the Panama Canal and use of any seaport facilities under the jurisdiction of the United States should be permanently denied to any vessel which, after the date of the adoption of this concurrent resolution, carries or attempts to carry to Cuba a cargo consisting in whole or in part of petroleum or petroleum products, or armaments or other materials of war; and be it further

Resolved, That the President is requested to take such action as may be necessary to give effect to this concurrent resolution.

Mr. SCOTT subsequently said: Mr. President, I have submitted today a concurrent resolution that it is the sense of the Congress that passage through the Panama Canal and use of any seaport facilities under the jurisdiction of the United States should be permanently denied to any vessel which, after the date of the adoption of the resolution, carries or attempts to carry to Cuba a cargo consisting in whole or in part of petroleum or petroleum products, or armaments or other materials of war.

The resolution further requests that the President take such action as may be necessary to give effect to this resolution.

This resolution is an effort to provide the President with additional weapons to drive the Russians and their Communist hirelings out of Cuba.

The 1962 annual report of the Board of Directors of the Panama Canal Company reports the following increases in Red trade:

Showing a very impressive percentage increase for the year was the volume of cargo moving to Red China and Russia. Cargo movements to Red China totaled 877,000 long-tons for an increase of 600 percent and movements to Russia totaled, 344,000 long-tons for an increase of 48 percent. Sugar movements from Cuba accounted for the vast majority of this combined tonnage. In the return flow of cargo, Red China and Russia shipped 52,000 tons of cargo to Cuba.

The United States very properly stopped purchasing Cuban sugar in order to bring pressure upon the Cubans and thereby encourage the downfall of Fidel Castro. But Red China and Soviet Russia have been taking huge amounts of Cuban sugar in barter deals.

We know that some of that Red bloc trade has been in oil, and we know that oil feeds the Cuban war machine. The resolution I propose is an effort to arm the United States with additional weapons to stunt the growth of the Cuban war machine and to prevent the further arming and resupply of Soviet military forces in Cuba.

RESOLUTIONS

PERMISSION FOR CERTAIN FORMER SENATE EMPLOYEES TO TESTIFY IN THE CASE OF PENNSYLVANIA AGAINST BERMAN ET AL.

Mr. JACKSON (for Mr. McCLELLAN), from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 108) permitting certain former employees of the U.S. Senate to appear and testify in the case of Commonwealth of Pennsylvania against Ber- man et al., which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full where it appears under the heading "Reports of Committee.")

PERMISSION FOR A CERTAIN EMPLOYEE OF THE SENATE TO TESTIFY IN CERTAIN PROCEEDINGS

Mr. JACKSON (for Mr. McCLELLAN), from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 109) permitting a certain employee of the Senate to appear and testify in certain proceedings, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full where it appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT A TRANSLATION OF A BOOK ENTITLED "LARGE DAMS OF THE U.S.S.R.," WITH ILLUSTRATIONS AND AN EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

Mr. MOSS, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 110) to print as a Senate document a translation of a book entitled "Large Dams of the U.S.S.R.," with illustrations and an ex-

planatory statement, which under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document a translation of the book "Large Dams of the U.S.S.R.," prepared under the National Science Foundation translation program, together with illustrations and an explanatory statement of Senator FRANK E. MOSS of Utah in connection therewith; and that there be printed an additional 500 copies of such document for the use of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF RULE XXV OF STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE RELATIVE TO MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES WHILE THE SENATE IS IN SESSION

Mr. CHURCH (for himself, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. MCGEE, and Mr. PASTORE) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 111) amending rule XXV of the standing rules relative to meetings of committees while the Senate is in session, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. CHURCH, which appears under a separate heading.)

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE CLYDE DOYLE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. ENGLE (for himself and Mr. KUCHEL) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 112) relative to the death of Representative CLYDE DOYLE, of California, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. ENGLE, which appears under a separate heading.)

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO TRANSPORTATION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills which have been requested by the administration. These measures, embodying the recommendations contained in the President's transportation message of April 1962 are, except for technical adjustments, identical to the proposals introduced and heard last year before both the Senate and House Commerce Committees.

This is major legislation, calling for a substantial modification of the existing Government regulatory pattern; a modification characterized in last year's message as "greater reliance on the forces of competition, less on the restraints of regulation." The central provision geared to this philosophy is one that would extend to the now fully regulated railroads, the agricultural and bulk commodity exemptions from controlled minimum rates available to highway and inland water carriers. Wisely, however, the letter of transmittal from the President also suggested, as an alternative, that— regulation might be applied in the areas presently exempt. I, therefore, renew my request that, in the interest of equality, one of these solutions be adopted.

Expeditious and effective decisions on these bills would be facilitated if the administration would also transmit to Congress the factual studies and underlying data on which the recommendations are based. It has been a perennial problem in the field of transportation legislation to subject value judgments and opinions to factual analysis because the facts have not been readily available. Prompt receipt of this information will enable not only prompt decisions, but better ones.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the President of the United States, and a letter from the Secretary of Commerce requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letters will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

S. 1061. A bill to exempt certain carriers from minimum rate regulation in the transportation of bulk commodities, agricultural and fishery products, and passengers, and for other purposes; and

S. 1062. A bill to provide for strengthening and improving the national transportation system, and for other purposes.

The letters presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

MARCH 5, 1963.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT (MR. SPEAKER): Although our Nation enjoys one of the most highly developed and diversified transportation systems in the world, it has been severely handicapped by laws and regulations which have failed to keep pace with advancing technology. In my message to the Congress last year, I pointed out that the basic objective of our transportation system must be to assure the availability of fast, safe, and economical transportation services needed in a growing and changing economy to move people and goods, without waste or discrimination, in response to private and public demands, at the lowest cost consistent with health, convenience, and national security. In that message I recommended a number of legislative steps to accomplish this purpose.

If action is not taken to establish a transportation policy consistent with the new demands upon the economy, we face serious problems of dislocation and deterioration in both the transportation industry and the economic life of the Nation which it affects. I urge that action be taken to establish such a policy.

Our objectives must be achieved, primarily, by continued reliance on unsubsidized, privately owned facilities, operating under the incentives of private profit and the checks of competition insofar as this is practicable. The law should provide a consistent and comprehensive framework of equal competitive opportunity that will achieve this objective at the lowest economic and social cost to the Nation. There must be equality of opportunity for all modes and for all passengers and shippers, without any special preferences. There should be maximum reliance on the forces of competition consistent with a continuing need for protection against destructive competition be-

tween forms of transportation or between competing carriers.

I am transmitting herewith, for the consideration of the Congress, draft legislation carrying out these principles, providing equality of opportunity among carriers, removing artificial barriers to the realization of the inherent advantages that each mode of transportation possesses, and assuring the protection of the antitrust laws against any destructive competition.

The most significant recommendation in my message of last year dealt with the inequality resulting from exempt transportation of bulk commodities by water and agricultural products by truck. All traffic, however, moving by railroad is fully regulated. I recommended that this inequality be corrected by removing minimum rate regulation from all transportation of bulk and agricultural commodities, but under the protection of existing laws against monopolistic and predatory trade practices applicable to business generally. In the alternative, appropriate regulation might be applied in the areas presently exempt, as I recommended in my message last year. I, therefore, renew my request that, in the interest of equality, one of these solutions be adopted.

I am also enclosing a copy of a letter from the Secretary of Commerce to me discussing legislation in greater detail. I urge that the Congress give prompt consideration to these proposals. I also recommend that legislation be enacted to make domestic truck air carriers ineligible for operative subsidies in the future, to require motor carriers and freight forwarders to pay reparations to shippers charged unlawfully high rates, to make motor carrier safety regulations applicable to private carriers, and to repeal the prohibition against rail carriers transporting commodities in which they have an interest.

These bills, if enacted, will represent a major accommodation to the present needs of the economy. They should strengthen our carriers, provide their users with a better and cheaper system of transportation, and help relieve the taxpayers of unnecessary burdens.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., February 15, 1963.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Submitted herewith are two proposed bills to implement certain recommendations contained in your message to the 87th Congress on April 5, 1962, concerning "The Transportation System of Our Nation." Both bills are consistent with the primary objective of that message to achieve a more efficient and economical national transportation system by placing greater reliance on competition. The first bill would reduce regulation by exempting from minimum-rate control carriers not presently exempt in the carriage of bulk commodities, agricultural and fishery products, and intercity passengers. The second bill would:

(a) Authorize and encourage common carriers to conduct experiments in rate simplification, freight classifications, and new services;

(b) Extend to all shippers and carriers the right to ship vehicles and containers by any mode at nondiscriminatory rates;

(c) Encourage the establishment of through service and joint rates by all combinations of modes and assure the reasonableness of such rates;

(d) Provide for cooperative enforcement of highway transportation regulation by the ICC and the States;

(e) Increase and extend the civil forfeiture penalties to violations of safety

regulations and operations without authority;

(f) Require air carriers to pay reparations to shippers charged unlawfully high rates;

(g) Authorize simplification of Government transportation rates and procurement and greater flexibility in the use of motor vehicle common carriers for the transportation of mail; and

(h) Transfer the existing railroad loan guarantee program from the ICC to the Department of Commerce.

These bills are substantially the same as those introduced in the last Congress (S. 3242 and S. 3243; H.R. 11583 and H.R. 11584). The only changes are necessary technical corrections. In order to keep these bills in the same form as those on which extensive hearings have been held, we have not incorporated proposals which you recommended in your message last year which had previously been introduced in the Congress. It is recommended that you again endorse proposals to make domestic trunk air carriers ineligible for operating subsidies in the future, to require motor carriers and freight forwarders to pay reparations to shippers charged unlawfully high rates, to make motor carrier safety regulations applicable to private carriers, and to repeal the prohibition against rail carriers transporting commodities in which they have an interest.

As you have said, fundamental reforms in our national transportation policy are required now to achieve a fast, safe, and economical transportation system sufficient to meet our national economic and security objectives. Equality of opportunity for all forms of transportation is a keystone of this reform. Therefore, I recommend strongly that the Congress act favorably on these bills to strengthen and improve our national transportation system.

Respectfully yours,

LUTHER H. HODGES.

ADEQUACY OF NATIONAL RAILROAD FREIGHT CAR SUPPLY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and 35 cosponsors, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which is designed to improve the railroad freight-car shortage. This measure has been requested by the Interstate Commerce Commission, a copy of whose "Justification" is included to explain the procedures and need for the bill.

In addition, I am appending a letter from the vice president and general manager of the Burlington Railroad pointing out some most current facts which should be considered.

Particularly at peak harvest time, the perennial railroad freight-car shortage has been particularly costly to both the railroads and the producers. This can be avoided by providing for economic incentive for a freight car to be returned to the owning railroad.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the vice president and general manager of the Burlington Railroad be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1063) to amend section 1 (14) (a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight-car supply, and for other purposes introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and other Senators), was

received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

This proposed bill would give effect to legislative recommendation No. 2 of the Interstate Commerce Commission as set forth on page 198 of its 76th annual report as follows:

We recommend that section 1(14) be amended to authorize the Commission to determine whether per diem charges for the use of railroad freight cars shall be computed on the basis of cost of ownership and maintenance, value of use, or upon such other basis or combination of bases as will, in its judgment, provide reasonable compensation to the owner, contribute to sound car service practices, and encourage the acquisition of an adequate national fleet of freight cars.

JUSTIFICATION

The purpose of the attached draft bill is to grant the Interstate Commerce Commission authority to prescribe per diem charges for the use of railroad freight cars on a basis that will provide an economic incentive to the railroads to acquire and maintain a supply of freight cars adequate to meet the needs of commerce and the national defense.

The diminishing supply of railroad freight cars has been a matter of considerable concern to the Commission for many years. Despite the generally expanding economy of the country, the ownership of freight cars is now less than it was during World War II. As a result, critical shortages of varying duration and severity have occurred in almost every year during periods of peak loadings. Studies made in 1950 indicated that a total of 1,935,500 freight cars would be required by 1956 to meet the anticipated needs of shippers. As of January 1, 1956, however, freight-car ownership and control of class I railroads (including railroad-owned or controlled refrigerator cars) totaled only 1,774,614 cars. As of October 1, 1962, this figure had fallen to 1,626,281 cars.

In addition to inadequate car ownership, one of the greatest contributing factors to recurring freight-car shortages has been the failure of some carriers to utilize the existing fleet of equipment more efficiently. During periods of critical shortages the Commission has resorted to every means at its command to cope with the problem. Greatly stepped-up demurrage charges have helped to insure prompt loading and unloading by shippers and receivers. Such action is ineffectual, however, when the equipment is in the hands of the carrier.

A relatively high percentage of unserviceable or bad order cars over the last several years has also constituted an important factor in aggravating the freight-car shortage situation. Considering 5 percent of car ownership to represent a normal amount of unserviceable cars, the percentage for the years 1959-61 was 8.4, 7.1, and 9.2, respectively. Moreover, while the figure has declined somewhat to 8.6 as of January 1, 1962, and 8.3 as of October 1, 1962, this is the result of an increase in cars being retired as well as in cars being repaired. In this connection, it is noted that the percentage of unserviceable cars being held for heavy repairs (more than 20 man-hours) has increased from 5.6 of car ownership (not including railroad owned or controlled refrigerator cars) as of January 1, 1955, to 7.1 as of October 1, 1962.

Since the earning value of the average freight car greatly exceeds the current per diem charge of \$2.88, some of the carriers have found it cheaper to pay the per diem or car rental charge than to own cars. These carriers, therefore, have no economic incentive to provide their fair share of an adequate car supply.

Some time ago the Commission attempted to take the profit out of "renting" equip-

ment by imposing a penalty per diem charge which it believed would furnish a pecuniary spur to deficit railroads to acquire a sufficient number of cars to at least take care of their own loading obligations. (Increased Per Diem Charges on Freight Cars, 268 I.C.C. 659 (1947)). However, in *Palmer v. United States*, 73 F. Supp. 63 (1947), a three-judge district court set aside the Commission's order holding that it could not prescribe per diem charges for "regulatory" purposes. The effect of this decision has been construed as precluding the Commission from prescribing per diem charges which would produce a profit to the carrier owner, provide an incentive for car ownership, recognize the value of the use of freight cars, and require the acquisition and maintenance of a car supply adequate to meet the needs of commerce and of the national defense. While the Palmer case may not place the stringent limitations upon the Commission which some suggest, we believe that there is sufficient doubt in this respect that it should be made clear in the statute that the Commission has authority to establish per diem charges above the bare costs of ownership and at a level that would make the advantages of owning equipment more attractive.

If the advantages of owning equipment could be made more attractive, there should be a greater willingness on the part of every railroad to make its just and equitable contribution to the national freight car fleet. The draft bill proposes to accomplish this objective by amending section 1(14)(a) of the act so as to authorize the Commission in establishing a per diem charge for the use of freight cars to determine whether such charge should be computed upon the basis of the elements of ownership expense involved, including a fair return on value, or on elements reflecting the value of their use, or upon such other basis or combination of bases as, in the Commission's judgment, will provide reasonable compensation to the owner, contribute to sound car service practices, and encourage the acquisition of an adequate national supply of freight cars. In essence, the proposal would authorize the Commission to fix per diem charges which would motivate every railroad to maintain its ownership of freight cars at a level which will meet the needs of the shipping public during normal times and provide a reasonable supply during periods of emergency. Its enactment would thus overcome the effect of the decision in the Palmer case and would be of substantial assistance to the Commission in its efforts to alleviate the crippling economic effects of freight car shortages.

BURLINGTON LINES, Chicago, Ill., March 4, 1963.

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: When you reintroduce the per diem bill—identical to S. 886 last year—here is some late information which may be useful:

(1) The overall freight-car fleet is at its lowest level in more than 40 years, and each recent year, as well as each recent month, produces a new low. The earlier committee report contains earlier statistics, but the attached sheet shows for all freight cars (both owned and serviceable) and for boxcars (both owned and serviceable) the figures for January 1 of each year, 1958, through 1963, and for February 1, 1963.

(2) Extremely severe car shortages were suffered during the fall and early winter last year, and right now severe shortages of boxcars, for grain loading, exist quite generally in the West. In many areas this recent shortage has been accurately described as the "worst yet."

(3) If each railroad owned its share of needed freight cars, the debits and credits would offset each other, that is, the total

amounts paid as rentals by car users would substantially equal the total amounts received by car owners. The Supreme Court, in effect, has expressed this conclusion. The facts do not accord with this theory. For many years the national per diem account has produced a net debit, ranging from \$95.7 million in 1940 to \$140.3 million in 1950, to \$321.2 million in 1960, and to \$344.3 million during 1961. Obviously, under these conditions, many roads do not own their fair share of the fleet. Stated otherwise, car rental has become increasingly more attractive than car ownership, with serious adverse effects upon the national car supply.

Cordially yours,
ELDON MARTIN,
Vice President and General Manager.

All freight cars

Date	Ownership	Serviceable cars
Jan. 1, 1958-----	1,746,684	1,656,791
Jan. 1, 1959-----	1,725,723	1,577,708
Jan. 1, 1960-----	1,677,965	1,556,602
Jan. 1, 1961-----	1,661,577	1,505,730
Jan. 1, 1962-----	1,606,696	1,465,568
Jan. 1, 1963-----	1,552,371	1,427,868
Feb. 1, 1963-----	1,546,951	1,419,887

Boxcars

Date	Ownership	Serviceable boxcars
Jan. 1, 1958-----	736,442	701,711
Jan. 1, 1959-----	722,732	672,011
Jan. 1, 1960-----	705,738	655,665
Jan. 1, 1961-----	692,565	634,561
Jan. 1, 1962-----	663,762	610,048
Jan. 1, 1963-----	637,775	587,960
Feb. 1, 1963-----	635,051	584,746

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I am pleased to join in the sponsorship of S. 1063. I do so in the hope that it will, in at least some measure, help to relieve the recurring crises in shortages of boxcars by prescribing bases and procedures whereby there will be charged a more fair and adequate compensation for use of freight cars.

We in the Midwest have become unhappily accustomed to too few cars during our harvest season. At one time last fall, it was estimated that some 8 or 9 million bushels of grain were piled on the ground in Nebraska, Iowa, Missouri, and Illinois.

We have become accustomed to it but we do not like it. Each year, we call for action to end this shameful shortage of boxcars, but each year the problem only worsens.

Now, the boxcar crisis has become almost a year-round event. This is because the Department of Agriculture has vastly aggravated the situation with massive shipments of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks, some of them at the very height of the harvest season, and continuing through the winter.

I am informed that protests to the Secretary of Agriculture from the Interstate Commerce Commission are unheeded. This seems a strange attitude for an official allegedly concerned with the welfare of the Nation's farmers.

S. 1063 will help to alleviate the problem, but it will not be an overnight solution. The time has come for a concerted attack on this chronic condition by the shippers, the railroads, the Government agencies involved, and the Congress.

The number of dollars lost each year while grain spoils on the ground in the Midwest is incalculable. These lost

dollars are paid by everyone: the farmer, the shipper, the taxpayer, and the consumer. It is sheer waste which is singularly out of place in a nation which takes great pride in the efficiency of its agriculture and its transportation system.

There is much that those of us with responsibility in this area can do:

First, the Congress by approving this bill and such additional legislation as is required, can discharge its obligation to give the administrative agencies the necessary tools to do the job.

Second, the Interstate Commerce Commission, by firm but fair application of service orders, can exercise its responsibility to check abuses of car use. In this connection, the Commission must devote adequate personnel to the job. It is discouraging to note that the Commission currently allots only 58 jobs to the car service section. Two years ago, this figure was 64. It was reduced to 63 with the transfer of 1 position to the public information program in the office of the Secretary. Presumably this is another evidence of the importance this administration attaches to managing the news—even the news concerning car shortages. In fiscal 1962, 2 more positions were dropped and last October, the car service section was notified that instead of the 64 positions it had requested, only 58 would be allotted, a further reduction of 3. For all I know, those three are also writing press releases.

Third, shippers and receivers of carload freight contribute to the shortage, by holding cars for an excessive length of time for loading or unloading. In effect, they use them for storage. This practice must be discontinued.

Fourth, the situation is complicated by the "assignment" of cars to certain industries. No accurate figures are available, but an educated guess by an expert in the field places the figure in excess of 20 percent of the supply. This has the effect of holding out of the general availability a fifth of the cars, placing the general shipping public at a distinct disadvantage with relation to special, favored industries.

Mr. President, none of these steps is being suggested for the first time. What is required now, in addition to approval of S. 1063, is a determination by all those concerned with this problem that it will be solved.

As a first step, the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission should call a conference of representatives of farmers, shippers, carriers, and the appropriate Federal agencies and insist on the development of a plan which will eliminate an unnecessary piece of economic nonsense which has precisely the same effect on the economy of the Nation as has a nationwide strike.

REDEFINING THE UNITS AND ESTABLISHING STANDARDS OF ELECTRICAL AND PHOTOMETRIC MEASUREMENTS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the act re-

defining the units and establishing the standards of electrical and photometric measurements to provide that the candle shall be the unit of luminous intensity. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Secretary of Commerce, including a statement of the purpose and need for this proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1064) to amend the act redefining the units and establishing the standards of electrical and photometric measurements to provide that the candle shall be the unit of luminous intensity, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and statement of purpose and need presented by Mr. MAGNUSON, are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., March 1, 1963.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are enclosed four copies of a draft bill "To amend the act redefining the units and establishing the standards of electrical and photometric measurements to provide that the candle shall be the unit of luminous intensity," and four copies of a Statement of Purpose and Need in support thereof.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there would be no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

LUTHER H. HODGES,
Secretary of Commerce.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED

When the act redefining the units and establishing standards of electrical and photometric measurements was passed in 1950 the term "candle" was in general use to designate the unit of luminous intensity. The act therefore designated the candle as the statutory unit of intensity of light. Since 1950, however, the word "candela" has been increasingly used in place of candle. At the present time the term "candle" is obsolete in international usage and domestically the Council of Illuminating Engineering Society has approved use of the term "candela." Moreover, "candela" is the term used in the International Lighting Vocabulary. Because the term "candle" has been designated by statute, the National Bureau of Standards has, over the past several years, used this term when reporting values of luminous intensity domestically. However, when making such reports abroad the term "candela" has been used, as for example in reports to the International Bureau of Weights and Measures. The Department believes it is desirable under the circumstances to change the statutory designation to accord with international usage in the interest of simplifying and expediting the work of the Bureau of Standards.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 20b OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, by request, for appropriate reference, a bill which would amend section 20b of the Interstate Commerce Act. This bill is introduced at the request

of the American Bar Association's Committee on Railroad Reorganizations and Readjustments and is similar to S. 2733, which I introduced in the 87th Congress. In fact, the only difference is that the new bill includes an amendment suggested by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The American Bar Association believes that in the light of experience under section 20b of the Interstate Commerce Act, which was enacted in 1948, changes to increase its usefulness in effectuating the voluntary modification of railroad financial structures thereunder should be made so that (a) section 20b would be applicable not only to railroad corporations but to all carriers subject to paragraphs (2) to (11) of section 20a of the Interstate Commerce Act, except motor carriers having annual gross operating revenues of less than \$10 million; (b) the assent of the holders of 75 percent of the outstanding securities of each affected class now required under section 20b would be reduced to 66½ percent; (c) the Commission would be authorized, as it deems appropriate, to consolidate proceedings under 20b with merger proceedings under section 5(2) of the Interstate Commerce Act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1065) to amend section 20b of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

CORN PURCHASES BY HOG PRODUCERS

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, in the 1st session of the 87th Congress we passed a bill which amended section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, to allow the sale of feed grains from CCC stocks at 75 percent of the support price, for maintenance of foundation herds of livestock in disaster areas. This relief is made available where the Secretary of Agriculture determines it necessary to alleviate damage, hardship, or suffering caused by severe drought, flood, or other natural disasters.

At the present time some 70 counties in Georgia have been declared disaster areas by the Secretary, and, therefore, are eligible for this assistance. This means that livestock producers in these counties are eligible to buy corn from CCC stocks at approximately 99 cents per bushel for foundation herds of cattle, sheep, and goats.

It has now been brought to my attention that hog producers are not eligible for this relief. Therefore, hog producers in these counties must pay approximately \$1.32 per bushel for the same corn.

Mr. President, I feel that this emergency program should be extended to hog producers, and I introduce a bill which would make this possible. I ask that it be referred to the appropriate committee; and I hope favorable action will be taken in the near future.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1068) to make feed available at reduced prices for foundation herds of hogs in disaster areas, introduced by Mr. TALMADGE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

FEDERAL GRANTS TO STATE AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATIONS

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself, and Senators STENNIS, EDMONDSON, AIKEN, and YOUNG of North Dakota, a bill authorizing Federal grants to State agricultural experiment stations, on a matching basis, to help finance physical facilities as needed for effective conduct of adequate research programs.

In many instances, Federal and State research funds are utilized in providing qualified and efficient personnel to research specific farm problems. In too many of these instances the States have been unable to provide adequate physical facilities to fully utilize the talents of these research scientists.

This bill will authorize Federal assistance to the States as provided by the Congress to provide adequate facilities to obtain the optimum results from our research efforts. Its passage and funding will expedite research to solve many farm production problems. The solution of these problems will benefit the consumers of the Nation, as well as the farmers, who are doing such an excellent job of providing the food and fiber to feed and clothe our people and to support our foreign relations through donations and Public Law 480 sales.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1070) to assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations, introduced by Mr. EASTLAND (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH AND MENTAL RETARDATION PLANNING AMENDMENTS OF 1963

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill entitled "Maternal and Child Health and Mental Retardation Planning Amendments of 1963." I ask unanimous consent that the bill and an analysis of it be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Connecticut? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, this bill completes the introduction of legislation to carry out President Kennedy's program in the field of mental health and mental retardation.

I am pleased and proud to present this bill to the U.S. Senate. I first came to know intimately the problems of the mentally retarded when I served as Governor of Connecticut. I was deeply im-

pressed not only with the seriousness of the problem, but also with the indomitable courage of the families who bear this burden. The parents of retarded children are humanity's finest.

Despite great advances in medical science, mental retardation continues as a major national health, social, and economic problem.

It affects twice as many individuals—over 5 million—as blindness, polio, cerebral palsy and rheumatic heart disease combined.

About 400,000 of the mentally retarded require constant care or supervision. Over 200,000 are cared for in residential institutions mostly at public expense.

States and localities spend over one-half billion dollars for care and services for the mentally retarded.

Several billions of economic output are lost because of the inability of the mentally retarded to fully achieve or produce in our complex society.

But worst of all is the untold human anguish and suffering which results from mental retardation. Whenever and wherever it strikes, it is a tragedy for the entire family.

An estimated 15 to 20 million people live in families in which there is a mentally retarded individual. The cost to families who care for 96 percent of the Nation's retarded children and adults cannot be measured in economic terms alone, great as this might be. The cost of treatment and care of a mentally retarded child can and often does exhaust a family's financial resources. But economic costs cannot compare with misery and frustration and realization that one's child will be incapable of living a normal life or fully contributing to his own well-being and to society in later life.

Recognizing this problem, the President has proposed a nine-point legislative program to prevent mental retardation and to help the mentally retarded lead more useful, more satisfying lives. In the President's words:

This neglect must end if our Nation is to live up to its own standards of compassion and dignity and achieve the maximum use of its manpower.

The President's proposals include funds for the construction of mental retardation research centers and the construction of facilities for the care, treatment, and training of the mentally retarded. These proposals are embodied in the bills S. 755 and S. 756, introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare [Mr. HILL].

The proposals also include amendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act which would provide Federal assistance for services to the mentally retarded and others whose vocational rehabilitation potential is difficult to determine. This also has been introduced in the form of S. 968 by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

In addition, the President has proposed training, research, and demonstration grants for improving the education of handicapped children and special grants for schools for special projects in slums and depressed areas. Both pro-

grams would give emphasis to the problem of mental retardation in these special education fields and are included in the administration's omnibus education bill (S. 580) introduced by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and others.

Finally, the President has proposed:

First. Project grants to the States to plan for comprehensive State and community action on mental retardation.

Second. Project grants for comprehensive maternity care—including infant care after childbirth—for women in low-income groups among whom there is a high incidence of births of children who are mentally retarded. This would be a 5-year program of project grants in which the Federal share would be up to 75 percent. The program would be administered by the Children's Bureau, under a proposed amendment to the Social Security Act.

Third. An expansion of both the maternal and child health program, and the crippled children's program of the Children's Bureau from the current \$25 million annually for each program to an ultimate \$50 million annually, after 7 years. Under the President's budget for fiscal 1964, at least \$1 million would be used specifically for mental retardation activities in these two programs.

Fourth, a new research program of the Children's Bureau authorizing grants, contracts, and jointly financed cooperative arrangements relating to maternal and child health and crippled children's services. Of the recommended first year appropriation of \$2.1 million, it is expected that about \$500,000 would be used for research in the field of mental retardation.

The bill I introduce today is designed to carry out these four proposals in the President's program.

The bill is identical to H.R. 3386 introduced by Representative WILBUR MILLS. Its principal provisions were first recommended by the President's panel on mental retardation, whose work was carried on while I served as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. It is the administration's bill providing a necessary first step to initiate comprehensive planning by the States to make sure that needs and resources are carefully assessed and that programs for the retarded are given careful consideration throughout the Nation.

A healthy start in life should be the birthright of every child born in the United States. Unfortunately, this is not now the case. Despite the efforts already made by State and local health agencies in partnership with the Federal Government, there is much that still needs to be done to promote the health of mothers and their offspring so that these children may, insofar as humanly possible, be both physically and mentally fit; so that they may be, indeed, the Nation's greatest asset.

In order to accomplish this goal, the present programs for maternal and child health and for crippled children must be extended and improved, including clinical services for mentally retarded children, as provided in this bill. The great

unmet needs for these services are steadily increasing because of the rising child population, rising costs of medical care, and changes in the practice of medicine and public health resulting from research findings. The results of research and the programs in modern medical practice should be more widely available, especially to mothers and children with critical needs.

Studies show that expectant mothers with low income often receive little or no prenatal care, frequently have complications of pregnancy, and are most likely to have premature babies who are particularly prone to brain damage and resultant mental retardation. These mothers and their babies constitute the vulnerable group in special need of care.

Programs for maternal and child health and crippled children's services will be more effective if they are accompanied by adequate programs, as proposed in this bill, for research directed toward the evaluation of services.

The problem of mental health and mental retardation can no longer be ignored. As the President said in his historic first message to Congress on this subject:

This situation has been tolerated far too long. It has troubled our national conscience—but only as a problem unpleasant to mention, easy to postpone, and despairing of solution. * * * The time has come for a bold new approach.

The proposed legislation to deal with the problems of mental health and mental retardation now pending before Congress presents a great opportunity for this Nation to live up to its highest tradition of compassion for the less fortunate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1072) to amend the Social Security Act to assist States and communities in preventing and combating mental retardation through expansion and improvement of the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs, through provision of prenatal, maternity, and infant care for individuals with conditions associated with childbearing which may lead to mental retardation, and through planning for comprehensive action to combat mental retardation, and for other purposes introduced by Mr. RIBICOFF, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

EXHIBIT 1

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Maternal and Child Health and Mental Retardation Planning Amendments of 1963".

INCREASE IN MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH SERVICES

SEC. 2. (a) The first sentence of section 501 of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1960, the sum of \$25,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "the following sums are hereby authorized to be appropriated: \$25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, \$30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, \$35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, \$40,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and the succeeding fiscal year, \$45,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending

June 30, 1968, and the succeeding fiscal year, and \$50,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and succeeding fiscal years."

(b) Subsection (a) (2) of section 502 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(2) The Secretary shall allot one-half of the sum appropriated under section 501 for each fiscal year as follows: He shall allot to each State \$70,000 and such part of the remainder of such one-half as he finds that the number of live births in such State bore to the total number of live births in the United States in the latest calendar year for which he has statistics."

(c) (1) The first sentence of subsection (b) of section 502 of such Act is amended to read as follows: "The Secretary shall also allot to the States (in addition to the allotments made under subsection (a)) the remaining one-half of the sum appropriated for each fiscal year under section 501."

(2) The second sentence of such subsection (b) is amended by striking out "Such sums" and "such sums" and inserting in lieu thereof "Such one-half" and "such one-half", respectively.

INCREASE IN CRIPPLED CHILDREN'S SERVICES

SEC. 3. (a) The first sentence of section 511 of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1960, the sum of \$25,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "the following sums are hereby authorized to be appropriated: \$25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, \$30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, \$35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, \$40,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and the succeeding fiscal year, \$45,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and the succeeding fiscal year, and \$50,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and succeeding fiscal years."

(b) So much of subsection (a) (2) of section 512 of such Act as ends with "to the States" is amended to read as follows: "The Secretary shall allot one-half of the sum appropriated under section 511 for each fiscal year as follows: He shall allot to each State \$70,000 and shall allot the remainder of such one-half to the States."

(c) (1) The first sentence of subsection (b) of section 512 of such Act is amended to read as follows: "The Secretary shall also allot to the States (in addition to the allotments made under subsection (a)) the remaining one-half of the sum appropriated for each fiscal year under section 511."

(2) The second sentence of such subsection (b) is amended by striking out "Such sums" and "such sums" and inserting in lieu thereof "Such one-half" and "such one-half", respectively.

PROJECT GRANTS

SEC. 4. Part 4 of title V of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"PART 4—GRANTS FOR SPECIAL MATERNITY AND INFANT CARE PROJECTS AND RESEARCH PROJECTS
"Special project grants for maternity and infant care

"SEC. 531. (a) In order to help reduce the incidence of mental retardation caused by complications associated with childbearing, there are authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, \$15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and \$30,000,000 for each of the next three fiscal years, for grants to assist in meeting the cost of projects as provided in this section.

"(b) From the sums appropriated under subsection (a), the Secretary is authorized to make grants to the State health agency of any State and, with the consent of such agency in the case of a project in which such agency is unable or unwilling to participate, to the health agency of any political subdivision of the State, to pay not to

exceed 75 per centum of the cost of any project for the provision of all necessary health care to prospective mothers (including, after childbirth, health care to mothers and their infants) who have or are likely to have conditions associated with childbearing which increase the hazards to the health of the mothers or their infants (including those which may cause physical or mental defects in the infants) and who are unlikely to receive all necessary health care because they are from low-income families or for other reasons.

"(c) Payment of grants under this section may be made (after necessary adjustment on account of previously made underpayments or overpayments) in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments and on such conditions, as the Secretary may determine.

"Research projects relating to material and child health services and crippled children's services

"SEC. 532. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, such sums as the Congress may determine to enable the Secretary to make grants to or jointly financed cooperative arrangements with public or other nonprofit institutions of higher learning, and public or other nonprofit agencies and organizations engaged in research or in maternal and child health or crippled children's programs, and contracts with public or private agencies and organizations, and with individuals, engaged in research or in such programs, for research projects relating to maternal and child health services or crippled children's services which show promise of substantial contribution to the advancement thereof.

"(b) Payments of grants or under contracts or cooperative arrangements under this section may be made (after necessary adjustment, in the case of grants, on account of previously made underpayments or overpayments) in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments and on such conditions, as the Secretary may determine."

MENTAL RETARDATION PLANNING

SEC. 5. The Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE XVII—GRANTS FOR PLANNING COMPREHENSIVE ACTION TO COMBAT MENTAL RETARDATION

"Authorization of appropriations

"SEC. 1701. For the purpose of assisting the States (including the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa) to plan for and take other steps leading to comprehensive State and community action to combat mental retardation, there is authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$2,200,000.

"Grants to States

"SEC. 1702. The sums appropriated pursuant to section 1701 shall be available for grants to States by the Secretary during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and the succeeding fiscal year. Any such grants to a State may be used by it to determine what action is needed to combat mental retardation in the State and the resources available for this purpose, to develop public awareness of the mental retardation problem and of the need for combatting it, to coordinate State and local activities relating to the various aspects of mental retardation and its prevention, treatment, or amelioration, and to plan other activities leading to comprehensive State and community action to combat mental retardation.

"Applications

"SEC. 1703. In order to be eligible for grants under section 1702, a State must submit an application therefor which—

"(1) designates or establishes a single State agency as the sole agency for carrying out the purposes of this title;

"(2) indicates the manner in which provision will be made to assure full consideration of all aspects of services essential to planning for comprehensive State and community action to combat mental retardation, including services in the fields of education, employment, rehabilitation, welfare, health, and the law, and services provided through community programs for and institutions for the mentally retarded;

"(3) sets forth its plans for expenditure of such grants, which plans provide reasonable assurance of carrying out the purposes of this title;

"(4) provides for submission of a final report of the activities of the State agency in carrying out the purposes of this title, and for submission of such other reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Secretary may from time to time find necessary for carrying out the purposes of this title and for keeping such records and affording such access thereto as he may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports; and

"(5) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for funds paid to the State under this title.

"Payments

"Sec. 1704. Payments of grants under this title may be made (after necessary adjustment on account of previously made underpayments or overpayments) in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments and on such conditions, as the Secretary may determine."

MEANING OF "SECRETARY"

Sec. 6. As used in the amendments to the Social Security Act made by this Act, the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

ANALYSIS OF MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH AND MENTAL RETARDATION PLANNING AMENDMENTS OF 1963

Section 1. This act may be cited as the "Maternal and Child Health and Mental Retardation Planning Amendments of 1963."

INCREASE IN MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH SERVICES

Section 2. The Social Security Act authorizes grants to State health agencies for services for promoting the health of mothers and children, especially in rural areas and in areas suffering from severe economic distress. The States must provide matching funds for one-half of the amount appropriated; the remainder is not matched and is distributed to the States on the basis of the financial need of each State for assistance in carrying out its State plan. The law now authorizes \$25 million annually for these grants. This section would increase the amounts authorized for annual appropriation for maternal and child health services from the present \$25 million to \$30 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964; \$35 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965; \$40 million for the fiscal years 1966 and 1967; \$45 million for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969; \$50 million for the fiscal year 1970 and each year thereafter.

During the next fiscal year an estimated \$500,000—part of the increased funds—would be expended on programs for the mentally retarded. This amount would increase in subsequent years.

The expansion of maternal and child health services provided for in this section would contribute to the reduction of infant and maternal mortality. States vary widely in rates of infant mortality (ranging from 19.6 to 41.6 per 1,000 live births) and in rates of maternal mortality (from 1.2 to 8.8 per 10,000 live births.) These rates could and should be reduced through application of

measures such as maternal and child health services.

States would be in better position to keep pace with increased demands for these services as the child population continues to increase.

More mentally retarded children could be served through special diagnostic clinics for these children provided through State maternal and child health programs. In 1961 over 15,000 children, as compared with 12,000 in 1960, received services through these clinics. Despite this increase, applications for these services continued to exceed the resources of the clinics.

INCREASE IN CRIPPLED CHILDREN'S SERVICES

Section 3. The Social Security Act authorizes grants to State crippled children's agencies for services for locating crippled children and for providing medical, surgical, corrective, and other services and care, and facilities for diagnosis, hospitalization, and after-care for children who are crippled or who are suffering from conditions which lead to crippling. The States must provide matching funds for one-half of the amount appropriated; the remainder is not matched and is distributed to the States on the basis of the financial need of each State for assistance in carrying out its State plan. The law now authorizes \$25 million annually for these grants. This section would increase the amounts authorized for annual appropriation for crippled children's services from the present \$25 million to \$30 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964; \$35 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965; \$40 million for the fiscal years 1966 and 1967; \$45 million for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969; \$50 million for the fiscal year 1970 and each year thereafter.

During the next fiscal year an estimated \$500,000—part of the increased funds—would be expended on programs for the mentally retarded. This amount would increase in subsequent years.

The increased funds under the proposal would encourage and assist States to keep pace with the following needed developments already underway in crippled children's programs:

1. Further broadening of the definition of "crippling" until all State crippled children's programs would serve children with any kind of handicapping condition or long-term illness.
2. The removal of unreasonable barriers to eligibility for services such as State requirements for court commitments or residence status.
3. Extension of the programs to urban areas.
4. The development of outpatient centers for handicapped children organized and staffed to provide the comprehensive services needed by children with all types of handicapping conditions, thus bringing together the services now being provided in many separate clinics.
5. The development of inpatient and outpatient facilities appropriate for adolescents.
7. The provision of special services for children who are both deaf and blind.
8. The development of demonstration centers for the early care of children with paraplegia and quadriplegia brought about by accident or disease.

PROJECT GRANTS

Section 4. The prevalence of mental retardation is higher in those population groups where maternity care is inadequate. The rate of premature births is higher among these groups, and the rate of mental retardation is substantially higher among premature infants than among full-term infants. Women who are most likely to have premature babies, with the resultant increased proportion of mentally retarded and brain-damaged children, are predominantly women in families with low incomes, who receive

little or no prenatal care and who have complications of pregnancy. There are increasing numbers of women, especially in our larger cities, who are receiving inadequate maternity care. Complications of pregnancy are more prevalent among families with low income than in the rest of the population. For women with complications of pregnancy, it is of critical importance that good maternity care be provided during the prenatal period, labor, and after delivery. Their babies, especially if premature, will require intensive nursing care in hospitals.

This section authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to carry out a 5-year program of grants to provide necessary health care to prospective mothers who are unlikely to receive all necessary health care because they are from families with low income or for other reasons. In addition to health care during pregnancy, the care would include, following childbirth, health care to mothers and their infants. The health care would be available particularly for prospective mothers who have or are likely to have conditions associated with childbearing which increase the hazards to the health of mothers or their babies, including those which may cause physical or mental defects in the infants.

The annual appropriation authorized for these grants would be \$5 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964; \$15 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and \$30 million for each of the next 3 fiscal years.

The grants would be available to the State health agency or, with the consent of such agency, to the health agency of any political subdivision of the State. The grant would not exceed 75 percent of the cost of any projects.

This program would help to reduce the incidence of mental retardation caused by complications associated with childbearing. Of paramount importance would be efforts to decrease the number of premature births among which there are notable larger numbers of children born with handicapping conditions, including mental retardation.

The grants would enable health departments to provide comprehensive maternity care to selected high-risk patients and to improve greatly the quality and adequacy of care for these mothers and their babies by paying for their care in hospitals equipped and staffed to provide services of high quality for mothers suffering from complications of pregnancy.

This program would also increase the availability of prenatal clinics and bring them closer to the population served, so that patients could be seen earlier and complications recognized and treated in their early stages.

It would reduce overcrowding in the public hospitals.

It would contribute to increasing our knowledge of ways of reducing childhood disability that is related to damage during childbirth.

This section would also enable the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants for research in maternal child health or crippled children's programs. They could be made to public and other nonprofit colleges and universities and public and other nonprofit agencies and organizations already engaged in this research. Contracts for this purpose could also be made with such groups and with other private research groups and individuals.

Congress would determine the sums to be used for this purpose.

The President's budget for 1964 includes \$2.1 million for these purposes, of which an estimated \$500,000 would be for work in the field of mental retardation.

Under its basic act of 1912, the Children's Bureau may conduct its own studies, but it does not have authority to make grants or

enter into other cooperative financial arrangements for research studies.

A few research projects have been supported through the grants under the Social Security Act made to State agencies for maternal and child health and crippled children. While these programs are doing much to improve the health of mothers and children, they could be even more effective if accompanied by an adequate program of research directed toward the evaluation of program services and their improvement.

This proposal would enable the Children's Bureau to carry out more adequately its responsibilities in child health research, as complementary to and coordinated with the program of the National Institute of Child Growth and Human Development.

The research under this proposal would contribute to improving the development, management, and effectiveness of maternal and child health and crippled children's services throughout the country.

MENTAL RETARDATION PLANNING

Section 5. Mental retardation has been a major national problem for many years. An estimated 5.4 million people in our population are mentally retarded in varying degrees. Of the 4.2 million children born each year, about 3 percent—at birth or later—will be classified as mentally retarded.

More than 4,000 of these new babies born every year, it is estimated, will be so profoundly retarded that they will be unable during their lives to take care of even their own basic needs. About 12,600 will suffer "moderate" retardation, remaining below the 7-year-old level of intellectual growth. The remaining 110,000 will be mildly retarded, able—as adults—to acquire limited job skills and achieve almost independent community living—if they are given special training and assistance.

In many ways, the mentally retarded require help throughout their lives—through childhood, adolescence, adulthood, and old age. Their special needs, which change according to the degree of retardation, include education, rehabilitation, employment, health, legal protection, family and residential care, and a variety of community services.

Community services generally take the form of diagnostic and clinical services, care in residential institutions, special education, vocational rehabilitation, and social services—such as professional work with parents' groups, casework, group work, and day care.

However, resources for the mentally retarded vary widely from State to State and among cities and communities within the States.

Only one-fourth of the mentally retarded children have access to special education. The waiting list for care in residential institutions grows longer. The 20,000 children who in 1960 were served by the 90 clinics in the country represent only a small fraction of the children who need this kind of help.

This section authorizes a one-time appropriation of \$2.2 million for grants to assist States in developing plans for comprehensive State and community action to combat mental retardation.

The State plan would describe what action is needed, assess the resources available to meet that need, and define ways in which State and local activities may best be coordinated.

These grants would assist the States to work out a State plan which would assure full consideration of all aspects of services essential to planning for comprehensive State and community action to combat mental retardation.

The proposed grants to the States for planning in the field of mental retardation would have four primary objectives: To provide a means for encouraging all the

States to initiate a systematic followup action on the report of the President's Panel on Mental Retardation; to enlist the support of the State Governors, top officials, and outstanding laymen in planning to meet present and future needs in the field of mental retardation; to enhance public awareness and understanding of the massiveness of the problem and of the resources and modern knowledge now at our disposal to combat it; and to foster the development and coordination of the mental retardation aspects of programs of education, rehabilitation, welfare, employment, health, civil rights protection, and recreation.

MEANING OF "SECRETARY"

Section 6. Defines the term "secretary."

BIG PINE AND LAFAYETTE RESERVOIRS ON TRIBUTARIES OF WABASH RIVER, IND.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I introduce today bills to authorize the construction of Big Pine and Lafayette Reservoirs on tributaries of the Wabash River in Indiana. These projects received the approval of the division engineer earlier this week in an interim report submitted on the continuing study of the Wabash River Basin.

The news of the serious flooding in the headwaters of the Ohio River and its tributaries reminds us again of the need for adequate protection from the ravages of flooding. The reservoirs which would be authorized by these bills will make a significant contribution to the overall flood control program of the Wabash Basin. Through their construction, millions of dollars in damages may be saved, and the human misery attendant to the flooding will be relieved.

In addition to the flood control benefits, other benefits in conservation, recreation and water supply will be derived from the Lafayette and Big Pine Reservoirs.

The people of the Wabash Valley are vitally interested in the protection from flooding and in the complete development of their water resources. The construction of these reservoirs will be another step in the long struggle to achieve proper water resource development in the valley. I am hopeful that these bills may be considered and approved during this session of the Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. BAYH (for himself and Mr. HARTKE), were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Public Works, as follows:

S. 1073. A bill to authorize the construction of the Lafayette Reservoir in the State of Indiana for flood control, recreation, and related purposes; and

S. 1074. A bill to authorize the construction of the Big Pine Reservoir in the State of Indiana for flood control, recreation, and related purposes.

A FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES ACT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on behalf of Senators HART, KEATING, JAVITS, and

myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to prohibit discrimination in employment in the District of Columbia.

The bill, entitled the Fair Employment Practices Act, provides that it shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer to refuse to hire, or to discharge, or to discriminate in employment against any individual because of his race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; that it shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employment agency to fail, or to refuse to classify properly or refer for employment any individual for any like reason; and that it shall be an unlawful employment practice for a labor organization to cause or attempt to force an employer to discriminate against any individual.

The bill establishes a five-man Fair Employment Practices Commission for the District of Columbia to hear and dispose of all charges that fall within the bill. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be allowed to lie on the table for 5 days, so that additional Senators who so desire may join as cosponsors; and I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the bill be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, the bill I introduce today deals with one of the most serious economic, social and moral problems facing this Nation at the present time.

I speak of the silent conspiracy of discrimination against persons of different racial, ethnic, religious, and national origins which exists in this country and in our Nation's Capital.

I am concerned today specifically with discrimination against minority racial groups in the District of Columbia in the area of employment; and with the multitude of social problems that follow in the wake of discriminatory employment practices, each of which may spell a human tragedy, a life consumed by crime or delinquency, a life corrupted by vice, by alcoholism, by poverty and human degradation.

As chairman of the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, I have been told that there are thousands of young people in this city who are no longer in school, but who cannot obtain employment largely because of their color. And I have been told time and again that the inability to obtain work is one of the main causes of delinquency and crime among young members of the Negro population of this city.

How can a victim of job discrimination grow up as a constructive human being in this city, in the midst of a vital, dynamic, governmental complex that rewards hard work and effort, when from the day he first begins to understand the world around him, he must learn that he has failed already.

He learns to want the rewards of hard work and to live much like anyone else, yet he is at the same time denied the opportunity to achieve this. How can he be expected to train, to work, and to hope for a better future, for a good job, for the chance to raise and support a family, when he sees from examples all around him that no matter how hard he may work, how hard he may strive, he will not be given the chance

to put his training, his knowledge, and his skill to the test.

How can the average nonwhite young person in Washington, or in most other large American cities, compete and draw satisfaction from his studies in school when he knows that the nominal rewards available to white classmates are not available to him. They are not denied him because he is stupid or lazy or deficient in still other ways, but rather because the prejudiced majority has conspired against him.

Recent estimates made available to our committee regarding the Washington employment situation show that about 75 percent of the jobseekers at the U.S. Employment Service are nonwhite. At the same time, however, these estimates show that 75 percent of the available positions are open only to white applicants.

It is shocking to learn that from 80 to 100 percent of the jobs in various fields are not obtainable by nonwhite workers in this city. It is shocking to know that certain business establishments in need of employees will not hire colored persons, however qualified, even though there are no white applicants for the positions.

Recent estimates given to us show that in savings and loan companies, brokerage houses, title companies, and real estate and mortgage firms, there is an almost 100-percent exclusion of Negro employees. In banks, insurance companies, and most other clerical and semiprofessional positions, only 1 percent or less of the employees are Negroes. In public utilities there is a virtual total exclusion of male Negroes, and only about 5 percent of the female employees are colored. In the department stores, where perhaps the greatest progress has been made, only about 15 percent of the work force is colored.

A most important problem area in this respect is also that of skilled labor. Some labor leaders in Washington have worked diligently over the years to eliminate discrimination, and to improve the status of nonwhite workers. I want to particularly mention here Mr. J. C. Turner, president of the Greater Washington Central Labor Council, AFL-CIO, who has championed this cause in the face of many obstacles.

But ruthless segregation and exclusion of nonwhite craftsmen still persist. Even though the operating engineers are integrated to some extent, and although there exist two Negro locals for cement mixers and bricklayers, most colored persons are employed only as unskilled laborers. Even in the colored unions, some pay differential prevails, with nonwhite bricklayers, for example, receiving up to 35 cents per hour less than their white counterparts.

Furthermore, there is still a virtual 100-percent exclusion of colored craftsmen from almost all other unions. This is generally true of the electricians, the plumbers, the steamfitters, stonemasons, tile setters, glaziers, and sheetmetal workers. In these unions there are no Negro journeymen and no Negroes are admitted for apprenticeship training which leads to the journeyman status.

We have been told that recently the carpenters have admitted one Negro to their apprenticeship training. While this is a commendable gesture, it does not materially reduce the discrimination problem.

In replying to a Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee questionnaire concerning youth employment, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia made the following statement:

One of the outstanding shortages or needs in the youth employment field in Washington, D.C., is the opening up of apprenticeship and white collar job opportunities for Negroes. Also the lack of manufacturing industries here contributes to the problem. The majority of youths in the District of Columbia are Negroes (over 60 percent) and because of discriminatory hiring practices by employers, particularly in the work areas listed above, job opportunities for them are very few.

These examples show that nonwhite persons in the Nation's Capital from age 14 up are second-class citizens. The percentage unemployed among them is twice as large as the figures for the white population.

It is true that unemployment is a problem for a great number of young people and adults, regardless of race or ethnic origin. It is also true, as someone once noted in a letter to the editor of the Washington Post, that no group, no one race or religion, has a monopoly on misfortune.

All of this we recognize. But discrimination is not misfortune in the regular sense of the word. It is not something that depends on chance or circumstance. It is not something that depends on individual factors, on time factors, or even on social and economic conditions, such as wars, depressions, or the exhaustion of natural resources in a geographic region, all of which inadvertently affect large groups or segments of the population.

Discrimination is rather a deliberate process of singling out a group of the population for prejudicial treatment. And in its most vicious forms it is a categorical elimination of this group from participation in the free competition, in the opportunities, and in the rewards available to other Americans.

To the extent that such an unfair process affects youths across the country, it helps mold these youths into what has been called social dynamite, dangerously discarded and strewn around American towns and cities.

To the extent that these practices prevail in our Nation's Capital, they make this city a less effective showcase to the world than what it must be. And, because the District of Columbia is governed by Congress to a large degree, Congress must bear responsibility for the conditions which prevail here.

I will say, without fear of contradiction, that in spite of the numerous studies carried out regarding racial prejudice and discrimination, the amount of damage these attitudes and actions do to the country as a whole and to each and every person in it has never been and perhaps cannot be estimated. In terms of shattered national ideals, in terms of internal political strife on the race issue, in terms of social and eco-

nomie waste in men lost to crime and idleness, in terms of our damaged relations with other nations, in terms of lost creativity in the arts and sciences, the price we pay for discrimination staggers the imagination.

We cannot afford to pay this price anywhere, but least of all can we pay it in the very heart of this country, the Nation's Capital.

We cannot allow young people to grow up in this city under the cloak of hopelessness; we cannot allow them to grow up with the knowledge that no matter how hard they may study and how diligently they may work they cannot become lawyers or doctors or skilled craftsmen for no other reason than the color of their skin.

If we allow these inequities to continue, we are consciously fostering crime and delinquency in Washington, because when a civilized person cannot find legitimate work in an urban society, he may in desperation turn to the law of the jungle—the law of force, of assault, and of burglary. In today's world a position in the labor force is so important to a person's concept of his own self-worth, that the continuous inability to obtain work is a morally destructive process. It is a process that destroys the personality, that distorts concepts of right and wrong, that destroys hope for a better future, which is the basic force of all life, the driving power of all human activity.

When I surveyed the crime and delinquency problem in Washington last year, I was told time and again that one of the most effective ways to control violence and vandalism in this city would be to increase employment opportunities for its inhabitants, both young and old. And particularly, work opportunities must be found for the minority group parents, long subjected to vicious discrimination, as well as for the younger generation, the members of which are only now beginning to experience the silent conspiracy directed against them.

I have said in the past that this city must symbolize the best of which our country is capable. I believe that our Nation's Capital must be an example to our own country and to nations the world over of the best we can offer in terms of equal employment opportunities, in terms of educational opportunities, in terms of humanitarian endeavors, and even in terms of crime prevention.

To achieve a part of these goals and to help wipe out the evil wrought upon us all by racial discrimination, I submit for proper reference a bill to establish a Fair Employment Practices Commission in the District of Columbia and to outlaw any discrimination in employment against anyone because of his or her race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry.

I have outlined the reasons why such legislation is necessary. Together with the proposal, I want to make a final comment regarding its purpose.

Some men, without laws to guide and restrain them, are prejudiced, discriminatory, and unjust; some will use any means to gain economic advantage. On the other hand, we have labor leaders

in this city who want to see justice done. There are employers in Washington who would hire nonwhite workers, but who are helpless because of the informal rule of men in their respective fields of business. These men need a law to back them up. They need a law to protect them from their prejudiced fellows and to guard against retaliation, against censure, and against economic reprisal from others less responsible than they.

Twenty-four States have enacted such laws and numerous municipalities have passed ordinances with similar intent. Our need here is every bit as great and in some ways even greater.

I am happy to have the distinguished Senators HART, KEATING, and JAVITS as cosponsors of this measure, and I hope it will receive speedy and favorable consideration by this entire legislative body on whose shoulders lies the responsibility of governing our Nation's Capital.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1075) to prohibit discrimination in employment in the District of Columbia because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry, introduced by Mr. DODD (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DODD. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator permit me to join him as a cosponsor of the bill?

Mr. DODD. I am honored that the assistant majority leader should wish to cosponsor it. I am grateful to him.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask unanimous consent that I may be listed as a cosponsor of the bill. I compliment the Senator on his leadership in this matter.

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

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am happy, once again, to join the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] in sponsoring this important legislation. The Senator and I have served together on the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, and in this capacity, we have firsthand knowledge of the correlation between unemployment and a rising crime rate. Youngsters who cannot find gainful employment all too often find diversion in delinquency.

The District of Columbia has a number of problems which complicate the job market. This is not an industrial city, and there are not many opportunities for unskilled workers. Many of our Washington unemployed, especially those who have recently arrived, have been poorly trained in segregated schools. To add to the dismal picture, vocational training is entirely inadequate, since it is not even offered, in most cases, until a child reaches senior high school. Anyone who has worked with these children knows that the problem must be met before 10th grade because by that time the hard core of the untrained have dropped out of school.

We recognize these impediments to increased employment opportunities, and neither minimize nor exaggerate them. Each problem must and will be solved by long-term planning and patient work. Some steps to solve the employment crisis, however, can be taken immediately. They do not require massive retraining, introduction of new industry, or an overhaul of the educational system. For example, the passage of a single statute—this bill, introduced by the Senator from Connecticut, myself, and other Senators—will go a long way toward alleviating the District's problems.

Putting aside for a moment the difficulties encountered by the unskilled worker in search of a job in Washington, D.C., let us consider the case of a young Negro who has finished high school, college, or even graduate school, and applies for a nongovernment job in this city. What obstacles does he face? None would deny that the color of his skin—notwithstanding all other qualifications—is his major impediment. As the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] has pointed out, savings and loan companies, brokerage houses, insurance companies, banks, public utilities and even distinguished law firms are virtually closed to him. This, unfortunately, is an across-the-board policy, applied to an entire race, not occasionally to an individual applicant.

Approximately 80 percent of the schoolchildren of this city are Negroes. I ask, in all sincerity, what does equality of opportunity in education mean to these children, if after graduation, there is no equality of job opportunity? How can we ask them to stay in school, to study and prepare themselves to be responsible citizens when we know in fact that even a Phi Beta Kappa key will not unlock the doors that are barred to them?

Last Thanksgiving, we were given a small sample of what could happen if racial inequality is allowed to continue in this city. It was not pleasant, and certainly the demonstration was inexcusable, but at least it was understandable. Intolerance will not long be tolerated—by Negroes, or by whites of good will. The Federal Government has gone a long way toward eliminating discrimination in employment but there are indeed "miles to go and promises to keep."

I am proud to say that New York was the first of 24 States to adopt a fair employment practices act, and its impact has been substantial. Contrary to the dire predictions of its opponents at the time adopted, it was quickly accepted, both by employers and by the public, and very few prosecutions under the law have been necessary.

We who are responsible for governing this city must take the important first step offered in this bill to make Washington truly the model city for all the Nation. I urge early hearings and prompt action by the Congress. Meanwhile, I exhort private sectors of our economy in this city to reconsider discriminatory hiring policies, to unlock the doors which have been barred to Negroes, and to give meaning to the promise of equal opportunity.

DISALLOWANCE OF DEDUCTIONS FOR CERTAIN TRAVEL AND ENTERTAINMENT EXPENSES

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, at this time I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 274 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to disallowance of deductions for certain travel and entertainment expenses.

One of the provisions which the Congress enacted last year, as part of the Revenue Act of 1962, requires allocation of the costs of traveling expenses where the travel is for more than 1 week and the nonbusiness portion of the trip is more than 25 percent of the total time away from home. Where such an allocation is made, only expenses allocated to business would be allowed as deductions.

This allocation rule was intended to replace the so-called principal purpose test and the but-for rule of prior law. Under these rules, if the primary purpose of travel was to transact business, the travel costs would have been deductible; or, to state it another way, if the travel would not have been undertaken but for business reasons, the travel costs would have been deductible. These rules allowed deduction only for travel expenses. Personal living or family expenses incurred during a period of business travel were never deductible.

Under these tests, it made no difference that the employee, agent, or taxpayer might have derived some personal enjoyment out of the travel; if the trip was primarily business-oriented, the travel costs would have been deductible.

These seem to me to be sensible, practical, and responsible rules. Nonetheless, hastily and without proper consideration of the effects, Congress last year injected personal, nonbusiness elements and motivations into the calculation of deductible travel costs. Mr. President, I was a part of that procedure, inasmuch as I sat on the conference committee between the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee, where this provision was dealt with, although I am frank to say that I do not know exactly how it got into the law. This year, when we saw that it was included, none of the members of the committee was exactly sure how it got in.

I believe that if a clear business purpose for travel is established, the amount of tax deduction for the travel expense should not be made to depend upon the extent to which trip was also pleasurable. The proposed legislation is designed to restore the effectiveness of the principal-purpose test and the but-for rule, which were unwisely upset last year.

I do not condone abuses of tax deductions, nor do I believe that any Senator or Representative does.

The proposed measure would not permit abuse.

To the contrary, I am convinced that the principal-purpose test and the but-for rule of existing law are rational, logical, and workable tax rules.

The Internal Revenue Service has applied them vigorously for many years, and it should be permitted to continue to do so in the future.

On the other hand, the illogical consequences of the new allocation rule are absurd. Let me illustrate:

Corporation X spends \$110 for a round-trip ticket to send an employee to Chicago, on a Monday, for 5 days of business conferences, including travel time. He signs a \$1 million contract. It just happens that the employee's mother lives in Chicago, and the employee plans to spend 3 days there with her, following his business conferences. These days are Saturday, Sunday, and Monday. On Monday afternoon, just before the employee boards a jet for his return flight, his mother has a stroke, and the employee spends the next 2 weeks with her.

Under last year's amendment, corporation X is allowed to deduct only \$25. Contrast this with the following example:

Corporation Y spent \$110 for a round-trip ticket to send its employee to Chicago for a 1-day conference; and the employee would not have gone but for the conference. He signs a contract which results in a \$100,000 loss to his corporation. Following the conference, the employee spends the next 6 days in riotous living in Chicago.

Under last year's amendment, corporation Y would be allowed to deduct the entire \$110. I do not believe the distinction is justifiable.

Moreover, last year's amendment is irrational, in that it places a tax premium upon delay. By this, I mean that the more slowly a taxpayer or employee travels on a business journey, the greater will be the portion of the travel cost which is deductible.

Contrast the following situations for the same business purpose and to the same destination—one, involving travel by fast jet; and the other, travel by slow boat.

Corporation M sends an employee to London, for 2 days of business discussions. The flight takes 1 day each way. While in London, the employee takes 2 weeks vacation, to tour the Continent. Under last year's amendment, corporation M would be permitted to deduct four-eighths of the travel costs, or about 22 percent.

Corporation N, on the other hand, sends its employee to London, by boat, for the same 2 days of business discussions. The trip involves 5 days at sea, each way. This employee also takes a 2-week vacation, to tour the Continent with M's employee. Under last year's amendment, corporation N would be permitted to deduct twelve twenty-sixths of the travel costs, or nearly 50 percent.

By restoring the vitality of the but-for rule, as the proposed legislation contemplates, neither corporation M nor corporation N would be penalized through denial of a deduction for travel expenses incurred in legitimate business operations.

Let me make perfectly clear that neither the proposed legislation nor the

law which would be restored by its enactment would allow deduction for any part of the travel expenses involved in the 2-week tour of the Continent. Such expenses are not business related, and should not be deductible to any extent.

I submit that the same commonsense analysis requires that business-related travel expenses not be disallowed as a deduction to any extent. The cost to corporation M and corporation N of getting their respective employees to the London conference should be fully allowable, without regard to whether their employees return home immediately upon completion of the business discussions. Likewise, the costs to corporation X, as well as that to corporation Y, of getting their respective employees to business conferences in Chicago should also be fully deductible.

In addition to deleting from the law this illogical, irrational, and arbitrary travel allocation rule, the proposal would also modify the substantiation provision of last year's act, by eliminating travel from the burdensome record—and receipt—keeping rules of the statute and from the even more burdensome regulations issued under that provision.

This, in my opinion, will remove much of the criticism of the existing regulations, by making receipt collecting unnecessary, except in the case of entertainment expenses amounting to more than \$25. It also would restore the established rule of the Internal Revenue Service under which employees who travel for their employers on per diem, mileage, or fixed reimbursement arrangements, and who are required to render an adequate accounting to their employers, would be considered to have accounted also for tax purposes. Under this established rule, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue would continue to review employers' accounting procedures, for the purpose of determining whether they provide for an adequate accounting by employees.

I do not believe Congress intended to change the law as it applied to these employee-salesmen. In fact, both the Senate Finance Committee report and the report of the House Committee on Ways and Means made it emphatically clear that it did not so intend. These reports stated:

For example, it may be provided that substantiation will not be required for traveling expenses, where such expenses (including the cost of meals and lodging) do not exceed prescribed minimum amounts. This will be of special benefit to employees whose per diem allowance while traveling is within limits established by the Secretary under this provision.

Notwithstanding this unambiguous expression of congressional intent, these per diem, and so forth, arrangements were blanketed in by the new substantiation regulations. In some cases, I am informed that the employee recordkeeping required by employers has tripled. Time spent in recordkeeping and receipt collecting is time lost from selling their companies' products. The proposed legislation would put these people back to work at their selling jobs, thereby spurring the economy.

Still another objectionable feature of last year's amendments would be corrected by the legislation. Under the substantiation regulations, issued in final form on December 27, 1962, amounts disallowed as a deduction, because of the travel-allocation rule, are required to be included in the income of the employee involved with the travel. This arbitrary requirement is completely contrary to the stated intent of the Senate Finance Committee and of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, when the reports of these committees stated that the provision did not affect the question of the includability or excludability of an item in the income of any individual. We were content with the existing law in that respect.

I feel confident that the Congress did not intend to create income for employees or independent contractors where there had been none before. Notwithstanding this clear expression of congressional intent, the Treasury regulation, issued under the provision which asks nothing more than recordkeeping, taxes employees and agents on the amount of travel expenses disallowed as a deduction to their employer or principal. Under the proposed legislation, such income would not be imputed to employees or agents.

Summarizing the proposed legislation, it deletes from the statute, the travel-allocation rule, and eliminates travel from the detailed substantiation requirements of the law and regulations. It does nothing more. It preserves the amendment of last year, denying a deduction for expenses for meals and lodging while in travel status which are lavish or extravagant. It does not affect in any manner whatsoever the tax treatment of expenses for gifts or entertainment.

Section 274 may require further attention by the Congress, to prevent wholesale closing of restaurants and widespread unemployment in the restaurant, entertainment, and hotel industries.

Factual data which I have received shows that business in these industries is off 18 to 30 percent, requiring many of them to retrench, with a loss of jobs in the category of waiters, entertainers, and other personnel, the net result.

There still exist in the businessman's mind apprehension and confusion as to just what will and what will not be allowed as legitimate business deductions.

It is my view that if this apprehension and confusion are not eliminated by the Internal Revenue Service, our entire economy will suffer. Congress cannot allow this to occur.

Thus, the decision as to whether further legislation will be required will, of course, depend on what is disclosed by the substantiation regulations which shortly will be issued by the Internal Revenue Service.

I hope Congress will act promptly and favorably on this proposed measure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1083) to amend section 274 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to disallowance of deduction for

certain travel and entertainment expenses, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

PREVENTION OF GOVERNMENT COMPETITION WITH FREE ENTERPRISE

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to prevent the Federal Government from engaging in activities in direct competition with private enterprise. It also establishes a carefully framed policy gradually to phase out and terminate existing Federal activities which compete with the free enterprise system. Joining with me in sponsoring the bill are the chairman and the ranking minority member, respectively, of the Government Operations Committee, Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN and Senator KARL E. MUNDT, who have pioneered in this field for years. Moreover, they are joined by the following Members of the Senate who have also demonstrated great leadership and support for the free enterprise system: Senators HARRY FLOOD BYRD, JOHN J. WILLIAMS, STROM THURMOND, and JOHN G. TOWER.

HOOVER COMMISSION STUDIES

One of the great achievements of the Hoover Commission was the effort it made in the field of eliminating Government activities which compete with private enterprise. The Bureau of the Budget in January 1955, February 1957, and September 1959, issued directives to carry out the recommendations of the Hoover Commission in this area. As a result of this, much was accomplished during the Eisenhower years.

In President Eisenhower's last state of the Union address, he pointed out that during his administration "there has been a firm policy of reducing competition with private enterprise. This has resulted in discontinuance of some 2,000 commercial and industrial installations operated directly by Government agencies."

The policy stated by the Bureau of the Budget in 1955 was as follows:

The general policy of the administration that the Federal Government will not start or carry on any commercial activity to provide a service or product for its own use if such product or service can be procured from private enterprise through ordinary business channels. Exceptions to this policy shall be made by the head of an agency only where it is clearly demonstrated in each case that it is not in the public interest to procure such product or service from private enterprise.

GOVERNMENT COMPETITION INCREASING

While significant progress was made under these directives, not nearly enough was accomplished, I regret to say. Some new activities were undertaken that should not have been; others were continued that should have been terminated. Unfortunately, the present administration is not vigorously implementing the earlier policy directives. Rather than ending programs which compete with the free enterprise system, on balance this competition is being sharply increased. It was estimated in

August of 1962 that the present administration has increased the Government's investment in activities that compete with private business by more than \$2 billion.

CONGRESS SILENT

One of the reasons for this sharp increase is that there is no clearcut legislation firmly establishing the policy of the Federal Government in this area. The earlier Bureau of the Budget directives were welcome positive steps. But obviously they do not have the effect of law. The Federal agencies felt perfectly free to circumvent and even to defy these directives which can be withdrawn at any time and the degree to which they are enforced is dependent upon the wishes of the administration. For these reasons, I feel legislation is necessary and the bill I am introducing would clearly establish the policy of the Federal Government in this area.

ALLIES FAVOR FREE ENTERPRISE GROWTH

There are many who question the advisability of moving in this direction, who feel that our modern society requires more Government activity rather than less. In this connection, I think it is interesting to note the action taken by the Government of Western Germany during recent years. This Government, like many European governments, has had considerable experience with government control of production and distribution as distinguished from private control, and is now moving toward denationalization of industry.

For the past few years, the Government of Western Germany has been endeavoring to divest itself of many of its enterprises, including shipyards, steel mills, iron ore mines, and electricity generating stations. Since 1957, it has sold many enterprises, and has added virtually none at all.

One of the most dramatic recent moves in this area was the announcement in 1961 that the Government was offering the public a chance to buy stock in Volkswagen, the great automotive manufacturing company which until now has been owned by the Government.

It seems to me that one of the most dramatic facts to emerge during the postwar changes in the economies of the world is the fact that private enterprise is the most effective way of production. Because our own experience has shown this to be true, I feel that legislation guaranteeing private control of production and elimination of Government competition with private enterprise to the greatest possible extent would help to strengthen the economy. For these reasons, I urge passage of this bill.

BILL SUMMARY

Briefly, the bill declares that it is the policy of the Federal Government to encourage private competitive enterprise to the maximum extent consistent with national security and the public interest. It provides for the establishment of regulations governing establishment of new activities in this area, assuring that bureaus or agencies intending to establish such an activity must first obtain approval from the Director of the Bureau

of the Budget, who must determine that the function cannot be performed by private enterprise without adversely affecting national security.

MASSIVE FEDERAL INVASION OF FREE ENTERPRISE

Strange as it may seem, nobody, whether in or out of Government, knows accurately just what competitive businesses Uncle Sam is engaged in, how much money has been invested in them, and how much it costs every year to run them.

The Hoover Commission's job of investigating Government's invasion of business was done with magnificent competence—but no one ever pretended that the facts and figures were complete.

The Budget Bureau studied the problem for more than 2 years and came up with a figure of more than 19,000 business installations—but frankly admitted that it had not reached the bottom of the pile.

Estimates of Government's capital investment in business operations range widely from \$30 billion—no insignificant sum in itself—to 5 times that amount. I should not be surprised if it is actually even more than that.

As for costs of operation, the annual budget—as thick as the Washington telephone directory, but much less comprehensible—is not of the slightest help. The first lesson learned by a bureaucrat is to hide—himself, his job, his subordinates, and most of all his account books.

GREAT POTENTIAL SAVINGS AND REVENUES

It is obvious that a good deal of money could be saved by getting Government out of competitive business. It is equally obvious that the tax take of the Treasury would be very considerably increased if the great amount of business now done by nontaxpaying Government plants were thrown to privately owned, taxpaying companies. And no jobs need be lost in the shiftover, for the Government workers would be needed to keep on doing what they are now doing.

The purpose of my bill is to get the Government out of business in direct competition with taxpaying companies—and to keep it out.

All receipts from the sale of Government businesses—and they should be a very substantial amount—should be applied to the reduction of the national debt.

Taxes received from the proprietary companies that purchase these Government installations—and they should be in considerable amount—would, of course, be used to reduce the deficit with which we are now faced.

HELP BALANCE BUDGET

It is a program that should bring satisfaction to present administration fiscal planners, for it would provide new sources of tax revenue without adding to the burdens of present taxpayers. It should also bring some feeling of amelioration to the general public.

Unhappily, from the taxpayers' viewpoint, most of Government's businesses are highly competitive with private enterprise, and their advantages are both unfair and insurmountable. They operate with the people's money—yours and

mine—they are not expected to make a profit; many of them are not managed with even decent efficiency, and they share none of the burden of taxation that confiscates half of the earnings of privately owned competitors. Under Federal control there is little incentive to achieve efficiency in business-type activities since they do not have to compete in the market place and cost is no object.

FEDERAL SAVINGS, A MYTH

It is claimed by those who support virtually unlimited Federal competition against the free enterprise system that it is cheaper for the Government to do the job. However, in a vast majority of cases, this is just not true, since the purported lower Federal cost estimates are fictitious and misleading. This elementary fact was lucidly proclaimed by the Hoover Commission in the preface of its report on business enterprises which said:

The Government business-type enterprises, except in a few instances, pay no taxes, and pay little or no interest on the capital invested; they seldom charge depreciation and frequently their directing personnel is not included on their payroll. Likewise, the fringe benefits of Government personnel in most instances are not included in their costs. Moreover, in addition to the fact that most of them pay no taxes, they deprive the Government of taxes which would otherwise be paid by private enterprise if it conducted these operations. Therefore, their claims of financial success are often wholly invalid; and, worse, with the advantages they receive from the Government, they are unfair competition.

EXAMPLES OF FEDERAL COMPETITION

Congressional investigations dating back to 1932 have listed more than 100 categories of business in which Government is engaged. Many of them were started, probably legitimately enough, to meet special emergencies of wartime—but when the wars were over, the businesses quietly kept going, regardless of the losses they incurred.

Thus various Government shipyards, which serviced 10,000 vessels in World War II, are still in full operation, though they service only a few hundred ships today.

Thus the Navy continues to build ships in Government yards, though by expert testimony they could be built for 15 to 28 percent less in private yards—at a saving of millions of dollars.

Thus the Defense Department continues to hang on to reserve plants which were built during World War II. Some of them have been sold at prices ranging from 10 to 30 cents on the dollar of original investment, whereupon they become valuable as sources of tax revenue. A year and a half ago Secretary McNamara directed that others be sold, but restrictions make them hard to move.

SOME PROGRESS MADE

True enough, there has been some progress in recent years' efforts to eliminate Government competition. The Mississippi Barge Line, continued for a generation of annual losses after World War I, was finally sold to a private company, in whose hands it became a profit-making taxpayer. The synthetic rubber plants of World War II were finally sold to taxpaying companies. The Recon-

struction Finance Corporation was substantially dissolved. The coffee roasting plants of the three armed services, which would not drink the same brand of coffee—were sold. The Navy's paint factories were disposed of. The Defense Department got rid of its plant nurseries and a lot of its laundries, drycleaning plants and cobbler shops.

GOVERNMENT STILL COMPETING

But the PX stores still compete unfairly with taxpaying department stores. Government engineers compete unfairly with taxpaying engineering companies. Government printing plants do half a billion dollars' worth of business every year when much and perhaps all of it could be done by taxpaying plants. The Post Office continues to make its own mailbags and locks, and to run an unneeded postal savings bank. Military Air Transport competes unfairly with commercial airlines. Various services make wooden boxes in competition with companies that could make them better and cheaper—and pay taxes. Government operates warehouse space which should certainly be in private hands.

The Tennessee Valley Authority, which supposedly entered the fertilizer production business as an experiment, now sells \$20 million worth annually, at less than cost. Now TVA wants to get into the coal mining business, after successfully getting into the steam power generating business.

The list is endless.

TIME TO ACT

And it is high time something was done to put a stop to this competitive waste of the people's money—and this loss of needed tax revenue.

The first step in the process of ending this unhappy situation is for the Congress to adopt a policy, a definite and positive policy—that Government should get out of business to the maximum extent possible, and stay out.

That is the purpose of the bill I am reintroducing. It is not an extreme bill. Rather it represents a moderate, workable, first step to accomplish this objective. It is the work product of years of detailed study by the Bureau of the Budget.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1093) to establish a Federal policy concerning the termination, limitation, or establishment of business-type operations of the Government which may be conducted in competition with private enterprise, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BENNETT (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

RATES OF POSTAGE ON PUBLICATIONS DESIGNED SPECIFICALLY FOR RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION CLASSES

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I rise to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to adjust second class postal rates payable by publications designed specifically for use in religious instruction

classes. Public Law 87-793, which became effective on January 7, 1963, changed existing rates so that the classroom publications in question are unreasonably burdened and will become increasingly so as additional raises in the rates take effect.

Prior to January 7, 1963, all classroom publications were charged pound rates equal to 50 percent of the rate for publications generally with respect to the advertising portion of the publication and 60 percent of the rate for publications generally with respect to the non-advertising portion. Minimum charge per piece was one-eighth of a cent.

Effective January 7, 1963, second class postage rates were increased and the basis for computing postage on classroom publications was changed. Now, classroom publications are required to pay postage equal to 60 percent of that paid by other publications.

The effect of this change has been to increase the minimum per piece charge for classroom publications from the one-eighth of a cent formerly paid, to a little over one-third of a cent for 1963, nearly one-half of a cent for 1964, and three-fifths of a cent thereafter. When the third installment of increases becomes effective on January 1, 1965, postage costs for classroom publications will have increased 480 percent.

Clearly, these rates are confiscatory, especially for classroom publications designed for religious instruction. These publications are in enough financial difficulties. The enormous increase of rates would put many of them out of business and thus deprive thousands of dedicated Sunday school teachers of valuable tools of instruction. My bill is meant to alleviate the burden upon these publications. It would not affect rates paid by classroom publications generally, and would not change pound rates for religious classroom publications. It would, however, lower the minimum charge per piece for the latter to fifteen one-hundredths of a cent during 1963, two-tenths of a cent during 1964, and twenty-five one-hundredths of a cent thereafter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at the end of my remarks and that it be allowed to lie on the table for 10 days so that Senators who wish to cosponsor the bill may do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record, and lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The bill (S. 1099) relating to rates of postage on publications designed specifically for religious instruction classes, introduced by Mr. SCOTT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4359 (b) (2) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) The postage on classroom publications, other than those designed specifically for religious instruction classes, is 60 per

centum of the postage computed in accordance with paragraph (1). In the case of classroom publications designed specifically for use in religious instruction classes the rates per pound shall be 60 per centum of the rates per pound specified in paragraph (1) and the minimum charge per piece shall be .15 of a cent if mailed prior to January 1, 1964, .2 of a cent if mailed during calendar year 1964, and .25 of a cent if mailed after December 31, 1964."

PROHIBITION OF IMPORTS OF FLAT GLASS FROM COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to prevent the importation of flat glass which is the product of any country or area dominated or controlled by communism. The increasingly large imports of window and sheet glass, glass louvers, and other flat glass products from Communist lands are posing a grave threat to the glass manufacturers of this Nation.

There should be prompt action to reduce or eliminate the threat. The administration has not acted, but I hope it will do so. Meanwhile, I am taking this legislative alternative to prevent further damage to American glass industry. My bill states that the President shall, as soon as practicable, take such measures as may be necessary to prevent the importation of these products.

I have been informed that today the United States has in effect no quantitative restrictions—import quotas—or other regulations in regard to imports of these glass products from Communist countries. Two of the countries involved, Poland and Yugoslavia, even enjoy the benefits of most-favored-nation treatment and the consequent applica-

bility of reduced tariff rates. While the other Communist countries do not enjoy such treatment, nevertheless their state-owned industries ship glass into this country that sells at prices sometimes as much as 50 percent below the prices quoted in our very competitive domestic industry.

Mr. President, it is well known that Communist nations utilize economic activity for political purposes. Their export policies are not aimed primarily at raising the standard of living of their people but at damaging the economies of the free nations. Even if free nations levied 100-percent tariffs on Communist products, these goods would continue to be dumped where the effects on domestic industry would be most harmful.

At the present moment, Communist glass is being brought into selected markets, chiefly in New England, Florida, and the Gulf States. However, there are indications that such imports will spread and jeopardize other States along the Atlantic seaboard.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks there be inserted in the RECORD a table prepared by the Economics Division of the Legislative Reference Service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the table will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1100) to prevent the importation of flat glass which is the product of any country or area dominated or controlled by communism, introduced by Mr. SCOTT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The table presented by Mr. SCOTT is as follows:

Window glass imports from Communist countries, 1960, 1961, January–November, 1962

[Quantity in thousands of pounds; values in thousands of dollars]

Country	1960		1961		January–November 1962	
	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value
Czechoslovakia.....	14,534.8	287.5	13,445.6	404.0	13,000.7	354.3
East Germany.....	1,502.2	65.2	1,361.9	64.6	1,049.4	45.7
Poland.....	304.5	10.8	1.6	.4	1,824.5	65.4
Rumania.....	105.0	4.7	2,710.1	118.7
U.S.S.R.....	2,816.0	77.8	10,491.0	432.0	17,006.6	603.6
Soviet bloc.....	19,157.5	441.2	25,405.1	905.8	35,681.3	1,187.7
Yugoslavia.....	166.2	8.7	46.5	4.0	648.8	27.0
Total.....	19,323.7	449.9	25,451.6	909.8	36,330.0	1,214.7

NOTE.—Due to rounding, detail does not add to total.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census. U.S. imports of merchandise for consumption; commodity by country of origin (Rept. FT 110) 1960, 1961, January–November 1962.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate these figures, which show the quantity and value of window glass imports from Communist countries for the most recent 3 years. They show the increasing danger which I want to eliminate by means of this bill.

I also ask unanimous consent that this bill remain on the table for 10 days so that any Senators wanting to co-sponsor may do so.

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

REMOVAL OF STATUE OF GENERAL RAWLINS TO GALENA, ILL.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, at 18th and E Streets, NW., the little park opposite the Interior Department Building is graced by a statue of Gen. John Aaron Rawlins. There has been introduced a bill which calls for the removal of the statue of General Rawlins to Wyoming, largely because he spent 1 night in camp somewhere in that State.

Mr. President, we in Illinois have some interest in General Rawlins. He was a

native of Illinois, and was the chief aide to the then Commander in Chief, Ulysses S. Grant. Therefore, we believe it would be most appropriate that the statue be removed to Galena, Ill., the home of General Rawlins.

To that end, I introduce a joint resolution to authorize the city of Galena, or an appropriate association or organization of citizens thereof, to remove to Galena the statue of Gen. John A. Rawlins, now located in Rawlins Park, Washington, D.C.

In connection with the joint resolution, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief article which was published on March 11 in the Washington Daily News.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the article will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 59) to authorize the city of Galena, Ill., or an appropriate association or organization of the citizens thereof, to remove to Galena, Ill., the statue of Gen. John A. Rawlins located at Rawlins Park, Washington, D.C., introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The article presented by Mr. DIRKSEN is as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of Monday, Mar. 11, 1963]

A STATUESQUE BATTLE

Gen. John Aaron Rawlins, shadowy though his past may be, has managed to stir up some heat between two U.S. Senators.

Senator GALE MCGEE, Democrat, of Wyoming, introduced a bill recently to move the Rawlins statue from Rawlins Park, opposite the Interior Department Building, 18th and E Streets NW., to Rawlins, Wyo., where the general is reputed to have stopped at a railroad camp one night.

Senator VANCE HARTKE, Democrat, of Indiana, has a constituent, Charles D. Rawlins, the great-nephew of the general who wants the statue either left in Washington, which the Government opposes, or moved to Illinois, the general's native State.

The bronze image of General Rawlins was cast in 1874. He was Grant's chief aide and later his Secretary of War.

Senator MCGEE is quite definite about his interest in the matter, stating, "We do not agree on this particular matter of legislation."

Senator HARTKE has withheld comment until he hears from Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, concerning Senator MCGEE's bill.

Until the matter is settled, the general will just have to bear the Washington weather with the rest of us.

ACCEPTANCE BY THE UNITED STATES OF AN INSTRUMENT FOR THE AMENDMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution providing for acceptance by the United States of an instrument for the amendment of the constitution of the International Labor Organization.

It was my pleasure and honor to participate in the 1962 ILO meeting in Geneva and I was one of the American

delegates who voted to adopt this resolution.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution, along with the accompanying letters of the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Labor, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution and letters will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 60) providing for acceptance by the United States of America of an instrument for the amendment of the constitution of the International Labor Organization, introduced by Mr. McNAMARA, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The letters presented by Mr. McNAMARA are as follows:

FEBRUARY 15, 1963.

The Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I submit herewith a proposed draft joint resolution providing for acceptance by the United States of America of an instrument for the amendment of the constitution of the International Labor Organization adopted by the 46th session of the International Labor Conference which met at Geneva in June 1962. The proposed amendments would increase the size of the governing body of the organization from 40 to 48 members, to reflect the recent increase in membership of the organization, and would make certain related changes.

The purpose of the proposed joint resolution is to authorize the President to accept the instrument of amendment on behalf of the United States. The United States accepted membership in the ILO pursuant to joint resolution of Congress approved June 19, 1934 (43 Stat. 1182; 22 U.S.C. 271), and accepted the revised constitution of the ILO pursuant to joint resolution of Congress approved June 30, 1948 (62 Stat. 1151; 22 U.S.C. 271 note). Under Article 36 of the ILO constitution, amendments take effect when ratified or accepted by two-thirds of the members, including 5 of the 10 members of chief industrial importance.

I enclose a copy of the instrument of amendment, together with a letter from the Acting Secretary of Labor, dated September 13, 1962, stating the objectives of the proposed changes in the ILO constitution and the coordinated view of the Departments of Labor and Commerce on the desirability of accepting them. The Department of State joins in recommending that Congress by joint resolution authorize the President to accept the instrument of amendment.

The amendments would involve no increase in expenditures or other obligations on the part of the United States. The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of the proposed legislation to Congress for its consideration.

A similar communication is being sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, September 13, 1962.

The Honorable DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: At its 46th session, the International Labor Conference adopted the Instrument for the Amendment of the

Constitution of the International Labor Organization, a certified true copy of the authentic text of which is enclosed. The instrument was adopted by a vote of 309 for, none against, and one abstention. The United States supported this proposal in the governing body and the U.S. delegation voted unanimously for it in the conference.

The instrument of amendment would increase the size of the governing body of the International Labor Office from 40 to 48 members to reflect the growth and composition of the membership of the organization since 1954. At that time, when the governing body was last enlarged, 71 nations belonged to the organization. Today, the membership has increased to over a hundred countries, largely due to the admission of the newly independent, developing, and mainly agricultural countries of Africa.

The instrument would reflect this situation by making possible fuller representation in the government, employer, and worker groups in the governing body from all parts of the world. Of the 24 persons representing governments on the governing body, 10 will continue to be appointed by the members of chief industrial importance, and 14 will be appointed by the members selected for that purpose by the government delegates to the conference. The last sentence of paragraph 4 of article 7 of the constitution has been deleted on the ground that it has ceased to be justified in practice.

Consideration has been given by representatives of the Department of Commerce and the Department of Labor to submission of this instrument of amendment to both Houses of the Congress, since this Government's original acceptance of membership in the International Labor Organization was taken upon the authorization of the two Houses of Congress by joint resolution. It is the view of these departments that the instrument is completely satisfactory to this Government and that its early submission to both Houses of the Congress for acceptance would be highly desirable.

Considerable interest was taken by the newer nations in the adoption of this instrument. The United States played an active role both in the governing body and at the conference in its formulation and adoption. The next elections for the renewal of the governing body of the International Labor Office are to be held during the 47th session of the International Labor Conference, which will meet in June 1963, and another election will not be held for 3 years. Failure of the United States to accept the instrument of amendment without delay could create an adverse impression among the newer governments, particularly if the next governing body election could not be held in accordance with the amendments due to a lack of sufficient formal acceptances.

In evidence of good faith as one of the leading members of the organization, with the added responsibility as a state of chief industrial importance, it is recommended that early action be initiated to bring about acceptance by the United States of the instrument of amendment. This action would be consonant with the unanimous support given by the U.S. Government, employer, and worker delegates to the adoption of the amendment at the 1962 Conference.

Your early consideration of this matter will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Acting Secretary of Labor.

AMENDMENT OF SENATE RULE XXV,
RELATING TO MEETING OF COMMITTEES WHILE SENATE IS IN SESSION

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, on January 9 of this year, our distinguished

majority leader, as chairman of the Senate democratic conference, appointed an ad hoc committee of the conference to consider and recommend ways in which the business of the Senate may be expedited.

The committee has met a number of times, has considered various possibilities, and its chairman, the senior Senator from Oklahoma, has reported to the conference chairman, in part, as follows:

Your committee recommends and urges the earliest possible consideration of S. Res. 89, an amendment of rule VIII of the standing rules of the Senate. This resolution was introduced February 19 by Senator PASTORE and others.

Your committee further recommends that urgent consideration be given a forthcoming resolution, of which Senator CHURCH and other members of the ad hoc committee will be sponsors, to revise the rules to permit committees to sit during the morning hour without need of any special permission from the Senate, while applying the present rule, which requires special consent, to the Senate session following the close of the morning hour. The application of such a provision, along with the recommended rule of germaneness, would greatly expedite the disposal of legislative business and help to increase attendance at debate in the Senate Chamber at the same time. No limitation would be imposed on the right to extend debate.

My purpose now, Mr. President, is to submit for myself and Senators MONROE, ANDERSON, MCGEE, and PASTORE, the second resolution mentioned above. It would amend rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate so as to render inapplicable to the Senate that provision of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 which provides that no standing committee of the Senate shall sit, without special leave, while the Senate is in session. In lieu of this provision, it would require special leave of the Senate only in those instances when a standing committee desires to sit after the conclusion of the morning hour, or after the Senate has proceeded to the consideration of unfinished business. The intent of the proposed amendment is to free the time normally devoted to the morning hour for the work of the standing committees, in order to expedite the business of the Senate.

Mr. President, Senators are aware of the nature of the morning hour as it has developed in the Senate, and of the rules governing it. It serves a useful function, but I think it is self-evident that it is not a function which requires the attendance of Senators who do not have morning business to pursue, so long as no legislative business is taken up. Accordingly, we who sponsor this resolution believe that whatever considerations might justify a conditional prohibition against allowing committees to sit while legislative business is being transacted on the floor of the Senate have no application to the morning hour, and should be removed.

The benefits to be obtained by this modification of the rule are equally obvious. The time available for committee work would be significantly increased. The flow of work to the Senate calendar would be speeded, the time of

Senators and witnesses devoted to committee work would be more effectively utilized, and the remaining provisions of the rules designed to encourage the attendance of Senators in the Senate while its substantive work is underway would be emphasized by the removal of an extraneous and bothersome restriction.

I ask that the resolution may be printed in the RECORD, and that it be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 111) amending rule XXV of the standing rules relative to meetings of committees while the Senate is in session, submitted by Mr. CHURCH (for himself and other Senators), was received and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"5. No standing committee shall sit without special leave while the Senate is in session after (1) the conclusion of the morning hour, or (2) the Senate has proceeded to the consideration of unfinished business, whichever is earlier."

Section 2. Section 134(c) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 shall not be applicable to standing committees of the Senate.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR PROCUREMENT OF AIRCRAFT, MISSILES, AND NAVAL VESSELS FOR THE ARMED FORCES—AMENDMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 843) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATION BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nomination of W. Averell Harriman, of New York to be Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs.

In accordance with the committee rule, this pending nomination may not be considered prior to the expiration of six days of its receipt in the Senate.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of S. 143, the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] be added as a cosponsor.

S. 143, which was introduced on January 14, and cosponsored by the senior Senator from Montana, would authorize assumption by the various States of civil or criminal jurisdiction over cases arising

on Indian reservations with the consent of the tribe involved, and permit gradual transfer of such jurisdiction to the States.

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

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of S. 468, the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] be added as cosponsors.

S. 468, introduced on January 24 and cosponsored by the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] would amend title 23 of the United States Code relating to highways in order to require the approval of the Secretary of the Interior to surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates for projects on the Federal aid highway systems for the purpose of protecting fish and wildlife and recreation resources.

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

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF RESOLUTION

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, at the time I introduced Senate Resolution 48, which would create a standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the name of the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] was omitted from the resolution inadvertently as a cosponsor. The Senator from Florida has been a consistent supporter of that work since 1951. I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the resolution the names of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] be added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 48.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills and concurrent resolution:

Authority of March 7, 1963:

S. 1012. A bill to make voluntary admissions and confessions admissible in criminal proceedings and prosecutions in the courts of the United States and the District of Columbia: Mr. TALMADGE.

S. 1029. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to eliminate certain inequities and restrictions and permit a more effective distribution of Federal funds: Mr. LONG of Missouri and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

Authority of February 28, 1963:

S. Con. Res. 25. Concurrent resolution favoring observance on July 4 of each year by the ringing of bells throughout the United States, of the anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence: Mr. BAYH, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. CLARK, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DODD, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HART, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PELL, Mr. PROUTY, and Mr. SCOTT.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

Address delivered by him before the National Security Commission of the American Legion, in Washington, D.C., on March 14, 1963, dealing with the subject of direct and indirect assaults against the free enterprise system.

By Mr. BIBLE:

Address delivered by Senator CANNON before the Western Regional Quality Control Conference, at Las Vegas, Nev., on February 22, 1963.

By Mr. BAYH:

Address delivered by Senator HARTKE before the District of Columbia Dental Society on March 11, 1963.

MISSILES IN CUBA

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is quoted by the news services today as saying that he and other Senators believe there may be as many as 40 intermediate range ballistic missiles in Cuban caves.

I suggest, Mr. President, that this a serious charge, coming as it does in the face of photographic evidence, produced by Defense Secretary Robert McNamara on February 6, showing that 42 missiles were shipped into Cuba and from Cuba back into the Soviet Union. Secretary McNamara also said that continued aerial reconnaissance has shown that missile sites were bulldozed and remain inoperative, and that no further missiles have been shipped to Cuba.

Mr. President, to continue to play the missile numbers game in the face of these concrete facts is a dangerous and irresponsible political pastime in this nuclear age, when judgment dictates that unity, responsibility, and strength must be the cornerstone of our foreign policy.

It would appear to me, Mr. President, that some of our colleagues across the aisle seem to be dedicated to the task of shaping the image of the Republican Party into that of the "war party." If this be their purpose, I submit they are doing an admirable job.

But we reach a point where charges for charges' sake become, in fact, a threat to the effective foreign policy of a Nation.

Mr. President, if these charges are to be made, they should be backed by evidence. If the evidence is available, it should be brought forth as forcefully as the charges. If such evidence cannot be produced, those who persist in making these accusations should stop their efforts to mislead the American people by attempting to exploit the sensitive Cuba situation for political purposes.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE MOVES

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, it is the difficult task of government, in determining how it shall perform its services to the citizens, to draw the line between service and economy. I believe our Gov-

ernment has a very fine record in drawing that line to meet the total interests of the Nation. But on occasion, as in all human enterprises, we err on one side or the other.

Such, I believe, was the case when the Internal Revenue Service decided to shift many of the managerial and servicing functions of its office in Cheyenne to Denver, to effect purported economies of centralization. I realize that Wyoming has fewer than 400,000 people, and that we are continually doing things in bigger and better ways; nevertheless, the citizens of my State are deserving of consideration in this matter.

The Federal income tax, by its very nature, is a fairly personal thing. Those who have problems with their taxes—and it is not difficult to have such problems—can most easily explain their problems to a civil servant who is familiar with their way of life. There is no better way to understand the problems of an area than to live in it.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I do not believe it fair to require a citizen to travel an additional distance to another State, to obtain assistance in settling a tax question. The payment of taxes, even in support of the most equitable government, should be with the minimum of pain and discomfort.

The general taxpayers of Wyoming would suffer most by this move, but there would also be considerable suffering on the part of employees who would be required to move to another city. I realize that when one accepts Government service, one also accepts the chance that moves will be made.

However, in this case the move would be especially onerous because it is unjustified. The loss of capital in selling a home on a market that is at the moment unfortunately depressed, the loss of income for women employees who cannot leave husbands and families, and the loss of local income caused by the removal of several families, all combine to make real hardship for the employees involved, for the city of Cheyenne, and for the State of Wyoming.

Mr. President, in view of these facts, I have determined to oppose this move with all the resources at my command. I intend to carry my convictions to the Internal Revenue Service, and I would ask the support of the Members of this body in this cause.

I should like to see an immediate decision made on this matter. No one likes to live under a cloud of uncertainty; and nothing would be worse for the morale of these Federal employees than to be kept on pins and needles for months and months while these matters are discussed.

Mr. President, the proposed move is unfair and unnecessary. I propose that it be abandoned at once, and that these employees be relieved of their anxieties and returned to the service of the taxpayers of Wyoming.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD three letters, which I have received in recent days, reflecting upon this situation.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHEYENNE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Cheyenne, Wyo., March 11, 1963.
HON. GALE W. MCGEE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCGEE: You are undoubtedly aware of the proposed move of certain personnel from the Cheyenne Internal Revenue Service Office to Denver, Colo. The alleged reason for this move is economy. In itself, this is an admirable objective. However, I have been discussing the effects of this move with several Wyoming tax practitioners; and they are of the opinion that the removal of supervisory personnel to Denver will work to the detriment of the citizens of Wyoming.

Of course, there is an actual financial detriment involved in that several families will be moved from Cheyenne to Denver. However, the real detriment results from removal of the supervisory personnel. These are the people that handle the first appeal from the ruling of an agent. Therefore, future appeals will be made to people residing in Denver who have no knowledge of the cattle or oil business. The local practitioners inform me that this is not a "paper tiger." The second level appeal people are now in Denver and seem to have little understanding of Wyoming problems. In the past, Wyoming taxpayers have been able to receive fair treatment because the Internal Revenue Service people lived in this state and understood its problems. To quote one local tax man, "Some of our problems eventually rubbed off on them."

An additional effect probably will be the removal of certain agents from Casper to Cheyenne. While we are always glad to have these people, we do not want them at the expense of Wyoming taxpayers.

Finally, the end result of this move will be that all auditing functions will be concentrated in the bigger cities with all of the evils that come from centralization of government. The Wyoming taxpayer will no longer have any contact with the people who are auditing his return. Furthermore, it will then be necessary to travel to Denver to discuss a problem. If we are still a state, it would seem that we are entitled to be treated as one and retain some contact with those who are reviewing our tax problem.

The Cheyenne Chamber of Commerce believes that this is a serious problem and should be given immediate attention. Perhaps you will be able to learn the exact extent of the proposed move so that we will be able to more definitely pinpoint our objections.

Yours truly,

PAUL B. GODFREY,
President.

N.A.I.R.E., LOCAL CHAPTER 31,
Cheyenne, Wyo., March 11, 1963.

Senator GALE W. MCGEE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCGEE: On March 5, 1963, in a special message to all Internal Revenue Service employees, Commissioner Caplin announced certain changes in the field structure of the Internal Revenue Service. In brief, the New York region is to be absorbed by the Boston region; the Omaha region is to be absorbed by the Chicago region; certain districts are to be shifted from one region to another; 4 districts are to be absorbed into other districts in the same States; and 12 small districts which are now separate entities are to become modified districts, with much of their managerial and servicing functions shifted to an adjoining, larger district. The Cheyenne District, comprising the entire State of Wyoming, is to be-

come a modified district, with Denver as its servicing district. Our purpose in writing to you is to inform you of the impact and effect of this change on the employees involved.

Most of the published information relates only to the few managerial and supervisory positions to be affected. The transfer of service functions, however, would also involve many other positions. Informed estimates indicate that from 35 to 45 families in Cheyenne are directly concerned, and that the reduction in local payroll would be in excess of \$250,000 each year.

It is true that many of these people would be offered similar positions in other districts; however, many of them, such as married women, would not be able to move. Another real problem would be that most of those who could move would have to sell their homes in an already depressed real estate market.

The employees are not convinced that the change relating to small districts is wise. They believe that very little of the estimated \$5 million annual saving relates to this part of the change, that it will result in a decrease in service to the taxpaying public, and that the impact on them personally is therefore not justifiable. Many of their comments are summarized in the attached copy of a letter to our National Executive Secretary. If you prefer, many of our employees would be happy to write to you direct, but we thought that incorporating their problems into one letter would save you time.

Secretary Dillon has recently postponed any implementation action until after he has reviewed the change in the light of the protests received. We hope that you will agree with our opinions and that you will do what you can in our behalf.

Very truly yours,

W. L. VICKERS,
President, Local Chapter 31.

N.A.I.R.E. LOCAL CHAPTER 31,
Cheyenne, Wyo., March 11, 1963.

Mr. GEORGE BURSACH,
Executive Secretary, National Association of
Internal Revenue Employees, Wash-
ington 5, D.C.

DEAR MR. BURSACH: As you know, Commissioner Caplin's special message to all employees of March 5, 1963, announced certain modifications in the field structure of the Internal Revenue Service. Cheyenne, as 1 of the 12 small districts, is to be a modified district, with much of our staff and service support to be furnished by the Denver District. The purpose of this letter is to inform you of our local employees' reaction to this change. Copies are being furnished, together with cover letters containing additional information, to Senator McGee, Senator Simpson, Congressman Harrison, Governor Hansen, and Cheyenne Mayor Bill Nation.

Many, although by no means all, of our people's comments relate to personal problems and hardships which they envision, some because of individual circumstances and others related to the present economic situation in Cheyenne. Both kinds are included in the following summary, which I believe is a representative excerpt. Most of the selected comments quoted were expressed, in varying forms, by several employees. I am summarizing them in one letter in order to give you a concise picture of the present morale problems here.

"Perhaps some of the regional offices and service centers could be advantageously combined, but it doesn't necessarily follow that the small district offices aren't performing a useful function in fully serving the communities and States in which they are located. Further, even though a reduction of management functions in the small districts might be justified, it would not follow that the servicing and support functions

should be transferred in toto to larger districts. There would still be the same volume of work of this kind; the same number of employees would still be required to do this work; and its removal would decrease the effectiveness of the servicing and enforcement effort, as well as minimizing taxpayer assistance. Why, then, uproot or otherwise work personal hardships on the people who are now doing the work?"

"How long can a modified district retain its entity? They're hiding their heads in the sand if they really do believe that we can operate as they tell us we will. I don't think they're telling us the whole story."

"Service to the Wyoming taxpayers is bound to be reduced. Apparently all of the servicing functions are to be transferred to Denver."

"Think of the effect of an annual quarter-million dollar reduction in payroll in our already depressed local economy."

"Even though it will cost me money to move, as I know I must, I am not so much concerned about myself; I have lived with the concept of mobility for a long time. I am concerned about the impact on our married women who can't possibly move."

"The general reaction is one of shock, of frustration, of disappointment, of disillusionment."

"It's all happening so fast, and we have had no advance warning. Out of the clear blue sky, we are suddenly told that we will have to move. They say that they will exert every effort to help us. It seems to some of us that they haven't really considered what this means to those who can't move."

"My job is one of those eliminated. I am a single woman, true, but I still have family responsibilities. I recently bought a home here to provide for my aged and invalid mother. To sell it on the present Cheyenne market would cost me money I can't afford."

"Two or three years more work would see my family over the hump; by then our expenses for school, etc., would be reduced so that both my husband and I wouldn't have to work."

"The lack of information is working a terrific hardship on my own and many other families. All personal plans for vacations, school, etc., for this year are affected."

"How can they make so much ado about integrity and then pull a stunt like this?"

"The people largely adversely affected are those in the modified districts. Why should the people in the servicing districts sit there undisturbed, and actually benefit from the change; why should not the positions they occupy be open to competition to displaced personnel?"

"It's difficult to live with the feeling of insecurity. Most of us just don't know where we stand."

"I recently moved here in good faith to accept a position in this district office. When I arrived, I bought a home for my family. I assume that I will be placed elsewhere, but the problem of providing a home for my family there is a very real one. I don't expect to sell my present home for anywhere near enough to realize my equity. In fact, I probably will lose it entirely. Where can I find enough money to make a down payment in a new town?"

"I know of several recent instances where people leaving Cheyenne had to sell their homes at tremendous losses."

"My husband is employed in Cheyenne. How can I move to 'follow the work' to another office?"

"Most of the published information concerns the management officials to be transferred. Many more people, particularly lower-paid married women, won't be able to move. What about them?"

"All this to save five million a year? Have they considered how much it will cost the families involved?"

Unquestionably, we will lose much talent and experience because of employee belief that the Service has let them down. How do we regain our composure, our dignity, our esprit de corps—how long will it take for management to be accepted again by employees—how long will it take to regain our stature?"

These, of course, are initial reactions, and much of the evident despair can be attributed to what we hope is a lack of information. Mr. Paul Schuster, our local District Director, has committed himself to keeping our employees rapidly and fully informed, and has done an admirable job in this regard. Personal problems, however, would still exist, no matter how much information is disseminated, if the planned changes were put through in their entirety.

Your Bulletin Board issue of March 6, 1963, relates to the proposed change, but the emphasis is entirely on the number of management people that may be involved. As we in the modified districts see it, however, this completely ignored the problems of those in lower echelons who, although they may be offered jobs in other locations, would be unable to move because of family responsibilities. In our district, there are the people who are most troubled.

Many of our people think that this unprecedented and hasty tactical move was a serious error in employee relations. There is no question about the fact that employee morale has reached its lowest ebb. Some of our people have said that IRS is too insecure and that they will shop around for other positions.

We have just been informed that Secretary Dillon has called for a review of the proposed change in the light of protests received and that he has also delayed any change until January 1, 1964. The employees are hoping for a quick decision, because they believe that this is just a short reprieve. Anxiety is at a high pitch during the interim, and the index of efficiency nose-dives when decisions are in a study state. Whatever the decision, it would be better to know.

In summary, then, we do not believe that the change as it relates to the modified districts would materially benefit the Service; we do believe that it would work serious hardships on our people.

Sincerely yours,

W. L. VICKERS,
President, Local Chapter 31.

BEEF PRICES

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the State of Wyoming derives a large share of its income from the sale of livestock.

Indeed, the very mention of the name "Wyoming" connotes the same kind of image as it does in mentioning the name of the State of the distinguished Vice President and the President of this body—Texas. It brings to mind visions of vast herds of cattle, of mammoth cattle drives and colorful cowboys. And while the modern cowboy bears little resemblance to those now found on television, the importance of the western livestock industry has not changed.

It is therefore very disturbing to me, Mr. President, to watch the price of fat cattle sharply decline in recent months. In a free enterprise economy we are accustomed to price fluctuations but those that we have witnessed recently are of such a nature as to indicate that something more than supply and demand may be behind them.

In the last 60 to 70 days the price of fat cattle has dropped \$7 a hundred-

weight. This means, Mr. President, that a Wyoming stockman who brings a 1,000-pound steer to market now receives \$70 less for that animal than he did late in December. This is not a monetary loss that can be easily assumed and a continuation of this trend would spell economic disaster for many of my State's beef producers.

For several years the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee has had a specific interest in the administration of the Packers and Stockyards Act. As a member of this subcommittee I have been an advocate of a vigorous administration of that act. And I have suggested that an increase in operating funds was necessary. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Appropriations Committee has been generous in its support of my proposals and we have witnessed in recent years positive results of our concern that our laws in this area be completely and impartially enforced.

Mr. President, we cannot rest on our laurels. We in the Congress owe it to the Nation to protect the individual citizen from any unfair or illegal practices that may impinge upon his ability to earn his living. Therefore, I intend to take a very close look at this recent price drop. I intend to discover its affect upon the producer and the consumer and the reasons behind such a drastic change.

At this point I do not know what this investigation will turn up. But I intend to make its results known to this body. This matter is of vital importance to a great segment of the population and it is essential that we make certain that the rights of all concerned are fully protected.

TIME TO CONSIDER THE CONSUMER

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, for a number of years import restrictions on residual fuel oil placed an increasingly heavy burden on the consumers of the entire east coast of the United States, which accounts for nearly two-thirds of the total U.S. consumption of residual fuel oil. Residual fuel oil supplies about a third of our industrial fuel needs, about 15 percent of all electric utility fuel needs and it heats the bulk of all apartment and public buildings along the east coast. In short, it is a vital commodity, particularly for the New England States and for New York.

Yet, Mr. President, under the arbitrary and clearly inadequate quota allocation for the year ending March 31, 1963, residual fuel oil suppliers report that supplies are nearly exhausted and that unless emergency help is provided no more residual fuel oil will be available until the new allocations are effective April 1. This presents a particularly serious problem because the exceptionally cold winter has required greater consumption than usual of oil stocks used for heating and to generate electricity.

Action is necessary to provide necessary additional supplies for this year and to insure that the same kind of shortage does not keep on occurring year after year, to the serious detriment of the east coast suppliers and all their consumers. It is clearly time for the Department of

the Interior to take a realistic stand on the matter.

In my judgment, there is no fair or legitimate reason why the millions of consumers in New York State and New England should be compelled to pay higher prices for such an important commodity as fuel oil merely at the whim of a few coal interests. Last year, as a result of similar shortages, the customers of the Long Island Lighting Co. had their bills upped because of oil shortages at this time of year. American shippers have had to pay more for the fuel oil they need than foreign vessels docked right beside them, whose bonded oil is not subject to import duties. The entire import quota system on residual oil is exactly the type of special interest protection that hurts millions of consumers and has the overall effect of hampering the industrial growth that is so important to this Nation.

Mr. President, I favor complete abolition of residual oil quotas over the next few years and the establishment of a genuinely competitive market for residual oil and other fuels on the east coast. Should this not be feasible at the moment, what is urgently required, is a meaningful relaxation of the present unnecessarily restrictive quota system. My colleague [Mr. JAVITS] and I have directed an urgent request to the President to review the entire program and to take a fair and equitable consideration of the needs of the consumers of this important product. The report submitted in the form of a memorandum for the President by the Office of Emergency Planning on February 13 makes it clear that present arrangements do not serve the genuine national interest. Residual fuel oil comes primarily from Venezuela, which is an integral member of the hemispheric defense system on which we depend. It is absurd to conduct a vast foreign-aid program under the Alliance for Progress for Venezuela and at the same time to deny to the Venezuelans the right to sell products we badly need in the United States.

Furthermore, it is wholly inconsistent to speak of tax reform, closing tax loopholes, and providing additional funds for consumer spending on the one hand while perpetuating a system of fuel regulations that hurts consumers, hampers industrial growth and benefits only a tiny minority of special interests. It is even more inconsistent to talk about the need for a faster rate of economic growth while maintaining a fuel policy that penalizes new factories or installations and makes it harder for the competitive suppliers of these facilities to provide fuel at a reasonable price.

Mr. President, it is important to take a broad view of this problem. National economic considerations and international policies are involved. The existing policy on residual fuel oil imports, as the Office of Emergency Planning has made very clear, no longer meets the economic needs of the great majority of those concerned. I sincerely hope the President will review this situation promptly and take action to encourage a meaningful relaxation of residual fuel imports, a relaxation which can redound

to the benefit of millions of consumers and will help promote the economic growth we all desire.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include, following my remarks, the text of a telegram sent by Senator JAVITS and myself to the President yesterday.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This wire concerns the imminent decision on residual fuel oil import quotas for the year beginning April 1, 1963.

We believe that the report to you, released on February 13, 1963, by the Office of Emergency Planning, is convincing evidence of the unnecessary hardships caused by the quota system to the consumers of fuel oil in the United States—especially on the east coast. The report is also significant in that it establishes the irrelevance of the argument that residual fuel oil quotas are necessary for national security. Such considerations are clearly and properly put on a hemisphere-wide basis, and the issue of coal reserves and coal transportation facilities for domestic emergency purposes is finally put to rest. Therefore, we favor elimination of the residual fuel oil import quota system.

However, should the optimum course of eliminating the system not be possible at this time, we urge the following steps:

(1) "Meaningful" relaxation of the quota for next year.

(2) Revision of the quota allocation system so that independent distributors of fuel oil and consumers may freely deal in this product within whatever overall national quota may be established.

(3) At the minimum, institution of a system whereby additions to the overall national quota, urgently required by the installation of new facilities to service a growing population and expanding industry, may be distributed in a competitive manner; that is, by permitting new fuel oil consumers freedom of choice among suppliers by allocating to such installations or their fuel oil suppliers sufficient fuel oil to meet their specific needs.

It is our view that the third suggestion would serve to prevent perpetuation of a noncompetitive system and could serve as an experiment in changing the administration of the entire quota system in line with the consumers' interest in competition among suppliers.

We urgently request immediate action to bring about increased and competitively supplied amount of residual fuel oil to meet vital consumer needs.

JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate.
KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senate.

TOOLS FOR FREEDOM

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, a very impressive and energetic organization has been brought to my attention known as the Tools for Freedom. This private, nonprofit organization, which has been in operation for 2 years, was initiated by American businessmen concentrated mostly in the New York and New England areas. Under the very able and competent leadership of its executive director, Robert Murrow, it is now expanding into a nationwide program.

Mr. President, the purpose of Tools for Freedom is to assist schools in the emerging countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America by providing them with desperately needed training tools—tools

which have become obsolete in American industry, having been replaced through technological improvements and automation. To date, various U.S. manufacturers have donated over 200 tons of equipment in response to the numerous requests submitted by foreign schools in 14 underdeveloped countries of the free world. Quite clearly, by their efforts, Tools for Freedom hopes to help these countries improve, increase, and expand their own industrial and agricultural productivity. In turn, this program offers advantages to U.S. manufacturers in the form of tax benefits in addition to providing overseas showcases for their products which in some instances may stimulate overseas contracts.

Mr. President, by donating the material upon which the emerging countries can build their economy, U.S. business is in fact running its own private and effective foreign aid effort. In the long run, by increasing the economic growth and stability of these countries, U.S. business can help combat the tide of communism.

FUTILE AND FOOLISH CIVIL DEFENSE PROGRAM SHOULD BE ENDED

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, civil defense bureaucrats including those heading up the civil defense spending program in the Department of Defense continue in their efforts to dupe the American public into believing that we have an effective civil defense program.

In the midst of the Cuban crisis last October the planners doubled the number of potential shelter spaces, so-called, overnight. By simply using a mimeograph machine they lowered the suitable safety factor from 100 to 40—meaning one would supposedly be 40 times safer inside than out. Of course, it is highly problematical whether in a nuclear attack lives would be saved even if a person were 100 times safer in one of these spaces than out of it.

At any rate, signs were hurriedly put up indicating shelter areas—most of them after the crisis subsided. I suppose that the main purpose of these shelter signs was to soothe the anxiety of any worried citizen, as they certainly would serve no other worthwhile purpose.

For instance, a member of my staff reported to me that his apartment became a fallout shelter overnight. When he called local civil defense headquarters for information as to the nearest shelter for him and his family, he was told he was living in it. Signs were put up outside his door denoting his floor as a fallout shelter—one flight above ground level. It is as though the planners believe that merely by scattering shelter signs around public buildings, office buildings, and apartment houses they will somehow convince Americans they are safe in event of nuclear attack.

Although the Congress appropriated \$208 million in 1961 and an additional \$38 million in 1962 for marking and provisioning fallout shelters, when the crisis came most of them could not be found,

were not marked, or were unusable. Only a handful were provisioned. Rations and medical kits on which millions of dollars had been spent were still stocked in Federal warehouses and arsenals. Since then some of these so-called shelters have been provisioned with distilled water, which will eventually deteriorate, and a commodity known as fallout shelter biscuits. For the latter, incidentally, bakeries throughout the Nation have received millions of dollars of taxpayers' money. I suppose that we can find some little consolation for this expenditure in the fact that in some small way our economy—or at least that of our bakers—was stimulated. That is the only good that could possibly result from this boondoggle.

Mr. President, in the *Dayton Daily News*, one of Ohio's great newspapers, there appeared on March 3, 1963, a column entitled "Shelterless Welcome To Join Our Cracker-Chewing Gang," by Jim Fain, the outstanding editor of that fine newspaper. It is an excellent example of perceptive journalistic reporting at its best. There is nothing so devastating to pomposity and the ridiculous as laughter.

Through the medium of serious humor Mr. Fain in a few words reveals the ludicrousness of the civil defense program. Through such responsible journalism those in charge of our civil defense effort will soon learn the truth of Lincoln's remark "you can fool all the people some of the time, and some of the people all the time, but you cannot fool all the people all of the time." I commend this column to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the *RECORD* as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

SHELTERLESS WELCOME TO JOIN OUR
CRACKER-CHEWING GANG

The thing you need most in newspaper business we finally got: Our very own personally monogrammed bomb shelter.

There are big yellow signs plastered all over us here at Fourth and Ludlow to convince the scoffers. Civil defense regards us as a port in storm, whatever the rest of you think. We are haven, sanctuary, Gibraltar (no cracks about last apes, please). We are nuclear fallout proof, however much radiation sickness we may contract from those 100-megaton letters to the editor you launch our way.

This is not a singular honor. There are 25 other public shelters hereabouts. The new public library is probably the safest—and there you have cultural riches during the 2 weeks you are supposed to keep your head down.

Hotels and motels are considered ideal because of the libations on deck there. We boast no saloon here at the *Daily News*, but the civil defense people have us awash with water.

In our basement right now there is water enough to keep 1,140 ordinary people afloat for 2 weeks. Walter Lippmann only knows how long that much water will last a newspaper crowd. As a general thing, we do not approve of adulterating whisky.

Anyway, we have 945 gallons of water downstairs in case you feel thirsty after the bomb drops. Furthermore, we have no pistols to keep you out. You're welcome to come in and heist a glass with us.

We also have some wheat flower biscuits that look like graham crackers and taste (it says here; this I have not market researched; we all have our principles) like animal crackers. Do they still make animal crackers?

The charm of these crackers, according to the CD again, is that they don't make you thirsty, so the water goes further. It probably also is true that they don't make you hungry, so the crackers go further.

Anyway, we have enough for 340 people for 2 weeks. I am not sure how many crackers that is, probably four or five dozen.

If you are big for crackers, relax. More are en route. We expect soon to be able to feed a multitude of 1,140 as many crackers as they can swing.

It also pleases us editorial types here on the third floor of the building (face it: The editorial syndrome by definition reflects paranoid certitude that it is the center of the universe) that the shelter signs point in our direction.

Civil defense says this is because the middle floors of a building are safest. We know better. Neither living nor dying by the sword, we can blithely absorb sticks, stones, and megatons in profusion. It's that ever-loving overkill pen we sweat out. Just keep us out of the sharp-tongued, linguistic briar patch, Brer Fox. Then bombs a-gley.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, over \$1 billion has already been wasted on civil defense. In the budget for 1964, \$300 million is requested of which over \$200 million is for shelter purposes. It is projected that over \$543 million will be requested for shelter protection alone in each of the ensuing 4 fiscal years. As of yet, administration officials have failed to enunciate a clear, firm policy as to what our goals are insofar as civil defense is concerned. Last year we were asked for \$700 million, this year \$300 million. Where will it end?

Those favoring a massive fallout shelter building program have estimated that it will cost anywhere from \$20 to \$200 billion. Even then there is no guarantee that it will be effective. With extensive advances being made in rockets and nuclear technology, such a fallout shelter program would probably be obsolete before being completed. Unless we are prepared to embark on such a vast gamble and spend perhaps \$200 billion of the taxpayer's money, we should carefully consider the wisdom of piecemeal appropriations amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars with no really effective purpose.

Mr. President, I desire at all times to support the administration when I can in good conscience do so. I am proud of the record being made by President Kennedy. I am proud of his firm, determined, resolute and unyielding policy toward Khrushchev and Castro's Cuba, which compelled Khrushchev to turn tail, withdraw his missiles and airplanes, and is now compelling him to withdraw his troops. However, I urge administration leaders to review present civil defense policy so that we in the Congress may be aware of the ultimate cost and of what will actually be accomplished. Until that is done, I for one, do not intend to vote for further expenditures of hundreds of millions of taxpayers' dollars for foolish and useless civil defense programs.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I am glad to yield to my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired. The senior Senator from Ohio may be recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional minute so that I may yield to my colleague.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the Senator from Ohio may proceed for 1 additional minute. The Senator yields to his colleague.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I express my concurrence with what my colleague has said about the plan for expending Federal money in the amounts mentioned for the building of shelters under civil defense. I think that the positions my colleague has taken in the past several years have been sound. No plan has been evolved.

I recall that as early as 1950 there was talk about spending \$50 billion. What this will eventually lead to no one can foretell.

Mr. President, I subscribe to the views my colleague has expressed.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I thank my colleague.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE CLYDE
DOYLE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, by now the House has heard the tragic news about our colleague, the late CLYDE DOYLE, of California, who passed away only a few hours ago. All of us mourn his passing.

I had the pleasure of calling the late Representative DOYLE my friend. For nearly 20 years he served his district, his State, and his country in the Congress of the United States. He was a dedicated public servant. He paid unswerving devotion to his country and to his country's needs.

The Nation has lost a valued public servant, and we have lost a very dear friend.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I should like to join in expressing sincere sorrow over the passing of CLYDE DOYLE. He was a fine man and a most conscientious Member of the other body. Only a week or two ago I saw CLYDE and thought he looked not up to par, so I said, "CLYDE, you ought to slow down a little bit." He said, "Well, that is a hard thing to do." That was typical of him.

He was one of the hardest working Members of the other body, sincerely dedicated to the interests of our country. His loss will be deeply felt in many areas. We will miss him here in the Congress and throughout the Nation. I extend to his family my sincere sympathy.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my friend from New York.

Mr. ENGLE rose.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I now yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I deeply regret the death of my old and very dear friend, CLYDE DOYLE, who passed away very tragically and unexpectedly today.

He was elected to Congress by the 23d District of California nine times.

He was a very fine lawyer, a man with the strongest sense of civic responsibility, a dedicated public servant.

He was blessed, above all else, with a great love for people, and he had a very special quality of enthusiasm which never faded with the passing of the years.

I wish to quote what our great and beloved former Speaker of the House of Representatives, Sam Rayburn, said about CLYDE DOYLE:

CLYDE DOYLE is one of the most effective men in his committees and also on the floor of the House of Representatives.

He is able, he is honest, and he has the facility for expressing himself in such a way as to impress all the Members of the House with his knowledge of the subject in hand. I think CLYDE is one of the very best men we have in the House of Representatives.

We have shown our confidence in him in many ways.

Of course, Mr. President, that was true. The people of his district showed their confidence in him in many ways.

He received both the nomination of his own party and that of the Republican Party in 1952 and 1958. In the last election in which a Member of the Congress was permitted to cross-file on both tickets, he was the only Member of the House in southern California who had the distinction of being nominated by both parties. This was an unusual and a unique tribute.

His outstanding community leadership over a period of many years was recognized by his own community. In 1936 he received unanimously the award of the Meritorious Citizenship Plaque by a vote of all the service clubs in Long Beach, Calif., as the most valuable and useful adult citizen in Long Beach.

CLYDE DOYLE will be deeply missed by all of us who knew him so well. His services in the Congress of the United States were extremely valuable. CLYDE DOYLE believed there was no office in the land that equaled service in the Congress of the United States. He was proud of that service. He was proud of the great district which he represented.

His death is a loss not only to the State of California, but to the Congress of the United States and the American people.

I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I join my colleague in a word of tribute to our late colleague, Representative DOYLE, of California. I came to know him well through our duties relating to the subject of the armed services and respected him and appreciated the great character he was.

One of the things that impressed me was his untiring interest in the youth of the Nation. He was always trying to get the country to take a step forward and open up opportunities and correc-

tive measures for our young people. I join my colleague in expressing our sorrow at the news of his passing.

RED SKELTON—GREAT AMERICAN ENTERTAINER—RECEIVES NATIONAL BROTHERHOOD AWARD

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on Monday night in San Diego, the National Conference of Christians and Jews conferred its highest honor—the National Brotherhood Award—on a distinguished American, Red Skelton.

Millions of us, of course, know Red Skelton as one of the world's superb entertainers. Perhaps not all of us know of his great humanitarianism.

As the conference's citation pointed out, Red Skelton has made a "distinguished contribution to the advancement of good human relations among all people."

Red Skelton's infectious humor has done more than bring happiness to millions of his fellow Americans. He has pointed out our foibles, but always affectionately and gently, in the conviction that we are all brothers and sisters under the American flag—and could laugh at and with each other because we are free and equal, one as good as the next, regardless of origin, station, belief, or color.

Because of his love for his fellow American, he has always been willing to entertain, whether an audience was great or small.

Before entering the service in the Second World War he gave some 3,500 shows before GI audiences. As a member of the Armed Forces, he made countless appearances before audiences ranging from 1 to 20,000.

The number of times he has helped his fellow man—whether with his time, influence, or money—will never be accurately recorded. Red Skelton, moreover, would not want them recorded.

It will come as no surprise that Red Skelton is a deeply religious man.

His credo, in his own words, is:

I believe we were all put here for a purpose—and I was put here to make people laugh. If it's good enough for the Man upstairs, it's good enough for me.

Red Skelton, indeed, is a true believer in the aims and purposes of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, which, in a few words, are: "The brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God."

I feel, and I am sure my colleagues and Americans everywhere will agree, that our beloved comedian with the shock of red hair and rubber face is a most fitting recipient of the National Brotherhood Award.

FLOOD CONTROL SYSTEM SAVED \$205 MILLION

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, toward January, the heavens suddenly began to open in the Sacramento Valley in my State of California. The downpour continued and gathered strength. A flood of vast proportions was in the making, driven by a gale. The runoff of water swept trees and cabins before it,

as it hurtled toward the floor of the valley.

Had it not been for the effective and efficient system of dams, levees, and by-passes in the Sacramento Valley, flood damage would have wreaked a grievous toll.

The Army Corps of Engineers estimated that \$205 million of destruction would have accompanied the torrent of rain except for the farflung, manmade flood control system in which the Federal Government played a crucially vital part. For the third time in the last 10 years, the giant Folsom Dam saved the Sacramento area from calamity. I salute the Federal Government, the Congress, and the Engineers, for the protection of life and property in my State, and for the splendid role which the National Government played. All this is discussed in an excellent article by Mr. Tom Arden appearing in the Sacramento Bee, Sunday, March 10, 1963.

I ask consent that the article appear in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FLOOD CONTROL SYSTEM SAVED \$205 MILLION

(By Tom Arden)

The Army Corps of Engineers figures dams, levees, and by-passes in the Sacramento Valley combined to prevent \$205 million in damages during the violent storms of a few weeks ago.

Without this coordinated system of controls, the Sacramento River, according to a survey just completed, would have wrought damages totaling \$160 million and \$45 million in havoc would have been caused along the American River.

In the San Joaquin Valley, the Sacramento district office of the Army Engineers reports about \$15 million in damages would have resulted from floods if dams had not been built to check riverflows.

Particularly dramatic, says Col. Herbert N. Turner, Chief of the Army Engineers Sacramento district, was the effectiveness of Folsom Dam and the north levee system from Carmichael Bluffs to the new State fair site in preventing the American River from overflowing to cause the type of flooding which occurred in 1950, before the dam and levee were constructed.

The stage was set for the flood control system to play its role in the Sacramento Valley when rain began pelting down January 29. First came 4 to 6 inches well spread over the watershed areas of the Feather, Yuba, and American Rivers.

Another 24 hours and the downpour was increased by another 6 to 8 inches with the prospect of more to come.

EFFECT OF RUNOFF

"As the storm moved in from the southwest, driven by gale wind against the frozen Sierra," reads a special report just completed by Clyde J. Gorman, chief of the technical liaison branch of the Army Engineers Sacramento district, "runoff climbed and brought with it trees, cabins, trailers, and butane tanks in the 2-mile drop to the valley floor.

"Mountain highways and railroads were washed out, communications knocked out.

"The Yuba broke all records with a flow of 150,000 cubic feet per second, 2,000 over the peak which contributed to the well remembered Yuba City disaster of 1955.

"The Feather peaked at 186,000 as against 203,000 in 1955, which shows the storm pattern tapering off to the north.

"But on the American the 1955 flow of 219,000 was topped by a flow of 240,000, second only to an estimated flow of 280,000 in the legendary flood of 1862."

SAFE PASSAGE

"Had there been no flood control system the lower Sacramento Valley would have been a shallow sea and the delta, plagued by high tides and heavy inflow, would have looked like an extension of Suisun Bay.

"Instead, channel capacities of the levee and bypass system were utilized to pass the flood safely through the valley. This is not to say there were no anxious moments. High velocity flows cut into the levee slopes below Nicolaus on the Feather, and upstream at Yuba City residents mindful of 1955 began to evacuate. But the levees, as they are supposed to do, contained the floods, provided people a place to stand and fight if need be, and to patrol the rivers.

"With only moderate flows above the latitude of Chico, the Sacramento River had no problems until its confluence with the combined Feather, Yuba, and Sutter bypass flows. It was here that Fremont weir picked up an overflow of 193,000 cubic feet per second and sent it down the Yolo bypass which can accommodate 377,000 cubic feet per second at this point."

SIMPLE ARITHMETIC

"Below this point the Sacramento main stem continued to carry 94,000 cubic feet per second. The channel capacity of the river at Sacramento is 110,000. Add 193,000 to 94,000 and you get 287,000.

"The difference between 287,000 and 110,000 river capacity leaves small speculation as to where the excess inflow of 177,000 from the north would have gone.

"Now consider the simultaneous threat from the east on the American. Add an inflow of 240,000 to a river that could stand only 17,000 more cubic feet per second at Sacramento.

"But Folsom Dam caught and restrained the American. The water began creeping up behind the spillway gates and it was time to use the leveed channel capacity below Folsom. This channel can take 115,000 cubic feet per second, so releases from Folsom were stepped up 10,000 per hour until they reached 110,000."

"ROOM FOR BOTH

"It will be remembered that the Sacramento main stem at its confluence with the American could now take only 17,000 more second feet. So the Sacramento weir was opened and 94,000 cubic feet per second was turned into Yolo bypass before the American could hit town.

"This left plenty of room for both rivers with 16,000 cubic feet per second to spare. The small remaining space behind Folsom left some room to maneuver had the storm continued.

"It was a smooth and efficient operation which did not escape carping from those who choose to live between the levees and those who do not understand.

"But it saved the town and the croplands between here and the bay."

ANSWER TO CRITICS

Some complaints were made that water was released too fast from behind Folsom Dam, which has a storage capacity of 1 million acre-feet.

But Federal officials pointed out the level of Folsom Lake jumped from 443,500 acre-feet to 835,000 acre-feet in a little more than 2 days.

Despite the need to maintain space for possible more heavy inflows, it was emphasized, the releases into the American downstream from the dam were less than the project was designed for.

FEDERAL-STATE WATER RIGHTS— MUST THERE BE CONFLICT?— SPEECH BY SENATOR MOSS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, few areas in Federal-State relations have offered more resistance to settlement than the complex and controversial area of Federal-State water rights. The problem is national in scope, but it is especially troublesome in the semiarid regions of the West where every drop of water is precious, and where Federal ownership of millions of acres of land raises jurisdictional problems over the development, appropriation, and use of the water there.

Earlier this week in Los Angeles, Senator FRANK E. MOSS, of Utah, gave a comprehensive and challenging summary of the water rights question. The occasion was a water rights symposium at the annual midwinter conference of the National District Attorneys' Association, of which Senator Moss was formerly national president. I commend his excellent speech entitled "Federal-State Water Rights—Must There Be Conflict?" to all who are interested in water and the right to use it.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL-STATE WATER RIGHTS—MUST THERE BE CONFLICT?

(Speech by Senator FRANK E. MOSS, of Utah, before annual Midwinter Conference of the National District Attorneys Association Los Angeles, Calif., March 11, 1963)

It is indeed an honor and a privilege to be with you here today to participate in this symposium on Federal-State water rights problems. Having been born and raised in the arid State of Utah, the importance of water is deeply ingrained in my consciousness. From the vantage point of membership on the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and as a member of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources during the period of its existence from 1959 to 1961, I have had considerable exposure to the problems of Federal-State conflict over water rights. Because of the importance of the problem, I believe there is no other problem area facing the Congress the outcome of which could have such a profound effect on the future of the Western States.

The issue was highlighted by the Select Committee on National Water Resources in its report to the Senate in January 1961. After a recitation of the basis for conflict, that committee called for broad objective inquiry into the problem, and for statesmanship of the highest caliber on the part of both the Congress and the States in the solution of the Federal-State water rights problem. The committee concluded its remarks on this subject with the words:

"A solution must be worked out, and worked out promptly, for the preservation of the historic pattern under which our people have grown great."

I was indeed pleased to hear from my old friend, Hal Kennedy, about the work he is doing, through his statewide Federal-State Water Rights Committee of the Feather River Project Association, to develop public understanding of the problems involved. For among the other findings of the select committee it was pointed out that the first

and most important step toward getting anything done in the water field is the development of increased public awareness and understanding of the problems, of their effects on the Nation's economy, and the possible ways of solving them. I believe that a continuation of efforts along the lines that Hal has started may lay the groundwork for eventual success in our endeavor to work out an acceptable solution to these problems. I agree with him that the task ahead is not an easy one, and that it may be a year or more before the climate is favorable for seeking congressional action on legislation which will make a start on clarification of the problem.

SOURCE OF CONFLICT

Although widespread interest in the Federal-State water rights conflict has developed only in the last decade or so, the sources of conflict between Federal and State sovereignty have been building up over more than a century. These conflicts have been the subject of concern to water users and their lawyers for many decades, but it took a combination of circumstances, culminating in the Fallbrook case and the Supreme Court decision in the Pelton case, and other recent developments, to bring the conflict out in the open. A few brief comments as to the two sides of the controversy will be helpful in describing what we should try to do.

In support of the position held generally by the States, several Federal statutes enacted in the latter half of the 19th century, in connection with the disposition of portions of the public lands, led to the supposition that the United States had permanently transferred control over water rights to the States. I refer particularly to section 9 of the act of July 26, 1866, where the Congress specifically provided for upholding existing water rights, and that all patents to the public lands were to be subject to vested water rights; to section 17 of the act of July 9, 1870, which included a similar protection of vested water rights; and to the Desert Land Act of March 3, 1877, which provided that water rights were to depend on prior appropriation, and that surplus waters of the public lands were to be free for appropriation and use by the public, subject to existing rights.

Furthermore, in legislation admitting certain Western States to the Union, Congress accepted the State constitutions, which included provisions recognizing and confirming existing water rights, setting up procedures for acquiring water rights under State law, and in some instances specifically declaring State ownership or control of waters arising or flowing within the States concerned.

Several later Federal enactments also indicated that Congress was thinking in terms of State control of water rights. For example, section 8 of the Federal Reclamation Act of 1902 includes express provision that Federal activity in the field of reclamation was not to interfere with State laws relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water used in irrigation, or any vested right acquired thereunder, and the Secretary of the Interior was directed to proceed in conformity with State laws in carrying out the provisions of the Reclamation Act, thus implying, according to some students of the problem, a recognition of State sovereignty over the use of water for irrigation in the Western States.

Later, section 27 of the Federal Power Act, enacted by the Congress in 1920, states that that act was not to be construed as affecting or intending to affect or in any way to interfere with the laws of the respective States relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water used in irrigation or for municipal or other uses, or any vested right acquired therein. Fur-

thermore, the law required the applicant for license to furnish satisfactory evidence that he had complied with the requirements of the State or States within which the proposed project was to be located.

Another factor leading to more active conflict between Federal and State laws was the great expansion of Federal programs in the field of water resources in 1936, brought about by the congressional declaration of policy on flood control, in which that function was stated to be a proper activity of the Federal Government because of the adverse effects of floods on commerce between the States and on the national welfare.

Potential conflicts between Federal flood control activity in the Western States and State laws having become very apparent and very widespread in the first few years of operation under the 1936 Flood Control Act, Congress, in the 1944 Flood Control Act, declared its policy to recognize the interests and rights of the States in determining the development of the watersheds within their borders. Congress also provided, in section 1(b) of the act, that the use of works authorized for navigation shall be only such use as does not conflict with any beneficial consumptive use of water in the 17 Western States. These provisions have been reiterated in each successive Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Authorization Act since that date, thus seeming to indicate a continuing willingness on the part of the Congress to relinquish the sovereignty of the United States over navigable waters in specific cases. The constitutional issue has not been finally settled in connection with these projects, however, because it is a well documented fact that one Congress cannot bind future congresses; thus, the waiver of navigation rights could be repealed at some future date.

A final, and the most recent Federal statute that I am going to mention in this context is the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of August 4, 1954. Section 4 of this act establishes, as one of the prerequisites for Federal assistance in watershed development, the requirement that local organizations or landowners acquire such water rights, pursuant to State law, as may be needed in the installation and operation of the works of improvement.

From the viewpoint of the laws which Congress has enacted, therefore, I think it could be said that there need be no conflict between Federal and State water rights. Congress has expressed itself in, and the President has signified concurrence by affixing his signature to, many statutes which to me at least make this abundantly clear.

In support of the Federal side of the controversy, however, it can be stated that none of the legislative enactments I have just mentioned made any effort to change Federal responsibilities in the field of commerce, nor was any reference made to their effect on Federal responsibilities in the fields of national defense and general welfare, or on the treaty-making powers of the President. To the contrary, the Congress on several occasions, going back to the latter years of the 19th century, has reaffirmed by statute the Federal sovereignty with respect to navigation.

The primary support for the Federal side appears to rest on certain Supreme Court decisions upholding Federal sovereignty against claimants of water rights under State laws. There seems to be agreement that among the most important of these are *United States v. Rio Grande Dam and Irrigation Co.*, decided in 1899, and *Winters v. United States*, decided in 1908, both of which made it clear that the sovereignty of the United States over waters needed under the commerce and the treaty-making clauses of the Constitution had not been broadly relinquished by any statutory enactments.

Several other court decisions and statutory enactments are worthy of mention in this necessarily brief discussion of the emerging conflicts between Federal and State sovereignty.

In one of these, *United States v. Appalachian Power Co.*, sometimes called the *New River* case, decided by the Supreme Court in 1940, the broad definition of navigable waters stated by Congress in section 3 of the Federal Power Act was broadened further by the Court's dictum that the tributaries of navigable streams also came under the commerce power. This had the effect of broadening greatly the navigation servitude.

Another court decision that has caused serious concern among western lawyers is a 1946 decision by the Supreme Court, the case of *First Iowa Electric Cooperative v. Federal Power Commission*, which made it clear that State laws governing the use or control of water of navigable streams were not applicable when they trespassed in a field also covered by Federal law.

A third decision I want to mention in this context is the one which has had the greatest influence in building up the Western States' concern over potential conflicts between Federal and State laws over water rights. I refer, of course, to *Federal Power Commission v. Oregon*, usually referred to as the *Pelton* case. In deciding this in 1955, the U.S. Supreme Court affirmed the supremacy of Federal jurisdiction over unappropriated, nonnavigable waters arising from or flowing over reserved lands. Soon after the *Pelton* case was decided, the fears of western water users were heightened by certain pleadings made by the Department of Justice in various lawsuits pending in the West over the water of certain streams, particularly the *Blue River* case in Colorado, and the *Hawthorne* case in Nevada. Pleadings by the Government in these cases, asserting paramount rights to water under the so-called reservation doctrine of the *Pelton* decision, led many westerners to fear that the United States proposed to take away, without compensation, existing water rights acquired under State law. This has been denied by the Department of Justice, although questions remain as to which water rights have been acquired under State law in such manner that there is no future challenge possible as to the existence of a valid property right.

Even before the *Pelton* case was decided, the actions of the Federal Government in the suit seeking adjudication of the waters of the Santa Marguerita River threw doubt on water rights obtained by appropriation under California law when the Federal Government was in a position to claim riparian rights. So much has been said about this suit, that I believe it inappropriate for me to add anything further, particularly since the suit is still pending in the U.S. District Court for Southern California. This case, *United States v. Fallbrook Irrigation District*, led to the first efforts to seek a legislative solution to the widening conflict.

LEGISLATIVE ACTION TO DATE

In the last decade, about 50 bills have been introduced in the House and Senate in an attempt to solve the Federal-States water rights controversy by legislation. It would take too much time, and, I am sure, would be repetitious of much that is being covered by other participants in this symposium, for me to list them all at this time. I think it is helpful, however, to point out the four principal types of bills which have been introduced. There have been, and are, a number of variations, but in general, the bills have all fallen within one of these general types.

The first type of bill, exemplified by S. 863 in the 84th and 85th Congress, the Barrett bill, would in essence relinquish Federal control over water in the West to the States.

All waters, whether navigable or not, would be free for appropriation and would be subject to State control for all beneficial uses. The Federal Government would be required to proceed in conformity with State laws in the appropriation and use of water. The Federal Power Commission could only license hydroelectric power projects if previous approval of the State with respect to the use of the water had been obtained. It has been argued that the provisions of the bill are so broad that, if enacted, the Federal Government could engage in water resources development in the Western States only with the consent of the States involved.

A second type of bill is somewhat less drastic in its effect on Federal operations, but it does embody a comprehensive provision recognizing State control over water resources, including water on public lands of the United States. These bills are exemplified by S. 1416 of the 86th Congress, in the sponsorship of which I was joined by a number of other Senators. They would require the Federal Government and its licensees to appropriate and use water in compliance with State laws, and would prevent Federal acquisition of or interference with water rights except upon the payment of just compensation, unless the rights were acquired by purchase, exchange, gift, condemnation, or where water is available for acquisition upon proper application to a State for a right to water necessary for the conduct of an authorized Federal program.

A third group of bills covers a lot less ground than the others, being limited in effect to repealing the reservation doctrine of the *Pelton* decision. These bills, exemplified by S. 851 of the 86th Congress, would provide that the withdrawal or reservation of public lands shall not affect any right to use of water acquired pursuant to State law, either before or after the establishment of such withdrawal or reservation, nor the right of any State to exercise jurisdiction over water rights conferred by the act admitting such State into the Union, or the State's constitution.

A fourth general type of bill is exemplified by S. 2636 of the 87th Congress introduced by Senator KUCHEL in September of 1961. This bill goes slightly beyond the third group of bills to provide that the use of water for navigation in the United States west of the 98th meridian would be subservient to any present and future beneficial consumptive uses, that all rights to the consumptive use of water claimed by the United States under the laws of any State shall be initiated and perfected in accordance with the procedure established by the laws of that State, and that any waters taken by the United States other than by agreement with the owner shall be taken by proceedings in eminent domain. So far no hearings have been held nor have views of any of the Federal agencies been obtained on the bill.

So far in this Congress, only one bill has been introduced, S. 101, by the junior Senator from Colorado. This bill incorporates the provisions of the "reservation" bill, prohibits taking of water under Federal authorization without just compensation for prior water rights, and requires the beneficiaries of any Federal project, license, loan, or grant to secure water rights under State law.

Senator Kuchel and I have discussed the possibility of introducing a water rights bill in this session, but are waiting for, among other things, the outcome of this conference so that any constructive suggestions that are advanced here can be considered.

In spite of my agreement with the philosophy behind most of these bills, I must confess that a realistic appraisal of the current situation leads me to the conclusion that there is little or no opportunity for any of these bills to become law at this time. The hearings records of the Congress are full of

objections which have been raised by the agencies of the United States to the provisions contained in one or another of the bills. On only one occasion has there been indication that a certain type of legislation would be acceptable to the administration. This was reflected in the compromise bill worked out in 1958 and submitted to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee as a proposed repealer of the Pelton decision. However, this bill in the exact form agreed to by the executive branch of the Government, was never introduced. The modified bill that was introduced, the third group of bills that I mentioned earlier, was objected to by the Department of Justice because of the provision dealing with the right of a State to exercise jurisdiction over water rights conferred by the act admitting such State into the Union or such State's constitution. Last December a spokesman for the Department of Justice indicated that he believed the former administration bill went too far, too soon, in that it would disclaim federally reserved rights without there first being a determination of what is being disclaimed or its effect on present or future development programs.

ALTERNATIVES FOR FUTURE ACTION

In the solution of any problem, it is always worthwhile to examine the alternatives. What can we do now? The path of least resistance, of course, is to continue along the path that has been followed for the last few years—that is, to let the situation rock along the way it is, with water rights and interrelationships of Federal and State activities being decided on a case-by-case basis, while the Federal and State positions become even more entrenched. This, it seems to me, would serve to further entrench the Federal point of view, as the Court decisions more and more seem to favor the Federal position. I would question, however, whether we in the West can continue and grow in this fashion, unless we are willing to accept a continuously expanding and growing Federal role in the field of water, and a gradual deterioration of the position of the States and those dependent on water rights acquired under State law.

A second alternative is to support a detailed study in an objective manner of the issues. Such a course of action was recommended by President Eisenhower's Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy in December of 1955, which called for a study to be made by the Federal Government in collaboration with State and local entities to determine the relationships between property rights to water and the social and economic development of the Nation and the local areas, and of the principles and criteria which should be incorporated into Federal, State, and local laws regarding rights to the appropriation and use of water that would assure its best and most effective use, while at the same time encouraging maximum participation by all parties concerned. No action was taken on this recommendation for the reason, I am told, that the late Senator Barrett felt that all the answers were already known, and that no study was needed.

A third alternative is to ignore the opposition of the Department of Justice and press and to enact legislation in this session of the Congress on the basis of our present knowledge. As I said before, I don't believe there is much likelihood that this course of action can be successful unless the issues could be presented with a lot more light and a lot less heat than has been the case heretofore.

This leads me to the fourth alternative, which is to carefully muster all the facts that we can, develop a bill that is supported by those facts, develop public support for that bill, and then press for its enactment. This, I believe, is the most practical of the

alternatives I have suggested. The question then is what facts can be mustered that will convince Congress and the President, over the likely objections of some of the executive branch agencies, of the need for legislation now, and how shall we proceed.

First, I think we will have to obtain all the facts we can about specific instances where Federal action has resulted in the taking of water that was being used by others. I must confess that a rather detailed perusal of many articles on the subject of Federal-State conflict in water rights has failed to turn up many cases where actual damages can be shown. The few cases I have uncovered where actual damages due to loss of water seems to be demonstrated appear to be based on disputes over water rights acquired by the Federal Government by purchase or in other manner under State law. For example, *Hudspeth County Conservation and Reclamation District No. 1 v. Robbins* (213 F. 2d 425) and *Elephant Butte Irrigation District v. Gatlin* (61 N.M. 58). While it is regrettable that both of these were dismissed because the United States could not be made a party to the suit, I am not at all sure of how those cases would have been decided if the dispute could have been tried on its merits. All too often, the cases cited most frequently are based on the loss of the potential development of a water right that has never been actually put to use. I think there is a real need for a detailed, objective study of all the cases that have come up where conflict between Federal and State laws over water rights is alleged, so that the issue can be presented to the Congress in a more easily understood way than it has been in the past.

Many of the State or local projects that are alleged to have been delayed by the Federal-State conflict have never reached the point of authorization by the State. It will be necessary for the sponsors of such projects alleged to be delayed by the Federal-State water rights conflict to come forward with plans, facts, and figures to support the claims that are made that projects are delayed.

Claims are made that the conflict is jeopardizing the entire California State water plan—that bond counsel may insist on a higher interest rate than otherwise if the water rights are clouded by potential Federal claims. My recollection is that the election at which the bond issue was validated in 1960 was a closely contested one. Care must be taken that the opponents of the project are not allowed to stir up the water rights issue so as to continue their opposition to the project in an undercover way. I do not think there is any evident reason why, on the basis of cases that have been decided, there should be any question raised as to the water rights for the California water project that could lead to a higher interest rate on the bonds. Admittedly, some of the pleadings made by the Justice Department, and frequently cited as causes for concern, perhaps could lead to trouble, but I don't believe that they have as yet been accepted by the courts.

Another area in which we must move carefully is in recognizing the effect of the legislation proposed on the multibillion-dollar Federal water resources development projects. We may be sure that no legislation can be enacted that jeopardizes the Government's investment in the navigation, flood control, irrigation, and hydroelectric power projects that have been constructed. In the latter two categories, I don't think there is much of a problem, as most of them in the West, at least, have been constructed under the Federal reclamation laws, with water rights perfected under State laws. The disputes which have come to the courts over compensation for water rights seem generally to have been decided in such a way as to provide for compensation. The matter of

water rights, however, has not been as satisfactorily resolved in connection with navigation and flood control projects, and may prove more troublesome, in connection with projects authorized for those purposes. Another area which would appear to retain considerable potential for possible conflict is in connection with Federal fish and wildlife and recreation projects.

In the light of the very brief review that I have made of the situation, therefore, I must conclude that the evidence so far presented as to the Federal-State water rights conflict is somewhat less than conclusive, and that there is need for a more complete and more objective study of the whole problem than has yet been undertaken.

I would suggest that the study be undertaken jointly, by a commission with membership taken from the ranks of Congress, from the executive branch of the Government, the States, and from the public, the latter members, of course, to be from the West.

I realize this is not a new idea. I hesitate to suggest it because of the delay involved, and yet I sincerely believe there is a need for such a study before anything can be done by Congress to quiet the fears of the West. I will appreciate any views that are expressed through this symposium on this subject. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I pledge myself to do everything in my power to push on to a satisfactory conclusion in this controversial area.

PASSING OF AN ERA: DON ANDRES LUGO

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, it is with some sadness and regret that I rise to comment on the recent passing of a member of one of California's oldest families. The death of Andres Lugo at the age of 97 marks the close of an era. The end of a period of history which I believe gives nothing away to any other in its romance, charm, and, above all, graciousness.

The dashing figure of this last of the "Old Spanish Dons" typified the three generations of Lugos who lived under the four flags of California—Spanish, Mexican, Bear Flag, and, since 1850, that of the United States. The grandfather, Don Antonio Maria Lugo, was born in 1775 at Mission San Antonio de Padua. There he received the personal blessing of Father Junipero Serra.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 1 more minute.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Chair.

After serving in the army of the Spanish king, he received in 1813, by royal landgrant, 29,514 acres southeast of Los Angeles. To this Don Antonio gave the name Rancho San Antonio. In 1835 he added the Rancho Santa Ana del Chino and in 1842 the 37,000-acre Rancho San Bernardino to the family holdings.

Life in the southern California of that era was a pastoral one. Horsemanship was a fundamental skill and for the best riders, an art. Don Antonio enjoyed the reputation of being "the best horseman in all California in his day." It is said that he could ride days on his beautiful silver-mounted saddle without leaving

his own land. His was a domain stretching from snow-capped peaks almost to the shores of the Pacific.

Don Antonio Maria Lugo contributed to the early development of southern California. In 1818, he adopted the first "Yankee" to come into the region—Joseph Chapman, "El Ingles"—incidentally, the first tourist to become a settler—and provided him with land and cattle. The traditional hospitality and openhandedness of the ranchos welcomed these immigrants. In 1851, Don Antonio sold the Rancho San Bernardino, which included the future sites of San Bernardino, Redlands, and Colton, to Mormon settlers from Salt Lake for \$2 per acre. Rancho Santa Ana del Chino, he gave to his daughter and her Yankee husband.

When southern California became part of the United States he served as "alcalde"—mayor—of Los Angeles; and his word and his experience of 80 years did much to unscramble land titles, when he appeared as a witness before the U.S. Land Commission.

Don Vicente Lugo, the son of Don Antonio, also fitted the description of a dashing caballero of the ranchos. Writers of the period in fact referred to him as the "Beau Brummel of Los Angeles."

However, Don Vicente, while enjoying the gracious life of the times, continued the family's role of civic leadership. In 1840, he built the first 2-story adobe in the city, a building, which in 1867 he donated for the founding of St. Vincent's College. This small beginning has developed into one of southern California's leading educational institutions, Loyola University.

In 1850, Don Vicente Lugo built the family ranch, Rancho San Antonio. This is furnished in the fashion of the day using the works of Indian craftsmen as well as the best mementos from Europe. The first upright piano brought to California, purchased for 1,000 hides from a Yankee windjammer which had sailed around the Horn, still stands in the Lugo home today. To this adobe house Don Vicente retired to enjoy a way of life which a traveler described:

No horses so fast, no cattle so fine, no land so fertile, no rancho more famous than the Rancho San Antonio. No family more prominent, no hospitality more welcome or freely partaken, no hacienda more lovely, happy, or prosperous than that of the Lugos.

Don Andres Lugo, who died recently, represented the third generation of this family. He inherited the family tradition for horsemanship and cattle raising. But his hobby always centered on the maintenance of the traditional appearance, style, and spirit of the old Spanish days. His figure, clad in the romantic costume of the early Spanish Californians with silver saddle and trappings, often entertained new immigrants to the Golden State with his fancy riding and roping feats.

Mr. President, I cannot help but feel sad at the passing of this last representative of that long-departed but fondly remembered way of life. The gallant figure of Andres Lugo passes from the California scene as we celebrate another

milestone—California's new place as the first State in population. The thousands of acres once owned by the Lugos sustain many millions of these newcomers, and the long-lived history of this family becomes part of their heritage.

I thank the Chair.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE CLYDE DOYLE, OF CALIFORNIA

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. KUCHEL. I am through, unless a Senator wishes me to yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that the Senator from California yielded the floor.

Does the Senator from California desire to ask unanimous consent that he retain the floor while statements are being made about a deceased colleague?

Mr. KUCHEL. Yes.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, does the Senate have official notification?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No. As the Senator from California said a moment ago, there has been no official notification yet of the death of the Representative, but eulogies were started, and it is customary to recognize a colleague from the same State. Senators agree with this exception to the rule, sympathize with it, and are willing to recognize that the Senator may hold the floor, and he, in turn, may yield from time to time to other Senators to make statements. The Chair has been warned that he has not been following the rule. The Chair does not want to be subject to criticism for doing that. The Chair knows that if the request is made, it will not be objected to, and Senators have not been objecting. The Senator from California can hold the floor and yield for 3 minutes at a time. If he wants additional time, he can get it.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Chair. I ask unanimous consent, first of all, that any of our colleagues who desire to make statements in the RECORD on the lamentable passing of our colleague may be permitted to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wish to join in the remarks by our colleagues on the passing of Representative CLYDE DOYLE, with whom I served in the House for many years.

He was an outstanding Member of the House, and his useful work will be remembered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to join with my colleagues in paying my respects to a dear and wonderful friend who has now gone to his heavenly reward. I have known Representative CLYDE DOYLE for a long time. He was a fine and great Congressman from Cali-

fornia. I was grieved to read in this morning's press that he passed away last night.

Representative DOYLE served his country faithfully. He served his State with outstanding ability and dedication. His life was one of compassionate service to his fellow men. I feel it a real loss to learn that he has passed on.

I extend to his loved ones, the members of his family, and to his friends the heartfelt sympathy and sincere condolences of both Mrs. Humphrey and myself. We were privileged to know Representative DOYLE for many years.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, CLYDE DOYLE was a Representative not only of his district in California, in the best sense of devoted service; he was also a man of conscience and courage.

It was my privilege to serve with him in the House for many years. I cherished a personal as well as an official friendship with him. I mourn his untimely passing earlier today.

This is said slowly, with a sense of memory for a good and great man. He worked as if he were to live forever. He lived as if he were to die tomorrow.

CHARLES HADEN ALLDREDGE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, one who drank deeply from the draught of life and, at the same time, gave much to life, has passed from our midst. I shall miss Charles Haden Alldredge, whom I knew as a scholar, a good friend, and a delightful companion who carried on a lifelong love affair with the humanities.

Charley Alldredge had Southern liberal roots; his soft Alabama accent among Washington cosmopolites was a constant reminder of his birthplace, Montgomery. His father was the late Haden Alldredge, who served for many years on the Interstate Commerce Commission and was one of the great liberals of the South.

Charley's first and last love was writing. He was friend and confidant of some of Washington's best known columnists. A graduate of the University of Alabama, he first worked on the Alabama Journal in Montgomery. He brought his writing talents to politics in the first Senate campaign of the present senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and, after a decade of service with the Public Works Administration, hit the campaign trail again in 1948 with then Senator Alben Barkley in his ultimately successful campaign for the Vice Presidency.

My path and Charley's crossed during the years of my own campaigns for President and Vice President, in which he served as my press adviser. He was quiet and droll, always kind and gentlemanly. One of his hobbies was growing flowers and frequently when we were out on the campaign trail, he would worry about whether the aphids were getting on his roses and whether he ought to rush back and spray them.

His love of things beautiful was also reflected in another hobby, writing poetry. His hosts of friends in and out of Washington have thrilled to receive Christmas cards containing his own verse. Sometimes he would enclose

other poems which—as he advised the recipient on one occasion—“have nothing to do with Christmas or the winter solstice but which the poet recommends to his friends as easy to memorize.”

Mr. President, I have selected a few of Charley Alldredge's poems which I would like to place in the RECORD. They reveal far more eloquently than can I the richness of Charley's life, his gentle humor, and the many sides of his wonderful personality.

SILENCE

The silences of winter mark it more than snow and cold;
The blood of life runs slower when the year is old.

Silent does the fox run, hidden is the fly,
In secret lies the viper as the year goes by,
But what a joyful stirring from every living thing
Will mount to shake the heavens in the thunderclap of spring.

MASKS

If I should know you for a thousand years
I would not see your face;
When I come close to you
You take off a mask,
But there is another there,
And another,
And another,
And finally the mask you swear is your face
Is most inscrutable of all.
I shall never see your face,
Nor you mine,
Nor, since it is unbearable,
You yours.

MAGIC

Old magic still lurks
In shadowed places—
Heavy with regret
The dark deceiver—
But what joy
When the old magician sees,
Stumbling toward him,
A young believer.

I ask unanimous consent that an article dealing with the life of Mr. Alldredge be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHARLES H. ALLDREDGE, SERVED HILL OFFICIALS

Charles Haden Alldredge, public relations adviser to many prominent New and Fair Deal figures including the late Vice President Alben Barkley and former Interior Secretary Oscar Chapman, died Sunday at Washington Hospital Center following a long illness. He resided at 617 North Carolina Avenue SE.

Mr. Alldredge received much attention when acting as press adviser to Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, during the Senator's campaigns for the Presidency and Vice-Presidency.

Mr. Alldredge was born in Montgomery, Ala., in 1911. His father, the late Haden Alldredge, was for many years a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

After graduating from the University of Alabama, Mr. Alldredge began newspaper work on the Alabama Journal in Montgomery but soon turned to public relations. One of his first such enterprises was handling the first Senate campaign of his fellow townsman, LISTER HILL.

In 1938, Mr. Alldredge entered Government service with the Public Works Administration. His service there encompassed many of the agency's projects and nearly every State. In 1948, he resigned from Interior to accompany Mr. Barkley, then a Senator, in his campaign for Vice President.

Mr. Alldredge also wrote poetry and was a knowing critic of the arts. He was a trustee of All Souls Unitarian Church during the ministry of the late A. Powell Davies.

A sister, Mrs. J. Allan Jones, of Montgomery, survives.

CHARLES BARTLETT OF THE CHATTANOOGA TIMES

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, one of the Nation's finest and best-known newspaper reporters, Mr. Charles Bartlett, recently changed jobs. After 17 years as the Washington correspondent for the Chattanooga Times, one of the great newspapers of our land, Charley will write a four-times-a-week syndicated column as a member of the Washington bureau of the Chicago Sun-Times. Fortunately for the readers of the Chattanooga Times, his new column will appear in that newspaper.

All of us who have known Charley wish him well in his new undertaking. I concur wholeheartedly in the statement of the publisher of the Chattanooga Times, Mr. Ben Hale Golden, that Charley's "balanced reporting of the news and his high personal integrity have always provided this newspaper with a written product commensurate with the national reputation of the Chattanooga Times for responsible journalism."

Charley won the Pulitzer Prize for outstanding national reporting for the year 1955 when he exposed a conflict of interest that led to the resignation of the late Harold E. Talbott as Secretary of the Air Force. His wide circle of friends in Washington—among them, the President—and his talent for earnestly seeking the truth have given him an understanding of Government that few men possess.

On leaving the Chattanooga Times, Charley Bartlett wrote an article entitled "Thoughts on Leaving a Wonderful Newspaper." It is one of the most touching things I have read in a long time.

I ask unanimous consent that this article, together with an editorial in the Chattanooga Times, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOUGHTS ON LEAVING A WONDERFUL NEWSPAPER

(By Charles Bartlett)

WASHINGTON.—Just as it is never clear why a man would leave a wonderful wife, it is far from clear why a reporter would leave a wonderful newspaper.

Professional and marital compatibility are much akin to a man in that if he doesn't have one, he has only a faint hope of having the other. Women are more complex than newspapers but the essential elements of greatness are much the same in both—a character that combines instincts, understanding, and durability; a responsive personality, and a persistent sense of each day's obligations.

A man gets married for love and works for pay but when compatibility develops in both areas, the emotion seeps into the professional side just as the pay finds its way into the mechanics of marriage. It thus becomes possible to love a great newspaper.

A young man joining such a paper has only energy to offer against the riches made available to him. The distilled knowledge that he has brought from the university is like a drop of perfume in a horse barn as he applies it against his weathered mentors and their intricate insights into the ways of men. His past experiences pale into nothing against the vistas of life that open as he begins to wend his way, asking questions, about the city.

He finds that he has a glorious entry into the aspirations, schemes, and reminiscences of a wide range of men and women. He has been given license to summon their reactions in moments of crisis, to taste the wormwood of their defeats, to share the luminosity of their peaks of success, and to observe the reactions that attend their deaths.

His most delicate times arrive when he confronts their disputes as an observer who must seek confidence from both sides and establish, informally and in writing, the earnestness of his search for truth. In these tests, the young reporter derives his stamina and yardsticks from the character and traditions of his newspaper. His test becomes also a test of these traditions and of his editors and if all three fail, the public is badly armed and another small cancer is lodged in the culture.

The growing reporter has the uncomfortable sense at times that in choosing to become an observer instead of a participant, he has taken a protected course which permits him to know neither victory nor defeat. This is his cross but it is lightened by his claim to a part of the rightful evolution of the times and place in which he works.

He knows that he and his colleagues have been persistent in behalf of the pressures which make for right over wrong and for improvement. He feels that he can claim some pride in progress, in the human and physical blemishes that are driven from the scene, in the merit that is recognized and advanced, and in the problems that are met. He and his paper can rarely claim to have been a decisive force but they have the satisfaction, at least, of having worked to be constructive.

As he goes along, he will be charged with cynicism but such a philosophy does not exist on the staff of a strong and healthy newspaper. Cynicism is not the same as the swift recognition and repulsion that develops among newsmen against frauds who seek publicity or seek to avoid it. If reporters and their papers began to fall prey to such creatures, the public could be badly used by them. This again is where the character of the institution, and its ability to foster and sustain a clear eye in its employees, count so heavily.

Actually in every facet of his labors, a reporter is enhanced or hobbled by the character of his newspaper. He becomes in essence largely a reflection of this character. He takes his strength from it, when it is good, and his weaknesses, when it is bad. His best efforts are only a small atom of the composite strength and quality represented in a publication with strong traditions and intentions.

A man could not in good conscience leave a great wife. But a reporter can without remorse leave a great newspaper because he knows well that its greatness is durable and that if there is a loser, it is he.

BARTLETT'S NEW ROLE

During the 17 years he has represented this newspaper with distinction, most of that time as our Washington correspondent, Charles Bartlett has developed an acquaintanceship with newsmaking Americans such as few in the trade possess.

Now, as is announced today, he will devote full time to the national syndication

of his articles in a growing list of newspapers.

To this endeavor, Charley Bartlett will lend his great warmth as a person as well as his writing ability, drive, persistence, and broad field of contacts.

It is naturally with much regret that we see him leave us. But we consider ourselves fortunate to have kept him this long. A Pulitzer prizewinner, he has added to the Times' reputation in the Nation's Capital and elsewhere.

While continuing to carry his reports, we shall follow closely his work in the milieu of the bigtime syndicates.

His wide circle of friends and readers will join us, we know, in wishing Charley Bartlett all the best in his new venture.

THE NATIONAL RAILROAD FREIGHT CAR SUPPLY

MR. CURTIS. Mr. President, I rise in support of legislation sponsored by the senior Senator from Washington, our distinguished chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee. I am gratified to note that many other Members of the Senate will join Senator MAGNUSON in the introduction of his legislation seeking to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply. Ever since coming to the Senate, I have co-sponsored this legislation in prior Congresses and I have been pleased to appear before the Senate Commerce Committee in its behalf.

The railroad industry is plagued by a situation which becomes more acute each year. At this time, sufficient cars are not available in the grain producing areas of the Middle West to meet the demands for shipment of grain. On one railroad, the Burlington, operating in my State, the current car shortage is now 10,400 cars. In recent days, the newspapers in my State have written many stories pointing out the acuteness of the current problem.

When I appeared before the Senate Commerce Committee on June 8, 1959, testifying in behalf of identical legislation, I stated:

I come from a section of the United States wherein our railroads have been more diligent in maintaining an adequate supply of rolling stock than prevails in other areas of the country. Yet, each year, during periods of peak car loadings, we are plagued with car shortages because cars owned by the western roads are in use on lines elsewhere. For many railroads it has become more economical to pay the existing per diem rate for use of another road's cars than to maintain an adequate supply of their own requirements. This is a situation which has existed for many years and it deserves solution.

We know that, at the present time, railroad cars are being retired from service at a rate which exceeds the construction of new cars. This fact increases the need for enactment of the legislation being heard today by your committee. I urge favorable consideration of S. 1789 at the earliest opportunity.

In the meantime, the situation has worsened substantially. In 1959, the numbers of serviceable freight cars of all kinds were 1,577,708. As of February 1, 1963, the numbers of serviceable cars were 1,419,887. Meanwhile, the practice of certain roads to pay per diem in lieu of beefing up their freight car supply has increased in tempo. This is brought to

light by the rise in payment for car rental from 1950 to the present time. In 1950, railroads throughout the country paid \$140.3 million for car rental under the current per diem rate. In 1961, the amount paid for car rental under the current rate was \$344.3 million. This clearly illustrates how certain roads who are prudent in their efforts to maintain adequate supply of freight cars are being severely penalized by management decisions of roads who do not desire to maintain an adequate supply of freight cars. Many Members of this body have been diligent in their efforts in recent years to bring about the equity which this matter deserves. We cannot temporize much longer and avoid the responsibility for taking necessary action. I earnestly hope that the Senate can proceed to the consideration of this bill within the very near future and that it will be enacted.

THE AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION

MR. METCALF. Mr. President, the American Political Science Association is no stranger on Capitol Hill. Most of us have become acquainted with the association and its important activities through one or more of the successful programs it sponsors. Best known perhaps is the highly regarded congressional fellowship program, which annually brings to Washington a group of deserving young political scientists and journalists for an inside look at the legislative process.

Those of us who have had congressional fellows working in our offices do not need to be reminded how beneficial this program has been both for the interns and Members of Congress. Besides the congressional fellowship program, the American Political Science Association sponsors a number of other activities of special interest to Members of Congress.

This year for the first time the association offered an orientation program for new Members of the other body. From all reports, this endeavor was highly successful in helping new Congressmen overcome some of the problems involved in organizing an efficient office operation. The association also assisted this year in the direction of the first William Randolph Hearst Foundation's Senate youth program. Under this program, two high school seniors from each of our 50 States, plus the District of Columbia, were brought to the Nation's Capital for a week to study our National Government. This program, too, was very successful.

Now the American Political Science Association is embarking on yet another worthwhile program of particular interest to Members of Congress. It is the congressional staff fellowship program, designed to improve the professional competence of staff members in both Houses of the Congress. The congressional staff fellowship program will permit selected House and Senate committee staff members, as well as assistants to Members of Congress, to study for periods of 6 months or 1 year at colleges

and universities of their choice. The program is being financed under a grant from the Ford Foundation, which has assumed the costs of so many worthwhile educational, cultural, and social activities. I might add that the Ford Foundation also contributes a substantial part of the funds to finance the congressional fellowship program.

Mr. President, two of our colleagues, the assistant majority leader, the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the assistant minority leader, the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], are members of the advisory committee for the 1963-64 congressional staff fellowship program. Other committee members include, from the other body, the assistant majority leader, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS], and the assistant minority leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS]. Dr. Charles Hyneman, distinguished service professor at Indiana University, is chairman of the advisory committee, and Mr. Claude Hawley, chairman of the board of the American Growth Investment Co. of Washington, D.C., is a member of the committee.

The decision of the American Political Science Association to inaugurate the congressional staff fellowship program grew out of a long and active interest in congressional operations. While we all know of the many inservice training programs for executive agency personnel, there are few comparable opportunities for congressional staff members. The new fellowship program will help provide research opportunities for staff assistants of our committees and our offices and, at the same time, encourage further development of a permanent and more competent congressional staff system. I suggest, Mr. President, that this is a commendable goal—one which each of us can wholeheartedly support.

Details of the program's operation have been worked out in consultation with the advisory committee to insure that it will be consistent with the schedule and workload of the Congress. The American Political Science Association will conduct and administer the program, but staff fellows will plan and carry out their own study and research programs under the guidance of departmental chairmen and faculty advisers at the colleges and universities of their choice. I am told that the terms of the fellowship awards will be as flexible as possible to meet the study and research needs of individual congressional staff members.

Mr. President, I take this opportunity to express my gratitude to the American Political Science Association for its continuing and constructive interest in the operations of the Congress. I am sure I speak for all of my colleagues when I say that we appreciate the efforts of the association to improve the internal machinery of Congress and to help the American people better understand the Congress and its operations. I especially want to thank Dr. Evron Kirkpatrick, executive director of the association, whose tireless efforts have made

many of these worthwhile programs possible. He is ably assisted by Mr. Donald Tacheron, a 1961-62 congressional fellow who now serves as assistant director of the association.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a fact sheet explaining the American Political Science Association's congressional staff fellowship program be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the fact sheet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE APSA CONGRESSIONAL STAFF FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

Advisory committee: Chairman, Charles Hyneman, distinguished service professor, Indiana University; Representative LESLIE ARENDS; Representative HALE BOGGS; Claude Hawley, chairman of the board, American Growth Investment Co., Washington, D.C.; Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY; and Senator THOMAS KUCHEL.

Beginning this year, the American Political Science Association will award fellowships for university study and research to selected House and Senate office and congressional committee staff members. The purpose of this new congressional staff fellowship program is to improve the knowledge and skills of administrators and researchers, encouraging thereby the further development of a permanent and highly professional staff made up of the most expert and well educated personnel. The competition for the awards will be open to all professional congressional staff employees. Winners will undertake their study and research at the college or university of their choice.

Awards are planned in 1963-64 and in subsequent years in the following categories:

One-year fellowships carrying a maximum stipend of \$14,000, including tuition and moving expenses.

Six-month fellowships carrying a maximum stipend of \$8,000, including tuition and moving costs.

The total number of awards each year will depend somewhat on the number of qualified applicants in each category. Generally, however, six of the 1-year fellowships will be available, and these awards will be divided equally between House and Senate staff members. Similarly, six of the 6-month fellowships will be available, with two awards to be made in the Senate, four in the House.

The amount of the stipend in both categories will depend upon the award winner's level of professional development, study and research plans, and number of dependents.

Financed by a grant from the Ford Foundation, the congressional staff fellowship program will be conducted and administered by the association. Overall policy guidance will be provided by the House-Senate advisory committee.

PROGRAM SCHEDULE

For the first year of the congressional staff fellowship program, the application deadline is April 15, 1963. Selection of award winners is expected to be completed shortly thereafter. In subsequent years, the competition will be announced in mid-June, the application deadline will be November 1, and award winners will be notified in mid-January of the following year.

University residence requirements will be flexible, providing for adjustments to fit the needs of individual fellows. Generally, however, staff members holding the 6-month fellowship will be expected to be in residence at their respective universities for about one semester or its equivalent, beginning after Congress adjourns in the late summer 1963, and ending in January or early February 1964. Similarly, the 1-year fellowships will require university residence from mid-September to the end of May.

SELECTION OF WINNERS

Applications will be reviewed upon receipt by a three-member screening committee, members of which will be appointed in consultation with the bipartisan House-Senate advisory committee. The screening committee, established on a bipartisan basis, will be made up of a senior staff member from both the House and Senate and a political scientist. Selected applicants will be invited to appear before this committee. Upon completion of interviews with these candidates, the screening committee will draft a recommended list of winners and alternates for final review by the advisory committee.

APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants must complete a standard biographical data form, provided by the association, and must list three references. A brief statement of the applicant's research and study interests and how these are related to his professional responsibilities and goals must accompany the application form. In addition, the applicant must submit a letter from his immediate superior containing assurances that (1) the applicant will be able to return to his position after completion of the fellowship, and (2) the applicant's study and research project is related to the professional responsibilities of his present position.

CRITERIA FOR SELECTION

The general criteria for selection will be superior academic training and/or professional experience. Preference will be given applicants who are between 25 and 40 years of age and who have had at least 3 years of experience in and are currently holding a congressional staff position.

STUDY PROGRAM PLANNING

Congressional staff fellows will plan and conduct their study program, under the guidance of departmental chairman and faculty advisers, on an individual basis. However, the association will be of assistance wherever necessary in arranging for these programs and in arranging for registration in the universities involved. Association representatives also will discuss the program with staff fellows and their faculty advisers periodically during the fellowship period.

FURTHER INFORMATION

Application forms and further information are available at the association, 1726 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington 6, D.C.; telephone DU 7-8585.

PATRIOTISM AS AN INTEGRAL PART OF FORMAL EDUCATION

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I should like to bring to the attention of Senators an article by Mr. Jenkin Lloyd Jones entitled "Get New Text Books, America" that appeared in the March 11 issue of the Washington Star.

This article is a most timely and cogent treatise on a vitally important subject, the education and moral strengthening of our youth.

In graphic language Mr. Jones has pointed to the trend toward a downgrading of patriotism in our schools and he asks what has happened to the teachings of obedience to the flag and to love of country which once was such an integral part of formal education.

I request unanimous consent that this article by Mr. Jones be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GET NEW TEXTBOOKS, AMERICA—RETURN TO STANDARDS OF OLD IS URGED; PATRIOTISM, HEROISM, MORAL TEACHING

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

If we can ever cure the asinities of the "looksay" method of teaching reading, which has condemned many hundreds of thousands of young Americans to word guessing, it will be time to start in on the content of grade school textbooks.

These beautifully printed and illustrated books include texts so remarkable for their dullness that it is little wonder young America can hardly wait to get back to TV. Most of them have been steamcleaned of every vestige of excitement, of inspiration, and romance.

There is no reference to God or religion. This is regarded as controversial. There is no story of war. If we don't think about it, maybe it will go away. There is nothing that would give rise to patriotism. How old fashioned.

I have before me a fifth grade reader, "Days and Deeds," published last year by Scott, Foresman & Co., and standard in many hundreds of American school systems.

With a puerile vocabulary it discusses such things as Uncle Lem's new outboard motor, John's lawn-mowing business, and how Wally, the bloodhound, helped Jerry, the police dog, find his missing bone.

I have also before me a reprint of McGuffey's Fifth Eclectic Reader published in 1879. Let's skip through the list of contents:

"The Relief of Lucknow, London Times. Battle of Blenheim by Southey. Sands of Dee by Charles Kingsley. An Old-Fashioned Girl by Louisa May Alcott. An account of a riot in the Massachusetts State Prison. Supposed speech of John Adams by Daniel Webster. Excerpts from the Virginians by Thackeray and from Hamlet. Dissertation on Roast Pig by Charles Lamb. A Frigate Chase in the English Channel by James Fenimore Cooper. The Boston Massacre by Canroft. No Excellence Without Labor by William Wirt. Religion, the Only Basis of Society by William Channing."

Blood and thunder? Plenty of it. Heroism? Of course. Moral homilies? In profusion. Religious preachments? Unashamed. Patriotism? With pride. And in addition tough words and involved sentences that would flabbergast the fifth grader who has been brought up on the thin consomme of today's "Days and Deeds" series.

On June 20, 1961, Dr. Max Rafferty, school superintendent of La Canada, Calif., made a speech that caused a sensation and resulted in his election last fall as California Superintendent of Public Instruction over the dead bodies of the progressive educators. He asked: "What happened to patriotism?" and I quote:

"We have been so busy educating for 'life adjustment' that we forgot to educate for survival. Words that America had treasured as a rich legacy, that had sounded like trumpet calls above the clash of arms and the fury of debate, we allowed to fade from the classrooms.

"Liberty and Union, now and forever, one and inseparable * * *"

"We have met the enemy and they are ours * * *"

"Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute."

Search for these towering phrases in vain today in too many of our schools. The golden words are gone. Patriotism feeds on hero-worship and we decided to abolish heroes.

The quest for the Golden Fleece has been crowded out by the visit of Tom and Susan to the zoo. The deeds of the heroes before Troy are now passe, and the peregrinations

of the local milkman as he wends his way among the stodgy streets of Blah City have taken over. Bobby and Betty pursue this insipid goal of a ride in the district garbage truck while the deathless ride of Paul Revere goes unsung.

For Roland at Roncesvalles we have substituted Muk-Muk the Eskimo boy. It is, I think, significant, that education during the past three decades has deliberately debunked the hero to make room for the jerk.

No wonder these heroless American kids often broke down before the Red brain-washers in the Korean prison camps. They had no points of reference. They had no understanding of the traditions of liberty. In many cases, the Communists were delighted that there was so little to erase. It was a cinch to unteach those who had never been taught.

In commenting on a modern sixth reader, "Bright Peaks," put out by Houghton Mifflin, Dr. Russell Kirk says: "With the exception of a poem by Sara Teasdale, another short poem by Robert Frost, and an autobiographical piece by John Muir, every selection is by a fourth- or fifth-grade writer."

Why? Could it be that the fifth and sixth grades can't read the classics as they did in the days of McGuffey? Could it be that the bankruptcy of the look-say method and the stubborn refusal of many school administrations to admit the error have required them to pretend that there is special virtue in extending kindergarten-style reading to the upper grades?

It's time America got a new set of textbooks. It's time we quit boring bright students to death with the banalities of John and Jane visiting the henhouse. It's time we put romance and courage and excitement and some frank moral indoctrination before our children in their most impressionable years.

We don't have to go back to McGuffey.

There's plenty of good writing. But let's give our children some literary taste, some ethical calories and patriotic vitamins.

To hell with these sawdust sandwiches.

STRIP MINING

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on March 7, 1963, on behalf of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], and myself, I introduced a bill to provide for a study of strip surface mining operations in the United States to be made by the Secretary of the Interior, and for a report to Congress of the results of such study.

The States of Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Indiana, Illinois, Ohio, and Tennessee are vitally concerned about strip mining. I have the pleasure today to report to the Senate that the Tennessee Valley Authority, in whose area strip mining has destroyed the fertility of much land, has taken the position that it will support the bill introduced by the Senator from Pennsylvania, the Senator from Indiana, and me.

OHIO RIVER BASIN CLEAN STREAMS PROGRAM

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I am pleased to report that the Ohio River Basin clean streams program, carried out under the leadership of the Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission—ORSANCO—has been selected by the American Society of Civil Engineers as the "Outstanding Civil

Engineering Achievement of the Year" for the 1963 award. The award was announced recently by the society's board of direction at a meeting in Atlanta.

The clean streams program is a unique complex of municipal and industrial waste-treatment facilities which have been built throughout eight States in the Ohio Valley. The States—Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia—established the commission in 1948 as a coordinating agency to control pollution and safeguard water quality. The chairman of the commission is Bern Wright, chief of the division of water resources for the State of West Virginia.

The record shows that 97 percent of the population on the main stem of the Ohio River now is served by sewage-treatment plants in operation or under construction. In 1948, only 1 percent of the population had such facilities.

Progress has been recorded by industries in the Ohio Valley, too. Eighty-five percent now are in compliance with at least basic control requirements.

Mr. President, I am especially pleased by this award and with the progress which has been made under this program, for it was in 1948, at the invitation of Governor Tuck, of Virginia, that I spoke to separate sessions of the Virginia Legislature, urging that Virginia become a member of the sanitation compact. Initially, the people living in the Ohio River watershed deep in the south of Virginia felt that the situation was of no concern to them, and Virginia refused to join the compact. Eventually, all the States in the basin became members, and the great good which has developed is now apparent.

Mr. President, this in no way implies that the job is done. There are still many obvious evidences of pollution because of continued delinquency on the part of some municipalities and industries, and incompetent or careless operation on the part of others.

However, the progress made in eliminating gross pollution has paved the way for introducing those refinements in control and practice that will insure for the Ohio Valley optimum utilization of water resources.

The annual ASCE award is based upon an engineering project which is rated by the judges as one that demonstrates the greatest engineering skills, offers the greatest contributions to engineering progress, and represents a definite service to mankind.

The announcement of the award brought this comment from Edward J. Cleary, ORSANCO's executive director and chief engineer:

In harnessing the skills of the engineering profession to the great task of curbing water pollution, the people of the Ohio Valley have demonstrated that where there is a will, there is a way. Under the leadership of the eight States, more than a billion dollars has been invested since 1948, in the construction of municipal and industrial waste-control facilities. The sheer magnitude of the undertaking suggests the variety and competence of engineering talent that was enlisted for the biggest river clean-up job in the world. It is most gratifying,

therefore, that the American Society of Civil Engineers should regard the Ohio Valley program as an outstanding achievement.

Headquarters of the commission are located in Cincinnati, Ohio.

The achievements in the Ohio River Valley reflect the great good that can be done by the States themselves when they vigorously and with firm purpose decide to solve a problem.

FRUITS OF THE LONGSHOREMEN'S PACT

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the seeds sown in the recent "take it or else" longshoremen's pact with the east and gulf coast shipping industry are beginning to sprout. I call attention to headlines and articles appearing on two consecutive days, March 11 and March 12, in a leading financial and business publication. The March 11 headline reads: "Dock Strike Caused First Trade Deficit Since 1950; January Exports at 9-Year Low." The March 12 headline reads: "Steamship Lines To Boost Freight Rates to Latin America; Dockworker Pact Cited."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that both articles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 11, 1963]

DOCK STRIKE CAUSED FIRST TRADE DEFICIT SINCE 1950—JANUARY EXPORTS AT 9-YEAR LOW

WASHINGTON.—The dock strike in January caused the United States to suffer its first negative trade balance in more than 12 years, the Census Bureau reported.

The agency said seasonally adjusted exports plunged to \$982.1 million in January, down 47 percent from December and the lowest for any month since March 1954. Exports ran \$111.1 million below January's imports, which were 20 percent below December's volume because of the tieup of ports on the east and gulf coasts.

Not since October 1950 have U.S. imports exceeded exports. The usual surplus of export earnings over import expenditures is relied on to partially offset this country's outlays abroad.

The dock strike started December 23 and ended January 25. Government trade experts expect figures for both exports and imports for February to show a sharp rise when published a month from now.

During the strike, exports and imports continued only along the west coast and overland between Canada and Mexico. The Census Bureau said its figures probably overstated the impact of the east and gulf coast port tieup on exports compared with imports.

For one thing, longshoremen were able to start unloading waiting ships on January 26 and had 6 days to recoup part of the month's import total. But officials said there was little time left in January to reload these ships with U.S. exports.

Also, Census officials said, exports compared unfavorably with imports because of the way they're counted. Imports are tallied when Government statisticians receive notice of merchandise arrivals, whether the goods are actually unloaded or not. Thus some of January's reported imports actually remained unloaded on ships waiting in the ports. Exports, in contrast, are counted only when an outbound ship leaves the harbor.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 12, 1963]

STEAMSHIP LINES TO BOOST FREIGHT RATES TO LATIN AMERICA—DOCKWORKER PACT CITED

NEW YORK.—Steamship general cargo freight rates from U.S. Atlantic and gulf coast ports to Latin American ports are expected to be raised sharply in June and July. The recent contract settlement with the Longshoremen's Union was blamed for the expected rise.

C. D. Marshall, chairman of the Associated Latin American Freight Conference, and of the individual conferences that comprise the organization, said one unit has already notified the Federal Maritime Commission of a freight rate increase and that others will follow shortly.

A conference is a voluntary organization of steamship lines, offering regular service between two areas, which charge identical rates for their services. Mr. Marshall said about 15 to 18 lines will be affected by the rate increases, which might produce up to 10 percent more revenue for the lines.

REVENUE TO RISE 15 TO 18 PERCENT

The first to announce an increase is the U.S. Atlantic and Gulf-Venezuela and Netherlands Antilles Conference. Mr. Marshall said the new rates for this conference, which will take effect June 10, will produce about 15 to 18 percent more revenue for the carriers.

He said increases planned by the other conferences would be more moderate because the other conferences had made rate increases periodically in recent years and "endeavored to keep up with ever-increasing costs." He said the Venezuelan and Netherlands Antilles Conference is making its first general increase in rates since 1955.

The four steamship lines belonging to the Venezuelan Conference are Alcoa Steamship Co., subsidiary of Aluminum Co. of America, Grace Line, subsidiary of W. R. Grace & Co., Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., and Royal Netherlands Steamship Co. An associate member is the Venezuelan Government's Venezuelan Line.

In addition to the Venezuelan Conference tariff proposals, six individual steamship lines have proposed rate increases of about 5 to 10 percent since the dock strike ended, a Federal Maritime Commission spokesman said.

The six lines are West Wind African Lines, Thorden Lines, Finn Lines, Scandinavia America Lines, Moore-McCormack Lines (whose application applies only to the Danish trade), and America-Europe Line. The spokesman also said that west coast of Italy-North Atlantic Freight Conference had notified the Commission it was studying a rate increase but had made no formal rate filing as yet.

Mr. Marshall said no northbound rate increases are anticipated from the Latin American ports to U.S. Atlantic and gulf ports because most of the traffic is southbound. "Practically no cargo comes from places like Jamaica, Haiti, Santo Domingo, Venezuela, and Panama, except for certain specific commodities like coffee or bananas," he said.

Conferences planning to raise their rates include those shipping from the U.S. Atlantic and gulf ports to the west coast of Central America; west coast of South America; Jamaica; east coast of Colombia; the Leeward and Windward Islands and the Guianas. He said ship operators belonging to the Panama conference were also considering rate increases.

Mr. Marshall said the principal reason rates are being raised is "the increased cost to carriers because of the costly settlement of the recent longshore strike." A 5-week strike by the International Longshoremen's Association on Atlantic and gulf coasts ended January 26.

SOME RELUCTANT TO ACT

Some conference groups, however, expressed reluctance to announce new rate increases because of strong competition from independent or nonconference steamship lines.

A spokesman for the Far East Conference said members haven't decided whether they will increase rates. "There certainly is justification for an increase," he said, "but one of the main reasons for not raising them is strong independent competition."

A. J. Pasch, chairman of the North Atlantic to European ports conference groups, said, "We're effectively stopped from raising our rates because of nonconference competition. Despite the fact that a number of our rates are on a noncompensatory basis, they're still being cut by the independent operators."

A spokesman for the conference serving ship operators from the United States to India, Pakistan, Ceylon, and Burma, said there has been no discussion on increasing freight rates.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on January 18, on the floor of the Senate, I commented on the dockworkers' strike, deploring the fact that our laws were inadequate to deal with this very serious situation, which, in the words of the President of the United States, was described as "doing intolerable injury to the national welfare" and "as disrupting vital free-world commerce." The impact of the strike was felt throughout the Nation, including inland Ohio. This situation was much in evidence as the strike was materially responsible for our 9-year low in exports, as described in the foregoing article.

Mr. President, I do not want to be repetitious, but, in my opinion, what I said on the floor of the Senate on January 18 should be repeated today in light of these two recent developments resulting from this strike and the provisions in the pact. I ask unanimous consent that a portion of my statement made on January 18 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in spite of the President's statement concerning the "intolerable injury to the national welfare," neither he nor any existing public agency is able to do anything about it. Thus, we have a situation in which the Longshoremen's Union, through its network of operations and reciprocal services rendered by other unions, has paralyzed the shipping facilities sailing on the high seas along the east and gulf coasts of the United States. International commerce is at a standstill. The Government is unable to do anything about it.

Can we tolerate power of that type, possessed by a union, resulting in damage to the economy of the country and creating "intolerable injury to the national welfare"?

It is hard to believe, yet it is true, that the small segment of our economy represented by the Longshoremen's Union is able to exercise a power greater than that vested in the President of the United States or now capable of being exercised by the people. Yet it is true; the Longshoremen's Union is a government within the Government. It has made the decision that no ships shall sail upon the high seas; yet nothing can be done about it.

So we have an empire within an empire. This union, engaged in work connected with transportation, is the empire within our society; and, whether we like it or not, under

present law we must concede that it is all powerful.

The power to substantially and, if so determined, to completely destroy the transportation facilities of our country should not be permitted to exist in the hands of anyone. Excessive power makes tyrants out of persons possessed initially of the most compassionate attitudes; by power bad men are made worse; by power, good men frequently become bad. When allowed to be exercised without restraint, power is taken away from the people as a whole, and is vested in a few. I quote the words of Lord Acton:

"All power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely."

In this work stoppage by concerted action, the unions have set up a wall against the importation and exportation of any goods affecting our welfare and the economy. It has done so through a monopolistic control of the docks on the east and the gulf coasts, achieved through the working arrangements of the different unions and through monopolistic control impeding the free flow of trade.

Under the laws, the business managements of our country are comprehensively regulated. These laws are intended to prevent all monopolistic practices and restraints of trade. Operators of businesses have, under the laws prohibiting monopolies, been prosecuted and sent to jail; yet, unions connected with transportation are suffered to tie up the country by monopolistic practices and restraints of trade which the antitrust laws prohibit to business.

If there came before the Senate a bill proposing to give to the President of the United States the powers now possessed by persons in charge of the transportation labor unions, I would vigorously oppose it on the floor of the Senate, both by way of argument and by way of vote. If, by some extraordinary circumstance a similar power were sought to be placed in me, either as a citizen or a Senator, I would vigorously reject it as being inimical to the interest of my country.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I now refer to the headlines and article: "Steamship Lines To Boost Freight Rates to Latin America—Dockworker Pact Cited." On February 19, I spoke on the floor of the Senate commenting on the longshoremen's strike settlement. In my remarks, I referred to the subject of confirmation of Christian A. Herter for Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, who, in reply to my question concerning whether or not in the development of foreign trade it would become important to keep ourselves in a competitive position with the world markets, said that it was definitely so; that if we are to sell in the markets of the world, it is necessary that our prices be of a nature that will permit us to compete with other countries.

Mr. President, this proposed boost in steamship lines' freight rates attributed to provisions in the dockworkers' pact, as described in the foregoing article, will make it even more difficult for U.S. industry to compete in the world markets.

Referring to the provisions in the pact, on February 19, I said:

What bothers me is that if the average increase in the longshoremen's agreement is 8.8 percent, will that become the guideline in demands made by the workers in the shipyards, on the docks of the inland lakes, and on the ships sailing under the U.S. flag on the high seas? Will it become the guideline in the steel industry and in the railroad industry? If it does, if 8.8 percent

is to be the guideline, what is our ultimate destination?

Mr. President, the answer is clear. The seeds have sprouted, and we are now beginning to taste the fruit, bitter as it may be. On Monday of this week, I joined with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] as cosponsor of S. 287, placing the transport industries under the antitrust laws. This is an extremely important piece of proposed legislation and should be enacted by Congress and signed by the President.

GRADUAL TERMINATION OF FARM CONTROLS AND SUBSIDIES

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I have introduced a proposal, Senate Joint Resolution 52, which would require the Secretary of Agriculture to submit to Congress proposals for the gradual termination of Federal farm controls and subsidies. Last year, in the course of debate on the agriculture bill, I offered an identical measure as an amendment. Of course, my amendment was rejected; but, at the same time, it did generate some constructive thought and discussion. Let me reiterate that I did not propose the termination of farm controls and subsidies, but merely proposed that the Secretary of Agriculture study the problem and make suggestions for gradual termination, such suggestions requiring affirmative action by the Congress. I am well aware that the sudden removal of Federal farm programs would knock the props out from under many agriculture enterprises which have been planned in consideration of existing programs. But I have long contended that a great many professional, full-time farmers and ranchers do not desire Federal controls and subsidies. I have today received a letter from one such farmer, Mr. Clark Wood, which I shall presently place in the RECORD. It typifies the independent, free-enterprise spirit of the farmers in my State.

Mr. President, having reintroduced my agriculture resolution, I should like to announce that I shall again submit it as an amendment when farm legislation comes along. I am hopeful that we shall take up this debate where we left off last year, and shall make progress toward the enactment of this or similar legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Wood's letter printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. JOHN TOWER,
U.S. Senator,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR TOWER: Just a few days past I received the attached notice of 1963 wheat yield payment from the Department of Agriculture. I have my two farms rented out and, at first, I did not know what the heck this money was for. I contacted my renter and found out.

Well, it seems that he had some of this small acreage frozen out and simply plowed it up. Along came the inspector and he turned in the data that we did not plant what we are allowed to plant. So, therefore, the "Great White Father in Washington" sends along the "vote purchasing" money.

I am not too darn smart, but it is not difficult for me to multiply this little \$13.44 check by a few million and see where some of my tax money is going.

It was my pleasure to watch and listen to Senator DIRKSEN and Representative HALLECK on TV February 3, 1963, on the "Meet the Press" program. They were sanely talking about cutting expenses all the way across in Washington and I think that such damnable giveaway programs as represented by this little check I am sending is a darn good place to begin. Believe you me, the farmers I know do not want the Government in the farming business. Senator, the boys at the local ASC offices actually go out and beg farmers and ranchers to accept this and that giveaway deal from their offices. They have (not recently because I turned them down flat) pleaded with me to go in on all sorts of conservation programs, telling me how much the Government (me and 188 million others) will pay me.

Now I firmly believe in conservation of land and water and, in that this ranch belongs to me, I further believe that it is my responsibility to care for it like I would my family, etc. In fact, I have done quite extensive conservation work on my property here in Crosby County. I did this on my own expense and did not ask the Government for help. Even so, due to some mesquite work I did in 1958, I had to go clear to the Appellate Division of the IRS in order to make such expense stand up on my tax return for that year. Mind you, that was on work that the Government will pay money for if a landowner will ask for it, but the IRS didn't want me to do it on my own hook. Besides the approximately \$13,000 I spent in killing mesquite, it cost me \$1,500 attorney fees (plus traveling expenses for him) just to retain the right to do for myself what the Government wants to do. Had I gone the giveaway route it would have cost the taxpayers several thousand dollars, but I prefer to be independent and, incidentally, to run my own business without some little "pip squeak" fresh out of college coming over here and telling me how to run my cattle on land that "they" have assisted on. Again, I say that I am not endowed with all the brains, but I do think that I am, by virtue of years of experience on this land, more capable of determining what is good for my land and what is not more than a bunch of boys that have learned their farming and ranching out of a book. If it were not for the fact that we are forced into a farm program and they have to come over and measure acreages, etc., I wouldn't even allow them on my place. May the Lord help us if Washington gets into the cattle industry like it has in the farming business.

Now, as to the President's proposed tax cut and increased expenses—I haven't much comment other than that it simply doesn't make any sense. It is plain idiotic and I trust that you and others can muster enough help to knock such a plan right in the head.

I would like for you to take the \$13.44 check which I have endorsed and send it to the Republican National Committee and I wish that all farmers and ranchers would take all such checks and do the same with them. Maybe we could bust that mess in that manner.

Sincerely yours,

CLARK WOOD.

ADDRESSES BY VICE PRESIDENT JOHNSON IN FLORIDA

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, it was a great pleasure to the people of Florida to have with us at the March 11 ceremonies commemorating the 400th anniversary of St. Augustine, Fla., as the first settlement in the New World,

the Vice President of the United States, the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

While in Florida, and prior to the commemoration ceremony, the Vice President received an honorary degree from Jacksonville University, at Jacksonville, Fla. All of us were proud to be present on the occasion when that honor was conferred upon the Vice President. Those of us who were with him, including Senator HOLLAND and Congressman MATTHEWS, will long remember his words, the encouragement he imparted to the people, and the affection the audiences displayed for him.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech the Vice President delivered at Jacksonville University, and also the one he delivered at the dinner commemorating the 400th anniversary of St. Augustine, Fla., be printed in the body of the RECORD.

Both of these excellent speeches certainly deserve to be read by every thinking American.

There being no objection, the speeches were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON, JACKSONVILLE UNIVERSITY, JACKSONVILLE, FLA., MARCH 11, 1963

President Johnson, members of the faculty, young Americans, I am most grateful—and most proud—for this honor you accord to me and to the national office in which I am privileged to serve.

Your remarks, President Johnson, were most generous. While it would be ungracious for me to deny kinship, under the circumstances this hardly seems the appropriate moment to claim a family relationship. Our Johnson-to-Johnson exchange program may be subject to some misinterpretation—but I am delighted to be the beneficiary.

I could not feel more at home than I do on your campus. It was from a new and small institution of higher learning that I received my degree. When I hear men ask, "What value is a small school?" I am always tempted to reply with that wise and often-quoted answer, "What value is a baby?"

We are at the beginning of the golden age of higher education in our country. Our national needs cannot be met by the facilities or the faculties now in existence. In the next 10 years we must build as many college classrooms and dormitories as were built in the last 200 years. We must by 1970 graduate half again as many physicians as are produced today—more than double the output of Ph. D.'s in engineering, mathematics, and the sciences, and we must triple our graduate enrollments in these fields.

If our country is to survive and if our cause is to succeed, Americans in this decade must undertake a commitment to higher education without parallel in world history. As Thomas Jefferson once said, "If you expect a nation to be ignorant and free, you will expect what never was and never will be."

The effort made here is effort which must be emulated and duplicated in many other communities and in all the States. We are what we are today, as a Nation, because of the longstanding commitment of our resources to education. As early as 1787, the Northwest Ordinance set aside 1 lot in every 10 in the Northwest Territory for the maintenance of education. One hundred years ago, in 1862, we established the program for land-grant colleges. The total land donated by our national Government for educational purposes is four times the area of New York State.

Today, we are investing 3 to 3.5 percent of our annual national product in education.

This is much—but we cannot be content that it is enough. The Soviet Union invests more than twice as much on a relative basis.

At the beginning of the 1950's, we were graduating 19,600 students in physical sciences. At the beginning of the 1960's graduates in these fields had dropped to 17,400—a decline of more than 10 percent. The same pattern has occurred in the biological sciences, in engineering and in other fields. Ten years ago, we unquestionably were turning out twice as many scientists as the Soviet. Today, the Russians are producing twice as many as we are.

We cannot safely dismiss these facts or disregard the implications. Our Nation's prime resource is its youth. We are permitting a waste of that resource which is intolerable for a nation as rich, as strong and as responsible as ours.

About 1 million students are currently quitting high school before graduating. Of the top 10 percent of the high school graduating classes, 100,000 are not continuing on to college. Forty percent of those who enter college drop out before graduation.

A nation as rightfully concerned as ours with the visible erosion of its beaches and shorelines, of its topsoil and trees, of its natural resources and its gold reserves, cannot afford to be indifferent to the less visible but far more serious erosion and waste of its single most precious asset—the asset of young minds.

In a very real sense, the measure of a nation is its attitude toward its own youth. We must live by that standard. We cannot be unconcerned or indifferent that 700,000 boys and girls between the ages of 16 and 21 are unable to find work—or that nearly 1 out of 5 of the unemployed in our country is under the age of 21.

We cannot be indifferent or unconcerned that many of the hardships created by this transitional period in our national economy are falling disproportionately upon the young. That is the essence of the point I especially want to make here today.

We have in our Nation now an uncommon need and demand for educated minds. Much of the focus of industry, labor, and Government is directed to fulfillment of these needs. But there is another set of needs and demands of which less is heard. Those are the demands for the assumption of uncommon responsibilities by those who enjoy the benefits of our educational process.

Never before has a full education promised so much to the individual materially. Sixty percent of the families of college graduates now enjoy income in excess of \$10,000 annually. But families of the elementary and high school dropouts are concentrated at the other end of the income scale. Our society is rewarding educated men and women monetarily as no other society has ever done. In return for this, educated men and women must surely reward this society with a new sense of responsibility and dedication.

That is the challenge—the lifelong challenge—presented to each of you enrolled here.

What are those responsibilities and obligations you face? I believe they are these:

First, you assume an obligation for continuing individual growth. Emerson once said, "The things taught in colleges and schools are not an education, but the means of education." When you leave this campus, you will enter a world of continuing change. Your continued personal growth will be as vital to your country as the initial knowledge with which you depart this university. You may some day be graduates, but you must never cease to be students because America will cease to lead when its generations cease to learn.

Second, as educated men and women, you will bear the obligation and responsibility of full participation in the national life. Education would be the enemy rather than the

ally of our way of life if the products of our educational processes should exclude themselves from such full participation as an intellectual elite. Where national power derives from the consent of the governed, those who enjoy the best of education must participate in the political processes by which that consent is given or withheld. Your preparation and specialization in the academic disciplines must expand rather than contract your contribution to the broad disciplines of citizenship in a democracy.

Third, educated men and women must bear a special sense of obligation to preserve our heritage. The essence of our Nation's strength—the essence of our freedom—is the fact that our people have always had a capacity and a will to unite, to support a national interest above partisan interest or regional interest, or other interests. The debates and arguments of philosophical partisanship are intriguing on every campus. But if we extend the hard and fast divisions of such campus differences into our society as a whole, we shall weaken an indispensable strength of our system. Educated citizens must be the rallying leadership for national unity rather than the focal point of national divisions. As has been said, "When great questions end, little parties begin." The great questions of America are national questions, not partisan issues and it is to the Nation, not to parties, that educated men must always owe their first and ultimate allegiance.

Fourth and finally, there is for young people of America today—those who receive the benefits of higher education—a compelling obligation of service. Your generation will know leisure as no generation before has known it. That gift will be an endowment for good only if the leisure is used for the service of others, rather than the service of self. The security won by faithful endeavors as a student will be satisfying only as it is used to relieve the insecurities of others less fortunate, less able, and less learned.

This point cannot be given too much emphasis. Thirty years ago this week, in a time of deep despair and insecurity, a great President told Americans, "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself." Today, that is still true. Our Nation stands strong and upright in the world. Our arms are strong, our resources are strong, our cause is the strongest. We can only fall by allowing ourselves to be paralyzed by fears from within. It has been wisely said that "The habit of doing one's duty drives away fear."

Those among us who are most fearful today are, very often, those least occupied with performing duties on behalf of others. Mark Twain once gave the advice, "Make it a point to do something every day that you don't want to do. This is the Golden Rule for acquiring the habit of doing your duty without pain."

Capabilities acquired on this campus—and the other fine campuses of the land—will be lost if, in the life beyond college years, there is not a dedication to duty and the experience of performing duty which helps to build a better world for all. If, as we may justly hope, your generation is spared the duty of the battlefield, you will be privileged to take up the greater duties and greater burdens of the fields of peace—at home and throughout the world.

We are building a new economy in our land. This east coast of Florida plays a mighty role in the future. The grime and grimness of earlier times is giving way to new patterns of industry, commerce, and higher values of human worth and aspirations. But as our pace forward accelerates, many are left behind. These must not be forgotten, and if we forget them, their neglect will some day shake the ladder on which we all climb.

The poor, the sick, the unschooled, and untrained are still with us at home as in the world. Men and women who acquire the wealth of higher education must use that wealth to help enrich and improve the lives of the people to whom it is denied.

Our Nation needs you now where you are. But the Nation's need of your talents and your abilities and your conscience will not end when your work here is completed. Your own service to freedom—your own fulfillment of the treasure of your heritage—will begin then as you assume the special obligations and responsibilities which educated men and women must bear in a society such as ours.

In this century—and in this decade—the tide is running with us. Nearly 200 years ago in the Federalist Papers, Madison and Hamilton said of their generation that it had "accomplished a revolution which has no parallel in the annals of human society." That revolution—of which we are heirs—still runs in this world. That revolution of freedom is still the strongest force upon our century. That revolution is destined to win the struggles of this century.

No generation of students has enjoyed the prospect you enjoy or the dimensions of attainment and accomplishment which are open now before you. You can reach the full dimensions of that future as you contribute your individual effort to assuming the obligations and responsibilities of the community of freemen. I envy you what the future holds for you—and I wish each of you well in all your labors as participants in the building of a better world of peace, justice, and freedom for all.

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON AT THE DINNER COMMEMORATING 400TH ANNIVERSARY OF St. AUGUSTINE, FLA.

We have had a wonderful day in Florida. I am most grateful to you for your invitation—and for the opportunity to participate today in these significant and memorable ceremonies.

Coming from the particular part of the United States that I do, it is especially satisfying to me to be here for this meeting tonight. The Colorado River of Texas—which traverses the congressional district which I first represented—served historically as something of a meeting point for the Spanish and Anglo-Saxon cultures in the Southwest.

Much of my life has been spent in contact with the living vestiges of that Spanish heritage. My first job after college was as teacher and principal in a Spanish-speaking school. My association with descendants of our Spanish heritage has been intimate and my friendship for them and affection toward them has been warm and rewarding all my life.

Under these personal circumstances, it is especially gratifying to me to have this part in your efforts here to remind the Nation of the rich endowment our culture has received—and the great debt our history owes—to the explorers and settlers from Spain, who opened the New World.

Many of our historians and history books have emphasized the Anglo-Saxon heritage of our country, treating as a mere incident the influence upon us of the other veins which transfused the heritage of the Old World into the bloodstream of the New. This exclusion of other heritages misrepresents the feelings of our people—and contributes at times to misunderstandings abroad.

If of this country have taken our language, our law, portions of our system, and other components of our life from the Anglo-Saxon heritage, we have also taken into our culture and our values and our national characteristics much that is important to us from virtually all the cultures of Europe.

Our own warmth toward our friends of Europe is universal and nonselective as our national policies of the postwar years have surely demonstrated. The feelings that the United States is preferential or prejudiced in its interests and affections among the peoples of all of Europe are feelings which originate among those who choose to see what does not exist to be seen and choose to feel what there is no basis for feeling.

In these times, we of the United States—like responsible peoples in all the lands of the West—are focusing our efforts and our resources on the future. We guide our policies and our purposes by the faith that wise efforts today can build a better tomorrow—a tomorrow of peace and justice and freedom for men everywhere. The future is not always clear. The coming of tomorrow seems sometimes to be uncertain. But the men who came from the Old World to open and explore and build the New World endowed us with an heritage of faith.

In efforts such as this St. Augustine restoration, we honor that special legacy. For certainly no American can come here and see the restoration of the first city on the North American mainland without appreciating anew how great was the faith of the men who landed on these shores 450 years ago.

From these shores we are reaching for new worlds. We need both the faith and vision of those earlier times to guide us forward. I can think of nothing more appropriate than that travelers can come to this coast to see the launching site of America's venture in the age of space and to have the privilege of seeing at St. Augustine this site where the age of freedom itself was launched in North America.

I think that the local leadership here and in Florida responsible for initiating this project deserves the special congratulations and gratitude of the Nation. The Quadracentennial Commission brought into being today is an expression on the part of the Nation of that support for your own enterprise and vision in redeeming this hidden asset which has so long been neglected and disused.

Tonight at this meeting we are privileged to extend the scope of participation in this program. The Ambassador from Spain and other representatives of his Government in Madrid are here both to break ground for a new permanent Spanish Exhibit and Cultural Center and to associate Spain itself in this historic undertaking.

Mr. Ambassador and Mr. Minister, on behalf of the people of the United States, it is my very high privilege to extend to your Government this invitation to join with us in this memorable and inspiring effort to recreate this monument. In part, it is in recognition of the contribution which men of your country made to the foundations of our own country and to the opening of a new dimension of freedom for mankind on this earth.

DEATH OF FORMER REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it is with a sense of deep personal sorrow that I announce the death of former Representative William Blackney, of Flint, Mich. He died this morning, at age 86. He came to Washington in the 74th Congress, and served, as I recall, eight terms from the 6th Michigan District. He was an outstanding legislator. I wish to take this account of his passing, and I extend to his family my condolences and sympathy.

RESIDUAL OIL IMPORTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to make some observations with respect to the fuel oil import quotas upon which the President is about to make a decision. The quotas are meaningful and important to the eastern seaboard and other parts of the country, and involve critical issues of foreign policy and foreign trade, especially insofar as they affect our relations with Venezuela.

I make reference to the fact that the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, Edward A. McDermott, reported to the President on February 13 that a great and meaningful relaxation of controls on the import of residual fuel oil was recommended. I also point to the fact that it has been rumored in the press that this year a lesser relaxation of those quotas will be made than was made last year. It is anticipated that it will be less than 12 percent of the figure which was last year's increase.

I point out that, according to the press reports, stocks of fuel oil in many parts of our country are at a dangerously low level, partly because of the cold winter, but largely because the imports allowed during the last year were not large enough.

I urge the President of the United States to subordinate any considerations which would induce him to do other than what is absolutely essential to the domestic economic policy and the foreign policy of the United States in terms of the liberalization of this quota. I point out that as much as I sympathize with those from coal regions and the domestic producers of fuel oil who may desire that the quotas be held down to the minimum, the conclusion of Mr. McDermott contained in his report is as follows:

Cutting residual fuel oil imports would be of marginal assistance to the domestic coal mining industry unless such reductions were to levels which would impose inordinate burdens on consumers and on the operation of the economy.

Then another part states:

The combination of decreased demand and dramatically increased productivity accompanied by some important geographic shifts has already caused important economic and social burdens. There is a basic governmental responsibility to cope with those difficulties through specific domestic programs.

Those quotations are contained on page 36 of Mr. McDermott's report.

So we would not do the coal industry very much good by adhering to present import limits. Although we might try to do it good, we would only be cutting off our noses to spite our faces, and we would do great harm to a large section of our economy.

Our stocks are at an inordinately low level. We are inadequately supplying the quota allocations for those who need them because of the installation of new facilities. For example, one power station in the city of New York alone requires an increase in the quota of about 50,000 barrels of oil per day.

So my colleague the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] and I have joined in representations to the President, which have been made a part of the RECORD, calling for "meaningful" relaxa-

tion of the quotas—the very word used by Mr. McDermott—for the next year, and a revision of the quota allocation system to give independent distributors of fuel oil and their consumers an opportunity to deal in the product, and at the minimum, the institution of a system whereby additions to the overall national quota, which are urgently required, may be distributed in a competitive manner.

I think those request are very reasonable. The President, with an understanding of his problems, must look at this question—especially in view of the finding that it cannot possibly be the way to cope with the problems of the domestic coal mining industry—in a way which is best suited to serve the economy of our Nation and foreign policy of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. BAYH in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 2 minutes.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I hope very much that the President will make that kind of decision, and that we shall have, at the very least, a liberalization of the quota equal to that of last year—I deeply believe that the needs exceed that amount—but that we shall certainly have no diminution over what was done last year.

RESIDUAL FUEL OIL IMPORT QUOTAS AND CONTROLS SHOULD BE STABILIZED BUT COMPROMISE ORDER IS ANTICIPATED

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the controversial subject of foreign residual fuel oil has been a much debated one in recent weeks. It is a fact well known by my colleagues that I am an advocate of tighter controls on imports of this waste product of foreign refineries than the administration has been ordering.

These views have been communicated in considerable detail to the President of the United States and I have several times discussed the subject in this forum.

Yesterday I received from the Special Assistant to the President, Hon. Lawrence F. O'Brien, a message from which I quote:

DEAR SENATOR: The time is approaching when the final decision of the President with respect to the future of the program of import controls on residual fuel oil will be made and announced.

Your correspondence with the President, particularly your letters of February 13 and 28, together with your statements on the Senate floor with respect to this problem, have, I believe, made a substantial contribution to clarify the several issues involved.

I feel sure that the President's final decision will reflect the vital interest of the coal industry that you have so ably delineated.

Sincerely yours,

LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN,
Special Assistant to the President.

Also on yesterday, I released a statement of my estimate of the impending residual oil import control order expected this week from the Department

of the Interior, in which it was said that all signs point toward a compromise order to be effective April 1 which will authorize import quota levels appreciably higher than my recommendation for stabilizing imports at the 1962 levels.

But I added that I am confident that the domestic coal and petroleum industries are going to attain vastly more protection against foreign residual oil competition than that which was recommended by the Office of Emergency Planning in a recent memorandum to the President. In the OEP document the President was urged to relax residual oil import controls. In fact, the implication was clear that OEP really was recommending a phasing out of the residual quota system.

When the OEP report was released, I immediately supported the positions of the coal producers, coal labor, the coal-carrying railroads, and independent petroleum groups that a decontrolling of residual oil imports would not be in either the best national economic interest or the national security interest and would definitely be detrimental to basic domestic fuels industries and domestic employment.

It is my belief that decisions to be announced for the administration by the Secretary of the Interior later this week will provide less increase in residual oil import quotas than that asked by east coast interests, residual oil marketers, the international integrated oil company producers, and by the President of Venezuela on the occasion of his recent visit.

I anticipate, however, that the Interior Secretary's order will announce residual import quota increases at levels above those which we of the coal economy areas had hoped would obtain.

Accordingly, neither the proponents of decontrols nor the advocates of tighter controls are likely to score what can be claimed to be a victory in this almost continuous controversy.

I do feel, however, that those of us who object to increasing penetration of domestic fuels markets by foreign residual fuel oils, with Government sanction and by Government edict, have sustained the recognition of such valid points as these:

The import control program is necessary in the national security interest.

Domestic economic interests are inseparable from national security requirements.

There is proper reason for the domestic fuels industries to insist that they and the transportation modes involved should not be subjected to competition from foreign residual oil in quantities in excess of a fair share of participation in American demand for energy fuels. Accordingly, I anticipate that there will be built into the residual oil import quota levels and into control regulations a formula embracing a ratio between availability and demand requirements that will be more equitable than heretofore.

Although it is objectionable to me that a foreign product of the nature of residual oil receives what amounts to an allocation of a noncompetitive area of fuel market demand, while our domestic

fuels must compete with each other for the balance, I sense a larger degree of willingness to recognize that the foreign fuel should not henceforth be permitted to usurp unreasonable shares of the domestic market. Foreign residual oil, dumped at predatory prices, gradually has diminished the competitiveness and the availability of domestic residuals and has disrupted the domestic coal market. A limit on the degree of disruption is essential, and I have reason to hope it will be built into the new orders to be released by the Secretary of the Interior. If so limited, the quota system will achieve a greater degree of stability than has prevailed during the past 2 or 3 years.

Such stability is a vital component in the ability of the coal industry, the coal-carrying railroads and related industries to anticipate more accurately their probable position in the fuels markets of the east coast.

On the basis of information available, I am hopeful that the residual oil import control program to be announced will apply for the duration of this administration, rather than merely on an annual basis. If so, then the coal industry and related industries will be able to plan responsibly for the future without fear of their projections being upset by periodic increases in residual fuel imports.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the time to solve the problems regarding Federal aid to education which have so far blocked the progress of legislation in the Congress is running out, and serious consequences to our youth on all levels of schooling may be anticipated unless programs are able to get underway this year to expand our educational facilities, raise standards of instruction and assist worthy students. The education "gap" in terms of the skilled manpower needed by our country is becoming more and more difficult to close with each year that goes by without a Federal aid program. The legislation before this Congress will go far toward meeting the situation created by our expanding school population and rapidly rising costs and I believe it should receive priority consideration.

Some of the issues and problems respecting aid to education are dealt with in a special number of the quarterly published by the Carnegie Corp. of New York. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the article entitled "Education and Politics," published by the quarterly, January 1963.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATION AND POLITICS

There are some perfectly decent words that nice Americans seldom use together in the same phrase. "Education" and "politics" are two of them. While each word is quite all right on its own (although education is considered to be superior because it is "spiritual" while politics is "crass"), the two in combination seem to conjure up

images of graft, corruption, and even "propagandizing."

Actually, the notion that politics and education should not have anything to do with each other is based on a misunderstanding both of politics and of the role of education in a democracy and how that role is determined. And the idea that they do not have anything to do with each other flies in the face of the facts.

Public education is paid for by public funds, and public funds are raised, and allocated, through the political process. Through this process, the community—as small as the township, as large as the Nation—decides both the total amount it is prepared to spend for a host of public benefits, and how the total amount will be split up among them all. In short, the political forum is where the citizenry fights about the things it cares about; it is where the public assigns priorities and establishes its values in rank order.

Not everyone comprehends this trading out of interests in the political marketplace. This is one reason why many political decisions do not in fact reflect accurately the most widely held public values but do often reflect those of "interests" which understand the political process very well indeed. In these cases, where does the fault lie except with those who are either too lazy or too naive to press the case effectively for their own interests?

For the basic importance of the inseparability of politics and education is not the fact that public money supports public education but what that fact represents: that the education of its youth is a primary interest of the Nation. And the Nation has many legitimate concerns—for defense, health, highways, and welfare, as well as education. The equitable allocation of resources in support of these interests is an extraordinarily intricate—and political—business.

Good education costs good money. And public education costs public money. Where it will come from, how it will be distributed, for what it will be used—these are important and complicated problems of public policy.

For there are many forces which influence the extent of public support for public education. Social, political, and organizational factors, as well as economic, play powerful roles. Increased understanding of these roles should help in the formulation of policies that will strengthen public education in the years ahead. With this objective in view, Carnegie Corp. several years ago made a few grants for studies of some of the issues involved in the financing of public education. Most of the studies are now completed.

The Syracuse University Press is publishing, in a series called "The Economics and Politics of Public Education," 12 monographs which were prepared under the general direction of Professor Jesse Burkhead of the department of economics. Four of them were released last month: "Schoolmen and Politics: A Study of State Aid to Education in the Northeast," by Stephen K. Bailey, Richard T. Frost, Paul E. Marsh, and Robert C. Wood; "Government and the Suburban School," by Roscoe C. Martin; "National Politics and Federal Aid to Education," by Frank J. Munger and Richard F. Fenno, Jr.; and "Issues in Federal Aid to Education," by Sidney C. Sufrin.¹

¹ Syracuse University Press, \$1.75 each. To be published in February are "Cost and Quality in Public Education," by Harold F. Clark; "Federal Aid to Science Education: Two Programs," by Paul E. Marsh and Ross A. Gortner; "State and Local Taxes for Public Education," by Jesse Burkhead; and "Administering the National Defense Education Act," by Sidney C. Sufrin. In April the final four will be published: "Aid for Federally

A study somewhat similar to that of Bailey et al., dealing with three Midwestern States, will be published in the summer by Alfred A. Knopf under the title "State Politics and the Public Schools: An Exploratory Analysis." The study was made by Nicholas A. Masters, Robert H. Salisbury, and Thomas H. Eliot, under a grant to Washington University.

"Tax Credits and Intergovernmental Fiscal Relations," by James A. Maxwell, professor of economics at Clark University, has been published by the Brookings Institution. Although the title may not make immediately clear the book's relevance to public education, it has decided relevance, for it is an exploration of some formulas for providing general purpose assistance to the States without stimulating Federal control.

Finally, a grant to the National Bureau of Economic Research has resulted in, among other things, a paper by Gary S. Becker called "Investment in Human Capital," and a conference of economists on that subject. They provide some new theories about the financial returns from investments in human beings and their education.

THE BACKGROUND—AND THE FUTURE

The cost of supporting the Nation's public elementary and secondary schools will continue to rise over the entire foreseeable future. The increase is inescapable because of the sheer numbers of pupils alone, because of the schools that must be built to house them and the teachers who must be paid to teach them. In short, the cost will continue to rise even without regard to improving the quality of education: without regard to the possible value of lowering the student-teacher ratio, for example, or of raising teachers' salaries, or of making widespread use of new teaching equipment.

Even now, and even in the rich States, there are many school districts with vast gaps between needs and resources. And although the tax effort of the poor States is generally greater than that of the rich ones, the average level of education support in those States falls far short of what is customarily regarded as adequate. As for the total national picture, James B. Conant estimated that by 1958 the educational deficit—the difference between what was spent and what should have been spent for the public schools—was from \$7 to \$48 billion per year.

Several years ago, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund's special panel on education estimated that by 1967 the schools and colleges would require double the funds they spent in 1957. No matter what the amount turns out to be, where is it to come from?

At the moment, the costs of public education are spread among three levels of government—local, State, and national—with the largest proportion coming from local sources and a very small proportion from Federal. In 1960, all but 4.4 percent of the funds came from State and local governments.

The important fact is, however, that State and local revenue structure as they are now utilized for the support of public education are inadequate for the financial tasks ahead. These revenue systems are rigid, based largely on sales and property taxes which are notorious for their slowness to reflect real increases in wealth and income. Thus they cannot produce sufficient revenues for supporting education and other activities—unless taxes are raised very substantially.

Affected Public Schools," by I. M. Labovitz; "Suburban Power Structures and Public Education," by Warner Bloomberg, Jr., and Morris Sunshine; "Social and Economic Factors in Spending for Public Education," by Jerry Miner; and "Education Price and Quantity Indexes," by William Wasserman.

And this most States and communities are loath to do.

The Federal Government has a tax advantage over State and local governments because its tax structure is more elastic. Since the vast majority of Federal revenue comes from taxes on personal and corporate income, increases in economic activity bring an automatic and immediate increase in Federal revenues. But there are many eager claimants for these extra dollars, and in addition a bitterly divisive political conflict surrounds the issue of Federal aid to education.

To sum up, educational interests, thus far denied effective access to the Federal coffers, find themselves in increasingly keen competition for scarce resources in the towns and States—resources which will become relatively more scarce as time goes on unless some major (and highly unlikely) tax reforms are made.

On this gloomy note, we turn now to some of the issues involved in Federal aid to education and the history of the struggle to get that aid, since, according to Munger and Fenno of the Syracuse study, "the Federal Government constitutes what is probably the last major untapped source of revenue for public school education in this country."

One of the major political issues of the day revolves around Federal aid to education. Tradition in the United States has held that education is primarily a local responsibility, and most people seem to believe that the question now is whether the Federal Government should or should not provide funds for the public schools.

The only trouble with this phrasing of the question is that it is inaccurate. The Federal Government does now give financial support to public education, and it has often done so for more than 100 years; in fact, endowments of land were given to the States for educational purposes as far back as 1785. Since then, a number of grants have been made for limited and specific purposes, but no long-term, general Federal aid program has ever been initiated. It is such general aid that proponents of Federal aid seek and have sought in many sessions of the Congress for 94 years. Since 1945, educational legislation of one sort or another has been pending almost continuously.

Although many bills have passed one or the other House of Congress, none has ever passed both during the same session. Several times bills have seemed to be on the verge of passage only to be struck down, under circumstances that prompted one observer to say that the measures are politically accident prone.

The reasons for their high mortality rate are analyzed by Munger and Fenno, both of whom are political scientists, in their fast-moving history of Federal aid legislation. (One of the great virtues of the Syracuse monographs, at least of those thus far available, is that they are written in a style that is clear, interesting, and straightforward and, on appropriate occasion, humorous.) Many different problems have swamped Federal aid; in fact, the most important barrier to passage has been the multiplicity of issues itself.

"The struggle over Federal aid has not been a single conflict, but rather a multiplicity of controversies only loosely related to one another," write Munger and Fenno. "The situation might be compared to a better-than-three-ring circus, although, in view of the tactics at times employed, a multiple bar-room brawl might make a more apt analogy."

THE MAJOR ISSUES

Race, religion, Federal control of education, division of the spoils among the States, the purposes for which aid should be given—each of these issues has figured as an effective deterrent to passage since the beginning of Federal aid legislation. But whereas in

the past one issue, or a combination of two or three, has been sufficient to block legislation, now all of them are involved in the controversy, which leads the authors to take an extremely dim view of the possibilities of early passage of general aid.

It is generally understood, for example, that the southern States are among those in direst need of outside funds for education. Yet the fear that any Federal aid bill, no matter how worded, will eventually be used as a lever for speeding desegregation has nullified hopes for substantial support from the South. Hence the votes must come from the populous States of the North and West—but there, especially in the Northeast, the religious question becomes important. Until 1945 the position of Roman Catholic spokesmen was one of opposition to any Federal aid; since then, however, they have held that such aid is acceptable—but if, and only if, parochial schools are somehow included. It was on this issue that President Kennedy's legislation came to grief in the last session of Congress.

Many people have feared that Federal aid would lead to undesirable forms of control over the content of education—the worst of their fears being that political figures or parties could use the educational system for ideological indoctrination. These fears persist among some people although virtually all advocates of aid, within and without the Government, have specifically denied the wish to control or even to influence education.

Another problem has to do with the type of formula that would be used in making grants. Attempts to equalize educational opportunity among the States pose political problems for legislators from the rich States which would, in effect, be giving more than they would get.

Finally, the issue of what the aid should be used for has divided even the supporters of Federal action. Some want aid only for school construction; others would permit use of the funds for teachers' salaries also. And this issue has begun to resolve itself along partisan lines, with Democrats favoring aid for both purposes, Republicans aid only for construction.

PROponents AND Opponents

One of the problems in pushing legislation has been that although widespread public opinion favors Federal aid, it is only mildly interested in it; it is not a hot vote-getting issue. Masters and his colleagues find the same phenomenon at the State level and remark that, although everybody is for the schools, legislators who champion the cause feel that they make little political hay out of their efforts.

In the presence of wide public support and the absence of loud public noise for legislation, the burden of pushing it has of course fallen (as it does on every issue really) on the particular groups interested in the subject and the allies they are able to rally within the Government.

Historically, the major outside proponents of Federal aid have included educators working through their organizations (primarily the National Education Association), women's groups, and labor. Opposed have been the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the American Legion, and, until 1945, Catholic groups. And although the Catholic position has changed, it in effect still serves as a deterrent because the only condition under which most church spokesmen are willing to see aid given is unacceptable to most of the proponents, quite apart from the constitutional question involved.

Munger and Fenno's account does not leave one with much respect for the political savvy of the outside proponents, of whom one of their critics (who was also for Federal aid) said: "The vast majority of the supporters of the principle of Federal aid

have adhered to a policy which has been vacillating in principle, opportunistic in tactics, and fatal in practice." The savage remark was made in 1945, and things haven't changed much since then, according to the authors.

The supporters have employed strategies ranging from the making of numerous compromises (although refusing to compromise in some instances where it might have paid off), to logrolling, to proposing wildly divergent sums from one year to the next. Munger and Fenno cite "The Very Modest Proposal," or the "16th of a loaf approach," which has failed presumably because it is totally transparent (everyone knows what happens once the camel's nose is allowed into the tent); and "The Outrageous Proposal," probably put forward on the premise that a plea for so much money would surely elicit at least a little.

THE BRANCHES OF GOVERNMENT

As for the situation in the White House and on Capitol Hill, Munger and Fenno point out that until the inauguration of President Kennedy no Chief Executive gave strong leadership for Federal aid. And in spite of the President's deep commitment, in the last session of Congress it was quite apparent that he believed that certain of his foreign policy legislation was of more critical importance and must be pushed at the expense of some domestic bills, including the education bill. Given the state of the world, Munger and Fenno speculate that this priority problem is likely to continue.

Because of the lack of Presidential interest until now, aid to education has been treated almost exclusively as a decision to be made by Congress. Strong efforts have been made to enlist bipartisan support for it—efforts which were greatly enhanced by the late Senator Robert A. Taft's conversion to the Federal aid cause in the 1940's. Until his death he remained one of the most persuasive and influential Senate spokesmen for it. Bipartisanship can cut both ways, however, and Democrats and Republicans have formed more efficient coalitions against than for Federal aid.

THE ISSUE OF FEDERAL CONTROL

One major point that the history of Federal aid legislation over the past 100 years proves, say Munger and Fenno, is the importance of social crisis in encouraging Government action. Virtually all Federal legislation for education has been a reaction to real or imagined crises of one kind or another rather than the outgrowth of a coherent philosophy with respect to the Federal Government's interest or lack of interest in education as such. Hence the grants that have been made were for specific purposes, to meet perceived needs.

This leads to a paradox. Many people question the propriety of general aid because they fear it would lead to undue Federal control or influence over education. Yet what little legislation has so far received approval is of precisely the sort that does influence education because, among other things, of its emphasis on certain fields; for example, vocational education in the law passed in 1917, science and languages in the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

Many observers believe that since general aid is unlikely to be enacted soon, the Federal Government will inevitably make further grants for specific purposes on which it is easier to get political consensus. (Russia's sputnik got more Federal money for education than all America's educators have been able to get for it.) The question of Federal control might be considered in terms of whether the integrity of the public schools will be better protected through aid which the State could use for a general strengthening of the system, or through acts of Congress passed in response to political pressures from within or without.

Thus far, at any rate, most proponents of general aid have been as vehement as their opponents in denouncing the evils of Federal control. But as Sidney Sufrin points out in his monograph, throughout the entire recent congressional debate "the meaning of Federal control, and of the alternatives to Federal control, or the relation of such control to the ideals of excellence, or to the facts of public need, were simply ignored."

Although he believes that the fear that the Federal Government will dominate public education is completely unfounded, he says that "the assertion of a national interest in public elementary and secondary education requires something more than the provision of funds. A national interest implies and requires national goals standards with sufficient flexibility to be reasonably harmonious with State and local goals and standards." He urges much closer cooperation among professional educators, and the participation of Federal agencies, in the effort to improve national standards.

"Federal money is undoubtedly significant," he writes; "but of greater significance are ideas, organizations, and programs."

FISCAL FORMULAS

If the Federal Government were to decide to ease the States' financial burdens in financing education, there are two major administrative methods by which it might do so. One would be for it to give the States revenues which it has collected, under any of several possible formulas. It might make flat grants, based for example on the number of school children in a given State; or grants designed to equalize educational opportunity among the States; or incentive grants to stimulate greater State effort or other actions.

The other way, funds would not actually change hands, so to speak, but the Federal Government could allow tax credits or deductions which would have the effect of increasing the States' revenues without increasing the total amount of taxes individuals pay.

In his book, James Maxwell explores this latter type, largely through an analysis of what has happened under the two major tax credit plans the United States has used so far, for death taxes and unemployment insurance. He concludes that the tax credit has several desirable features, in that it can be used to advance tax coordination and reform, and it provides financial resources for State governments without the risk of increased Federal control. The weakness, however, is that tax credits do not provide for equalization, and they tend to be inflexible. Maxwell suggests that "since Federal objectives are manifold, there will be no inconsistency in using several devices (including tax credits and deductions, unconditional grants, and conditional grants) during the coming years to ease the financial burden of State and local governments."

Thus far, however, the burden of supporting public education rests upon the local and State governments.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, one of the most critical problems affecting public schools today is the alarmingly high dropout rate of students who do not intend to go on to college. Any situation which finds hundreds of thousands of young people without jobs and without working skills of any kind is potentially explosive, and the increasing rate of juvenile delinquency throughout the Nation is one of the alarming symptoms of this illness in our social and educational systems. Present programs of Federal aid to vocational education, which have

been in existence for almost half a century, are hopelessly inadequate to cope with the problem and stand in need of drastic overhauling to meet the needs of today. And manpower retraining programs, important as they are, cannot hope to cope adequately with the unemployment problem as long as untrained and unskilled youths who drop out of school keep filling up the reservoir beneath the surface. We cannot retrain a youth who has had no training to begin with, nor can we deal with the problem by sending a relatively minor number of them into the woods for 6 months in a revival of the old CCC camps.

Some indication of the need for a nationwide vocational education program and the problems that are involved is provided in a special study of the problem which has just been released. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a study of vocational education in the United States entitled "The Forgotten Youth," prepared by the staff of the Senate Republican policy committee, March 4, 1963.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"THE FORGOTTEN YOUTH"—VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES—PART I

INTRODUCTION

"Ignorance and illiteracy, unskilled workers and school dropouts—these and other failures in our educational system have bred failures in our social and economic system: juvenile delinquency, unemployment and chronic dependency."

Thus does the administration rationalize its demand on Congress for a \$5.3 billion Federal aid-to-education program.

Facts indicate precisely the opposite to be true, i.e., failures in our social and economic system have bred failures in our educational system. And the basic failure of public education today has been the systematic refusal to acknowledge—in all of our major urban areas of population—social and economic changes that have been going on during the past four decades.

We have witnessed a massing in urban centers of youths whose background, heritage, and living standards challenge the social environment in which they now live. The academic program which met the needs of an urban community 25 years ago no longer meets the basic needs of that community today. Yet, the curriculum is still static in concept. The result has been the loss of old skills; new ones, needed to meet changing industrial patterns, are not taught.

Unemployment among the young is rising and will continue to rise unless major changes in our educational system are brought about to meet these changed social and economic conditions.

The Democratic administration's school aid proposals fall completely to face up to these basic changes and to provide even a semblance of a solution.

We recognize the need for a higher degree of skill and training in our colleges and graduate schools and encourage efforts—both private and public—to provide the quality instruction needed at these levels.

The administration's message, however, continues to place its primary emphasis on "glamour" aspects of education leading to the college entrance examinations. It endorses, in effect, trends already observed in American education to classify all other educational courses as being just a shade lower in dignity than the academic course.

This and succeeding studies are aimed at examining the needs of the 80 percent of our school-age population who will enter the work force without a college degree.

All Americans willing to work should have the opportunity to look forward to earnings that will enable them to establish a home and to rear a family in decency and dignity. As they lead productive and useful lives they contribute to the growth of America.

Theirs are the problems largely ignored in the administration's school message.

THE PROBLEM FOR YOUTH

In urban areas unemployment, particularly among the young, is rising. Chances of the urban youth, who has just graduated from high school or who has dropped out of school, finding his first job are lessened by the influx of rural youths who can no longer look forward to on-farm employment. In the past 5 years, on-farm job opportunities have fallen off by 800,000—and these youths have had to turn to the cities for a livelihood.

During these same 5 years, the net increase in job opportunities has risen by an estimated 1.5 million. Despite this increase, the young, unskilled worker finds it more and more difficult to get a job because he is unskilled.

The principal increase in job openings is in the service category, ranging from sales clerks to skilled computer mechanics. There is a growing demand for every type of skill in this broad area.

The American education system, as it is now constituted, does not provide the vast majority of high school graduates or school dropouts with these skills. Many may profit from academic studies but they should also be taught how to repair a TV set, operate an office machine, handle a cash register in a supermarket, maintain a building, or other skills necessary to get a job.

The Labor Department estimates that the demand for these and other skills will increase 150 percent by 1975 while the demand for the unskilled worker will decline by some 50 percent.

Our public schools are the obvious place where the needed skills could be acquired. Salable skills are not being taught to enough graduates and to even fewer dropouts.

A decade ago the high school graduate or school dropout could reasonably expect to find a job in some phase of industry. This annual addition to the work force was partially absorbed in this type of industry or on the farm. This situation no longer prevails. Today he is more likely to find himself an unemployment statistic than a productive worker.

In 1960, for instance, 700,000 16-to-19-year-olds who were not in school were unemployed. This constituted 15.5 percent of the 16-to-17-year-olds and 14.1 percent of the 18-to-19-year-olds as compared with the 6.8 percent of the adult work force unemployed.

While unemployment statistics for the young continue grim, an ironic paradox has developed. There is a growing problem among employers who are looking for skilled help but who cannot find it. These employment opportunities are not in the low-pay field, according to a recently published survey.

For instance, butchers in one New York meat wholesale house are earning \$10,000 a year.

A skilled cook—not necessarily a chef—can expect to earn between \$10,000 and \$12,000 in many New York restaurants and aboard American ocean liners. Skilled kitchen help of any kind is hard to find and consequently draws good pay.

American furniture manufacturers are increasingly turning to Europe to find skilled help because too few cabinetmakers are entering the work force in this country.

Skilled sheet metal workers are at a premium in most urban centers.

An apprentice draftsman with no experience starts at \$80 a week in Chicago. Similar wage scales are found in other major American cities.

Landscape gardeners, cosmetologists, cartographers, TV repairmen, plumbers, electricians, appliance repairmen, mechanics, and many types of sales people can start at nearly \$5,000 a year including overtime.

A Chicago auto mechanics union official reports that a body-and-fender man can expect to earn \$10,000 a year in almost any garage but adds that his local cannot supply enough men to meet the needs.

A spot check of classified ads in one major Chicago newspaper for Sunday, February 24, 1963, showed a demand for 5,042 skilled workers. Like situations prevail in other urban centers.

Businessmen throughout the country tell the same story; there just aren't enough skilled workers being added to our labor force each year to meet their needs. In some extreme cases this has resulted in business failure.

American luxury liners are fighting a losing battle with their European competitors partly because they cannot match the skilled service offered by the European lines.

During the past 5 years, 3,500,000 new jobs have been created, primarily in the service category. As every new shopping center is built, literally hundreds of new jobs are created, ranging from parking lot attendants through sales personnel to skilled mechanics and artisans. These jobs are in addition to those already existing in the community.

The Labor Department estimates that during the decade ahead demand for skilled workers will increase by 150 percent. If this projection is borne out it will mean that another 13.5 million such jobs will be created. But each of these jobs will demand more acquired skill.

Our educational system should and must be the source for these skills. As it is geared today—in its static adherence to curriculums of the past which no longer meet the demands of today and the future—it is not qualified to meet this challenge.

THE OVERLOOKED ANSWERS

A partial solution to the problems of unemployed youth as well as those of the employer looking for skilled or semiskilled help does exist within our educational system—the vocational or technical school—but it has been neglected and ignored. In some cases it almost seems that our school administrators have taken the attitude that if they don't look maybe these schools will go away.

While vocational education is not offered as an absolute solution to all of our social and economic problems, it should be more vigorously pushed, better administered, and more fully financed.

During the past year, the American taxpayer, through local, State, and Federal taxation, paid a total public school bill of \$18.1 billion. Of this, \$5.6 billion was for secondary (high school) education. Only \$254 million, or 4.5 percent, of this secondary school budget was spent on vocational education; 4½ percent of the budget was spent to supply the kind of skills needed by the 80 percent of our school population who will enter the labor force without a college education.

Although \$254 million is a sizable amount of money, it must be remembered that this is divided among the 50 States and among the 9.6 million high school students who form the 80 percent. This averages out to about \$28 spent for each of these pupils. This hardly seems adequate.

On a national scale this, in effect, amounts to no vocational education at all.

There are, of course, examples of fine programs producing excellent results. One such oasis is the city of Milwaukee, Wis., which spends \$4.8 million annually to train some 18,000 youths in all types of vocational and technical skills. An interesting side effect of the Milwaukee effort should be cited. In Milwaukee the high school dropout rate is 5.5 percent compared to the highest high school dropout rate in the country—40 percent. The city of New York has recognized the need and has established some excellent vocational schools. Undoubtedly, they should be expanded in scope and amount of expenditures.¹

In contrast, the city of Philadelphia, four times larger than Milwaukee, spends only one-seventeenth as much annually (\$280,000).

Another glaring contrast to Milwaukee is Washington, D.C. In the National Capital the crime rate is climbing rapidly, juvenile delinquency has reached the crisis point, school dropouts constitute a major problem, youth unemployment ranks high as a source of concern, and welfare rolls are bulging. In this city, the budget for vocational education is less than 4 percent of the total school budget.

THE FEDERAL ROLE

In this area of education the Federal role is historic, dating back more than 100 years. The first Land-Grant College Act was a demonstration of the Government's faith in a system of academic and vocational education and a demonstration of the concern the Government held that those who work with their hands be trained properly to perform their tasks with skill and stature in the community.

In 1917 this concept was broadened by the Smith-Hughes Act to include high schools. Congress after Congress since then—regardless of the party in power—extended and broadened this basic law.

In 1961 the administration called together a panel of experts to study vocational education needs. Headed by Chicago school Supt. Benjamin C. Willis, the panel reported back a year later, in November 1962.

The experts agreed there is a deep-seated need for added vocational and technical courses and that the need will increase during the years ahead. They recommended an immediate start and set a price tag of \$400 million.

Yet, in its school message the administration came up with the figure of \$73 million. A study of the complex problems facing young people today—and the society into which they must fit—indicates that perhaps the experts, not the administration, were on the right track.

ATTITUDES MUST CHANGE

More than financial assistance is needed. There must be a fundamental change in the attitude toward vocational education on the part of school boards, school administrators, and the general public.

The glamorous aspects of education are emphasized. Most of our money and time is spent providing an increasingly excellent background for the few who will graduate from college, ignoring the fact that this type of schooling is not solving the problems of the vast majority to prepare them for a useful career. Many of them sit and fidget through class after class until they reach the legal age limit when the truant officer no longer holds power over them—and they drop out. Meanwhile, they have become problems for the school administrator.

¹ A survey is currently being made of the 50 State programs, how they are financed and administered, and how well they are working. When results are complete enough to provide some idea of successes and failures, they will be compiled in a further study.

In most school systems the machine shop, the woodworking lathes, and the garage equipment are relegated to the basement, or worse, to obsolete schools which no longer are considered good enough to house academic classrooms.

Little, if any new equipment is bought. Not enough well-trained teachers are hired.

Vocational courses have been given a second-class status and a stigma attached to those taking them. Whether we like to admit it or not, facts indicate that too often administrators use vocational schools as dumping grounds for the unruly and the problem children. The vocational school becomes, in effect, a reformatory without bars. It is little wonder that many parents object strenuously to their children taking part in such programs.

Glance through any report on school problems and almost invariably—as in the case with the administration's school message—the emphasis is on the academic program. That school message devoted four whole paragraphs of a 13-page message to vocational education.

To achieve a really adequate vocational program will, then, require some fundamental changes in attitude among school officials, teachers, and the general public. The dignity of those attending vocational schools or taking vocational courses must be reaffirmed. A society cannot exist where no one is supposed to get his hands dirty.

Closer attention to this problem by community and national news media and by local and national civic organizations might help in bringing about this necessary attitude change.

Because such a program is designed to fill an educational vacuum for the vast majority of students, greater emphasis on finances must be accompanied by greater interest on the part of school administrators.

Such a program must be long-range in character. Lack of spectacular immediate results would not mean failure since appreciable results cannot be expected for at least 4 years, perhaps not even that soon.

A well-rounded vocational program should include a greater degree of on-the-job training in cooperation with unions and business but under the supervision of school officials. Such a program would have a twofold benefit. It would enhance the value of classroom learning with actual experience and it also would provide students with much-needed dollar earnings.

It must be remembered that in many of our urban centers families depend on their children's earnings to maintain themselves. If the students can bring home the needed money with pride, it not only points to a better future for them, it starts the family itself on the road to rehabilitation, another possible side effect of a well-grounded vocational program.

Such a program cannot be achieved in this country by spending 4 percent of the budget or 4 percent of the administrator's time.

Schools by themselves cannot solve the problem of juvenile delinquency. This is a problem for the home, the church, and law enforcement authorities as well as for the educator. Schools by themselves cannot provide jobs for the jobless or hope for those desperate young men and women who have looked but who cannot find dignified employment.

OTHER PROGRAMS QUESTIONED

In addition to its message on education, the administration has sent to the Congress this year requests for other types of youth programs. These include the Youth Conservation Corps and the local area youth employment program. The administration is obviously, through these programs, turning away from education for a solution to problems which it knows exist.

Even if approved by the Congress, these programs would only postpone for a year or two the impact of the employment problem on the young people and the Nation. These programs offer no real training or skill-acquisition opportunities. They are, in simplest terms, a new form of dole, a new form of burying our heads in the sand.

The young men and women who participate would find themselves, upon emerging, still without the necessary skills to meet modern job requirements. They would soon become once again among the unemployed.

OBSTACLES

There are obstacles to the creation of a truly effective vocational education program.

1. The attitude of the administration, of school boards, school officials, teachers, and the public must change. Their apathy and even hostility mitigate against a sound program and must be changed before effective steps can be taken.

2. Teachers in the academic field would undoubtedly object to a changed emphasis. After all, their jobs are at stake in this. If more emphasis were placed on learning the needed skills, more technically trained teachers and fewer academicians might be needed. Their unions and associations also could be expected to object.

3. School administrators would find it difficult to hire the properly trained vocational teachers needed in such an expanded program. Because the program in the past has been so small, teachers' colleges have either ignored it or placed upon it the same lack of emphasis as the school boards. Unless the public is properly informed, it will never overcome its apathy and provide the necessary support needed to encourage forward-looking school administrators to adopt the proper programs.

4. Initial union resistance might occur. As long as the skilled labor market is limited, union members will draw high wages and overtime pay and some union leaders might adopt the shortsighted policy of limiting the labor supply. Obviously, however, as the number of skilled earning union members increases, the unions themselves are improved and the union movement is strengthened. With the decline and near disappearance of the apprentice system, it may well be that vocational schools offer the major manpower pool from which future trade union members are drawn.

Of these factors, the most important is the attitude of the Government, school officials, and the public.

Public school education is valuable to the extent it prepares children to become useful citizens. If our American educational system is to meet this challenge and fulfill its responsibility, there must be a fundamental change in attitude and approach.

If our educational system does not meet this basic responsibility to all of our children, then regardless of how many billions we spend, we have failed the next generation.

THE MEANING OF FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, yesterday in an address before the Advertising Council, President Kennedy delivered a coldly realistic analysis of this Nation's economic history during the past two decades. The President's remarks demonstrate how economic decisions made during 1957 have resulted in 6 years of growing unemployment, rising budget deficits, worsening balance of payments, and increasing under-capacity operations.

As President Kennedy noted, in the decade prior to July 1957, unemploy-

ment had barely exceeded 4 percent. Since 1957, it has remained above 5 percent. And February saw unemployment rise to 6.1 percent.

In the decade prior to 1957, business fixed investment averaged almost 11 percent of total output. Since that time, it has declined to under 9 percent.

In the earlier decade the gross national product had expanded at the rate of almost 4 percent annually. The past 6 years have witnessed a total growth rate of barely 3 percent annually. Moreover, the balance-of-payments gap became a serious matter of concern after 1957.

The President noted that our total economy is currently functioning at \$30 to \$40 billion below capacity. I believe this figure is a most conservative estimate of our so-called production gap. I have received impressively documented estimates that our economy is currently functioning \$70 to \$80 billion below capacity. But whichever estimate you accept as more accurate, the resulting loss in jobs, wages, capital investment, and consumer products is tragic.

The President has presented this country and the Congress with the economic facts of life. He has, so to speak, laid it on the line. Can we afford to continue this record of partial economic fulfillment? Can we be satisfied with this squandering of our productive resources? Will we permit this country to slowly slip into another serious recession? These are questions every Member of Congress must ask himself.

Mr. President, in asking these questions we should also understand the term "fiscal responsibility" in terms of our obligation to foster an economy capable of restoring 4.9 million unemployed Americans to productive labors. We have the responsibility to foster a strong domestic economy that inspires confidence among foreign investors, thereby providing the basis for improving the balance-of-payments gap. We have the responsibility to bring this country's economy to a growth rate in excess of 4 percent annually. That is what we might call "fiscal responsibility." We have the responsibility to erase the \$70 to \$80 billion gap between our actual national production and our economic potential.

I suggest that for once we should define fiscal responsibility in terms of jobs, investments, wages, products, and growth, and not limit ourselves to the single criterion of the Federal Government's administrative budget. Our decisions regarding the Federal budget touch only one factor among many that eventually will determine the true extent of our fiscal responsibility.

Will Congress provide a fiscally responsible tax structure that will stimulate rather than depress our economy? Will Congress appropriate funds in a manner that reflects the needs of our modern, technologically sophisticated society, such as funds for mass transportation facilities, urban housing, and health and educational facilities? Will the Congress provide a realistic debt ceiling that recognizes that the actual debt burden

is steadily declining in proportion to the rising gross national product?

Each of these questions will be decided by Congress this year. It is my sincere hope that Congress will act in this fiscally responsible fashion. For if we do, the entire economy will reflect the wisdom of our decisions and millions of Americans will be eternally grateful.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from President Kennedy's address to the Advertising Council be printed at the conclusion of my remarks. I also ask unanimous consent that two editorials from the Washington Post, "The Tax-Cut Opposition" and "Reduction and Reform," also be printed in the RECORD. Finally, I ask unanimous consent that a thought-provoking letter from Leon Keyserling, former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, as published by the Washington Post, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts, editorial, and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
Mar. 14, 1963]

PARTIAL TEXT OF KENNEDY SPEECH

The first 2 months of the 88th Congress have been dominated by discussions of fiscal and economic policy—and the next several months may well be dominated by these topics. In the last 100 years, questions of economic policy have become as complex to the layman as questions of space and military technology. Free soil, free silver, and free trade, for example, were basically easier to understand than the balance of payments, the tools of debt management and the application of countercyclical forces. Today every problem has several alternative solutions, and every answer raises several questions. I am more than ever convinced of the words once uttered by George Bernard Shaw: "If all economists were laid end to end, they still would not reach a conclusion."

FAMILIAR QUESTIONS

Three familiar questions of fiscal policy must be decided by the Congress:

1. The limit on the national debt;
2. The size of the Federal budget; and
3. The desirability and extent of Federal tax reduction.

All three of these questions have faced the legislative and executive branches before—and we have an obligation to learn the lessons of history if we do not wish to relive it. Economic history—specifically the history of 1957-60, which produced two recessions from which the economy never wholly recovered—clearly warns us now that the wrong answer to each of these three questions would spell downturn and disaster for the American economy as a whole.

I do not speak as a partisan. The errors of a Republican administration and a Democratic Congress during those crucial years have been previously acknowledged by members of both parties. I do not review them now to gain political advantage in hindsight but to gain a greater degree of foresight on the same problems that face us now. I do not intend to assess the blame for the past—but we shall all be deserving of blame if we do not learn its lessons for the future.

HARSH RESULTS

The Federal Government—and I shall speak here not of any one party or branch of Government, but the Government as a whole—decided in 1957 to keep the debt limit unrealistically low, to cut back and stretch out budget expenditures, to tighten monetary policy and to reject all efforts at

tax reduction. The harsh results of those decisions are still with us.

In the decade previous to July 1957 unemployment had barely exceeded 4 percent. In the 64 months since those decisions, it has remained above 5 percent.

In the earlier decade, business fixed investment averaged nearly 11 percent of total output—it has since that time fallen steadily to roughly 9 percent today.

In the previous decade, our total output of goods and services, measured in constant prices, had increased at the rate of nearly 4 percent a year. Since mid-1957, the rate of increase has been limited to 3 percent.

All three of these decisions were taken in the name of fiscal responsibility. But if that high-sounding label is intended to refer primarily to budget and balance of payments surpluses, it was a name taken in vain.

STRONG ECONOMY

The preceding 11 fiscal years had produced seven cash surpluses in the Federal budget, for a net cash surplus of \$20 billion. The succeeding fiscal years produced one surplus and five deficits, including the greatest peacetime deficit of all time in fiscal 1959, for a net cash deficit of \$30 billion. Had the economy been operating at full employment, there would have been no deficit at all.

The balance-of-payments problem became a problem only after the mid-1957 decisions, with a total deficit of \$11.2 billion during the next three calendar years and a gold loss of more than \$5 billion during the same period. The fact that short-term interest rates had been increased 40 percent in 1955 and 1957 did not help to stem the tide. As the OECD said last December:

"Confidence in the dollar depends in good part on a strong domestic economy; it is unlikely to be fostered for any length of time by policies that keep the level of activity low."

Unfortunately, the size of the deficits in our Federal budget and our international accounts led the Government in 1959 to adopt even more restrictive fiscal and monetary policies. The Federal cash budget during the first quarter 1959 was operating at the level of a \$17 billion deficit at annual rates. By the third quarter, this had become a \$2 billion deficit—and by the second quarter of the next year, 1960, a surplus of \$7 billion. These figures are from Arthur Burns, who served my predecessor as Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, and who calls this "one of the very sharpest shifts of Federal finance in our Nation's history."

At the same time, Dr. Burns pointed out, economic expansion was curbed by a tightening of both short- and long-term credit—long-term rates, in fact, "advanced faster than during a comparable stage of any business cycle during the past hundred years."

The result was another recession, more unemployment, more unused capacity, and another incomplete recovery. Today output is \$30 to \$40 billion below our productive capacity. The rate of unemployment has risen to 6.1 percent of those actively seeking work. Corporate investment last year was—for the first time in any nonrecession year since the war—below the level of gross retained earnings. And business spending on new plant and equipment was at a lower level than it was in 1957.

SAME DECISIONS

Now, in 1963, the Government is once again faced with these same decisions. I hope we will bear in mind the lessons of history. I hope we will remember the editorial in Business Week magazine, June 28, 1958, which pointed out the effects of an unrealistic debt ceiling and a harmful slash in expenditures:

"In the second half of 1957 the debt ceiling forced the administration to cut back

programs needed for long-term national security. And the resulting slash in defense expenditures was an important contributing cause of the recession."

An unrealistic debt ceiling or budget cut today would also cause a slowdown in contracts, a stretchout in payments, a cash drain on business, and ultimately another recession. Instead of balancing the budget, it would produce a budget deficit far greater than the temporary addition to the deficit that will come from tax reduction. Let us remember that the \$12.4 billion deficit of fiscal year 1959 was the result of a recession which wiped out what had originally been estimated to be a surplus of \$466 million.

REALISTIC CEILING

This administration is not asking for an unlimited debt ceiling, but a realistic one which will still keep the actual debt burden—as measured by its proportion of gross national product—steadily declining.

We are not asking for uncontrolled budget increases, but for a prudent budget which, contrary to the trend at all levels of Government, actually reduces civilian expenditures below their level of the previous year, a feat which has occurred only four times in the last 15 years.

And we are not asking for an unprecedented tax cut, but for a program which will add only \$2.7 billion to the next budget deficit. Certainly it is clear that, if we slide into another recession, the deficit without a tax cut will be far larger than the projected deficit we face with a tax cut.

So I am hopeful that the lessons of history will be remembered by us all—by those of us in the administration and the Congress, and those in this audience who are leaders of opinion in the business community.

"The great advantage of Americans," wrote De Tocqueville in 1835, "consists in their being able to commit faults which they may afterward repair." To this I would add the fact that the great advantage of hindsight consists of our applying its lessons by way of foresight. If this Nation can apply the lessons and repair the faults of the last 5 years—if we can stick to the facts and cast out falsehoods and, above all, distinguish clearly between facts and falsehoods—then, surely, this great country can achieve the full fruits of greatness which today remain beyond our reach.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
Feb. 25, 1963]

THE TAX-CUT OPPOSITION

Although a parade of expert witnesses has passed before the Joint Economic Committee and the House Committee on Ways and Means, not one of the opponents of the principle of tax reduction has come up with a rounded and analytical counterargument. Since a vital issue is at stake, this failure to subject the principles of contemporary fiscal policy to serious intellectual scrutiny is indeed regrettable. What are the principal objections to a tax cut? Several loosely connected strands of the opposition's case can be extracted from the testimony of the various witnesses.

Prof. Dan Throop Smith of Harvard University, gave voice to a fear of inflation and balance-of-payments difficulties when he declared that an enlargement of the present fiscal deficit would constitute "a dangerous gamble with the country's currency and basic well-being." But the fear of inflation at this time is hardly well grounded. The trend of wholesale prices has been level or declining slightly since 1959, and with considerable excess capacity in most sectors of economic activity and effective foreign competition, it is not likely that the stimulus of a tax cut will generate inflationary pressures.

Nor can a great deal of weight be attached to the argument that a cut would significantly enlarge the international balance-of-payments deficit through an upsurge of imports. Such a threat could become serious only if a recession, affecting all or most of our overseas partners were to occur. And even in that eventuality, it is probable that the inflow of foreign capital funds would offset the decline of U.S. exports. It is noteworthy on this score that Per Jacobssen, the respected Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund, supports the tax reduction and appropriate monetary measures in order to withstand what he describes as the "deflationary tendencies in the present period."

A second and more sophisticated objection is directed to the proposition that the bulk of the tax relief should go to individuals rather than the corporate enterprises. Most of these critics favor a reduction in the very high personal income-tax brackets, but they would extend the bulk of the tax relief—if any—to corporations on the ground that it will stimulate investment. But this view overlooks the fact that the American economy has been saddled with considerable excess capacity since 1957. The ratio of cash flow—retained profits plus depreciation allowances—to outlays for new plant and equipment has risen in most sectors, and it is therefore doubtful that corporate tax relief alone would provide a significant stimulus to economy activity. Consumers are fickle creatures, but the available evidence seems to indicate that the bulk of any tax reduction would soon be spent. And when pressures are created by a rise in the volume of consumer expenditures, efforts will be made to increase productive capacity through capital investment.

The success of this chain of reactions, of course, hinges on the maintenance of business confidence. But despite a distaste for fiscal deficits and rising Government expenditures, there is little evidence of a serious deterioration in the longrun optimism that has characterized business thinking in the postwar period.

There is also the view that most of the current unemployment is structural and cannot be reduced by a rise in the volume of economic activity. But evidence to support this pessimistic proposition has yet to be produced.

Most of the objections to a tax cut are based upon groundless fears, dubious historical analogies and doubtful hypotheses concerning the determinants of investment. Perhaps a strong case against a tax cut can be made, but thus far the critics have been far from articulate.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
Feb. 26, 1963]

REDUCTION AND REFORM

The Symposium on Economic Growth conducted by the American Bankers Association Monday, may have regrouped the national consensus gathered behind the drive for tax reduction at this session of Congress. President Kennedy, in his address and in his answers to questions, made it clear that tax reduction at this session of Congress is, in his view, essential to economic growth, even if it can be achieved only by the sacrifice of some individual proposals for tax reform. The economists and bankers who participated in the symposium exhibited differing opinions on the relation between tax policies and growth, and on the other means of inducing rapid growth and even on the importance of short-run growth itself but they disclosed an almost unanimous belief that existing rates of taxation on personal incomes and corporate incomes are a drag on the economy.

The symposium has had the most desirable effect of putting the debate on the tax bill

back into an intellectual framework and divesting it of many of the political overtones that, in recent weeks, have almost drowned out the essential issue.

The President's forceful statement made its own unique contribution to getting the dialog onto the track again. He had the right answers to all the conventional objections to the tax bill. He was able to put into its proper perspective the debate over the deficit. He made the most convincing argument to persuade every reasonable listener that the choice is not between a large deficit and no deficit but is, on the contrary, between a large deficit and a larger deficit—between the deficit that will exist if taxes are reduced and the greater deficit that will develop if the economy stagnates, growth rate declines, unemployment increases and tax revenues decline.

The President made a double case for lowering the existing tax rates. He made a case that ought to convince those who believe a large deficit is the thing to be avoided and he made a case to convince those who believe in tax reduction for its economic effect. There is a temptation to say that the consensus behind tax reduction never would have been shaken if the administration had not mingled tax reduction and tax reform. If it was damaging to mingle the two purposes, and this newspaper has thought it damaging, that damage now has been largely repaired by the President's emphasis on the growth and antirecession purposes of tax reduction. This, it is clear, is what he believes is essential at this session of Congress. In the end, the President may have been tactically correct to combine both objectives. The exercise has demonstrated that the objections to this course were not purely theoretical or imaginary. There is as little agreement on the need for and the kind of tax reform required as there is general agreement on the need for and the kind of tax reduction needed.

The tax bill, after a perilous few weeks of confusion and disarray among the advocates of tax reduction, can now be put on the road to enactment by separating the reductions in rates from the reforms of structure. The administration made an honest effort to get all of its proposals, but it is clear now that the President will be content to get through the provisions that have to do with the country's ability to cope with its central economic problem of achieving a sustained economic growth.

FOR A TAX CUT

Your editorial of February 25 admirably disposes of the opposition to tax cuts. I believe we need big tax cuts now. But this does not justify the predisposition of some to regard as obstructionists those who question the proposals now before the Congress. Experience during the New Deal should have taught us that the notion that any kind of action is better than no action led to some erroneous and wasteful programs, and frustrated anything approximating full recovery until the advent of World War II.

I submit that the current tax program needs drastic change. Tax reduction of even \$7 or \$8 billion in the first year, with the reforms deferred, would do much more good than a complex medley of reductions and reforms spread out over 3 years, with a gross value of \$13 billion and a net value of \$10 billion.

Whether or not the reforms are deferred, and especially if they are, the distribution of the tax cuts should concentrate much more heavily than proposed by the administration in the middle- and low-income groups. Your editorial properly refers to the large amount of excess capacity since 1957, the high "cash flow" and the effect which a rising volume of consumer expenditure would have upon capital investment. Under current and foreseeable conditions, the exces-

sively large amounts which the current tax proposals allocate to investment stimulus, through corporate tax reduction, and through personal rate reductions for those who have and invest relatively large portions of their income, would be substantially wasted.

But the main defect in the current tax proposals is external rather than internal. Your editorial is entirely correct in rejecting the viewpoint that most of the current unemployment is "structural" (i.e., due to maladjustments in the available labor force). Nonetheless, most of the unemployment can be taken up only by profound changes in the structure of demand, granted that aggregate demand must be increased.

Tax reduction scattered among millions of families will add to their spending for traditional types of products, and may add some to investment in producers' facilities for such products. But the new technology and automation are advancing so rapidly that there is very little chance for much more employment in these more or less conventional areas, even if production and distribution rise considerably.

The automobile industry has been producing recently at a higher rate than in 1955, but with several hundred thousand fewer employees. The changes in the structure of demand required to create 12½ million net additional jobs within a decade call for vast expansion of housing and urban renewal, improvements in mass transportation, enormously enlarged educational and health services and facilities, etc. These all call for combined private and public efforts entirely apart from tax reduction, including large increases in Federal domestic spending.

So when the administration commits itself to a freeze on domestic public spending for several years ahead, as a quid pro quo for a questionable compound of tax reduction, thus doing violence to the valid cry raised over the years by so many, ranging all the way from the Rockefeller reports to J. K. Galbraith, it turns its back on what is essential if our basic needs are to be met, and if the economic growth and employment performance in the years ahead is to average any better than during the past decade.

LEON H. KEYSERLING.

WASHINGTON.

FAIR HOUSING ORDINANCE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, last week District Commissioner Walter N. Tobriner indicated that the Board of Commissioners would soon decide whether to issue an order banning housing discrimination in the District of Columbia.

This announcement by Mr. Tobriner is heartening news. The time for action to deal with housing discrimination in Washington is long overdue.

Last September, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights after a 2-day hearing, extensive investigation, and a careful report, unanimously recommended that Washington adopt a fair housing regulation to prohibit racial and religious discrimination. The report received overwhelmingly favorable response from the District of Columbia community.

In November, a group of eminent Washingtonians, the District of Columbia Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, which includes representatives of banking, real estate, industry, the church and civic affairs, urged that the Board of Commissioners issue a fair housing regulation. Since then dozens of organizations and hun-

dreds of individuals have added their voices to the plea for fair housing action in the District of Columbia.

If the citizens of Washington want a fair housing law, why has action been so long in coming? It has been suggested that there was legal doubt about the authority of the Commissioners to act.

However, the Corporation Counsel of the District has advised the Commissioners that they are authorized under their police powers to issue fair housing regulations.

The Corporation Counsel also indicated that as a prerequisite of issuing such regulation, the Commissioners should find as a fact "that any such condition of discrimination results or is likely to result in danger to the lives, limbs, health, comfort, quiet, or property of the inhabitants of the District of Columbia."

This requirement was not an onerous one and on November 30 and December 3, 1962, the District Commissioners held public hearings to determine whether there was a need for regulations to provide for nondiscriminatory use of housing facilities. Citizens were asked to furnish information which would enable the Commissioners to determine whether discriminatory housing practices had given rise to a situation where regulation is necessary "to protect lives, limbs, health, comfort, and quiet of all persons and all property in the District."

Representatives of more than 60 neighborhood, civic, religious, business, and fraternal groups, as well as Government officials and citizens speaking for themselves as individuals, submitted oral or written testimony in the course of the hearings. The overwhelming majority of these witnesses testified to the crucial need for fair housing regulations in our Nation's Capital.

Some of the testimony dramatically underlines the President's recent admonition that in looking at Washington we should direct our gaze beyond the broad boulevards, parks, and public monuments. The Commissioners heard testimony that reveals another Washington, D.C., a city whose residents live in a racially defined ghetto five times more crowded than the area where white residents are free to live. It is a city where the number of infant deaths in the Negro ghetto is five times as great as within the white areas; where reported cases of tuberculosis are two and a half times more numerous; where those with one-half the income of their fellow citizens pay out a much greater percentage of that smaller income for housing—housing which is markedly inferior.

And that other Washington is a city where criminal offenses and juvenile referrals are double the figure for the white areas. As a Negro lawyer who has lived in Washington for 35 years said at the hearings:

Deprivation means rebelling. Separate areas of residence can create strained relations between different groups of people, but unequal separate areas of residence are potentially dangerous not only to these groups of people themselves but to the very system in which they live.

More than one civic leader testified to the damage to mental health and comfort resulting from segregated housing and the conditions it engenders.

Evidence was cited to support a housing official's statement that—

Negro communities in the central city slums are developing into a kind of social and economic limbo from which there will be no escape.

Mr. President, if the District Commissioners needed evidence of the fact that housing discrimination endangers the "lives, limbs, health, comfort, quiet or property of the inhabitants of the District of Columbia," they received it in abundant quantity at that hearing. If they wanted proof that discrimination results in racial tensions and violence, they needed to look no further than the causes of the Thanksgiving Day riot at District of Columbia Stadium.

If they desired corroboration of the demoralizing and degrading effects of racial ghettos, they need only take a walk around our city. In my opinion there is no legal or factual impediment to a regulation prohibiting discrimination in housing.

Washington, sometimes called the first city of the free world, will not be fully free itself as long as those who praise the city and those who condemn it refuse to recognize the harsh realities of its split personality. As long as housing in Washington remains segregated, and many of the resulting problems are blamed on secondary or irrelevant causes, our Nation's Capital will remain a segregated city—one part free metropolis, one part ghetto.

Mr. President, it is time for Washington to join the growing list of cities that have acted to guarantee equal opportunity in housing for all their citizens.

I do not urge the District Commissioners to follow my beliefs in this matter any more than they should follow the beliefs of those opposed to a fair housing order. I only hope that the Commissioners will determine the needs and wishes of the people of the District and then act accordingly.

President Kennedy has said that when racial discrimination persists in Washington:

It sometimes constitutes a personal affront to the diplomats of sovereign nations and always reflects upon our ability as a Nation to live up to our constitutional ideals. Washington should provide an example of our worthiest profession and best practices, both for the Nation and the world.

If the District Commissioners follow the dictates of their consciences, and act in accordance with the needs and interests of the citizens of Washington, we will take a long step toward that goal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution of the District of Columbia Advisory Committee of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. This resolution was approved prior to President Kennedy's Executive order barring discrimination in federally assisted housing and should be read in that light.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF THE U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

We commend the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights for its forthright report on housing in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area. We support the Commission's findings and recommendations.

We favor the issuing of both a Presidential Executive order requiring equal housing opportunity in governmentally financed or assisted housing and a Board of Commissioners' regulation prohibiting discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin in the sale, rental or financing of housing accommodations within the District of Columbia. As the Commission has said, the problem of housing discrimination in Washington is metropolitan in scope. The response to this must also be of a metropolitan character. Therefore, action by the President and as well as by the District of Columbia Commission is needed if there is to be a total solution to our housing problems.

We call upon the President and the Board of Commissioners to issue an Executive order and a regulation respectively in regard to housing discrimination, and to put both the Executive order and the regulation into effect at the earliest possible moment.

More than a month has passed since the report of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission was submitted. In this time a number of responsible organizations of the District have spoken out in favor of such a regulation. The overwhelming public demand for action warrants an immediate response.

The fair housing regulation, to be effective, must contain administrative remedies rather than relying solely on criminal penalties. We urge the utilization of an administrative agency with authority to conciliate and mediate and with power to obtain appropriate relief, along the lines suggested by the Commission, if conciliation and mediation fail.

The objective of this committee is to make metropolitan Washington a model area in which our large nonwhite population lives in equality and friendliness with the rest of the community. The proposed order and District of Columbia regulation will go a long way toward that goal.

The District of Columbia Advisory Committee to the Commission on Civil Rights: Dr. Duncan Howlett, Chairman, Minister of All Souls Church; The Reverend E. Franklin Jackson, Vice Chairman, President of District of Columbia Chapter of National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; James M. Lambie, Jr., Secretary, Assistant Executive Director of CARE, Inc.; Paul R. Dean, Dean of Georgetown University School of Law; Patricia R. Harris, Associate Dean of Students, Howard University; George E. C. Hayes, Attorney at Law; Frank J. Luchs,¹ Executive Vice President, Shannon & Luchs Co.; Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., Attorney at Law; Ben D. Segal, Director of Education, International Union of Electrical Workers, AFL-CIO; Sterling Tucker, Executive Director, Washington Urban League, Inc.; Henry Kellogg Willard II, Banker-Treasurer, American Security & Trust Co.; J. Hillman Zahn, Vice President, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. of Washington.

¹ Mr. Frank Luchs made the following separate statement: "While I agree in principle with the resolution of the committee I am satisfied that a fair housing regulation should be issued by the District of Columbia Commissioners simultaneously with, or subsequent to, the issuance of a Presidential Executive order, or not at all."

USE OF SENATE AUDITORIUM TO SHOW CERTAIN DOCUMENTARY FILMS AND SO FORTH

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, for some time I have been concerned with the need for the American public to gain a greater understanding of the role Congress plays in the American system of government.

The average American citizen is primarily concerned with events of his personal life. He has little opportunity to become familiar with other considerations such as the operations of Congress which are, to him, highly marginal in importance. This situation is natural, proper, and to be expected.

But ultimately the strength of our democratic system is dependent to some extent on the appreciation and understanding the average citizen has of the machinery of democracy. Congress surely is a vital cog in that machinery.

Each year millions of Americans travel to Washington, D.C., to observe the Federal Government in operation and to view the more picturesque sections of this city. Most visitors include a trip to Capitol Hill as part of their Washington excursion. The guides stationed in the Capitol rotunda perform a valuable service by providing an interesting and enlightening tour of the Capitol itself. The emphasis of this tour rests with the architectural and historical aspects of Congress and the Capitol. Many Senators find time in their busy schedules to meet their constituents and explain the workings of Congress for them.

As an ex-teacher and a practicing politician, I know the value of direct exposure in awakening a person's interest in any subject—even Congress. It is our responsibility to provide the most meaningful and complete explanation possible of the workings of Congress for every visitor to Capitol Hill.

In order to introduce our constituents to the operations of Congress in a more effective manner, I propose that the Senate auditorium, room G-308 in the New Senate Office Building, be used to show documentary films on a regular, free-of-charge basis. These films would concentrate on describing the role and operations of Congress.

As my colleagues know, the Senate auditorium is not used frequently. Most of the time it sits locked and vacant. I am willing to wager that many Members of Congress have never had occasion even to see the room. However, it is a fine auditorium with excellent acoustics, seats, lighting and it is highly suitable for motion pictures. There are available several excellent movies outlining the work of Congress. I specifically know of one such series containing eight 30-minute films produced by the National Educational Television and Radio Center and titled "From Capitol Hill: Party Government and the U.S. Congress." Contained in this series are such films as "The Role of Congress," "The Senate and House of Representatives," "Congress and the President," and "Congress as a Means of Democratic Government: A Summary."

My proposal is very simple. On a regular schedule provide screenings of one or more of these documentary, non-partisan films on the workings of Congress. The movies would be shown on a free-of-charge basis. Each Senate and House office would receive a schedule of times when the films would be run, and constituents would attend at a convenient time. If the auditorium were needed for official Senate business, the films would be suspended for that period of time, or held in another location.

I also suggest the U.S. Capitol Historical Society as the ideal body to assume the sponsorship of this service. The U.S. Capitol Historical Society is dedicated to public enlightenment as to the importance of Congress in American Government, both in historic and contemporary sense. As a vice president of the society, I know it is absolutely nonpartisan in its activities, and therefore could serve as the ideal body to select the films to be shown. I intend to pass this suggestion along to Representative FRED SCHWENDEL, president of the society, and a Member of Congress vitally concerned with the importance of instilling in every American citizen a basic understanding of and appreciation for our democratic system of Government. I am indeed hopeful that the U.S. Capitol Historical Society will be able to assume the responsibility for this project.

Eventually a movie written specifically for the job of introducing visitors to Congress could be produced. As many Senators know, visitors to Williamsburg are treated to an outstanding color film on the American revolution that vividly brings to life their later tour of this historic American shrine. A similar film outlining both the history and contemporary activities of Congress would greatly assist in informing American citizens—and foreign visitors as well—about the activities of the legislative branch of Government.

Perhaps the U.S. Capitol Historical Society would also assume this longer range project. As a vice president of this society, I know that such a film is under active consideration once the new guide book on the Capitol has been published. Perhaps the society could collaborate with an outside group such as the National Education and Television and Radio Center in producing this special introductory film on Congress.

Mr. President, in order to implement this proposal I am forwarding my ideas to the distinguished chairman of the Senate Rules and Administration Committee, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], who is now in the Chamber. The need for such a program of public education is obvious. The means for accomplishing this objective appear to be at hand. I sincerely hope prompt action will be possible on this proposal.

NUCLEAR SUBMARINE CONSTRUCTION AWARDS ON COMPETITIVE BASIS

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, last month Mr. Armond G. Satalino of Eliot, Maine, wrote me a very interesting letter in which he charged first, that the

award of nuclear ballistic missile submarine building contracts was under the influence of politics; second, that the Kittery Naval Shipyard was not "getting it;" third, that the Electric Boat Co., of Groton, Conn., was getting "all, or at least a goodly number, of Polaris submarine construction contracts"; fourth, that private shipyards were getting too many construction awards; and fifth, that the Senators and Congressmen from New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Maine should join together to do something about the situation.

Upon receiving his letter, I had copies of it made and wrote President Kennedy, Secretary of Defense McNamara, and Secretary of the Navy Korth asking them for reports on the issues Mr. Satalino raised in his letter, a copy which I enclosed in my request to them.

I did so because I had observed in my reply to Mr. Satalino:

I have no evidence that politics controls the award of submarine construction contracts, although I must confess that it was only last year that I was the victim of partisan politics when the Kennedy administration refused to give me information on the award of the nuclear submarine to the Kittery Naval Shipyard. You may recall that I requested such information both before and after the Kennedy administration gave it to Democratic Senator MUSKIE but that the Kennedy administration refused to give me the information that it had given Senator MUSKIE. You may recall my protest against such "two bit" politics and the several editorials in the Portland papers condemning me for making such a protest.

In view of your point about politics controlling the construction awards, I have had copies made of your letter and have sent the copies to President Kennedy, Secretary of Defense McNamara, and Secretary of the Navy Korth, asking them for reports on the matter since it is they, not I, who control the selection of the construction awards and they are of the opposite political party.

Since Mr. Satalino raised the issue of alleged political influence, I further observed to him:

In that connection, I would point out that Massachusetts holds more political power on this matter about which you write in that not only is the President of the United States from Massachusetts but so is the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, and the junior Senator from Massachusetts is the brother of the President.

You may have noted recently in the Portsmouth papers that Senator CORTON and I joined in an appeal to President Kennedy and Speaker MCCORMACK to keep their 1960 campaign promises made 2½ years ago to order pay equalization for the Kittery Naval Shipyard workers.

I asked Mr. Satalino to give me any specific evidence that he had in support of his charge that the submarine awards were made on the basis of politics. I made that request to him in my letter of February 8, 1963. He has not responded to my letter and my request.

On behalf of the President, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Navy, my letters to them were answered by Assistant Secretary of the Navy Kenneth E. BeLieu by letter dated February 20, 1963, and a copy of which I sent to Mr. Satalino on February 21, 1963, the day I received the BeLieu letter.

In his letter, Secretary BeLieu stated that—

1. The submarine construction awards were not made on the basis of politics but rather on a competitive basis;

2. The Electric Boat Co. had won its construction awards on a competitive basis; and

3. In the past 5 calendar years, employment at the Kittery-Portsmouth Naval Shipyard increased by more than 2,100, while total employment at all of our naval shipyards, including Kittery-Portsmouth, decreased by approximately 800.

Because this is a matter of interest to the three States of Maine, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts, I ask unanimous consent that the letter of Secretary BeLieu be placed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,

Washington, D.C., February 20, 1963.

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In your letters of February 8, 1963, to the President, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Navy you requested information with respect to questions raised by Mr. Arnold G. Satalino, of Eliot, Maine. In a letter to you, Mr. Satalino indicated that politics influence the award or assignment of Polaris submarine construction projects, and asked why "all, or at least a goodly number, of Polaris submarine construction contracts seem to go to Electric Boat Co., in Groton, Conn."

As you probably know, the private shipbuilding industry for many years has been suffering from a scarcity of commercial shipwork. It has been the Navy's practice to award the major part of its new ship construction projects to private yards in keeping with their experience and capabilities. Although allocation of ship construction projects has been necessary in order to meet the urgent requirements of the Polaris submarine program, and to broaden the competitive base, this work usually is awarded on a competitive basis. It is not surprising that the Electric Boat Division, General Dynamics Corp., of Groton, Conn., should have been successful in obtaining a large portion of the Navy's submarine construction work, in view of the firm's long experience in submarine construction. I would like to assure you that factors such as the foregoing, rather than political conditions, influence our decisions as to who receives ship construction projects.

The Navy is fully aware of the excellent capabilities of the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, mentioned by Mr. Satalino, for Polaris submarine construction. This is evidenced by the substantial workload now underway there, which includes construction of the auxiliary submarine *Dolphin* (AGSS-555), nuclear submarine *Jack* (SSN-605), and Polaris submarines *John Adams* (SSBN-620), and *Nathanael Greene* (SSBN-636). Portsmouth is also converting the *Albacore* (AGSS-569), and has been assigned construction of the as yet unnamed SSN-646. Also, it should be reassuring to know that in the past 5 calendar years employment at Portsmouth increased by more than 2,100, while total employment at all of our naval shipyards, including Portsmouth, decreased by approximately 800.

I assure you that the Navy will continue to give earnest and thorough consideration to the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard in the assignment of naval shipwork.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH E. BELIEU,
Assistant Secretary of the Navy
(Installations and Logistics).

IMPACT OF THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the Peace Corps has had a tremendous impact upon the free world and especially those nations that have received volunteers. But the impact of those volunteers has not yet had its full affect upon the United States. This will come when these Peace Corps members begin to return to this country and to establish themselves in new careers. By the very nature of the Peace Corps many volunteers have been teaching in many areas of the globe and will undoubtedly consider teaching careers when they return.

A very interesting article regarding the impact of the Peace Corps on the American educational scene was written by its director, Sargent Shriver, in the March issue of the National Educational Association Journal. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHEN PEACE CORPS TEACHERS RETURN

(By Sargent Shriver, Director, Peace Corps)

This summer, almost 500 Americans who have been teaching overseas with the Peace Corps for 2 years will return to the United States. Will many of these Peace Corps volunteers pursue teaching careers here at home? How will their experience affect their attitude toward teachers and the teaching profession? What influence will these returned Peace Corps volunteers and those that will follow them exert on American education?

These are questions I'm frequently asked by American educators. They want to know the results of sending experienced teachers and college graduates (many without professional preparation) to teach in developing nations. The answers are beginning to emerge.

Education dominates Peace Corps work. Almost two-thirds of the more than 5,000 volunteers now serving are working in this field. Since the Peace Corps acts in response to requests from developing nations, we feel this indicates the significance these countries attach to advancing their education programs.

Some volunteers, we find, arrive at important insights about teaching and learning. Carol Byrnes, age 25, a Peace Corps teachers' aid in the Philippines from Duquesne, Pa., says:

"Our rewards in a project like this come from the satisfaction in seeing a child's face light up when he has learned to pronounce a new word properly. We have had to learn, and must continue to learn, how to be sustained by this kind of gratification.

"Only time and the future will tell if our efforts in the Philippines have been successful. Many of us have had to grow up and mature to the point of doing a job where we sometimes can see no material results of our efforts."

Another of our volunteers who is serving in the Philippines is David Szanton, 24, a native New Yorker. Here is how he describes his life as a teacher for the Peace Corps:

"Another fellow and I have a house of our own in the town of Numancia in the Province of Aklan.

"It is constructed mostly of bamboo and nipa palm, and has a living room, kitchen, pantry, and bath. The floors are split bamboo, and the house in general is quite airy, light, and comfortable. As far as I'm concerned, all this talk about the great discomforts the volunteers are putting up with is just so much hogwash.

"Most of our waking hours are spent one way or another working in or through the schools. The Bureau of Public Schools requested that we work largely in the fields of second language (English) teaching and science.

"Like most of the other volunteers, I've spent most of my time working with the teachers. I help them develop their lesson plans, teach them the general science they are to teach their classes, show them how to do science demonstrations, and pass along second-language teaching techniques we learned at Penn State and the training center here.

"When the new school year begins in June, I am going to stop spending so much time with the teachers and put in several hours a week working on remedial English with a small group of the slower students and on advanced science programs with about a dozen of the brighter kids who are more likely to go on to high school.

"Here you are given a position of leadership and great respect within a community. Quite clearly, there are already indications that these 2 years in the Philippines will be one of the most valuable and educational experiences of my life."

We feel, as does Szanton, that the time spent in the Peace Corps is an educational experience. For instance, Newell Flather, a volunteer teacher in Winneba, Ghana, got a chance to change the curriculum—an opportunity that would rarely come to a teacher in the United States. As Flather tells it:

"I consider my supreme achievement of the term to be the reorientation of the school's history program from British to West African. This job was left entirely up to me, and it involved a good deal of reading and study in order to find the right books for the students and the right syllabus for the teacher."

Flather, like other volunteers, assumes many additional responsibilities. He teaches English to the upper forms, is a form master, an entertainment master, and a debating union master.

Flather's latest project has been to help enlarge the school library, which had only 30 books when he arrived. Flather wrote his brother, his church, his high school, and various social groups in Massachusetts. The first 1,000 books arrived recently, and more are on their way.

Roger Hamilton, of Arlington, Va., who taught in Halfassini, Ghana, feels that many of the returning volunteers who have been teaching will want to teach in the United States but that those whose only teaching experience has been in the Peace Corps may be discouraged by the problems of certification.

The returning volunteers are going to be eager to get into their careers as fast as possible. Some, but not all, may have the patience or motivation to complete certification requirements for teaching. Responsibility falls on all of us to encourage these young people to stay in teaching.

According to Hamilton, "The volunteers are interested in getting into meaningful teaching situations quickly because they have been doing this overseas."

I am happy to say that some leading educators agree with Hamilton about the value of the teaching experience gained overseas by Peace Corps volunteers with bachelor's degrees.

Dean John Monro, of Harvard College, says, "Two years in the Peace Corps today can be as significant as a Rhodes scholarship."

George Makechnie, dean of Boston University's Sargent College, says: "I encourage my students to think of Peace Corps service. The Peace Corps will have a general salutary effect on education in this country."

Recognizing the value of the Peace Corps experience overseas and the possibility that

many of the returning volunteers may want to teach in the United States, some State boards of education are studying ways in which volunteers may receive recognition for their oversea teaching experience and how to help them meet certification requirements on their return.

One specific example is California, where Carl Larson, head of teacher certification for the California State Board of Education, feels that with their special preparation and experience the Peace Corps teachers normally can come back and directly start teaching in California.

"If the volunteers have been teaching satisfactorily in organized schools, and we can verify the fact, we will count the oversea teaching in lieu of the required student teaching," he says.

Dr. Larson adds that appropriate credit given by universities for the volunteers' training program would be accepted by the State as credit toward the number of education hours required for a teaching certificate.

We are very appreciative at the Peace Corps for the invaluable cooperation given us by schools and colleges throughout the country and by the American Association of School Administrators. For instance, school systems around the Nation are granting 2-year leaves of absence to teachers who join the Peace Corps. New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, Kansas City, Los Angeles, and Denver are a few of the major cities that have granted leaves, and scores of smaller school systems have taken similar action.

Georgetown University has set up graduate and undergraduate scholarships and Michigan State University has set up graduate assistantships for returning volunteers. Ohio University will award educational credits for teaching done overseas in teaching projects in the West Cameroons, sponsored by the Peace Corps and administered by the university, for those who are working toward teacher certification in Ohio. It will also give some credit for correspondence courses completed by the volunteers during their Peace Corps assignment.

Plans are underway at the University of Pittsburgh; New Mexico State University; and the State University College of Education at New Paltz, New York, to give similar credit. Like plans are under consideration at Syracuse University.

Even the volunteers who will not go into teaching on their return will, I feel, bring back with them greater understanding of the worth of a good system of education. For example, Jack Magri, who is teaching in Mogadiscio, Somalia, says:

"One thing is certain about my experience here. I'll return to the United States with a greater appreciation for our teachers and the teaching profession.

"While we are students, teachers are taken for granted. After we finish school, they are often forgotten. You can be sure I won't forget them now—I realize what an important contribution they are making."

Opportunities for teachers are now available in several projects, training for which is slated to begin in the spring or summer. The new projects are in Malaya, North Borneo/Sarawak, Thailand, Barbados, Ethiopia, Liberia, Sierra Leone, Philippines, Ghana, Nigeria, Nyasaland, Colombia, and Indonesia.

PROGRESS IN MISSOURI

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, we are very proud in Missouri of the progress that has been made in recognition of individual merit regardless of race, creed, or color. In this connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial from one of the outstanding Negro newspapers of the Nation, the Kansas City Call, from

its issue of March 1, 1963, entitled "Integration in Our Schools."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTEGRATION IN OUR SCHOOLS

Schools in the area are giving evidence that they are becoming truly integrated. Students are being rated and judged according to their individual merit rather than being limited because of their race, creed, or color as in days of yesteryear.

Two cases in point will illustrate the change in attitude in our schools.

The University of Kansas City, which a little more than a decade ago did not even admit Negroes as students, last Sunday sent a team of four top students to New York to compete in the nationwide television program, "College Bowl."

One of the four—and the captain—is Elbert Hayes, Jr., a Negro. The KCU team won and will return to the program next Sunday in New York. Hayes and his teammates proved themselves well informed on a variety of subjects, including literature, philosophy, science and history. They were just four boys pulling for their school.

At the William Chrisman High School in Independence, Mo., a Negro girl recently was chosen as the Valentine Queen of the school. She was crowned at a sweetheart dance attended by members of the basketball team, their dates, and other students.

Not so many years ago, Chrisman High had an all-white student body with Negro students of Independence going to a separate (but not equal) school. Now all of that is changed, thanks to the U.S. Supreme Court. At long last, our students are being measured according to their individual ability and worth with the color of their skin being merely incidental.

DUCK HUNTING IN MEXICO

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on March 4 I inserted in the RECORD a short account from the Washington Star of a hunting trip in which General Eisenhower participated in Mexico last month.

I have received a letter from Mr. Charles S. Jones of Los Angeles, Calif., who was a member of the hunting party with General Eisenhower. Mr. Jones points out that the newspaper account of the birds killed was in error. In order that the facts about the incident be available to Members of Congress and the public, I ask unanimous consent that his letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., March 8, 1963.

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: I have just read your remarks published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 4, 1963, page 3477, regarding General Eisenhower's participation in a hunting party at Culiacan, Mexico, on Saturday, February 23, 1963.

Inasmuch as you could not have been aware of the gross inaccuracy of the news story which you placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I feel sure you would like to have the facts in the matter.

The facts, Senator FULBRIGHT, are these: If the newspaper article had said that "The Eisenhower Party Shoots 75 Birds," instead of "Eisenhower Shoots 75 Birds," it would have been a more nearly correct headline. Actually, the total number of birds was 60.

Including my own, there were six guns in a party of about 20 people, both Mexican and United States citizens. While General Eisenhower is an excellent shot, he did not take his limit of 20 birds, and the shooting party finished the day with half of a legal Mexican limit.

The laws of the Republic of Mexico, and I enclose them for your convenience, permit a hunter to shoot 20 birds on Saturdays and Sundays, and 10 birds on week days. I refer you to the first two items on page 3 of the enclosed Caza Temporada 1962-63 published by the Mexican Government, and for your convenience, the translation of these two items follow:

"SECTION OF BIRDS

"Species and open hunting season and authorized game limit

"Duck family—Migratory ducks throughout the Republic: From November 1 to February 28, 10-bag limit per day or in possession from Monday through Friday, and 20-bag limit Saturday and Sunday.

"Ducks, nonmigratory, of the gulf and Pacific coasts of Mexico: From December 1 to March 31, 10-bag limit per day or in possession from Monday through Friday, 20-bag limit Saturday and Sunday."

I call your attention to the fact that the Mexican people have a duck of their own which their law describes as "resident duck," and which is not migratory, and these ducks, for the most part, made up the hunting party's bag. There were very few migratory ducks in the area, and, so far as I know, the mallard does not migrate so far south.

The Eisenhower party went to Mexico as guests of the Mexican Government and were entertained in Culiacan by as fine a group of people as one can meet anywhere in the world.

You will be interested to know that over 2,500 Mexican people came to the airport hoping to see and pay their respects to General Eisenhower. Thus, his visit to Mexico had a real significance in furthering the relationship of the two countries. Wherever he turned high praise was expressed for his participation in the people-to-people movement.

Since you deemed this news story important enough to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I feel sure you will appreciate these facts and that you would be the first to want to correct the RECORD.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES S. JONES.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I am particularly grateful to the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] for placing in the RECORD the letter he has received from Mr. Charles Jones, of Los Angeles. His letter sets forth the facts and clearly demonstrates the regrettable error of the newspaper account of General Eisenhower's pleasure trip into Mexico.

I need hardly add that all his life General Eisenhower has been dedicated to conservation and conservation practices. I deprecate exceedingly the inaccuracy of the news story.

IN COMMEMORATION OF TARAS SHEVCHENKO

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Taras Shevchenko, the national poet of the Ukraine, is a relatively unknown literary figure in the West, but he ranks among the greatest of the Slavic poets—on the level of Pushkin, in the view of some critics. The fact that he wrote almost all of his poetry in the Ukrainian language is at once the reason for his

obscurity and one of the chief contributions for which he is remembered today. For he was the first modern writer who was purely and thoroughly Ukrainian, and he gave much impetus to the development of a native Ukrainian language and literature. His poems were intensely patriotic, expressing the trials and the aspirations of the Ukrainian people throughout their history.

Shevchenko's life itself was filled with suffering. At the age of 24 he was released from serfdom, but 9 years later Czar Nicholas I, had him arrested because of his liberal, democratic ideas. He was condemned to serve as a common soldier in a remote area of eastern Russia, far from his beloved Ukraine. Even after his release 10 years later, Shevchenko never again enjoyed complete personal freedom, and he died one day after his 47th birthday—in the same year that saw the emancipation of the serfs by Czar Alexander II, of Russia.

At one point during his imprisonment Shevchenko wrote these despairing lines:

I shall not leave the slightest trace
Upon our glorious Ukraine,
Our land, but not as ours known.

Time has disproven this prophecy, for his life and writings have played a great role in shaping the Ukrainian national spirit and culture. The ideals to which Shevchenko stubbornly clung—national self-determination and democratic rule—remain a guiding light today for Ukrainians and other oppressed nationalities of Eastern Europe.

ST. LOUIS, RIVER TOWN

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the importance of water transportation to the city of St. Louis, the entire State of Missouri, and, indeed, all of the surrounding area that is served by boats and barges plying the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers, is laid out most graphically in a St. Louis Post-Dispatch editorial entitled "St. Louis, River Town," published February 25.

St. Louis is a river town today, just as it has been from its beginning. Lying as it does on the mighty Mississippi River and near the confluence of the Missouri River, St. Louis is a natural transshipment center for goods and wares destined for areas that lie at all points of the compass from her.

It is for this reason that St. Louis has long been known as the gateway to the West. That will be the central theme of the St. Louis bicentennial, which the city will celebrate in 1964 and 1965, as well as the inspiring gateway arch in the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial on the riverfront.

While the riverfront today may not be as colorful as it was around the turn of the century when steamboats lined the riverfront for 20 blocks, its volume of traffic has multiplied many times. Today, one tug moves a string of barges that carry more freight than the combined capacity of all that 20 blocks of steamboats. The importance of St. Louis as a river port has increased many fold.

The Post-Dispatch article sounds a call to protect, use and expand this great

port. That point is well taken—and well supported by the facts recited in the article, which I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. LOUIS, RIVER TOWN

A million and a half tons of petroleum products annually go out of the greater St. Louis industrial complex by water. A quarter of a million tons of iron ore mined in Peru and Venezuela come upriver by barge from New Orleans, along with 165,000 tons of scrap iron from Minneapolis, for the steel mills; and 440,000 tons of finished steel and tinplate move in and out. Of the \$200 million worth of grain moving out, a large and increasing part goes by way of the Mississippi River, much of it to be reloaded into oceangoing vessels for export to Holland, Germany, France, England, Japan, India, and Latin American countries. Ten million tons of coal move out, nearly half of it by water.

These figures indicate only part of what it means to St. Louis that it is a major center of the Nation for water as well as for rail, truck, pipeline and air transportation of freight. Water transport is a major mainstay of heavy industries here. Its low cost strengthens their competitive position and enlarges their market area—in coal, for example, 42 percent of the delivered cost nationally consists of transportation charges.

What the river means to St. Louis is presently a matter of more than usual concern because of proposals by the Kennedy administration to deregulate most of the traffic of the railroads, which would enable them to cut rates to destructively low levels and possibly drive their competitors from the inland waterways.

So it is a pertinent time to take stock of what low-cost water-freight transportation means to the industrial life and development of our area as part of an integrated transport system.

Many of us whose lives are directly affected by it are little if any aware of the teeming traffic of our waterfront—the quantities of superphosphate barged in from Florida, sulphur from Texas and Louisiana, fluorspar from Mexico, refined sugar from Louisiana, raw sugar from Mexico and the Philippines, barbed wire from Japan, semifinished steel from Belgium, Japan and Germany; the large and growing traffic outbound in chemicals, one of our major industries; the tinplate for our can factories, another principal enterprise.

St. Louis is headquarters of two of the largest common carrier barge lines in the country, Mississippi Valley and Federal, each carrying freight over some 4,000 miles of waterways—with regular service to Minneapolis, Chicago, Pittsburgh, Omaha, New Orleans, Chattanooga, Mobile, Birmingham, Fort Myers, Brownsville, and other ports. Here is situated the largest builder of towboats in the United States, the St. Louis Shipbuilding & Steel Co.

Water transport has not only provided low-cost freight hauling on its own account but has also through its competition been the most effective single means of obtaining favorable freight rates. It is credited with reducing rail rates on coal from St. Louis by some 25 percent. It has been a large factor in the success of the Granite City Steel Co., now the 14th largest steel producer in the Nation, enabling it to compete as far away as Baton Rouge with steel mills at Birmingham, several hundred miles closer to the market—and bringing down rail rates on the haul by nearly a third.

The asset of low-cost water transportation affects our future as vitally as it has affected our present, if not more so. This is best demonstrated in coal and steel.

Southern Illinois, across the river from St. Louis, contains what is said to be the largest known deposit of low-cost steam coal east of the Rocky Mountains. Until fairly recent years the railroads enjoyed a virtual monopoly on coal haulage and transportation costs were high. Many mines in the area were forced to close. Coal mining was almost defunct when water transport revived a measure of activity. Today an estimated 65 percent of the coal mined there goes out by water.

But the area looks to still further waterway development to realize the potentials of its coal resources by means of the proposed Kaskaskia River and Big Muddy Creek navigation channels and associated projects.

This development would be linked with the large iron ore deposit discovered in recent years 70 miles southwest of St. Louis at Pea Ridge, near Sullivan, which the St. Joseph Lead Co. and the Bethlehem Steel Corp. are jointly preparing to develop.

The proximity of these deposits to enormous coal reserves for use in manufacture into steel creates a remarkably rich opportunity for both eastern Missouri and southern Illinois to reap an industrial development which could be very large indeed—and its realization depends on low-cost water transportation.

St. Louis is not only a river town, it is a two-river town.

It was founded because it was on the Mississippi and near the Missouri.

Because it was a river town, it became the Gateway to the West, as our magnificent arch in the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial on the riverfront will signify.

It thrived until around the turn of the century on the river trade.

But though St. Louis may have lost some consciousness of the linkage of its destiny with the Meeting of Waters, celebrated in Carl Milles' memorable statuary, the link has continued and has become more important to us than ever before.

A single towboat now pushes barges containing more cargo than could have been carried by all the steamboats that once lined our waterfront for 20 blocks.

St. Louis and the industrial complex around it in two States reap an indispensable advantage from the Mississippi, mightier today than ever. It is essential to our future progress to protect that advantage from impairment, and to utilize and extend it.

MAYOR WAGNER'S COMMITTEE ON JOB ADVANCEMENT FOR MINORITY GROUPS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, last year Mayor Robert F. Wagner, of New York City, set up a unique program to open thousands of jobs in executive, professional, and skilled classifications to New York City's Negroes, Puerto Ricans, and other minority groups. The program was initiated in August through the formation of the mayor's committee on job advancement.

Recently the committee made its preliminary report. The study points out that the portrait of America as presented through national advertising media is inadvertently distorted by the exclusion of Negroes, Puerto Ricans and other minority groups from advertising layouts. Such distortion creates a serious impediment to job advancement since minority group members, confronted with an image of life in which only

certain majority group whites are successful, lose the ambition to acquire the skills necessary for advancement in employment. The committee winds up its report with some practical suggestions for improving the situation.

I commend and congratulate the mayor's committee for pursuing a much neglected aspect of the problem of job discrimination. I think Mayor Wagner's program is worthy of nationwide support and adoption.

I ask unanimous consent that a release dated February 21, 1963, reviewing the committee's report be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mayor Robert F. Wagner's committee on job advancement submitted today (Thursday) to Mayor Wagner its preliminary findings of a study into the portrayal in television shows, TV commercials and other mass media advertising of Negroes, Puerto Ricans, and members of other minority groups as part of the everyday life of America.

The committee, headed by Theodore W. Kheel and James J. McFadden, reported that its study to date confirms its original observation that a general absence of such portrayal in national advertising has resulted in a distorted image of the United States.

The committee reported also that it had found encouraging signs that the situation can be improved. An analysis of replies to a letter sent on December 6 by Mr. Kheel and Acting Labor Commissioner McFadden to 106 of the Nation's major industrial, business, and advertising companies with headquarters in New York City showed widespread support in principle for the committee's goal of integrating the minority groups into the advertising image of America at work, at play, and as consumers.

Several executives of large concerns replied that they would restudy their positions and seek to remedy the situation.

The report cited as an example of excellent cooperation the action of a major air line which reviewed and discussed the committee's suggestions and then approved an advertising layout in which Negro figures are readily identifiable. The committee called this especially significant since its own survey of all issues of four leading national magazines of general circulation had showed only two instances during 1962 of use of Negro models in major advertisements.

Other recent instances of enlightened action by advertisers included regular employment of a Negro girl model on a daily television network show, and the showing in a general circulation magazine of a well-known Negro entertainer endorsing a popular beverage.

While citing several favorable signs, the committee stated that general correction of the situation would be neither quick nor easy. It said one of the problems was the expressed belief of some manufacturers that an advertising layout representative of, and acceptable to, consumers in some parts of the country might not be acceptable in areas with a different population constituency and might result in lowered sales. The report suggested that satisfactory sales results by the pioneers in the desired forms of advertising could be used to persuade hesitant advertisers of their efficacy.

The committee said it would hold meetings, industry by industry, with national business and industry groups in an effort to resolve specific problems. It will also conduct informational and educational campaigns.

Another area in which the committee reported good chances for a favorable breakthrough was in the relation between advertisers and their advertising agencies. There was a tendency among several of the advertising agencies to whom the letter was sent to disclaim responsibility. These agencies replied, in effect, that they acted only on instructions of their clients and had no voice in policy.

The report pointed out, however, that several large advertisers, including clients of agencies that had disclaimed public responsibility, said they customarily left such matters to the advertising agencies. The results of their promise to explore with their agencies all the implications of portraying Negroes, Puerto Ricans, and representatives of other minorities as part of the American scene will be watched, the committee said.

The committee on job advancement has declared that the general exclusion, whether by design or inadvertently, of Negroes, Puerto Ricans, and other minority groups from television commercials and other mass advertising media has created a serious impediment to their job advancement. It maintains that such exclusion stultifies the ambition of many members of these groups to train themselves for jobs throughout business and industry in which most current advertising appears to suggest that there is no place for them.

IN COMMEMORATION OF THOMAS G. MASARYK, 1850-1937

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words in honor of Thomas G. Masaryk, the great Czech statesman who was born 113 years ago last week.

Thomas Masaryk was a rare combination of liberal philosopher and man of action. As a political leader and statesman he put into practice the ideas which he had earlier developed as a writer, teacher, and editor. In this respect and in many others he resembled one of our own very greatest Presidents—President Woodrow Wilson.

Masaryk's ideas were first translated into political reality in 1900, when his followers established the so-called Realist Party, the program of which was based on the principles set forth in Masaryk's early writings. In 1902 he gave the first series of Crane lectures at the University of Chicago, thus emphasizing the bond that has always existed between Americans and those Europeans who have struggled for national and cultural independence. Re-elected to Parliament in 1907 as a candidate of the Realist Party, Masaryk launched a series of critical investigations of corruption in the Dual Monarchy which ruled Austria-Hungary. These sensational attacks on the Hapsburgs naturally made him unpopular in imperial Vienna, but they earned him a reputation abroad as a courageous champion of public morality and honest diplomacy.

Early in World War I he escaped from Austria and conducted a political and propagandist campaign abroad on behalf of Czechoslovak independence. In 1916 a central revolutionary committee—the Czechoslovak National Council—was formed with Masaryk as its president. During the remainder of the war he worked in England, Russia, and the United States for the cause of Czechoslovak independence. His efforts culmi-

nated in 1918 when the United States and the Allied Powers recognized his national council as the de facto government of the future Czechoslovak state. That same year he was elected president of the new Czechoslovak Republic and was re-elected in 1927 and 1934. On Masaryk's resignation in 1935, Eduard Benes was chosen by the people to carry on the Masaryk tradition. Two years later Thomas Masaryk was dead, mourned by the nation he had created.

The tragic events of World War II and the postwar period have destroyed the liberal democracy which Masaryk brought to life in Czechoslovakia. But the alien Communist rule has eliminated only the external political reality; it is unable to break the Czechoslovak people's inner spirit of freedom and democracy, which Masaryk's life and works personified. That is the enduring heritage of this great philosopher-statesman.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE ROBERT A. LINN

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, Robert A. Linn, managing editor of the Cincinnati Post-Times Star, died Monday morning, March 11, 1963. He was 58. He had been managing editor of the Post-Times Star since 1945. He had undergone surgery 2 weeks ago.

Prior to becoming managing editor of the Cincinnati Post-Times Star, he was first makeup editor and city editor. He was well known throughout the Middle West as one of the most congenial of persons and most efficient and accomplished as an editor.

He is a native of Wheeling, W. Va. His first newspaper job was with the Wheeling News. He went from there to the Akron Times-Press and to the Cincinnati Post in 1938.

Until his final illness which was hepatitis, he was rarely out of touch with the operation of his paper. Although he was from West Virginia, he has many friends in Brown and Adams Counties in southeastern Ohio where most of his family still lives.

He is survived by his wife, Rita, whom he married in Akron in 1931, and three children, Robert A., Jr., of Detroit; James W. of Los Angeles, and Miss Mary Linn, who lives at home.

The funeral services are being held today—Thursday—in Cincinnati.

This man's dedication to his newspaper work was second only to that of his children and his family. I mention this because these children are all grown and well educated and he saw them through.

His operation for hepatitis was 2 weeks ago, he was expected to recover and on the road to recovery when an unexpected turn took his life.

MANAGEMENT OF NEWS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a few days ago I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some questions which the U.S. News & World Report had proposed to ask of me. They had called to say they were asking a series of questions of a

number of Senators and would like to put the questions to me. I, in turn, requested the questions to be put in writing, and when I saw them I was convinced they were "loaded" questions. I ask unanimous consent that the questions given to me by U.S. News & World Report be placed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

Subsequently, both U.S. News & World Report and some Members of the other body protested that the questions were not loaded and those of us who thought they were being misled.

But now in the March 18 issue of U.S. News & World Report there is an article called, "Why Congress Doesn't Give J.F.K. What He Wants." On the right-hand column of the two-page spread, sure enough U.S. News gives the answers to their loaded questions.

Mr. President, one merely need read this box and compare what U.S. News & World Report says is the opinion of Congressmen with the loaded questions they asked, to see quite clearly that the purpose of their questions was largely to denigrate the President and his program. I ask unanimous consent that this box, entitled "As Congressmen Size Up Kennedy's Problems," be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks and be compared with the original list of questions.

There has been a great deal of talk about managed news. I think, without question, here is an example of managed news on the part of one member of the news media.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. Why is President Kennedy, as a Democrat, able to exert so little influence over a House and Senate that have majorities heavily Democratic?
2. White House messages and ideas go to Congress and seem to disappear. As far as anyone can see they generate no response out in the country. Why?
3. Has the President failed to get into tune with the mood of the country?
4. Is there a feeling that the President's plans do not command wide support among the voters?
5. Is there distrust of the White House advisers who generate ideas and write messages?
6. Has the President, himself, lacked some element of leadership and ability to create confidence and attract loyalty?
7. Or: Are many Members of Congress simply wary about the political future and willing to trust their own political judgment more than that of the President?

AS CONGRESSMEN SIZE UP KENNEDY'S PROBLEMS

(NOTE.—A survey of scores of Senators and House Members turns up these explanations of why Congress balks at much of the President's program.)

Mood of the country: Little demand from voters for change. No sense of urgency in Congress for action on Kennedy bills.

Divided Democrats: Lack of a real, working majority for liberal causes. Strong coalition of Republicans and conservative Democrats.

Little pressure from the top: No hard-driving leadership in Congress to force action on the Kennedy program.

"Scatter shot" program: Say many Members of Congress. The President asks for too much, sends up too many messages, gets Congress and the country confused.

Kennedy advisers: Sometimes criticized as "impractical theorists" who can't sell their ideas to Congress.

Mr. Kennedy himself: Personally popular, but hasn't convinced some older heads in Congress that he knows answers better than they do.

Politics: Few Democrats feel they must ride President's coattails to get reelected.

Still, some Congressmen warn: Don't underestimate President Kennedy. He got a good many bills out of the 87th Congress, and may yet do better with the 88th Congress than anybody now expects. It's too early to be sure, these Congressmen say.

LIVESTOCK PRICE DROP CRITICAL TO AGRICULTURAL ECONOMY

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, a critically serious problem has developed in the livestock industry which has major consequences for the agricultural economy of America.

Since the first of the year prices on cattle and hogs have skidded drastically and experts in the field advise me that no relief from the situation is likely before early or midsummer.

Market analysts are frankly puzzled at the suddenness and sharpness of the break. There are many suggestions as to the cause, ranging from the unusually cold winter which kept housewives from the market on many days, to the newspaper and dock strikes. No doubt these and other factors were in some part responsible.

But the cold weather is ended; so is the dock strike—and hopefully the newspaper strike—will soon be ended.

I believe we must look past these causes to find a more substantial explanation for the current difficulty.

Since the end of World War II, when U.S. imports of beef totaled 127 million pounds annually, our imports have climbed to well over a billion pounds a year. Clearly, this factor has a significant effect on the price of livestock prices in America.

Mr. President, last May a persuasive case was made in this Chamber on behalf of the domestic cotton textile industry. The serious plight of the industry was impressively documented by a number of Senators who provided us with facts and figures on unemployment, the number of mills shut down, and the towns that were withering away because the cotton textile industry was in serious trouble.

As a result, the Senate gave to the President of the United States broad new authority to protect the industry by the imposition of quotas on textile products as to those countries who would not voluntarily agree to import quotas.

Many of us were sympathetic to the problem of the industry and felt that it was entitled to this degree of protection against foreign competition.

But we also felt that the authority proposed for the President should be broadened. Specifically, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and I joined in sponsoring an amendment which would extend the proposed Presidential authority to include agricultural products and particularly, livestock.

We failed in that attempt, largely because the administration opposed our ef-

fort. But throughout the debate, which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 108, part 6, pages 8522-8544, will be found repeated assurances of Members on both sides of the aisle that at the appropriate time, there would be support for the same kind of assistance to the other agricultural commodities as that extended to the cotton textile industry.

The time for a serious consideration of the problems of the livestock industry is now. We must explore such solutions as the development of a flexible system of tariffs, or import quotas, which will provide for short-term changes in harmony with market conditions and prevent long-term depressions of prices.

There are those who will unfurl the old banner of "free trade" and charge that this is protectionism. Mr. President, free trade is a two-way street; it cannot be practiced unilaterally. Recent developments by the European Common Market with respect to agricultural commodities have placed the American farmer in a position of economic disadvantage.

The problem is a serious one for U.S. agriculture, and it typifies one of the things most seriously wrong with this Government's approach to trade matters: It is based on consideration of foreign policy instead of upon economic considerations.

Surely our long and disillusioning experience with foreign aid has convinced us of the folly of confusing these two instruments of national policy. For this reason, I urge less reliance on the Department of State and its negotiators, and more on the Foreign Agricultural Service where farm products are concerned.

In short, Mr. President, so far as the farmer is concerned, he wants more reciprocity in "reciprocal" trade agreements. He wants the same protection that those in the industrial sector of the economy have including the cotton textile industry. The American farmer is not afraid of competition; he never has been. But he does have a right to insist that the rules be the same for both sides involved in any trading agreement.

The responsibility is squarely on the administration. Section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 provides, follows:

The President is authorized to negotiate agreements with foreign governments in an effort to limit the export to the United States of agricultural commodities or products.

The next move is up to the administration. It appears that no additional legislation is required. But if it is, I trust that those Senators who last year were so concerned about cotton, will come forward to support with equal enthusiasm a solution to the present difficulties of the livestock industry.

MORALE OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, one of our greatest problems in our Foreign Service today is to restore the morale and esprit de corps to what it once was.

This does not mean a continuous process of enlargement and of diffusion which is what the Foreign Service has

undergone ever since the War Manpower Act of 1946. If this act had been fully and properly implemented at the time in the spirit in which it was written, I believe that many of the future reorganizations that the Foreign Service has undergone since would not have been necessary. But the War Manpower Act was not implemented as it should have been, and, as a result, the Foreign Service has been progressively enlarged and emasculated.

Now to my mind our problem is the unscrambling of the omelet of Wristonization, of putting the round pegs back in the round holes, the square pegs in the square holes. In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point an article by William P. Cochran, Jr., which appeared in the Foreign Service Journal of March 1963.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIRD-RATE DIPLOMACY

(By William P. Cochran, Jr.)

At the end of World War II, we were within inches of having the best Foreign Service in the world. That is not just one man's opinion; it is confirmed by two dependable criteria: Foreign diplomats had begun freely to concede the proficiency of their American professional colleagues—and what better yardstick is there than the judgments of one's professional fellows?—and other countries had begun to copy our methods.

Our Foreign Service was best because it had the best system for selecting the most qualified among applicants for entry; the best system of performance evaluation; the best and most impartial system of promotion on the basis of proven merit; and an effective system for the selection-out and retirement of its deadwood.

This is no longer true. In the intervening years the quality of our Service has been diluted, its finest principles have been breached, and its pride and morale have been seriously damaged. Today we have probably the largest, best-paid third-rate service in the world.

It is painful to have to say this. I have devoted over 30 years of my life to the Foreign Service, and it has more than repaid my efforts. It hurts to report in public the criticisms which are current in private. Yet it must be said. I have discussed my views with numerous senior diplomats, ambassadors and others of long experience, and they differ only in their assessment of the extent of the damage, and of how long it will take to repair the injury.

To trace the process of deterioration we must go back to the end of World War II. There had been no adequate introduction of new blood during the war years, when recruitment was suspended. To help perform the new and greatly expanded functions arising out of the war effort—control of strategic materials, identification of traders with the enemy, trade controls, press, radio and cultural activities—a new mechanism, the Foreign Service Auxiliary, was created. After the war it became apparent that many of these wartime functions would have to be continued. But precisely because there had been no recruiting for several years, the Foreign Service was not prepared to handle these added responsibilities.

After V-J Day, an attempt was made to alleviate these deficiencies by admitting men and women of the Armed Forces through special examinations—the juniors at class 6, the more senior members at the grades to which their age, experience, and qualifications entitled them. Many of our finest

present-day officers came from these sources. Unfortunately there were not enough of them. Recruitment was resumed also, but once more the intake of officers was inadequate, due to budgetary restrictions and personnel ceilings. This failure to renew the tree adequately at the roots is responsible for many of the subsequent vicissitudes of the Service.

The long series of adversities which followed had two primary root causes; a plague of unstable management and a plethora of administrators. In the 11 years between 1944 and 1956, there were eight different chief administrators, and as many reorganizations. Almost without exception, each left things worse. Yet administrators proliferated, and by asserting their authority over the allocation of funds, by controlling organization, and by bringing to heel anyone who challenged their actions, they took control. With power, they began to resent the existence of a body, the Foreign Service, not subject to their fiat.

Thus decisions began to be taken which, in the judgment of the Foreign Service, undermined its entire program of recruitment and promotion, supposedly based on competence and merit.

The first of these alarming developments was the resignation of the Chief of the Division of Foreign Service Personnel in protest at unwarranted interference in his operations. Then control over both departmental and Foreign Service personnel was combined in one administrator, and the chief of foreign personnel became the subordinate of a man without, as the Wriston committee later phrased it, "familiarity with the overseas operations of the Foreign Service." Similarly, the position of the Director General was removed from the direct chain of command, and he was relegated to the organizational charts to the position he occupies today—that of a separate adviser on policy to the deputy under secretary for administration.

A third blow fell when the Executive Director of the Board of Examiners for the Foreign Service was forced out, and the board of examiners lost its independent status, being relegated to a position well down the administrative ladder.

Meanwhile, the inflow of new officers had again been interrupted by a 2-year moratorium on appointments at the entering level. This meant not only that the tree was starved by lack of feeding at the roots; it meant that young men and women who had passed the examinations had to wait over 2 years for appointment. Naturally, many became discouraged and found other uses for their talents. Word went around among university students that there was no use looking forward to a career in the Foreign Service, and many qualified young people who might have taken the examinations chose not to do so.

The amalgamation program undertaken on the recommendation of the Hoover Commission did little or nothing to relieve the personnel shortage. Despite considerable pressure, including the threat that if you didn't amalgamate you would not be promoted and might not hold your present job, less than 700 of the more than 10,000 Department employees applied for the 1,500 jobs that had been reclassified as requiring experience in the field, and only 450 appeared for the oral examinations. (Some 55 percent qualified under the greatly reduced standards.) In practice, amalgamation did not add one officer to the existing number; it only changed certain titles, from departmental or staff or reserve to Foreign Service officer.

The Foreign Service hoped that the change of administration in 1953 would bring it a new and happier administrative deal. Instead, it was shocked, in its first meeting with the new Secretary, by his demand for positive loyalty, which disclosed a tragic un-

awareness that the Foreign Service has always been dedicated to the execution of the policies of the U.S. Government, regardless of which party was in power.

Concurrently, Foreign Service morale was being dealt a heavy blow through the unsubstantiated charges of Senator McCarthy. The blow came not so much from the attacks as from the fact that nobody in the entire departmental hierarchy, under two administrations, had courage enough to stand up to Senator McCarthy and challenge him to produce his evidence. Trained to silence, the Service felt it had no vocal champion, no stout defender.

It is impossible to measure the harm done to our professional diplomacy by the security officers who were introduced at this time. Officers of unimpeachable integrity were revolted by their sneaky prying, and by the assumption that everyone was under suspicion. These "security" measures never uncovered a spy, but they did cost us the services of a number of our most intelligent, perceptive and astute officers.

In response to the growing consciousness that the Foreign Service did indeed need expansion and improvement, the Acting Secretary of State appointed a special committee to make recommendations on personnel policies. It took its name from its chairman, Dr. Henry M. Wriston, president of Brown University. Once more a surge of hope swept through the Foreign Service. Once more these hopes were to be disappointed.

The committee announced that it would hold no hearings. Experienced career men who had asked to be heard were ignored. Respected officers who had been asked to serve as consultants were not consulted. Recommendations made by chiefs of mission abroad, both career and noncareer, in response to an invitation from the committee, were rejected.

The first thing the Wriston committee did was to accept as premises the very assumptions which the amalgamation program had proven wrong: (1) that everyone in Washington wanted to serve abroad; and (2) that everyone in Washington was automatically qualified to do a good job in the foreign field. It then compounded these errors by making additional incorrect assumptions:

1. It urged that examination procedures "should rest primarily upon the candidate's record of experience and accomplishment." This presumed—incorrectly—that dependable records of experience and accomplishment existed for departmental employees.

2. The committee assumed that knowledge of foreign languages was unimportant. The report said: "If a candidate is otherwise well qualified, it should be enough for him to express his willingness, when assigned abroad, to make good his language deficiency." Is willingness, which may or may not be accompanied by ability, adequate for any purpose? Is it enough for a man to promise to start to learn a language after he has been assigned abroad? If language is important, he should know it before he arrives at his post; otherwise he will spend his 2 to 4 years learning the language, and then be transferred to another linguistic area.

3. A third assumption was that there is nothing to diplomacy; anyone can do it. (How else can one interpret the principle that anyone in Washington with an "acceptable" record is eligible for appointment to the career officer service?) I disagree. Good diplomacy requires certain educational tools, and certain personal characteristics. Its practices and methods are not beyond comprehension; any intelligent person can learn them—in 20 years or so of experience. But they are not acquired overnight or by osmosis.

Like the amalgamation program that preceded it, the integration program assumed

that anyone doing a good job in the Department could do an equally good one abroad. In many cases this was true. But in many others the assumption was false. The particular skills essential in Washington may have no great utility in a foreign country. A research specialist may do an outstanding job in the Department, operating with scholarly thoroughness and detachment, and an almost complete withdrawal from society outside the office. In Washington his being a recluse is merely an eccentricity. But would he be useful at establishing close relations with the people of another country? Let us assume that his specialty is the jurisprudence of Saudi Arabia. He is invaluable in Washington. But send him abroad? Where? Saudi Arabia, presumably. Does he speak the language? Can he and his wife stand the heat? Will he observe the niceties of Arab customs? He has always been a thinker, a contemplator; can he operate actively, can he persuade? And after his 2-year tour in Jidda, where do you send him?

The principle works also in reverse: who takes his place in research while he is gone? The Foreign Service officer with field experience is not qualified to do the expert's job in Washington. Even if he has served in Saudi Arabia, he does not have the encyclopedic knowledge of the legal system possessed by his predecessor. Two fish are now out of the water, two pegs are in the wrong holes, and nobody benefits.

It is hardly necessary here to discuss the superficiality of the examinations under Wristonization. After all, if you are going to coerce over a thousand people into the Foreign Service, you cannot subject them to an examination which may demonstrate that a fairly large proportion of them do not have the educational qualifications, the personal suitability, or even in some cases the desire to serve abroad. It is important, though, to remember that the candidate was not required to establish his qualifications for service abroad. A candidate was presumed eligible unless someone alleged otherwise; and the burden of proof was then to be on the challenger, not on the candidate.

Wristonization brought into the Foreign Service a large number of specialist officers with splendid qualifications and backgrounds. It also brought in a large number who were not qualified in any foreign language. And it transferred into the Foreign Service three other groups: the failures, the timid, and the unwilling.

By "failures" I mean those who had previously failed the Foreign Service examinations. "Timid" refers to those who had declined to take the oral examinations during the earlier amalgamation program, for fear they would not pass. The third group comprises those who never wanted to be in the Foreign Service, who had avoided amalgamation, and who now accepted integration reluctantly because the alternatives were to surrender their job rights or transfer to other agencies.

The net result of all these ill conceived, incompletely digested and abruptly imposed changes in the principles applying to the Foreign Service is that what we now have is scarcely recognizable as a career service. It has been debilitated by the forcible injection of mediocrity. Its pride and esprit de corps have been damaged by the McCarthy attacks and the absurd security measures that followed. Its basic principles have been repeatedly breached. If by a career service we mean one where officers enter at the bottom, we now have one where nearly two-thirds did not enter at the bottom. If by career service we mean one where entrance is attained only through difficult and highly selective examinations, we now have the situation where almost half took no examination worthy of the name. If we assume promotion from within on the basis of demonstrated merit, even this is questionable, if

only because the standards will have to be lowered, since you cannot heartlessly select out hundreds of unqualified people who were practically forced into the Foreign Service under Wristonization. In brief we have watered down the quality of our diplomacy—and the important characteristic of effective diplomacy is precisely its quality.

What, then, needs to be done? What steps are necessary to correct the errors we have made?

First, we must make up our collective mind as to what we want and need. There must be general acceptance of the principle that the only kind of diplomacy which America can afford today is the best. This means best in quality, not largest in quantity.

Second, we must realize that four things are necessary if we are to have the best diplomats we can produce: Careful initial selection, appropriate training, varied experience in both types of work and geographical areas, and adequate rewards. (The reference is not just to pecuniary rewards, although these are important; but even more to the intangibles of public and official support. The intangibles can have even greater effect on the morale and esprit de corps and effectiveness of a career service than monetary remuneration.)

As for careful initial selection, we must attract and recruit some of our best young brains (and above all, retain them). We must refresh the personnel tree at its roots, annually. Nothing must be permitted to interfere with this, neither war nor depression.

The induction of new officers should be by carefully selective examination, and should largely take place at the lowest rung of the ladder, in order that the recruits may be given the necessary training and varied experience before reaching the top ranks. There should also be provision for the lateral entry, at any step on the promotional ladder, of men who have proved their competence in other fields; but this privilege must be subject to two restrictions: First, such transfers must always be subject to a truly effective, comprehensive oral examination to ascertain the candidate's complete suitability; and second, there must be a legal restriction on the number of such transfers. This is necessary to keep the Foreign Service apolitical and to prevent a reversion to the spoils system. This limitation might well follow the lines of the former administrative rule: transfers into any class in any year should not exceed 10 percent of the number of officers already in that class. Additionally, this sort of restriction would prevent any such infusion of inexperience and incompetence as resulted from the Wriston program.

The selection process for younger officers should continue to be by means of written, oral, and physical examinations. These must include a detailed examination into the candidate's background, personality and character—that goes without saying.

A second step essential to the revitalization of the Foreign Service is the restoration of the prestige, importance and above all the independence of the Board of Examiners. It must be rescued from its present obscurity in the administrative machinery. Its procedures must always be above suspicion, and its methods must be the very best that proven modern testing techniques can evolve. It must be made legally immune to the kinds of improper pressures to which it was subjected a few years ago.

A third necessary step also involves the internal organization of the Department of State. The Office of Personnel must once more be given authority and independence. At present, it is a subsidiary body in the administrative machinery—and therefore subject to all the usual bureaucratic procedures and restrictions. It has nothing in common with administrative matters (costs of opera-

tions, procedures, cryptography, preparation of regulations, etc.) and should stand on its own feet. It must be separated from its present subordination to purely administrative functions and officials.

Once the authority, prestige, and independence of the Office of Personnel have been restored, arrangements must be made for a considerable improvement in the handling of personnel matters. There is a large body of opinion holding that there are far too many people handling transfers, assignments, and promotions—causing delays, confusion, and conflicts. There must be improved methods of consulting officers as to their work preferences, and as to the geographical areas in which they wish to serve. Some steps have already been taken to improve the means of consultation with officers about their records of performance, through the career counseling staff; but much more needs to be done. Officers can perform their best work only if they can discuss their problems and aspirations effectively with the superiors who control their destinies.

Measures must be adopted (if this has not already been done) to insure the inviolability of personnel records; and I can see no reason why the officers of the Foreign Service (who after all are those most intimately concerned) should not be told in specific detail what these measures are.

There must be more rigorous selection out of the unfit, and this system must apply even, and perhaps above all, to the very highest levels.

Thought must also be given to the installation of some type of formal discipline. The Service has grown to such dimensions that informal methods are no longer adequate. There is no present means of ascertaining guilt or innocence other than by investigation by an inspector. There is no punishment for infractions of law or regulations between the drastic penalty of dismissal, including the bringing of formal charges, or letting the culprit quietly resign, on the one hand, and a reprimand and an unfavorable notation in the efficiency records, on the other. Whatever the method, more discipline is necessary; and officers must expect to be sent where they are needed, and to be rigorously weeded out if they fail to live up to the high standards of the Service.

Not only does the Foreign Service officer corps need reinvigoration; the staff corps should be restored to its former independent identity, morale and effectiveness. It is as wasteful to devote the time and energies of carefully selected career diplomats to housekeeping chores—communication, supply, etc.—as it is to assign experts in these fields to political or economic reporting.

Careful thought must be given to the suggestions that the personnel of AID and USIA be "integrated" or "amalgamated" with the Foreign Service. Both organizations perform functions essential to our national interests abroad. Both contain many excellent people, who would be welcome additions to any organization. But it will be necessary to insure—by careful selection and examinations—that only the best of these people enter the career Foreign Service, if unification is determined upon.

One final step needs to be taken to prevent abuses: There should be a high-level inquiry into the state and morale of our professional diplomacy, about once every 5 years. The knowledge that the record would be examined and errors exposed would tend to reduce the number of errors. The knowledge that complaints would receive an impartial outside hearing would act to preclude errors of omission or commission. It seems certain that a great many of the abuses committed in recent years would have been avoided, or at least would have received far more serious consideration beforehand, had it been clear that the facts would soon become public, or would be reviewed for an

assessment of responsibility. The existence of such a Review Board would serve another useful purpose: it would discourage—and if necessary correct—any tendency for the Foreign Service to become a law unto itself. A periodic review of its performance and needs would not only prevent the Service from becoming ingrown; it would disarm those of its critics who persistently make this charge against it.

The Review Board might be appointed every 5 years, by the President, and should include one or two Members of each House of Congress. The Board should devote enough time to a review of previous legislation and experience to form a basis for its study of current conditions and needs. It should insist on freedom of access to opinion in, and a free expression of views by, the Foreign Service itself. The Board should avoid drastic one-time measures of the kind that destroy the organization they are intended to improve; it should avoid the other pitfalls which caused the Wriston committee to diagnose the illnesses correctly, and then propose precisely the wrong remedies.

Such a board will not necessarily guarantee a top-grade, fully effective Foreign Service. But if assured in advance of the interest and support of a public opinion determined to have the best diplomacy human ingenuity can provide, such a periodic formal review of the Foreign Service's performance and needs would both prevent abuses and correct those which might have crept in. It would improve morale and reduce unthinking and uninformed criticism. It would help to keep the organization active, vital, and alive. And it would contribute greatly to the goal of a service made up not of a great number of average diplomats but of the very best—the most intelligent, perceptive, and experienced—that education, evaluation, and experience can produce.

THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I rise today to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate a most interesting statistical report on the number of Peace Corps applicants throughout the United States who have taken the Peace Corps placement test.

As cosponsor of the bill to establish the Peace Corps, I have followed closely its manifold successes and accomplishments.

As of January 17, 1963, 17,533 persons have taken the examination. Actually, this figure is somewhat short of the actual number of applicants, for in the early days of the Corps, examination records were not kept. It is estimated that about 3,500 persons took the test in this early period, thereby bringing the total figure to approximately 21,033. This means that computed on the basis of the 1960 census, one out of every 5,473 Americans over age 18 showed enough interest in the Corps to take the examination.

To my mind, this is indeed a disappointing figure and reflection on our youth. I would have thought there would have been more of a spirit of adventure in the young. Here a young man or woman has the opportunity to see a new nation, learn a new language, live an adventurous new life, with all expenses paid and at the end of 2 years, to be discharged with an \$1,800 kitty. Obviously, there are many reasons why many individuals are not able to take advantage of this opportunity, but it is, I think, a sad reflection that so very, very few do.

It is my strong hope that in the future more and more men and women throughout our Nation will volunteer to join the Peace Corps. This unique opportunity to contribute, afforded to all qualified public-spirited Americans, has captured the imagination and hearts of peoples throughout the world.

I know that many of my colleagues in the Senate join me in the sincere hope that the Peace Corps will continue to operate effectively and that its successes will multiply still further in the years to come.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a State-by-State breakdown of the distribution of test applicants.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Tally of Peace Corps examinees by State of legal residence¹

Alabama.....	205
Alaska.....	25
Arizona.....	144
Arkansas.....	114
California.....	2,320
Colorado.....	328
Connecticut.....	314
Delaware.....	42
District of Columbia.....	158
Florida.....	501
Georgia.....	201
Hawaii.....	54
Idaho.....	78
Illinois.....	1,027
Indiana.....	324
Iowa.....	316
Kansas.....	209
Kentucky.....	163
Louisiana.....	186
Maine.....	90
Maryland.....	246
Massachusetts.....	690
Michigan.....	741
Minnesota.....	426
Mississippi.....	77
Missouri.....	359
Montana.....	100
Nebraska.....	128
Nevada.....	36
New Hampshire.....	96
New Jersey.....	584
New Mexico.....	101
New York.....	1,843
North Carolina.....	268
North Dakota.....	94
Ohio.....	825
Oklahoma.....	178
Oregon.....	267
Pennsylvania.....	999
Rhode Island.....	75
South Carolina.....	89
South Dakota.....	72
Tennessee.....	209
Texas.....	644
Utah.....	104
Vermont.....	67
Virginia.....	228
Washington.....	347
West Virginia.....	97
Wisconsin.....	465
Wyoming.....	41
Total U.S. residents.....	17,295
Residents outside United States.....	238
Grand total.....	17,533

¹ Accurate as of Jan. 17, 1963.

THE INTERNATIONAL RESCUE COMMITTEE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the International Rescue Committee has had a long and honorable record looking after

refugees from political persecution. For the first half of its life, it looked after the refugees from Nazi and Fascist abuses. And, for the last half of its life, it has been succoring refugees from communism.

The same philosophy has continued to apply through the years, though, because totalitarianism, no matter whether disguised under the garb of the Third Reich or the Communist International, has the same total objectives and persecutes its victims in the same absolute way.

Sevellon Brown, a most able and fine newspaperman, has written an excellent piece in the Providence Journal, with which he and his father have been long concerned, on the public record of the IRC.

I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD Mr. Brown's article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PROUD RECORD OF THE IRC

(By Sevellon Brown)

I've just been invited by the distinguished theologian, Reinhold Niebuhr, to become a sponsor of the International Rescue Committee's 30th Anniversary Year. Before replying, I read up a bit on the IRC's history, aims and activities, and what I learned was so fascinating that I thought it might interest some of you, too.

The 30-year mark stretches back to the advent of Hitler and his Nazis to political power in Germany. Rightly suspecting that Fascist persecution would send thousands of decent Germans fleeing into exile, a small group of private American citizens organized in 1933 the International Relief Association. For 8 long years, this agency provided vital help to people on the run from the Nazis.

Then came World War II and, in 1940, the fall of France. This presented a particular problem, because France had been the main haven for European exiles. But the terms of the armistice dictated to the French by the Nazis required the former to "surrender on demand" those who had fled from totalitarian rule, especially leaders in various fields of democratic life.

To try to deal with this problem, a new organization came into being, again the creation of a group of private American citizens. They named it the Emergency Rescue Committee, and in the next 2 years, in the face of ferocious odds, they managed to smuggle out of Vichy France more than 1,000 of Europe's most prominent leaders, intellectuals and artists.

The two groups merged in 1942 to form what is today the IRC. During the balance of the war, the IRC continued to help anti-Fascist refugees who had managed to make their way to Allied or neutral nations. With the return of peace, the committee shifted gears, as it were. The job now became twofold; first, to help thousands of displaced persons—war prisoners, forced laborers, expellees and refugees—to find new homes in the United States and other countries; second, to assist other exiles especially those of demonstrated leadership ability, to return to Germany, Austria and Italy to help rebuild their shattered societies.

People in the IRC might have supposed about this time that their work was nearing its finish. But no, far from it. As Dr. Niebuhr writes in his letter of invitation:

"It is a commentary of our times that the IRC—originally founded as a temporary committee to cope with a specific emergency—has by necessity become a permanent and significant institution. Rather than

diminishing, the number and extent of totalitarian states has risen sharply since 1933. In turn, what was once a trickle of exiles has swollen to flood proportions—since 1945, more than 10 million men and women have fled the Communist States alone."

In response, here are a few of the things the IRC has accomplished in that period:

After the Communist takeover in Czechoslovakia, a new wave of refugees from the Soviet satellites rolled across the frontiers. The IRC organized an Iron Curtain refugee campaign to provide emergency help for thousands of these unfortunates along an arc sweeping all the way from Sweden to Turkey.

When Moscow threatened to take West Berlin by force in 1950, the IRC arranged shipment of millions of pounds of milk, butter and cheese to the people of the beleaguered free city. Mayor Reuter credited this effort as giving a tremendous psychological lift to the West Berliners.

Aware that hundreds of thousands of people still remained in DP camps, and that among them were more than 8,000 of the "ablest, best trained men and women of Europe—a forgotten elite," the IRC launched a Resettlement Campaign for Exiled Professionals. In 2 years, this project had found new homes for some 1,700 professionals who, with their families, totaled 3,227 persons.

Perhaps the IRC's most famous performance came in the wake of the bloody and tragic Hungarian uprising in 1956. In 2 years' time, the organization collected nearly \$3 million in cash and goods for the aid and resettlement of about 200,000 Hungarian refugees.

But the IRC has not by any means confined its work to Europe. It provided notable assistance to many of the almost 1 million Vietnamese who fled from the Communist north after their country had been partitioned. It has labored hard to ease the almost insoluble refugee problem in Hong Kong, partly through direct aid in that city, and partly by resettling Chinese exiles in Taiwan, Brazil, Canada, and the United States.

And, of course, Cuba. The IRC has helped 20 percent of the 200,000 Cubans who have reached this country since the Castro revolution took on its current character, and it has resettled about one-fourth of the 40,000 Cubans who have vacated the Greater Miami area. Today, the IRC concentrates its main effort on helping Cubans in this country, and expects to do so until their nation regains its liberty.

All in all, I'd say a record to be pretty proud of. I imagine you can guess what answer I returned to Dr. Niebuhr.

SENATOR YARBOROUGH PROTESTS PROPOSED INCREASE IN TELEPHONE RATES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I have formally petitioned the Federal Communications Commission to suspend a proposed telephone rate plan that brings about an increase in 82 percent of all person-to-person calls in the United States, and would also increase rates on leased wires to newspapers.

The FCC has announced a plan whereby rates on telephone calls would be changed in two ways:

First, the phone companies would reduce rates between 9 p.m. and 4:30 a.m. on station-to-station interstate calls, and second, the telephone companies would increase rates on all person-to-person calls up to 800 miles from the point of origin.

I am opposed to the part of this rate change that would result in an increase

in all person-to-person calls up to 800 miles. It is my belief that the telephone companies should be allowed to go ahead with their voluntary experimental rate reduction on station-to-station "after 9" calls at night, but that the public and the FCC should have time to further study the impact of the proposed increase in all person-to-person calls up to 800 miles.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this time my letter of petition to the Federal Communications Commission, which explains my views more fully.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 13, 1963.

Re petition for suspension of a new telephone tariff schedule on person-to-person calls
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C.
(Attention: Common Carrier Bureau).

GENTLEMEN: In compliance with the requirements of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and supplementing the oral request made to Chairman Minow and other Commissioners of the Federal Communications Commission in open hearing held before the Subcommittee on Communications of the Committee on Commerce of the U.S. Senate on the 27th day of February, 1963, I, RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, U.S. Senator representing the State of Texas, do hereby petition for suspension of that portion of Tariff FCC No. 132 hereinafter described.

It is my understanding that Tariff FCC No. 132 provides for revisions in rates applicable to interstate message toll telephone service between points in the U.S. mainland. These revisions make effective the rate changes announced by the Federal Communications Commission in its Public Notice No. 30790, dated January 29, 1963. This tariff basically covers two classes of long-distance telephone service: (1) a decrease in station-to-station rates between 9 p.m. and 4:30 a.m. (all such rates countrywide are to be a flat rate of \$1 or less for the first 3 minutes); (2) an increase in all person-to-person rates at all hours of the day up to 800 miles.

Representations have been made by the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. as to the amount of reduction in charges to the public on an annual basis as a result of the decrease in station-to-station rates between 9 p.m. and 4:30 a.m. and the resulting loss of revenue to the telephone companies, but it appears that these representations have been based on past traffic figures under the old rates. It is reasonable to assume that the decrease in rates may well double or triple the amount of long-distance calls between 9 p.m. and 4:30 a.m. resulting not in a net loss of revenue to the telephone companies, but in an increase of net revenue.

These two adjustments of rates, it appears to me have been tied together as a package deal with the reduction in station-to-station rates from 9 p.m. to 4:30 a.m. acting as the sugar coating in which the increase in person-to-person rates up to 800 miles is to be made palatable to the consuming public. The increase in person-to-person rates would include 82 percent of all person-to-person long-distance calls in the United States.

Accordingly, I do hereby petition for suspension of that portion of the new tariff schedule which provides for increases in person-to-person rates up to 800 miles for a period of 12 calendar months beginning with the effective date to the tariff schedule, April 4, 1963, in order that we may first have available the benefit of the experience of the telephone companies under the reduction in station-to-station rates before burdening the telephone consumer with increases in rates

on 82 percent of all person-to-person long-distance calls in the United States.

I do not request any delay in the telephone company's experimental voluntary reduction of the station-to-station calls between 9 p.m. and 4:30 a.m. I think they should have this opportunity to test that reduction.

Respectfully submitted,

RALPH W. YARBOROUGH.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point FCC Public Notice 30790 dated January 29, 1963, and captioned "FCC Announces Plan for Reduced Nighttime Interstate Telephone Rates of \$1 or Less to Any Point Within Continental United States" and an article from Editor and Publisher of February 23, 1963, captioned "Press Protest Halts Phone Rate Increase."

There being no objection, the notice and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Federal Communications Commission public notice, Jan. 29, 1963]

FCC ANNOUNCES PLAN FOR REDUCED NIGHT-TIME INTERSTATE TELEPHONE RATES OF \$1 OR LESS TO ANY POINT WITHIN CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

The FCC announced today that the Bell Telephone Cos. will submit tariffs designed to become effective about April 1, 1963, proposing a major change in interstate station-to-station interstate call within the time period from 9 p.m. to 4:30 a.m. can be made between any two points within the continental United States for \$1 or less. For example, an after 9 p.m. call from Washington to the west coast will cost \$1. The lowest rate now for such a call is \$1.75 after 6 p.m. The after-9 reduced rates are designed to encourage telephone users to take advantage of the technological improvements in telephone plans introduced by the Bell system in recent years, much of which is engineered for peak daytime usage.

At the same time the after-9 reductions become effective, changes designed to adjust rate structures involving small increases of 5 or 10 cents in person-to-person calls up to 800 miles will be placed into effect. Person-to-person calls at these shorter distances have not borne their proportionate share of the cost of furnishing such services, and these minor increases will help to correct this inequity as well as the disparity where it exists between interstate and intrastate rates. Based upon 1962 traffic volumes, it is estimated that the proposed new rates would have resulted in a reduction of approximately \$55 million in revenues from the introduction of the new after 9 p.m. station-to-station rates, and an increase of \$25 million in revenue from the small increases in person-to-person rates, giving a net annual savings to the public of about \$30 million.

The changes in rate structures are being submitted in connection with the current analysis of the Bell System's construction plans and financial requirements under the Commission's continuing surveillance of the company's operation. During this recent review, the Commission received the views of a number of outstanding authorities in economics and finance as well as consultants in the regulatory field in addition to the views of company officials. In connection with this review, the Commission requested that a study be made looking toward the possible adoption of an after-9 plan.

The Bell System is undertaking an expanded construction program of \$3.2 billion for 1963. It also plans extensive research activities designed to further improve its service to the public. These activities will contribute importantly to our Nation's economic growth. It is recognized that in order to do this, the company's earnings must be

maintained at adequate levels. The Commission is of the view that the overall effect of the changes announced today will result in substantial savings to the public in telephone rates while permitting the company to maintain a level of earnings on investment within the range realized by it since the last rate reduction in 1959.

The public has shared promptly in the benefits flowing from advancements in telephone technology under the Commission's continuing surveillance method of ratemaking. In 1940, a station-to-station call from the east coast to the west coast after 9 p.m. cost \$4.25, as compared to the new rate of \$1. Overall, interstate telephone rates today are 19 percent below the levels of 1940.

Action by the Commission over the past 4 years has resulted in substantial savings to the public in telephone rates while at the same time permitting the company to maintain adequate earnings. In 1959, interstate telephone rates were reduced by \$50 million. Again in 1962, through the adoption of new separations procedures, an equivalent reduction of interstate revenues of \$46 million was effected enabling 41 States to reduce intrastate rates by \$40 million, and during 1961 and 1962, the prices of Western Electric products sold to Bell System Cos. were reduced by \$70 million on an annual basis.

A schedule attached shows a comparison of initial period rates on routes selected for illustrative purposes.

Comparison of initial period rates—Selected routes

	Person to person			Station to station		
	Airline-miles	Day	Night	Day	6 to 9 p.m.	9 p.m. to 4:30 a.m. ¹
Chicago to Detroit.....	238	\$1.30	\$1.10	\$0.85	\$0.65	\$0.60
Minneapolis to Omaha.....	292	1.45	1.20	.95	.70	.60
Baltimore to Cleveland.....	308	1.50	1.25	1.00	.75	.60
Boston to Washington.....	398	1.70	1.40	1.15	.85	.65
Portland, Oreg., to San Francisco.....	641	1.90	1.60	1.30	1.00	.65
Nashville to Washington.....	665	2.00	1.70	1.35	1.05	.65
Raleigh to St. Louis.....	659	2.05	1.75	1.40	1.10	.70
Chicago to New York.....	711	2.20	1.90	1.45	1.15	.70
Chicago to New Orleans.....	835	2.25	1.95	1.50	1.20	.75
Los Angeles to Seattle.....	981	2.40	2.05	1.65	1.20	.75
Boston to Miami.....	1,251	2.85	2.25	1.70	1.30	.80
Dallas to New York.....	1,369	2.85	2.45	1.80	1.40	.90
Boston to Denver.....	1,770	3.10	2.65	1.95	1.50	.90
Philadelphia to Salt Lake City.....	1,928	3.30	2.85	2.10	1.65	1.00
San Francisco to Washington.....	2,412	3.50	3.00	2.25	1.75	1.00

¹ Reductions start at 221 airline-miles.

[From Editor & Publisher, Feb. 23, 1963]

PRESS PROTEST HALTS PHONE RATE INCREASE

The plan to increase rates for telephone services on May 1 has been deferred.

Rosel M. Hyde, Acting Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, told a Senate committee February 18 that "further consideration" would be given to petitions of interested parties.

The American Newspaper Publishers Association and United Press International are asking for reconsideration of increases that would affect news services. The Associated Press planned to file data as part of the ANPA brief.

SOME RELIEF POSSIBLE

With the FCC under a hail of senatorial criticism, Mr. Hyde declared there was "no intent to drive out newspapers," and some relief may yet be worked out for publications.

With a few modifications, the FCC ruling made final the Commission's 1961 interim decision in a 7-year investigation of leased line rates of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and Western Union. At that time A.T. & T. estimated the new rates would increase costs to the press by 19 percent, to commercial customers by 2.1 percent, and decrease costs to government users by 7.8 percent. The final prescribed rates would increase press costs more than 150 percent in some cases.

In issuing its final decision on January 29 the FCC said it would consider any evidence which indicated the increased rates "would significantly impair the widespread dissemination of news information."

BODY BLOW TO PAPERS

Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma, said the FCC plan to hike rates \$4,012,000 for private or leased teleprinter circuits would be a "body blow to many small newspapers."

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, Democrat, of Texas, questioned the FCC proposal to raise rates an estimated \$25 million a year by hiking the cost by 5 to 10 cents of person-

to-person phone calls under distances of 800 miles.

Senator MONRONEY said the increased wire cost burdens threatened to drive out of business the small and county seat newspapers, which he called the backbone of American journalism.

Instead of charging a paper for the time it uses a leased wire, he said the FCC plan would force the paper to pay for a full 24 hours for a private line, whether it used it round the clock or not.

"There is no other utility that I know of that charges 24 hours," Senator MONRONEY said. "A newspaper that uses power to run the presses only pays for the electricity used, not on a 24-hour basis."

American Telephone & Telegraph Co., which leases the wires, has criticized the plan as discriminatory.

PERSON-TO-PERSON HIKE

Senator YARBOROUGH centered his attack on the plan to boost person-to-person rates. He questioned an FCC press release of January 29 describing it as "small increases" in calls up to 800 miles.

The same release highlighted the Commission's decision for a major change in long-distance rates, or the so-called after-9 rate. Under it, station-to-station calls between 9 p.m. and 4:30 a.m. can be made anywhere in the United States—from New York to San Francisco—for \$1. It becomes effective April 1 at an estimated cost to A.T. & T. of \$55 million.

Senator YARBOROUGH said a 10-cent increase on a 50-cent person-to-person call from Washington to Baltimore amounted to a 20-percent increase—"and I don't call that a small increase."

FIGURES SUBMITTED

Mr. Hyde said the Commission asked for full cost, traffic and accounting figures from A.T. & T., and based its decision for the proposed April 1 rate hike on these. "We had no reason," he added, "to doubt the validity of the statements."

The committee chairman, Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, Democrat, of Rhode Island, suggested that Mr. Hyde return for additional questioning at a later date and "come prepared to quiet once and for all, if you can," the continuous inferences that A.T. & T. dominates the FCC.

WALL STREET JOURNAL PRINTS ABLE ARTICLES ON OCEANOGRAPHY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in this age of science in which we live, one of the least known and least publicized of scientific fields is that of oceanography. We might say that, of all science, oceanography will always whet man's thirst for knowledge rather than quench it.

Texas is proud that the Department of Oceanography and Meteorology of A. & M. College, College Station, Tex., is one of the outstanding institutions in the United States, and perhaps in the world today, in this comparatively new field of inquiry.

Edwin A. Roberts, Jr., has written a series of four very informative articles concerning oceanography which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on March 5, 7, 8, and 12, 1963. I ask unanimous consent that these four articles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCIENCE OF THE SEA—POLITICAL PROBLEMS LIE IN WAKE OF OCEANOGRAPHY'S ADVANCE

(By Edwin A. Roberts, Jr.)

The oceanographer's science occupies a peculiar place in man's investigation of the physical world. Lacking the smoke and fire of rocketry, it has attracted little popular attention, yet its promises right now equal or exceed those of space exploration. We know the ocean is a cornucopia and we know how to tap it, while outer space is almost entirely a question mark—a fascinating question mark, but a question mark no less.

Consider that the ocean (there is really only one) covers 70.8 percent of the earth's surface, that scientific cultivation of marine life could feed the world population for decades to come, that the mineral wealth in sea water and on and beneath the ocean floor is all but beyond imagining, that the chemical and physical energy of the sea is a limitless source of power, that the ocean is a great control board by which man can direct the weather and change climates, and that realization of this potential is being delayed not by scientific problems, nor entirely by engineering ones, but by the lack of an international treaty fixing each nation's share of the world ocean.

Except for the concept of the 3-mile limit, the seas belong to everybody, which is the same as saying they belong to nobody. The idea that a nation's sovereignty extends but 3 miles beyond its shores is an anachronism, stemming from a long-ago British admiral's desire to sail that close to the coast of France. It makes little sense today and certainly fish have never taken it very seriously. The result is an international free-for-all that discourages any one country from cultivating the resources in a large area of the ocean, because any other country would be free to poach upon the preserve.

Nor is the absence of the broad-scale international agreement something affecting futuristic possibilities only. In recent years Britain and Iceland have exchanged gunfire at sea over fishing rights. France

just sent a warship to the South Atlantic to back up its fishing vessels in that country's present dispute with Brazil over lobster grounds, and there is sporadic controversy over the dumping of radioactive wastes in ocean trenches (a leaky atomic waste container could contaminate fish, and therefore people, thousands of miles from the dumping spot.)

A leader in the movement to establish jurisdiction over the use of the sea is Columbus O'Donnell Iselin, founder (in 1930) of the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution on Cape Cod and a kind of youthful elder statesman among oceanographers. In 1960 he appeared before a body of the United Nations to state the case for such an international agreement and got nowhere. He believes, moreover, that such a treaty will probably be a long time coming because the affluent nations of the northern hemisphere simply don't have to look to the sea for resources yet.

In other areas of the world, however, especially in poor, unstable South Asia, cultivation of the ocean would be a boon. But there the problems become even more complicated. Without any cultivation at all, for instance, the Indian Ocean (currently the site of a massive international oceanographic research program) is teeming with life, but Indians are not remarkably skilled fishermen. Moreover, the traditional Indian problem of moving food from the coastal areas to the interior gets particularly pungent when the cargo is fish.

Until the middle of the last century, sailors went down to the sea extraordinarily ignorant of their element. Aside from a general knowledge of the trade winds and the storm rookeries of the world, the early 19th century seaman had little understanding of the ocean's patterns. Then an American naval officer, Matthew Fontaine Maury, prepared elaborate (for that day) charts after supplying ship captains with special log books in which to record the behavior of winds and currents. This led to a highly successful international conference in Brussels in 1853 and a major step toward a concerted oceanographic program was taken.

A VOYAGE OF DISCOVERY

In 1872 England's famous scientific club, the Royal Society, persuaded the British Government to outfit a three-masted corvette, *Challenger*, for a round-the-world oceanographic expedition. The *Challenger* cruised 3½ years and covered almost 69,000 miles, netting along the way countless species of plants and animals from a variety of depths. It was on this voyage that scientists discovered what is still believed to be the deepest part of the ocean, the Marianas Trench in the western Pacific.

The Marianas Trench, recently plumbed by Jacques Picard and Navy Lt. Don Walsh in the bathyscaphe *Trieste*, is 36,000 feet deep. In other words—and a hole this deep deserves an illustration—if Mount Everest were dropped into the trench, the Empire State Building fixed on top of it, the Eiffel Tower mounted on top of that, and the Seattle Space Needle stuck on top of the Eiffel Tower, the latest atomic submarine would be unable to dive deep enough to reach the top of the Space Needle. And at the bottom of the trench, where pressure is measured by hundreds of tons, Picard and Walsh discovered life, including a fish resembling the common sole.

Although the discoveries of the *Challenger* voyage exceeded all expectations, the science it sought to advance was still in its infancy. After all, before Maury and the *Challenger* almost nothing was known of the oceans (the main water bodies were named Atlantic, Pacific, and Indian by international consent only in 1845). It has only been during the last three decades that oceanographers have added markedly to what was known after

the *Challenger* cruise, and it's only been since the end of World War II that scientists have had the instruments, and the money, to draw apart the waves for a close look below.

FEDERAL SPENDING RISES

Several universities have departments or subdepartments devoted to marine studies, but most of the work has been done by Woods Hole and by the Scripps Institution of Oceanography in California. The Federal Government, for all its participating agencies, has given increased support to oceanographic research—\$103.7 million in fiscal 1962 with \$123.8 million budgeted for the current fiscal year. Mr. Kennedy's new budget would boost oceanography appropriations to \$155.9 million. Some 90 percent of privately operated Woods Hole's budget is accounted for by Government contracts. There are many reasons, mostly military, why the Government wants to know more about the ocean and the ocean floor, especially in the era of the missile-firing submarine.

The peaceful implications of manipulating the sea, however, are far more dramatic than the military possibilities. One example is Columbus Iselin's proposal for the Gulf of St. Lawrence, a body of water which separates Newfoundland from the Canadian mainland and serves as the gateway to the St. Lawrence Seaway.

The upper layer of water in the gulf is fresh, cold, and without a great abundance of marine life. The lower layer is warm, salty, and teeming with marine nutrients (plankton and the progressively larger creatures attracted to it in the food chain). What would happen if the warm, fertile bottom water were continuously pumped to the surface?

Mr. Iselin believes the results would include keeping the gulf free of ice throughout the year (the seaway presently shuts down when ice makes it impassable in winter), vastly increasing the catches of fishermen, and improving Newfoundland's climate, which could stand some improving.

Before anything like this is done, scientists will study the plan carefully because, while the engineering job involved is relatively simple, they want to be sure such manipulation would be self-healing, that conditions would revert to normal without any unwanted effects if the plan, once put into operation, were discontinued.

RUSSIANS TALK OF EXPLOSIONS

Here again the problem of international agreements arises, because while a climatic change might benefit one country it could easily worsen the climate of another. The Russians have talked about using nuclear explosions to clear ice from frozen northern ports and even of creating new inland seas. A serious disturbance of the Arctic ice-packs, however, could raise the level of the ocean and, in some low-lying areas, have catastrophic consequences.

So if man is to manipulate the ocean he must do it with an eye on the global weal. Considering the record of attempts at universal cooperation among nations, there's no reason to believe such an enlightened covenant will be achieved soon. But the scientists already know how to improve weather, climate, geography, and the world supply of resources if the legal and political questions can be solved.

Joseph Conrad wrote: "The sea never changes, and its works, for all the talk of men, are wrapped in mystery."

True. But the wrappings are beginning to come off.

DAVY JONES' LARDER—PRIMITIVE FISHING METHODS LEAVE IT ALL BUT UNTOUCHED

(By Edwin A. Roberts, Jr.)

The business of obtaining food from the sea is, in A.D. 1963, at about where the busi-

ness of obtaining food from the land was many thousands of years ago.

The catching of fish and other edible marine life is largely a matter of hunting, rather than farming, and no one should have to be reminded today of how superior scientific farming is to hit-or-miss hunting. The bulging grain storehouses and the herds of fat, grain-fed cattle in the American West leave no doubt that enlightened cultivation and harvesting is infinitely more productive than taking to the woods with a shotgun.

Yet it is the shotgun method that commercial fishermen around the world have used for centuries and, with very few exceptions, they don't seem able or willing to change their methods. There are many reasons for this static situation, and they involve hoary traditions, marketing problems and international politics—not necessarily in that order.

The basic pattern of land cultivation is one that is pretty well understood by everyone who has either sown a wheat field or planted geraniums in an apartment house window box. But the growth of life in the sea is less well known and yet, because of its implications, it is well worth knowing about.

"GRASS OF THE SEA"

As life perhaps once began on this planet, life in the sea begins with yellow-brown algae called diatoms. This "grass of the sea" is the food of the smallest marine animals, the one-celled protozoa referred to en masse as plankton. Small fish (and some whales, too) eat the plankton and are in turn eaten by successively larger fish. By manipulating this process, by farming the sea, man could quite easily increase many times the population of food fish and the size of the fisherman's catches.

He could do this in a number of ways, all depending on some international treaty establishing jurisdiction over broad areas of the ocean.

Let us suppose, for instance, that U.S. fishermen decided to farm a 10,000-square-mile section of the sea off Cape Cod. First the area would be fenced in, either electronically or by means of perforated air hoses on the ocean floor which would send constant streams of bubbles to the surface. In theory the bubbles, or electronic impulses, would keep the fish being cultivated fenced in and easily harvested. If the fish were thus detained, their growth could be stimulated both by pumping up plankton-rich water from lower levels and by fertilizing the water from the surface.

By periodic dragging of nets the area could be weeded; that is, the so-called trash fish (fish of relatively little use to man) could be removed, thereby leaving the marine nutrients for the food fish.

Such farming of the sea is entirely feasible, according to Columbus Iselin, founder of the Woods Hole (Mass.) Oceanographic Institution, but the initial expense would hardly be justified if the developers were not given an internationally recognized claim to the area under cultivation. This promises to remain a big hitch.

But the concept itself has in small ways been practiced for a long time. In some parts of Southeast Asia, for instance, native rice growers stock their fields with baby carp and, when they drain the fields to harvest the rice, they also pick up a good catch of flopping, mature carp.

While farming the open sea would require a more sophisticated approach, the engineering problems are as nothing compared with other problems peculiar to the commercial fishing industry.

Commercial fishing in the United States is not a booming business. With the notable exception of the west coast tuna canneries and the southern shrimp industry, American fishing fleets generally find a limited market.

While Americans will apparently eat tuna fish, shrimp and lobster in heroic amounts,

they have little taste for many kinds of fish that are plentiful off our shores. One such fish is herring, and obviously if the return a fishing boat can get for herring is inadequate, very few boats will pursue it.

Nobody can blame the fisherman for this. But there are some causes for the industry's difficulties that can indeed be blamed on the fishermen. In New England, for example, the crews of fishing trawlers get the receipts for 60 percent of the catch while the boat's owner gets only 40 percent. This arrangement is a throwback to olden days and has little relation to the economic facts of life in 1963. Its most serious consequence is that it discourages the fishing fleet operators from buying new boats and equipment to make their business more efficient.

An important exception is found in the fleets that go after menhaden, an oily member of the herring family that's used for animal feed and fertilizer. The crews of menhaden boats, because their industry is relatively young, work on a salary basis along with a percentage of the catch. As a result, the menhaden fleets have a much better time of it economically than do their counterparts hunting food fish.

It is not overstating the case, moreover, to say that commercial fishermen as a rule treat new ideas with extraordinary caution.

Take, for example, the New England fishermen who are the inheritors of a long and romantic seafaring tradition. When they were told by oceanographers that there was money to be made by using modern methods to catch tuna off Cape Cod, they showed little enthusiasm.

A TUNA BOAT'S TAKE

Oceanographer Iselin responded by inviting a west coast tuna boat to make a trip through the Panama Canal to Cape Cod and catch itself some big ones. The resourceful west coast fishermen agreed and, for 5 days' work last summer, each man in the crew made \$6,000. Next summer, not surprisingly, a whole fleet of west coast boats is expected.

There is another instance of opportunity that thus far east coast fishermen have ignored. One of the most precious products of the sea, pound for pound, is shrimp. Oceanographers pointed out to Boston fishermen that the waters off the coast of Maine are crawling with a cold water variety of the crustacean, and that they might be marketed at a good profit.

The fishermen discounted the advice. Everybody prefers shrimp from the Gulf of Mexico, they said. The water off Maine is so deep they'd have to outfit their boats with heavier equipment. And anyway, cold-water shrimp tend to spoil quickly, perhaps even before the hauls could be delivered to the Boston dock.

Scientists told the fishermen that Americans preferred southern shrimp because that is the only kind they knew, that a relatively small investment in new equipment might return handsome dividends.

Even if we did it, replied the fishermen, the shrimp would spoil on our decks. Why not boil the shrimp on board as soon as they are caught? suggested an oceanographer.

We are fishermen, not cooks, was the answer.

The tuna and shrimp incidents are not reported here to make a case against New England fishing crews. Rather these attitudes merely exemplify the mental torpor of much of the world's commercial fisheries, with the important exception of Russia. The Russians have the biggest, most modern fishing boats on the sea with a range permitting them to sail where they please. Some of the Soviet vessels are floating canneries. Many Russian fishing boats are known to perform military functions as well.

That the United States lacks a fishing fleet to rival Russia's, of course, should be kept in perspective. Thanks to the ingenuity of American farmers and the good offices of the U.S. Agriculture Department, we have far more food in this country than our population requires. There has been no strong impetus to go after fish. In Russia, where food is less abundant, herring, and sturgeon are not just a Friday night change of pace.

ROLE OF THE SCHOOLS

It should be mentioned here that U.S. farm surpluses stem, too, from the research of the scientific community. Many colleges and universities operate their own farms on which new methods are tested—the successful ones being recommended to farmers. The schools doing research on seafood, unfortunately, are reluctant to operate their own fisheries because, they claim, they would be competing with the commercial fishermen who are having a hard enough time as it is.

The imbalance of the food supply around the world is often explained by citing poor soil (for field crops) in the tropics and the plant-killing cold in polar climates. But science is equipped today to deal with these problems. Soil chemists and mechanical engineers have the knowledge to vastly increase food production on land and sea.

What all this means is that modern man need not tolerate widespread deprivation because of technological or biological helplessness. The means are known to cultivate much of the three-quarters of the earth's land surface that is practically uninhabited, and these deserts, and frozen wastes and tangled jungles may yet be put to work.

Meanwhile the sea abounds with food enough to feed the world, but the initiative lies with man.

MARINE MINING—UNDERSEA DEPOSITS OF MINERALS AWAIT RESOURCEFUL ENGINEERS

(By Edwin A. Roberts, Jr.)

The wealth of nations derives from the bounty of the earth and the ways that bounty is used. In the 150 years since the beginning of the industrial revolution man has learned something about husbanding natural resources, but still the demands of modern technology have steadily reduced underground reserves of minerals and organic fuels.

Therefore, it's hardly surprising that American industrialists and military men look rather longingly at the world ocean whose 335 million cubic miles of water hold a greater supply of minerals than do all the mines and quarries of the continents.

Nor does the mineral treasure of the ocean end with the components of sea water. On the ocean floor, in most places at substantial depths, are vast scatterings of nodules—rock-like chunks that are rich in manganese and iron. And below the ocean floor, in the continental shelves that flank the U.S. coasts, are reserves expected one day to yield 20 billion barrels of crude oil and 150 billion cubic feet of natural gas.

Pumping oil and gas from beneath the sea is no great trick, providing the water is relatively shallow. Drilling rigs are familiar sights in the Gulf of Mexico, off the coasts of Texas and Louisiana.

Extracting salt from salt water is easily done by simple evaporation; the main aim, of course, usually is to get fresh water. Today, the practice has become relatively sophisticated, recovering at the same time such chemicals as sodium phosphate, potassium chloride and magnesium chloride. Another byproduct of the process is bromine. But although the composition of sea water has triggered a lot of wide-eyed speculation about its possibilities as an inexhaustible mineral source, there is a very big hitch. Magnesium, a metal of relatively great abundance

in the sea, is present in concentrations of about one-tenth of 1 percent whereas average rock or soil contains about 40 times as much.

ECONOMICS AND ENGINEERING

The eventual large-scale mining of sea water depends on two factors: The continued availability of economic concentrations of minerals on land and the development of sufficient supplies of cheap power to extract minerals from sea water at lower and lower cost.

As a matter of scientific knowledge, the metal-rich nodules that dot millions of square miles of the oceans' floor are there for the grabbing. As a matter of engineering knowledge, the inaccessibility of most of the nodules makes that grabbing presently uneconomic.

Dr. Edward D. Goldberg of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography in California has reported the nodules, which may range in size from that of a potato to a chunk 3 feet in diameter, have a mineral content made up of, on the average, 20 percent manganese, 15 percent iron and fractional amounts of nickel, cobalt, and copper. Nodules have been found, however, with far higher concentrations of these minerals.

While most of the nodules lie in the deep recesses of the ocean floor, great quantities have been found between Tahiti and Hawaii at depths of less than a mile. John L. Mero, research engineer for the University of California Department of Mineral Technology, believes mining these minerals is entirely economic.

Mr. Mero visualizes a massive pumping system, which he calls a giant vacuum cleaner, to do the job. But it remains for someone to put up the money to build the elaborate device and test it before its feasibility can be judged. Right now, many oceanographers are skeptical.

Regarding the resources beneath the continental shelves, man has made major strides in recent years in exploiting them. Currently an attempt is underway to poke a hole through the earth's crust to the mantle to see what's there. Named Project Mohole, the attempt is being made in the continental shelf off the coast of Central America because the crust is thinner there than it is on the continent proper.

Although Project Mohole is described as a pure-science enterprise, the techniques devised for sampling the earth's mantle from a floating platform on the surface of the sea could eventually be of aid to oil drillers and miners of the ocean floor.

One element not always mentioned in connection with schemes for making the sea give up its minerals is phosphorus, an element indispensable to all types of life. Man gets most of his phosphorus from plants but in many places the plants have a hard time getting it from phosphorus-poor soil. Moreover, 3,500,000 tons of phosphorus are washed into the sea every year.

THE OCEAN'S SEDIMENT

Because of this phosphorus loss to the sea, thought is being given to digging the element from the sediment on the ocean bottom. This sediment is a layer of varying thickness composed of the remains of marine life and the dust that filters down from the surface. Mr. Mero has calculated that aside from phosphorus, there is enough copper and aluminum in the sediment to last a million years at the present rate of consumption. Again the problem is one of engineering.

In view of this problem, the engineering feats of such creatures as the little oyster are interesting. The oyster, in the process of pumping thousands of gallons of sea water through itself, extracts minerals, such as phosphorus and copper, and concentrates them in its body.

One of the several problems known to man but not to oysters is that of establishing

legal ownership of the resources in the deep ocean basins (resources in or on the continental shelves are recognized as belonging to the coastal country). Abundant as the manganese nodules are, for instance, they are not so abundant that they can be regarded as oxygen in the air or the dissolved salt in the sea. National proprietorships may eventually have to be established.

Unlike research currently being conducted in the field of marine life, research into the location and concentration of deep-sea mineral deposits will probably not lead to important economic developments soon. With necessity absent, invention remains unborn.

But dwindling deposits on land and the growing needs of an expanding technology and population make it likely that the minerals of the deep will one day be put to work.

MURKY BATTLEFIELD—UNITED STATES MARSHALS DETERRENTS, DEFENSES FAR BELOW THE SEA

(By Edwin A. Roberts, Jr.)

On the October night when President Kennedy announced America's determination to eliminate the Cuban missile threat, it is likely that a U.S. nuclear submarine lay beneath the billows of the Baltic Sea, laden with weaponry capable of destroying 16 Soviet cities the size of Moscow. And because it was poised exactly where it was, it remained entirely invisible to the submarine-detection equipment of the Russian fleet.

We don't know all this for sure because U.S. atomic submarines operate under the utmost secrecy. But when we understand something of what such a submarine can do and when we know some of the open secrets of the ocean, a glance at the map suggests some of the areas where a Polaris sub might be expected to lurk in time of crisis. And from the depths of the Baltic, Polaris missiles would be within range of every major city in European Russia.

But the trick for a nuclear submarine is not just to be in position to do the most damage with its 16 missiles. It must also avoid detection and possible destruction itself, and from this need has developed an intensive Government-sponsored campaign to survey the ocean and the ocean floor.

The hypothetical submarine mentioned above, for instance, had found a hiding place in the sea, a pocket of warm water surrounded by cold water. Because sea water is a poor conductor of heat, the pocket of warm water lay surrounded by cold water without mixing with it.

Now, it is one of the countless phenomena of the sea that submarine-detection signals will be deflected at the meeting place of warm and cold water layers. Therefore, a sub lying in the right spot would be invisible to the enemy. This was known during World War II but it has only been in recent years that both the United States and Russia have been attempting to chart these warm water pockets in the strategic areas of the ocean.

Navy submarines and surface ships plus vessels operated by private oceanographic institutions are equipped with devices known as bathythermographs for determining the water temperature at various depths. It's known that Russian subs are similarly equipped and it's likely that the huge Soviet fishing fleet has heard of the technique.

NAVY'S FUTURE

Enormous as is the job of charting water temperatures in the vast, ever-shifting ocean, it is just one phase of oceanographic research being carried on for military purposes. It is somewhat ironic to recall that shortly after World War II, when Air Force jets first became a common sight in the sky, there was talk of greatly reducing the size of the Navy. Of what use, the question went, is a relatively sluggish armada when

jets and missiles are hurtling across continents in minutes?

Yet there is growing evidence today that the Navy, especially the undersea Navy, will provide one of the most formidable deterrents for years to come.

To appreciate the reasons for this it is necessary to appreciate the Polaris-type submarine itself. This craft can twice circumnavigate the globe without refueling and can stay submerged for months. It can dive to depths of almost 1,000 feet and move under water at better than 35 knots (the exact figures are classified but those are probably useful estimates).

Naturally, for a missile-carrying submarine it's essential that the skipper know exactly where he is at all times; otherwise, he would never dare fire a missile.

There are two principal ways that the navigator of an atomic sub calculates his position. One is with the use of an inertial guidance system, similar to the devices that keep missiles on course. This electronic behemoth records every movement of the vessel from the time it leaves port. The other navigational means is a remarkable sextant that takes star sightings through the periscope. Between these two instruments, the position of a sub—even after many weeks submerged—can be figured with great accuracy.

Still, scientists are trying to do better, and they must seek improvements without resort to radio transmission which would expose the craft to the enemy. Therefore a large-scale effort is being made to chart the earth's magnetic and gravitational forces beneath the sea. Magnetic and gravity readings vary from place to place due to the irregular shape of the earth and the varying densities of rocks beneath the ocean floor. If the necessary data were in hand, it would be possible for a submarine to simply check its magnetometer and gravimeter against the figures on its charts and it would know exactly where it was.

This system, however, is likely to remain in the research stage for some time, chiefly because of the enormity of the job of taking magnetic and gravity readings over thousands of square miles of ocean.

Another area of great interest to the Navy is the topography of the ocean floor which, in most places beyond the Continental Shelf, is a succession of mountains and trenches. Such undersea landmarks could be of great value to nuclear submarines; this may explain why charts of the ocean floor showing contour lines within 5 miles of each other are classified.

Exactly what the Navy has in mind for the ocean bottom is secret, although one well-informed civilian scientist says it has some interesting things cooking. There is talk of missile bases on the floor of the sea, undersea caves for use as submarine depots and hideouts, and various other futuristic possibilities. Oceanographers, however, tend to relegate such ideas to the science fiction bin and just chuckle when popular magazines report them as imminent.

A submarine's greatest asset is its secrecy of movement. When one considers that it took American and British frigates, submarines, and airplanes almost a week to find the hijacked Portuguese liner *Santa Maria* 2 years ago—even though the big surface ship's position was roughly known before the search began—one begins to understand how difficult it is to track down enemy submarines. And the best way to do it is still through the use of sound, with advanced sonar-hydrophone systems picking up the noise a moving submarine must inevitably make.

THE ATOM SUB'S ROAR

Water, of course, is an extraordinary sound conductor. It's so good that a small explosion set off beneath the sea near Australia

was picked up clearly by oceanographers in Bermuda. Columbus Iselin, of Woods Hole (Mass.) Oceanographic Institution, claims that a pistol shot fired at the right depth can be heard at the other side of the ocean. So when an atomic submarine is slipping through the water at high speed, it emits a steady roar—despite the many improvements made by the Navy to muffle it—and is therefore detectable.

Along with reducing the noise a submarine makes, the Navy is also studying the behavior patterns of sound at various depths. The submariners themselves have learned to distinguish the sound of another sub from the natural sounds of the sea.

The Soviet Union, with the largest submarine fleet in the world (well over 400 vessels), is believed to permanently station about 125 undersea craft in the North Atlantic. Thus, the U.S. Navy is faced with the formidable job of finding and tracking them. This will probably be done in the future with a kind of underwater radar device known as Artemis, which is actually a mammoth sonar machine. Artemis sends out, below the surface and over vast distances, electronic sounds similar to the lower notes on a piano. A long string of hydrophones, scattered throughout the Atlantic, picks up these sounds when they are reflected off any large object, and relays them via underwater cables to a 76-foot tower off Bermuda.

The tower, which is known as Argus Island and which stands atop an extinct volcano, receives the signals and feeds them into computing machines. When the system is fully developed, scientists will be able to distinguish sound bounced off a whale's belly from sound bounced off a hostile sub.

RUSSIA PUSHES OWN SYSTEMS

The Russians, to be sure, are also at work on submarine detection systems, but there is some evidence that they are far behind the U.S. in this department.

In the future, too, is the Navy's highly classified Project Caesar, which involves placing scores of hydrophones all around the North American Continent. One responsible civilian source said such devices can detect an enemy submarine within a range of 500 miles. This is enormously important because modern depth charges and modern torpedoes are immensely effective against undersea craft—nuclear depth charges can destroy a sub several thousands of yards away, and homing torpedoes, working on sonic, thermal or magnetic principles, are said to be errorproof.

Thus has man taken his genius for war and weapons beneath the sea. But amid the nuclear submarines, the underwater missiles, and the network of hydrophones, there are natural resources that defy calculation—more food than the world could eat, more minerals than two worlds could use.

The ocean now awaits the pleasure of man.

COSTLY RESULTS OF KENNEDY-FREEMAN FEED GRAINS PROGRAM

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, last year the Federal Government paid the American farmers nearly \$700 million to retire approximately 20 million acres of corn and other feed grains from production. At the same time under another program they paid the American farmers over \$200 million to subsidize the purchase of lime and fertilizer in order to increase the productive capacity of the remaining acres cultivated.

Today I wish to call the attention of the Senate to two very costly results of this contradictory and extravagant Kennedy-Freeman feed grains program.

First. In addition to the payments made to the American farmers we now find that the administration has paid over \$1 million to the wholesale seed dealers handling seed corn and sorghum seed to compensate them for the profit which they lost as a result of the reduced sales of seed corn and sorghum seed. Last year these payments totaled \$1,413,193.42 and ranged as high as \$20,000 each to some of the major seed companies.

Presumably these payments were made on the basis that as the Government paid the farmers to reduce their feed grain acreage there would be reduced sales of seed for the remaining acreage.

Of course once this principle is adopted I suppose the fertilizer companies could by the same line of reasoning claim compensation from the Federal Government for the reduced sale of fertilizer, the farm equipment manufacturers and dealers would have a claim against the Government for profits lost as the result of the sale of less farm equipment, local farm labor could file a claim for less jobs, and local merchants, bankers, and so forth, could all come in and claim compensatory payments as a result of the reduced volume of business due to acreage curtailment. Yes, if this principle is extended, everybody will get a free ride on the Kennedy-Freeman gravy train except the taxpayers.

The fact that the administration, after having once approved this New Frontier program and after having paid out over a million dollars, has decided to abandon the program for next year, does not eliminate the danger of such programs. Nor does the fact that last year was an election year when the doors of the Treasury were wide open remain without significance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a list of these payments to seed dealers, broken down by States.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

State	Corn	Sorghum
Alabama	\$31,293.00	-----
Florida	1,234.50	-----
Georgia	18,391.50	-----
Illinois	327,726.05	\$22.80
Indiana	154,237.18	-----
Iowa	197,598.49	7,972.20
Kansas	8,272.50	33,724.12
Kentucky	19,185.00	-----
Louisiana	23,134.50	-----
Massachusetts	1,875.00	-----
Minnesota	42,304.50	-----
Mississippi	3,778.50	-----
Missouri	57,109.08	820.80
Nebraska	55,725.59	41,010.68
New York	10,350.00	-----
North Carolina	33,474.00	-----
Ohio	78,686.10	-----
Pennsylvania	5,650.05	-----
South Dakota	2,215.50	-----
Tennessee	8,781.00	-----
Texas	25,128.00	148,070.28
Virginia	14,242.50	-----
Wisconsin	61,170.00	-----
Total	1,181,572.54	231,620.88

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Second, Mr. President, there was another fantastic result of this absurd Kennedy-Freeman feed grains program—a pro-

gram based on the principle that someone should be paid to do nothing.

In an earlier report, I mentioned the Farmers Investment Co., in Arizona, as having collected \$94,092.30 from the Government in 1961 as its payment not to cultivate all its lands. Today, I call attention to the remarkably easy way it found to make money fast on the New Frontier.

This company rented 582.3 acres from the State of Arizona—Maricopa County—at an average cost of \$3 per acre, or less than \$1,800. The U.S. Department of Agriculture, through the ASC state committee, then contracted to pay the company \$37.90 per acre, or a total of \$22,069.17, not to cultivate the same acreage. This represented a net profit of over \$20,000 merely to act as an agent between the State of Arizona and the Federal Government.

In Pinal County, Ariz., the Farmers Investment Co. rented three tracts from the State of 81 acres, 37.6 acres, and 37.6 acres, respectively, for which it paid the State of Arizona an average of \$4.50 per acre.

The Federal Government then contracted to pay the company \$41.30 per acre not to cultivate the 81 acres, \$43.20 per acre not to cultivate one of the tracts of 37.6 acres, and \$51.70 per acre not to cultivate the other tract of 37.6 acres.

The result was that on this second deal, involving the 156.2 acres which the Farmers Investment Co. rented from the State of Arizona—Pinal County—the company paid the State around \$700, and then collected a total of \$6,913.54 from the Federal Government not to cultivate the same acreage. This represented a net profit of approximately \$6,200.

On the two transactions the Farmers Investment Co. made an easy profit of over \$26,500 on land which it was renting from the State of Arizona for less than \$2,500.

There is nothing to indicate that these two transactions are isolated cases, nor is there any evidence to show how widespread this practice may be. But these two examples do show what can happen under a farm program that is designed, not on the basis of how it will benefit the conditions of the American farmer, but, rather, on the basis of how it will affect election results.

I have checked with officials of the State of Arizona, and they have confirmed the rental payments referred to above; and as confirmation of the payments made by the Federal Government on the same acreage, I ask unanimous consent that a letter signed by Mr. H. D. Godfrey, Administrator of the Agriculture Stabilization Conservation Service, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE, WASHINGTON, D.C.

November 28, 1962.

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senator.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in further reply to your letter of August 20, in which you requested information regarding

payments made under the 1961 feed grain program to the Farmers Investment Co. of Tucson, Arizona.

The Arizona ASC State Committee has advised us that the company in question did not divert any acreage of federally owned land in 1961; however, the following acreages of State-owned land were diverted under the 1961 feed grain program in the State:

County	Acres diverted	Payment rate per acre
Maricopa	582.3	\$37.90
Pinal	81.0	41.30
Do.	37.6	43.20
Do.	37.6	51.70

Program regulations for the 1961 feed grain program with respect to establishing payment rates where public-owned land is involved are as follows:

"The rate of payment under the program with respect to land which is leased or rented on a cash rent basis and which is owned by the Federal Government or by a State, a political subdivision or any agency thereof and which is otherwise eligible for participation in the program shall not exceed a fair payment rate as determined by the county committee. Such payment rate shall be the actual cash rent per acre of the land adjusted to take into account the quality of the acres which the producer designates as diverted when compared with the total acres rented, and the services performed and improvements made at the lessee's expense which are in addition to rent. A payment in excess of the cash rent may only be made if approved by a representative of the State committee."

If we can be of further service in this matter, please call on us.

Sincerely yours,

H. D. GODFREY,
Administrator.

REDUCTION OF TRADE BARRIERS AND SUPPORT OF NATO

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there appears in today's newspapers reports on and excerpts from two speeches on the nature and future of the western alliance, one by Dean Acheson, and the other by the Ambassador from France, Mr. Herve Alphand.

Mr. Acheson does not, as we know, hold any position in the U.S. Government. He is a partner in a law firm which has many international clients.

While I find much to agree with in Mr. Acheson's remarks, I also find what I think is a rather pathetic hope that President de Gaulle does not mean what he says, and that, even if he does, his objections to the Atlantic alliance can somehow be overcome.

Mr. Acheson is, in my opinion, indulging in a pipedream when he assumes that the United States, Britain, and the five Common Market countries other than France, can reduce trade barriers among them without the help of France, and even in face of her objections.

The fact is that in addition to France, West Germany and the Netherlands are also raising trade barriers against the United States. One of the principal objectives of the Common Market as it is emerging is the provision of a sheltered market for the farmers of the member countries. French farmers hope to benefit the most; but so do the others. Bar-

riers are already being raised against American poultry, fruit, and flour. More barriers against wheat products and feed grains will follow.

Agricultural exports to these countries account for about one-third of all American exports to them. Not just France, but several Common Market countries are seeking to curb just as much as possible the entry of those U.S. commodities.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD two articles on this subject from the western edition of the Christian Science Monitor of March 6. One is entitled "European Progress Curtails Import Needs." The other is entitled "U.S. Poultry Crisis Trails Hallstein Talks."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EUROPEAN PROGRESS CURTAILS IMPORT NEEDS
(By John Allan May)

LONDON.—Can the United States expect now to increase its agricultural trade with Europe?

Well, Europe's import requirements of wheat this year are likely to be considerably lower than last year.

Coarse-grain import requirements are expected to be somewhat lower.

Trade in dairy products is expected to meet some further difficulties.

A contraction of egg production is likely. Europe's imports of beef, veal, and pig meat very likely will decrease further.

Production and consumption, and trade in poultry meat, however, continues to expand.

Thus does the secretariat of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe sum up the market situation in European agriculture and the outlook for short-term trade.

CROP ESTIMATED

The total 1962 European grain crop excluding that of the Soviet Union is estimated at about 164 million tons, about 8 percent more than in the previous year.

In the U.S.S.R. the crop reached a record level of 147,400,000 tons, about 10 million tons more than in the previous year.

Wheat production in Western Europe is estimated to be 11 million tons higher than in 1961. Relatively large quantities of this are likely to be used for animal feeding.

With regard to coarse grains a reduction of the maize crop has been offset by a big barley crop.

The problems of the butter market remained unsolved in 1962, the Economic Commission for Europe reports.

The application of quotas in the London market stabilized prices but left some countries with large unsold stocks. These have increased in spite of an increase in butter consumption in a number of countries.

Trade in cheese and milk powder cannot be expected to absorb much more milk, the Economic Commission for Europe adds. An increase in milk production in Western Europe at the same time can be expected to add further to the difficulties of the market in dairy products.

The two salient features of the European egg market in recent years, the Economic Commission for Europe goes on, have been: (1) the familiar phenomenon of overcompensation of supply in response to price changes and, (2) the decline of West German imports for the third successive year.

Low egg prices during the hatching season this year could lead to a restriction of the number of eggs incubated and to a subsequent contraction of production in the 1962-63 season, it is said.

DANGERS SIGHTED

Consumption of meat has risen in all parts of Europe as a result of rising income, the Economic Commission for Europe declares. In line with this tendency meat production has also expanded. Europe's production has been increasing more rapidly than its consumption. Europe has expanded its own meat exports, particularly to the United States.

In Eastern Europe increased numbers of livestock in nearly all countries in 1962 points to a further increase in meat production there, too.

Production and consumption of poultry meat both continued to expand in 1962, the Economic Commission for Europe concludes. Falling prices have led to increased consumption and thus increased production. Technical improvements have raised productivity, but "a painful readjustment is still ahead for many traditional producers—particularly for those who produce poultry meat as a by-product of egg production."

The big importing market has been West Germany. This dependence on a single market has been "fraught with dangers in the long run" for exporters. Moreover, although German imports may remain high the pattern of the trade "may be influenced by the new regulations of the European Economic Community (the European Common Market)."

Apart from that change—of great significance of course to the United States, which is seeking to expand its exports of agricultural products—the Economic Commission for Europe sees no sign that the expansion of production and consumption in Europe will come to a halt in the near future.

U.S. POULTRY CRISIS TRAILS HALLSTEIN TALKS
(By Robert R. Brun))

WASHINGTON.—Walter Hallstein, President of the European Common Market, has started a round of talks here, and from President Kennedy on down he keeps hearing about chickens.

The current chicken crisis involves a domestic poultry surplus of gigantic size. It is being built up by a 12.5 percent per pound tariff slapped on American poultry by the Common Market countries last July.

President Kennedy spent 45 minutes with Mr. Hallstein Monday, and Mr. Kennedy hastened to bring up chickens.

So far Washington's officialdom doesn't seem to be quite sure what to do about the chicken surplus. It mounts every day.

But officials in their Hallstein talks are even more concerned about American agriculture's European Market generally. If the European Economic Community goes ahead with its plans, in the spring the Common Market will fix common import restrictions on wheat and feed grains.

QUESTION LOOMS

Overall, the Department of Agriculture believes that if the French and German farm lobbies are able to win out in the six-nation market, protective tariffs can well cut back American crop exports to Europe by 30 percent.

More than 30 percent of American exports to Europe are foodstuffs. It is figured that if half of this is lost, everything remaining constant, the U.S. healthy favorable trade balance could be turned into a deficit.

As it now is, the American international balance-of-payments condition is touch and go. This is why the Hallstein talks about poultry and the possible spring tariffs have a tone of urgency about them.

The administration is deeply anxious about the possible political repercussions of all this. If European tariffs continue to rise, then the traditional struggle between the free traders and the protectionists would have greater meaning.

But if grains are shut out of the EEC, then the administration actually might have a farm revolt on its hands, the congressional farm bloc could get much more hard to control in its voting, and the big farm organizations might demand retaliatory tariffs.

NO SOLUTION REPORTED

During the Hallstein visit the Common Market president will be asked if he actually expects the grain tariffs to come into effect this spring, now the Common Market is in an uncertain state following the De Gaulle break with its colleagues over British entry.

A delay of at least a year may be in the works, before the grain tariffs are implemented. The administration hope is that by then at least the beginning of a proposed series of international commodity cartels would have appeared that would insure the United States a certain share in the European farm market.

After the Kennedy meeting Mr. Hallstein hurried down the street to the Department of Agriculture where he met Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman. They talked turkey (and chickens).

No solution came out publicly, and it is agreed that little advance was made behind the doors, either.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I direct to Mr. Acheson's attention these sentences:

Overall, the Department of Agriculture believes that if the French and German farm lobbies are able to win out in the six-nation market, protective tariffs can well cut back American crop exports to Europe by 30 percent. More than 30 percent of American exports to Europe are foodstuffs. It is figured that if half of this is lost, everything remaining constant, the U.S. healthy favorable trade balance could be turned into a deficit.

As it is now, the American international balance-of-payments condition is touch and go.

Mr. President, let me say that I would be very much interested to find that Mr. Acheson represents a single farm producer or farm organization, in connection with any of his international law practice. But I represent a State which has a great stake in whether the foreign policy of the United States is to be one that sells short the American farmer. Let me make very clear—as I tried to do from this desk on January 16—that I do not intend to support a foreign policy, either by the Kennedy administration or by any other administration, that sells short American farmers. So far as I am concerned, I have voted for the last dollar to buttress Europe at the expense of the American taxpayers. It is undeniable—let me say to Mr. Acheson or to others who are following the line of his speech of yesterday—that today the NATO countries are in a better monetary position than is the United States to carry their full share of the burdens and the cost of NATO. I repeat that if De Gaulle wants to go it alone, I invite him to take a long walk. So far as I am concerned, I will not support a foreign economic program by this Government that causes the American taxpayers to pour more millions of dollars into the economy of the Common Market countries, while they follow a policy of exclusion to American farm products.

Mr. Acheson espouses the complacent dogma that our present defense policy in Europe must be continued because it is right; but he says nothing of how it is

to be paid for. I say that a defense policy which requires a continued drain on the American taxpayers, for the benefit of nations perfectly able to pay much more toward it themselves, is not right, and it should not be tolerated. The nations that are "putting the squeeze" on American farm goods are not worried about whether we maintain our conventional forces in Europe. Probably they believe there are enough policymakers in the United States gullible enough to follow the Acheson line that the United States is a bottomless pit of gold and greenbacks, and that we shall pay any price they ask just to keep our troops on their soil.

Mr. Alphanth makes very much the same totally mistaken assumption.

Let me say to the French Ambassador that we welcome his exercise of his right of free speech while holding his diplomatic post in this country; but let me also make clear to the French Ambassador and to any other ambassador who exercises the precious right of free speech on the platforms in America that we have the right to reply when we think their speeches are as unfortunate and as unsound as, in my opinion, was the speech made yesterday in California by the French Ambassador.

The French Ambassador brags of the favorable condition of France's balance of payments, but he neglects to say that it is being achieved at American expense. He brags of the defense expenditure by France, but neglects to mention that France is failing seriously to meet her obligations to NATO.

From the floor of the Senate today I say to the French Ambassador, "Where are French troops in NATO? Why has not France supported NATO with uniformed men in accord with the rightful burden that France ought to maintain in the support of NATO?"

The United States has been maintaining in Europe our full commitment to NATO, closer to a state of complete combat-readiness than the forces of any other member. France is not an equal partner in NATO by her own decision, not ours, because it is President de Gaulle's decision to keep French forces under his own command that should be under NATO command.

I am flatly opposed to a continued American subsidy to France through NATO. I am even more opposed to it in light of the Common Market exclusion of American farm commodities, which proves to me that the member countries have little interest in whether the United States remains in Europe or not.

If it is good enough for the European members of NATO to put half-filled divisions under its command with the pledge to fill them when and if a crisis comes, then it is good enough for us, too.

Mr. President, it is about time that we started doing it.

American taxpayers have been plucked long enough for the support of European defenses. The time has come for the United States to make clear to the NATO countries that they must pay their full share—not half their share or less—in the defense and support of NATO. The Congress of the United States and

the Kennedy administration are about to hear from the American people in ever-increasing tempo in opposition to further waste of money in Europe in support of NATO colleagues who are not willing to join in an equal support of freedom in the free world.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS LEAGUE CONFERENCE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Mr. LeRoy Graymer, executive secretary of the Oregon High School International Relations League; and a memorandum on the league's recent conference.

There being no objection, the letter and the memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON HIGH SCHOOL INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS LEAGUE, UNIVERSITY OF OREGON,
Eugene, Oreg., March 1, 1963.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We wish to sincerely thank you for your participation in the 16th Annual International Relations League Conference. The insights which you brought to the 600 participants at this meeting contributed greatly to their understanding of the implications of the social and economic revolutions being attempted by the Alliance for Progress program. As always, you succeeded in inspiring and educating the people attending this conference.

We are particularly grateful for your informal remarks at the advisor's luncheon. Not only did this stimulate considerable thought among the teachers present, it also helped the IRL executive committee in selecting a conference topic for next year. Although not specifically formulated, it will deal with some aspect of European unity or disunity.

I wish to indicate what a pleasant experience it was for me to meet and talk with you during your attendance at this conference.

The Institute of International Studies and the Oregon Education Association appreciate the continuous support you have given to the International Relations League over the years of its existence.

Since there was some conversation at the advisor's luncheon concerning the possibility of your placing some information on the International Relations League in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am enclosing some information on the league and this year's conference.

Thank you again for the time and energy that you have devoted to our program.

Sincerely yours,

LEROY GRAYMER,
Executive Secretary.

Résumé of International Relations League Activities and the 1963 Conference "Revista de la Alianza Para el Progreso" ("Review of the Alliance Progress"). This was the topic for the Oregon High School International Relations League conference held on February 7-9, 1963, at the University of Oregon. This meeting culminated a year-long study of the Alliance for Progress by the members of International Relations Clubs in 65 high schools throughout the State of Oregon.

The league, now in its 16th consecutive year of operation, is a jointly sponsored endeavor of the University of Oregon's institute of international studies and oversea administration and the International Relations Committee of the Oregon Education Association.

Its principal purpose is to promote an active interest in international relations among high school students and to provide a framework within which these interested students can effectively broaden their understanding of the issues and problems of this field. Coordinators of the program are members of the Oregon Education Association-International Relations League executive committee, including Mr. Lawrence Page, chairman, Lebanon; Mr. Ray Conlon, Portland; Mr. Paul Davis, Dallas; Mr. Gareth Goddard, Portland; Mr. Clyde McLain, Philomath; Mr. Arthur Motz, Myrtle Point; Miss Lois Rice, Cottage Grove; Mrs. Betty Roberts, Portland; Miss Fern Trull, Grants Pass; Mr. Patrick Maney, Oregon Education Association consultant; Mr. Leroy Graymer, executive secretary; and Dr. Robert Loring Allen, University of Oregon consultant. Staff includes Mr. Robert L. Curry, Jr., graduate assistant, and Mrs. Thelma Aman, administrative assistant.

In 65 of the high schools throughout the State, organized International Relations Clubs participate in the league program and engage in a variety of activities designed to improve relations among the people in Oregon communities and those in foreign nations.

Each fall the Institute of International Studies prepares a "Study Guide" for the students on a topic of vital concern in the area of international affairs. For the 1962-63 school year, the study guide was titled, "Review of the Alliance for Progress." Dr. Paul S. Holbo, assistant professor of history at the University of Oregon, wrote "Latin America: Problems and Progress" as a background paper for this study guide. The paper provides a comprehensive background on the geographical, historical, social, political and economic factors that have current impact on developments in Latin America. It also gives a foundation for understanding United States-Latin American relations.

The guide also contains a list of study questions, an extensive bibliography of books and periodicals pertaining to the issues to be discussed, and as well, the format for the annual conference. The publication, printed by the Oregon Education Association, was sent with other materials to each International Relations Club in the State, and some clubs in southwest Washington. Schools in which no clubs have yet been organized also received a copy. Other materials sent included copies of the Charter of Punta del Este which also contained discussion on the specific provisions in the Charter, studies which had been prepared for congressional committees dealing with questions pertinent to the Alliance, and several other valuable materials published by the Pan American Union.

The conference held during February or March each year provides an opportunity for some members of each club to participate in a program of discussion sessions and to hear prominent speakers who have special competence in the topic under discussion. Topics for these conferences in past years have included such issues as "Disarmament, the United Nations, and Problems of Emerging Countries."

The 1963 conference was patterned after a special meeting of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council at the ministerial level. It was at such a meeting in August 1961, that the Charter of Punta del Este was signed giving approval to the "Alianza Para el Progreso." Since each year a meeting of this body is held for the purpose of reviewing the progress made under the Alliance, a model of these meetings provides an excellent format for the international relations league program. Five hundred high school students and 75 teachers participated in this conference.

Schools gathering at this year's conference represented 20 member countries of the

Alliance plus a delegation speaking in behalf of Cuba. Country assignments were made early in the school year to allow the several schools representing a single country to meet for caucus meetings. Assignments were made as follows:

Argentina: Centennial (Gresham), Gresham, Reynolds (Troutdale).

Bolivia: Benson (Portland), Grant (Portland).

Brazil: Ashland Crater (Central Point), Medford.

Chile: Marshall (Portland).

Colombia: Hudson's Bay (Vancouver), Providence Academy (Vancouver).

Costa Rica: Forest Grove, Sherwood.

Cuba: Cleveland (Portland), Lincoln (Portland).

Dominican Republic: Franklin (Portland), Roosevelt (Portland), St. Mary's Academy (Portland).

Ecuador: Albany, Corvallis, Lebanon, Central (Independence).

Guatemala: McMinnville, West Linn.

Haiti: Douglas (Winston), Powers, Roseburg.

Honduras: North Salem, South Salem.

Mexico: Grants Pass, Riddle.

Nicaragua: Dallas, Stayton.

Panama: Clackamas (Milwaukie), Lake Oswego.

Paraguay: Marshfield (Coos Bay), Myrtle Point, North Bend.

Peru: Bend, Klamath Falls, Lakeview.

El Salvador: Astoria, Scappoose, St. Helens.

United States: North Eugene, South Eugene.

Uruguay: Cottage Grove, Springfield.

Venezuela: Beaverton, Woodrow Wilson (Portland), Tigard.

In addition, Sunset High School of Beaverton, Estacada High School, and The Dalles High School attended the conference as observers since their clubs were newly formed this year. The conference deviated from the actual Inter-American Economic and Social Council meeting in that a delegation representing Cuba was allowed to attend the conference. Those students representing Cuba helped to give voice to some inescapable forces operating in the Latin American scene. However, they were not allowed to vote in any proceedings at the meetings.

Committees of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council meeting at the conference represented a breakdown of the principal programs proposed by the Alliance for Progress. Every country had at least one representative on each committee and each of the committees was chaired by a high school student. Committee chairmen included:

Agrarian reform: Steve Talbot, Beaverton; Randy Grant, Grant (Portland).

Industrial development: Carrlie L. Walters, North Salem; Larry Gordon, Cleveland (Portland).

National development plan: Ken Birrell, South Salem; John Collins, North Eugene.

Fiscal and monetary reform: Ashro Wilson, Lincoln (Portland); Doug Dralle, Cottage Grove.

Social improvement: Larry Sutton, Lebanon; Janet Mathieson, St. Francis (Eugene).

Trade and commodity policy: Dick Solomon, Lincoln (Portland); Jim Sterling, Dallas.

Economic integration: Lisa Nickerson, South Eugene; Jenny Lou Thompson, Crater.

External assistance: Karen Krebs, Grants Pass; Bill Meyer, Tigard.

Graduate students from the university sat in on the committee meetings to serve as resource people and to help in the formulation of resolutions. Serving as resource aids at the meetings were Robert Arellanes, Tony Ternent, Dave Bradwell, Al Gutowsky, Al Wheeler, Al Escobar, Bill Kerby, Cal DePass, and Jim Zinser, all of the economics department; Ron Sheck and Bill Haneson,

geography; Jim Hutter, Bryan Downes, and Jim Mollneu, political science; Winston Cox, history; and Lee Donnell, international studies.

Each committee discussed a list of proposed resolutions. Two examples of the types of resolutions considered are—

1. Whereas agrarian reform will result in new landowners who probably will not be well informed on agricultural techniques and who will need expert advice.

Recommends to the governments of the member states the following alternative recommendations: (a) to seek basic technical knowledge from experts from the more economically advanced societies as a basic course of action, or (b) to concentrate on developing agricultural colleges in each member state, thereby developing its own agricultural experts.

A resolution discussed by committees on national development planning was—

2. Whereas many countries in Latin America do not have a trained and efficient civil service; and

Whereas this seriously handicaps the functioning of developmental planning and administration, as well as increasing the cost of government.

Recommends that Alliance for Progress funds be withheld from those countries where the above applies until plans have been submitted to establish a civil service based on merit.

(A list of resolutions considered at committee sessions is included at the end of this article.)

Those resolutions passing in the committees were then referred to plenary sessions. Individual committees designated two delegates to present each proposed resolution in the plenary sessions—one speaking for, and one against the resolution. (A list of the resolutions referred from the committees to the plenary sessions is also included at the end of this article.)

This year's conference was highlighted by two internationally known speakers. Senator WAYNE MORSE, chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, addressed the entire conference at the opening session, citing the implications of the Alliance for Progress for the future of United States-Latin American relations. Dr. William Sanders, Assistant Secretary General of the Organization of American States, spoke the following day on the complexities of the Alliance and the functions performed by various organs of the Pan American Union in programs to implement the Alliance.

Dr. Val Lorwin, professor of history at the university, spoke on the issue of Western European unity at the luncheon held for club advisers. Speaker at the Friday banquet was Dr. Robert Loring Allen, associate professor in the Department of Economics at the University, who addressed his remarks to the "Enemies of Mankind: Fear, Ignorance, and Poverty."

In addition to the students' activities directly related with the Alliance, delegates elected officers for the coming year. Angus Duncan, Medford, received the president's gavel from outgoing President John Brown, Riddle. The vice presidency went to Jim Mater, Corvallis, who succeeded Bob Gaskell, also of Corvallis. Kathy Hughes, South Eugene, turned her record book over to newly elected Secretary Carol Page, Lebanon. Taking over Emily Evans', of Cleveland, duties as historian was Cathy Candland, Bend.

Twenty-seven American field service exchange students attended the conference. These students, their native countries, and the schools they are now attending are listed below:

Henry Mannuchi, Argentina, Albany.
Ali Saner, Turkey, Ashland.
Gonul Akagunduz, Turkey, Astoria.
Ersin Meric, Turkey, Benson.

Francisco Pinto, Brazil, Centennial.
Yoshiko Akahori, Japan, Cleveland.
Iker Atsuyak, Turkey, Cottage Grove.
Alicia de los Santos, Argentina, Grants Pass.

Enrico Demola, Italy, Gresham.
Dagmar Henry, West Germany, Klamath Falls.

Kathren Koini, Greece, Lake Oswego.
Sami Guren, Turkey, Lebanon.
Luis Simmonds Matamala, Chile, Lincoln.
Azizah Yahya, Malaya, Medford.

Handewatini Nogosman, Indonesia, North Bend.

Jose Rafael Gitiirrez, Colombia, North Eugene.

Lisette Juarez, Guatemala, Providence Academy.

Lena Erickson, Sweden, St. Helens.
Michele Farish, South Africa, Scappoose.
Jolena Moneleoni, Italy, Sherwood.
Yolanda Arrata, Ecuador, South Eugene.

Bjorn Person, Sweden, South Salem.
Grace LaMonica, Italy, Stayton.
Ilona Pollhammer, Austria, Tigard.
Mette Schwartz, Denmark, Woodrow Wil-

son.

Louise Costille, Chile, Roseburg.

Ina Boelj, Netherlands, Florence.

At the conclusion of each year's conference, awards are made to the three schools judged to have the most outstanding international relations programs. The winners are selected from among those clubs demonstrating the most rigorous participation in the year-long study program and the annual conference. Clubs are also judged on the basis of contribution to improved understanding and relations between their own communities and those in other countries.

RESOLUTIONS CONSIDERED AT THE 1963 MODEL INTER-AMERICAN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Resolutions considered in committees reflect the thoroughness with which the delegates at the International Relations League Conference studied Latin American problems.

Resolutions presented to the committees on agrarian reform

1. Whereas the ownership of agricultural land is unevenly distributed in many areas of Latin America, many large land holdings are inefficiently managed.

Recommends that in view of this inequity and inefficiency, Latin American governments undertake a program of redistributing land ownership in smaller units to more people.

2. Whereas there is a pressing problem in food production and food distribution in Latin America, and any steps toward agrarian reform must take into account the possible effects on food production.

Recommends that any land reform take into account the possible economic benefits from the large-scale agricultural units so far as they can raise more capital, employ more machinery, and use better skills, thus resulting in a larger food supply than with many smaller units.

3. Whereas new landowners will need credit to finance their new undertaking, and up to the present, such credit to small farmers has been meager and inadequate.

Recommends to member governments, that banking and credit systems be revised to the extent that any bank director, who has an economic interest in any large-scale agricultural unit, be requested to act in accordance with the farmer and not himself.

4. Whereas few new landowners can afford agricultural equipment needed for efficient production of foodstuffs.

Recommends that Latin American governments make such equipment available to farmers on a communal basis; that is, the sharing of equipment which is public property.

5. Whereas only a small proportion of arable land is in use; and

Whereas Latin America needs the food production to conserve foreign exchange.

Recommends that some segments of the agricultural population be subsidized to effectuate resettlement.

Industrial development committees resolutions considered

1. Whereas many industries such as transportation, communication, banking, housing, et cetera, call for public industrial development.

Recommends to urge the governments of the member states to establish governmental agencies to either administer and control several of these functions, or to stimulate private activity in these fields through subsidies, land grants, and other incentives.

2. Whereas extensive capital investment is needed to promote basic industrial development in most Latin American countries, without initial impetus from foreign sources, further capital accumulation and investment will not be forthcoming.

Recommends that foreign capital investments be encouraged in Latin American countries through the policies of the domestic governments involved. Tax exemptions for foreign investors would be an example of such a policy.

3. Whereas capital-goods industries are the most important long range means for the economic development of a country.

Recommends that such industries be guided by governmental economic planning until the time when the economy is so developed that the economic decisions involved in the production of capital goods can be made in a free market. Private enterprise should be encouraged in certain sectors of the economy; however, some regulation should be implemented to assure rational economic development.

4. Whereas the resources possessed by each country in Latin America are less than those needed to satisfy all the economic needs of the peoples of each country.

Recommends (a) that through the complete and free exercise of private initiative, unrestricted by government activity, the most rational use of such resources will come about. (b) In view of this, governments should not involve themselves in industrial development, but should limit their activities to protect free enterprise and private property rights.

Resolutions in the field of national development planning

1. Whereas development planning is a complex task for which few Latin Americans are prepared and no facilities are available in these countries for specialized training.

Recommends that funds be provided by the United States for training in development planning.

2. Whereas the majority of foreign investment in Latin America has been in extractive industries.

Recommends (a) that governments of individual Latin American countries study the success of the Venezuelan experience and/or (b) that more native personnel be recruited for engineering and executive positions, and that at such point when a cadre of native personnel exist capable of operating the concern, local ownership be allowed to increase.

3. Whereas the issues involved in coordinating the development of the industrial and agricultural potential of a country are very complex and the political pressures upon the government are very great whenever a system of priorities for development is devised.

Recommends that each nation establish a national planning commission responsible to the chief executive and isolated from the legislative body.

4. Whereas statistical data concerning the population, resources, and economy in general are vital to development planning.

Recommends that each of the Latin American countries establish government bureaus for gathering the census and other necessary data.

Fiscal and monetary reform resolutions

1. Whereas tax laws exempt many institutions and individuals with considerable wealth, tax collections in many member countries are impeded by tax loopholes, evasion and tax dodging.

Recommends (a) that sweeping tax reforms be instituted where necessary; (b) that, through such reform, tax laws will not be made by a legislative body controlled by, or subject to the influence of large economic units which benefit from a lax tax collection system.

2. Whereas the major portion of government revenues is collected from taxes on consumption, (e.g. sales tax); and,

Whereas these taxes are regressive.

Recommends to the member governments, that a progressive income tax, supplemented by a business property tax be created and strictly enforced in order to secure the needed tax revenues.

3. Whereas those individuals in member countries who accrue income often invest their income in industrialized countries or deposit their earnings in the banking system of such developed countries, causing a drain on the capital available to the domestic economy.

Recommends (a) that Latin American countries impose high taxes on interest and dividends earned from foreign investments; (b) that governments of member countries pressure investors to invest their earnings in domestic industries.

4. Whereas chronic inflation in several member countries discourages investment (domestic and foreign).

Recommends (a) that an austerity program be adopted in order to arrest the inflation; (b) that the austerity program include price controls on basic essential commodities, wage controls, and control of foreign exchange for those engaged in international trade.

Discussion on social improvement

1. Whereas there is widespread illiteracy in Latin America; and,

Whereas a requisite of economic development is the attainment of a certain level of education.

Recommends (a) that initially, education be given a high priority by all republics having more than 50 percent illiterate population; (b) that personnel be recruited from developed areas to teach in Latin American schools; (c) that a program designed to wipe out illiteracy from the southern hemisphere in 5 years be developed.

2. Whereas education is a powerful means of transmitting the goals of the government.

Recommends that all education be placed under the direction of the state.

3. Whereas scientific and technical training is lacking in Latin America, and,

Whereas the process of development will demand greater amounts of individuals with this type of training.

Recommends that institutes for training said personnel be established in Argentina, Costa Rica, Honduras, Peru, and Venezuela.

4. Whereas the population in Latin America is growing at a rate close to 3 percent; and,

Whereas these countries are not self-sufficient in food production.

Recommends that governments should place high priority on regulating population growth by means amenable to their traditional, cultural and religious values.

Committees on trade and commodity policy

1. Whereas the Common Market is establishing uniformly higher tariffs on goods produced by other than its own members.

Recommends that OAS form a commission to bargain collectively with the Common Market for a favorable trade arrangement on commodities produced in Latin American countries.

2. Whereas the prices of basic commodities such as those produced by member countries tend to fluctuate greatly.

Recommends (a) that the industrialized countries maintain stable import prices on goods produced in Latin American countries; (b) that the industrialized countries maintain an adequate market for the goods of member countries; (c) that an Inter-American board be established to establish recommended production quotas and minimum prices on export commodities.

3. Whereas many member countries are to a great degree dependent on foreign sale of one basic commodity which may be subject to violent fluctuation in price and quantity demanded.

Recommends (a) to the governments of member countries, that incentives to develop other sectors of the economy which might prove successful in world trade; (b) such incentives might include subsidies or tax concessions.

4. Whereas most of the foreign exchange earned by Latin American republics comes from the sale of a single crop.

Recommends that the United States reduce the tariffs on manufactured goods so that Latin American producers of these goods may find markets outside their domestic markets which are needed for efficient operation of manufacturing in Latin America.

Resolutions presented to Committee on Economic Integration

1. Whereas Central American nations have taken the initiative in attempting to integrate their economies; and

Whereas this will tend to make the allocation of resources more efficient in this region; and

Whereas transportation is a problem for these countries.

Recommends that the Inter-American Development Bank give top priority to inter-country roads as against intra-country; and further,

Recommends that goods moving over these roads be duty-free.

2. Whereas 80 percent of the foreign exchange earned by Central American nations comes from the export of two crops (coffee and bananas); and

Whereas these crops are susceptible to wide price variation.

Recommends that efforts for diversification be encouraged and financially supported with funds from the Alliance, irrespective of efficiency considerations.

3. Whereas the existing Latin American Free Trade Area is limited to only a small number of the nations in the area, animosity may develop between members and non-members which could further hamper the interregional economic development.

Recommends that all members of the Organization of American States participate in a conference for the purpose of revising the Treaty of Montevideo to bring about a free trade zone for the entire Latin American area.

Resolutions considered by committees on external assistance

1. Whereas external assistance for the purpose of developing the economies of Latin American countries will inevitably bring with it some form of external control, and no amount of foreign aid will prove adequate to sustain long-range development plans.

Recommends that the members of the Organization of American States establish conformable tax expenditures and monetary policies toward the end of increasing the amount of public and private capital sources from within their own countries, and that

these countries consult the International Monetary Fund for recommendations on these procedures.

2. Whereas foreign aid that is predicated upon fulfilling certain contingencies set by an external power is a violation of the autonomy of a sovereign nation.

Recommends that all members of the Alliance for Progress set up a board of experts made up entirely of their own citizens, to draw up reform recommendations considered appropriate for each individual nation, and that nations providing the assistance accept these recommendations as adequate contingencies for granting aid.

3. Whereas several member countries are in great need of external assistance from the more developed countries; and

Whereas such assistance may be in the nature of a public grant or loan, or private funds.

Recommends that member country governments encourage private foreign investment through the enactment of legislation protecting such investment from nationalization.

Sixteen resolutions were referred from committees for consideration in the plenary sessions.

Resolutions referred from agrarian reform committees:

1. Whereas the ownership of agricultural land is unevenly distributed in many areas of Latin America, and many large land holdings are inefficiently managed.

Recommends that in view of this inequity and inefficiency, Latin American governments undertake a program of redistributing land ownership in smaller units to more people with consideration for efficiency and adequate compensation for landholders.

2. Whereas few new landowners can afford agricultural equipment needed for efficient production of foodstuffs.

Recommends that Latin American governments make such equipment available to farmers on a communal basis; that is, the sharing of equipment which is public property. The necessary funds shall be made available by the Organization of American States.

Industrial development committees resolutions referred

1. Whereas extensive capital investment is needed to promote basic industrial development in most Latin American countries, without initial impetus from foreign sources, further capital accumulation and investment will not be forthcoming.

Recommends that foreign capital investments be encouraged in Latin American countries through the policies of the domestic governments involved. Tax exemptions for foreign investors would be an example of such a policy.

2. Whereas in the modern world, economic advancement is generally synonymous with industrialization;

Whereas the Latin American countries for the most part have sufficient resources to establish basic capital goods industries; and

Whereas the establishment of organizations such as the Latin American Free Trade Area and the Central American trade group has attempted to assure even the smallest countries of adequate markets for basic capital goods.

Recommends that the natural resources of the countries be utilized as much as possible to establish capital goods industries, that the establishment of these industries be limited exclusively to private or public enterprises of the native countries, and that notwithstanding the above, aid be accepted, regardless of political ideology, from any country wishing to help in the establishment of these industries.

ADDRESS BY MAYOR WAGNER, OF NEW YORK, AT MEETING OF FEDERATION OF PROTESTANT WELFARE AGENCIES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Mayor Robert F. Wagner, of New York, at the annual meeting of the Federation of Protestant Welfare Agencies, in New York City, on February 26.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY MAYOR ROBERT F. WAGNER AT ANNUAL MEETING FEDERATION OF PROTESTANT WELFARE AGENCIES

I am glad to be at this gathering sponsored by the Federation of Protestant Social Welfare Agencies. I consider this organization to be one of the finest in the field. It is an outstanding illustration of what might be called—in sociological terminology—positive volunteerism; or to put it in plain English, it is a major social force doing many good works, supported by the concerted good will of a great number of private individuals acting through their voluntary organizations. This federation has consistently supported and encouraged the Government in the discharge of its responsibilities, without seeking to evade or unload any part of its own.

I salute the fine attitude of this organization. I have long known it, respected it and appreciated the good works it has performed and the leadership it has provided in the social work field. And not so incidentally, the praises of the federation are persistently sung to me by our eminent commissioner of welfare, Jim Dumpson.

It has been widely noted by foreign observers, beginning with the Frenchman, Alexis de Tocqueville, 125 years ago, that one of the peculiar things about Americans is—and always has been—their penchant for forming and joining voluntary organizations, clubs, lodges and associations, of every kind, to achieve their personal, social or political purposes. No question about it, we Americans are joiners by habit and inclination.

We Americans look to our voluntary organizations to do what needs to be done even before we look to government. And when we think of government, our first inclination is to depend on—and complain to—local government. This, too, is an American characteristic. It reflects our history.

It reflects our belief in democracy and, above all, our unlimited faith in our own powers.

In 1932, at practically the peak of the depression, with 16 million unemployed, all State and local governments in the entire Nation spent a combined total of \$444 million on public welfare. Even that figure was three times the amount spent in 1927. But in 1960, State and local governments spent \$4,250 million on public welfare—an increase of 1,000 percent over 1932.

Once upon a time, of course, private expenditures for public welfare—it was called philanthropy in those days—were much greater than public expenditures. Today, the balance has completely shifted. Thirty years ago, public welfare was conceived largely in terms of caring for the hungry, meeting the emergency needs of the jobless and the destitute, and providing a modicum of care for needy children, needy aged and the needy sick. In rough outline, that was about the size of it.

By today there has been an explosive expansion of services, along with an explosive change in our public welfare concepts. By now, public welfare has been institutionalized. The idea of it and the necessity of it have been generally agreed to. Indeed, the foundations and premises of public welfare

are only rarely attacked. This is to the good—except for one thing. Some of these premises are not being as closely inspected by analytical and sympathetic minds as perhaps they should be.

In fact, the city's social and human problems are growing beneath our eyes and under our hands. Today, we are discovering that we have in our midst a group of people who might be called the permanently poor. It is an unpleasant fact, but it is a fact that we have third generation welfare families in New York City. Many of them are so psychologically disadvantaged, bruised, and frustrated by their attempts to climb the walls of the well, that they have resigned themselves to life at its bottom, as did their parents—and in some cases, their grandparents.

All 1-day-old babies in New York City theoretically have the same potential for fulfillment and happiness. Yet it is a sad fact that something immediately divides many of these children into pigeonholes marked "probable success" and "probable failure" before they finish grammar school. In the Bedford-Stuyvesant area, for example, we have found that some children are already two grades behind by the time they get to the fifth grade. And in seven of the city high schools with predominantly nonwhite student bodies, we have found that the percentage of dropouts by graduation time runs from 33 percent to 60 percent. That simply means that as many as three out of five entering students drop out before they get their high school diplomas.

As Dr. James B. Conant has pointed out, this is "social dynamite." But it is also economic disaster for New York City; here in this city, by the end of this decade, we foresee a 20-percent increase in professional and technical manpower needs, along with a 19-percent decrease in manual and unskilled jobs. We will need more skilled workers. More and more of the unskilled will fall into the pool of the jobless, the aimless, the hopeless.

We must do whatever we can, whatever is necessary, to end this perpetuation of poverty. And this is just one problem out of many that have become apparent in the light of 1963.

Of course, I could cite our Welfare Department statistics on intake and case load to show how many individuals are being handled, how many children, how many adults, how many aged. I could cite all the varied and comprehensive services we perform—from vocational retraining of the jobless to tenant training in public housing. I could also cite figures showing how many social workers, case workers, supervisors, homemakers, and inspectors we now have on the job.

Within the framework of present practices, procedures, methods, and concepts, we can and should congratulate ourselves and point with pride to the level of the services we provide for the needy, the disadvantaged, the young, the aged, the weak, the helpless, and homeless, the maladjusted, and the unskilled.

But we also need to ask ourselves from time to time: Where are we going? What basic headway have we made against our problems? How much can social welfare contribute to a solution of these problems? What beneficial effects have our welfare programs had upon the social fabric of our community? While we are surely helping some individuals, what is happening to those who are not being helped? Are we strengthening the indigenous forces in the community? Are we raising or improving the level? Has our public welfare machinery retained the flexibility it needs? Is there not a tendency to become so involved with the internal problems of public welfare that our communications with the actual people involved have become somewhat strained?

I am aware that a Moreland Commission, a special high-level review commission established under the terms of the Moreland Act,

has just completed a study of the administration of welfare in New York State. I am proud to say that New York City's administration of welfare has come off very well in this report. Our procedures for detecting and discouraging chiselers and cheaters were noted and commended. I am pleased and satisfied that this is so. There goes another exploded myth in the welfare field.

But neither this Moreland Commission report nor any other I have seen really asked the deep, fundamental and searching questions I am suggesting.

I have suggested questions, but I have not given the answers. I do not pretend to know the answers. That is the trouble. I don't think any of us really know the answers.

We do know that to resolve our present problems, we need many, many more social services than we now provide. We need a substantial number of new and major measures by the Federal and State governments—on the economic, educational, and social welfare fronts. Most of the needed measures are well known. All of them are controversial, too, to put it mildly. Yet somehow we must secure the consensus that is necessary to obtain their enactment.

As far as the capacity of our own city government to do much more than it is already doing, I must tell you frankly that we have reached a point where I must ask you, and we must all ask ourselves: where is the city government going to get the money to pay for the additional services that we need?

Today, it looks as though, for the next fiscal year, we will face a gap of more than \$200 million between the revenues we can expect to receive and the expenditures we will be called upon to make. And this is a most conservative estimate. I don't yet have the final figures. We shall have to bridge this gap, because we are forbidden by our State constitution from operating at a deficit. The decision must be made whether to curtail our essential services or raise new revenues by local taxation. There is no other answer. Moreover, I must emphasize that our need for services will continue to expand in the years immediately ahead, while our present sources of revenue carry no such promise.

I do not say that our first object must be to reduce the money we spend on welfare, but we do need to determine whether the amount we now spend is being spent as effectively as possible, and whether we might not save some here and spend more there, and in so doing, make real headway against real problems.

For this reason, as well as many others, we must examine and reexamine our approach and commitments in the field of public welfare. In this process of examination and reexamination, I look to the private and voluntary agencies for help, counsel, and wisdom. I look to them to help supply the leadership. May the day never come when the leadership in social welfare is considered to be solely or even primarily in the hands of government.

Frequent reference is made to the partnership between public and voluntary agencies. I know that Commissioner Dumpson made a major address last year in support of such a relationship. I subscribe to that relationship, with all my heart. I go one step further. I say that whereas at one time there was a necessary shift of emphasis from voluntary agencies to public welfare agencies, today great and increasing emphasis must now be given to the role of the voluntary agencies. I hasten to add that I do not look to the voluntary agencies for significantly increased financial expenditures but rather to the greatly increased use of their human resources, of their experience.

I have said it before, and I say it again today, that we will need to draw more and more from the indigenous resources of the

community and of the neighborhood, from its internal resources. The word is mobilization, and more and more there must be a recognition that the community must supply part of the manpower to meet the totality of community needs and services. There is not enough money in anybody's treasury to pay for all that we need.

We must learn how to mobilize both the active and latent forces within the various neighborhoods and communities. Public welfare must cease to be solely or even principally the concern of professional social workers. It must become everybody's business.

Our entire city must be brought to feel the sense of immediate relationship with and concern for the new elements recently added to our city. All who need help must be helped. And this includes those whose chief need is to be needed. Above all, we must reverse the process whereby, in recent years, urban living—which is supposed to be the height of civilized living—has been stripped, in many respects, of both its urbanity and humanity.

The spirit of the jungle, rather than of civilized society, has entered into the central core of the city. Different population groups regard each other often suspiciously, sometimes even fearfully across the wasteland of noncommunication and misunderstanding of each other's problems and capacities.

All this must be remedied. All this can be remedied. All this shall be remedied, if all of us will work together with good will, with dedication, and with a total absence of prejudice and preconception.

We have the will to succeed. We must succeed.

PENTAGON ACTIVITIES AND TFX HEARINGS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, in view of the high public interest in the current hearings by the Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee into the award of the TFX fighter-bomber airplane contract, I wish to bring to attention as a matter of public record the statement of the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

The Senator's statement was issued yesterday and deals with certain aspects of statements made to the committee by the Assistant Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Arthur Sylvester.

Mr. President, I request that the statement of the senior Senator from South Dakota be made a part of this RECORD, and also that his statement be followed by the appropriate portions of testimony delivered by Mr. Sylvester before the subcommittee.

There being no objection, the statement and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR MUNDT'S STATEMENT ON PENTAGON ACTIVITIES AND TFX HEARINGS

In view of the one-two punch which the Pentagon threw at our Senate Investigations Subcommittee over the weekend and the complete failure of Assistant Secretary of Defense Arthur Sylvester yesterday to support with any evidence whatsoever his charges or complaints, it seems to me a few observations may be in order from the position of the minority members of this committee.

Obviously neither the committee policies and procedures nor the objects of our investigation can be determined by a minority which is outnumbered precisely two to one on the committee and far more than that in staff selections. However, I want to make

it emphatically clear that the minority is supporting this investigation 100 percent; that we have no complaints concerning the fairness and the objectivity of the investigation; that we deplore the in-fighting which has developed between the Democrats in charge of the Pentagon and those in charge of this investigation; and that we reaffirm our complete confidence in Chairman McClellan and our conviction that all members of this committee are conducting this investigation without any of the pre-conceived attitudes attributed to certain members by spokesmen for the Pentagon.

In fact, speaking as the ranking Republican member of the Committee, I think it is time the Pentagon began directing its time and its efforts to downgrading Castro, Cuba, and communism rather than to downgrading the committees on Capitol Hill.

The Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, says the committee, by its investigation, is undermining the confidence of the people in the military. Nothing could be further from the fact—actually we have been inquiring into reasons why the civilian heads of the Pentagon have vetoed the decisions of the military and imposed their own contrary judgments over the performance and cost recommendations of the military. We still are unprepared to say who was right but it should be clear to all that it is not our committee which challenged the military judgments. Rather it was the civilian Pentagon leadership which rejected their unanimous decisions. Whether such action is likely to increase or undermine public confidence in our military leaders is not for me to say.

President Kennedy himself served as a member of our committee when we were investigating labor racketeering in America. His brother, the Attorney General, served as our chief counsel. Both of them should, therefore, share with me full confidence in the objectivity of Chairman McClellan and our committee procedures. Rather than remaining silent while the Pentagon guns are trained on Capitol Hill, I would suggest the President and the Attorney General reassure the Pentagon and the public that the McClellan committee operates on a "let the chips fall where they will" formula and that it is not comprised of members who employ their political or personal preferences in conducting an investigation. I suggest the White House utilize its influence to issue a "cease-fire order" on the innuendos, insinuations and insults emanating from the Pentagon. If they are designed as an attempt to destroy public confidence in the McClellan committee I am convinced they will fail.

TESTIMONY OF ARTHUR SYLVESTER, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR PUBLIC AFFAIRS

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Sylvester, will you give us your name and your official position, please, sir.

Mr. SYLVESTER. Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs.

The CHAIRMAN. On yesterday, I received a letter from you. I present to you a copy of the letter and ask you to identify it, please, sir.

(Document handed to witness.)

Mr. SYLVESTER. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I wrote that letter.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Let the letter be printed in the record at this point.

(The letter referred to follows:)

"MARCH 11, 1963.

"DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am sorry that recent comments by me in response to news-men's questions concerning the TFX hearing have been interpreted to mean the Defense Department does not believe the committee is conducting a fair hearing.

"I am well aware of the committee's outstanding reputation for the way it conducts hearings and also your own reputation in

this respect. As a reporter who has covered other hearings conducted by you, I have firsthand experience of the committee's method of operation. I have every expectation that the tradition of fairness the committee has established will prevail in the current hearing.

"What has concerned me is the fact that the hearings up to now have produced a fragmentary and confused report to the public. At times it appears the questioning has resulted in a one-sided view of the issues involved.

"Perhaps this is the inevitable result of closed-door proceedings with an attenuated transcript made available twice daily. I am sure when the committee has concluded its inquiry and all the facts are in, it will become clear on an objective basis that the right decision on the TFX contract was made.

"Sincerely,

"ARTHUR SYLVESTER."

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Secretary, that letter was written as a followup, I believe, to a press conference you had last Friday. Is that right?

Mr. SYLVESTER. We have every day at 12 o'clock, Senator, a briefing for newsmen, at which on certain occasions we have news to give out and on all occasions I submit myself for questions to the newsmen. There was such a meeting, as usual, on last Friday at 12 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. I hand you herewith what purports to be excerpts, at least, from that news conference, your briefing of the press on that day. I will ask you to examine it and state if you identify it as such.

(Document handed to the witness.)

Mr. SYLVESTER. Senator, I gave Mr. Adlerman my copy, and I think it was properly numbered. This runs 21, 22, 23, 24—

Mr. ADLERMAN. It has been hurriedly copied for the Senators.

Mr. SYLVESTER. This isn't it, sir.

Mr. ADLERMAN. He only brought one copy with him. We had asked that they bring several copies.

Mr. SYLVESTER. That is not the one, Senator. It has a page out.

The CHAIRMAN. I was mistaken.

Without objection, then, this one can be stricken from the record.

Mr. ADLERMAN. What happened was he brought one copy and I am trying to make copies for the Senators. This ties it up. The copy he brought we are making duplicates of. I had asked for sufficient copies to distribute to each of the Senators. I also asked for the tape recording, itself. Mr. Sylvester stated that the man who was handling it was ill and they will have it down later. However, I understand that the tape recording of the press conference is delivered to Mr. Alderson's company and a transcript is made directly from the tape recording.

The CHAIRMAN. The only purpose of it is to have it before us so we could predicate questions upon it and for the purpose of accuracy.

Mr. SYLVESTER. Mr. Chairman, a tape is made—

The CHAIRMAN. You have no other copy of it?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I have given my copy of the transcript to the counsel. A tape is made every day and that tape goes to the Alderson Reporting Co. They then make one transcript for us. The transcript that we get and that I turned over is the original and only one made by the company, not by us.

The CHAIRMAN. I am sure that is accurate. Mr. SYLVESTER. The only thing I wanted it before us was for accuracy. But we will proceed.

Mr. ADLERMAN. Page 21 is missing here, but I think that one is complete.

Senator MUNDT. This one stops in the middle of the sentence.

Mr. ADLERMAN. Here is a copy. The only pages we are concerned with are from 20 to 26.

The CHAIRMAN. I present to you now, Mr. Secretary, what purports to be the copy that you turned over to the staff of your press conference last Friday. I will ask you to examine it and state if you identify it as such.

(Document handed to the witness.)

Mr. SYLVESTER. Yes, Mr. Chairman, all the pages are here. This is the transcript.

Senator MUNDT. How many pages are there altogether?

Mr. SYLVESTER. Senator, there are 28 pages. Senator MUNDT. Then I have all but one page.

Mr. SYLVESTER. Of which only a few pages relate to this matter.

Senator MUNDT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well. This document may be made an exhibit, Exhibit No. 41, for reference, and the part of it on pages 21 through 27 that may be pertinent to the line of questions that will follow may be inserted in the record at this point.

(The press briefing referred to follows:)

"Mr. SYLVESTER. Well, I expect to have some. I would only say you are getting a lot of figures out of this committee after the fact. They have obtained figures which did bear and were not available at the time, and were not under consideration at the time. I think that will come out very clearly when both Mr. Zuckert, Mr. Korth, and Mr. McNamara testify. And as I read the testimony, it sounds to me as if I were reading the counsel for Boeing.

"Question. Could we get any of these figures that are correct?

"Mr. SYLVESTER. What figures did you have in mind?

"Question. Well, specifically—

"Mr. SYLVESTER. I hope to have lots of figures.

"Question. For instance, nothing has ever been clearly stated by the Defense Department as to the comparative costs of the bid figures of the two companies. We have never seen what the Boeing figure was or what the General Dynamics figure is.

"Mr. SYLVESTER. Well, from what I see coming out of the committee, the Boeing figures vary.

"Question. It was released out of the committee, a whole table, which was read into the record.

"Question. This happens to be the Defense Department which let the contract. I have not seen any figure come from the Defense Department. What I am asking you—

"Mr. SYLVESTER. Well, you haven't seen any witness from the Defense Department at the top level.

"Question. Well, I am asking whether we can get those figures or not. I haven't seen the—

"Mr. SYLVESTER. I will be glad to let you see them when we are going to release them.

"Question. And I am also interested in some of the performance characteristics of the several competing versions which we haven't seen, and which I understand—

"Mr. SYLVESTER. Now, wait a second. We are not quite sure what you mean by several competing versions.

"Question. Well, there are two versions.

"Mr. SYLVESTER. In the final selection, there are two versions, the Boeing version and the General Dynamics. Now, what are you interested in? I will try and get it for you. What are you interested in?

"Question. In the final performance characteristics estimated for the—

Mr. SYLVESTER. You mean the final, the fourth and final evaluation?

"Question. Right. This would be helpful.

"Question. Art, did I understand you correctly to say that there are figures being made available to the committee that were not available to Mr. Zuckert?

"Mr. SYLVESTER. There are recomputations being made, where the committee has gone out and gotten recomputations of its own, which did not figure at all in the decision.

"Question. From Boeing?

"Mr. SYLVESTER. I don't know where the committee got them other than what I can read in the transcript.

"Question. Apparently the committee investigators had gone out—

"Mr. SYLVESTER. Mr. Gillet, one of the committee investigators, was the expert witness yesterday in the figures.

"Question. But there is certain data there in the committee's records which is clear that Mr. McNamara, Mr. Zuckert, and Mr. Korth had not seen before.

"Mr. SYLVESTER. I am talking about figures that have been introduced by the committee which they have gone out and gotten, the figures have been recomputed, both in the service and apparently by the company. I don't even know what I can read—

"Question. To follow up on Lloyd's question, is there any plan here to release any data from here, or information, in advance of Mr. Zuckert's or Mr. McNamara's or Mr. Korth's testimony?

"Mr. SYLVESTER. Yes, I have some plans.

"Question. Is this in advance of their testimony?

"Mr. SYLVESTER. I hope so.

"Question. Arthur, are you saying here on these figures being released after the fact, and so forth, are you indicating that perhaps there was some dirty work afoot, that these figures might have been known at the time, but somebody deliberately withheld them, or—

"Mr. SYLVESTER. I am not saying anything. I am just trying to state what is in the transcript and is the fact.

"Question. Are these figures accurate?

"Mr. SYLVESTER. I don't know. I am not an expert in the figures. I doubt that the committee investigators are, either.

"Question. Art, could you also as part of this problem discuss the question of whether the raw scores, whatever they were, which were cited in the memorandum issued last Saturday for release on Sunday night at 6:30, whether the raw score is a proper basis for comparison?

"Mr. SYLVESTER. I don't know what you mean by raw score, and I am certainly not going to make a statement off the top of my head here without having the figures before me, and I am not an expert in the figures.

"Question. Well, the term was used in your memo.

"Well, on what basis was the raw score computed? Can't we know that? I mean you are trying to prove something by this release, but you don't tell us what the raw score is. We want to know.

"Mr. SYLVESTER. It isn't that I don't tell you. It is because I do not have here in front of me the raw scores and I am not qualified, nor is anybody in this room qualified, to go into the question of raw scores at this time. The record will show in due time, and I trust it will show before that, if there is any question about raw scores. Obviously, by the very character of the words 'raw scores,' you are dealing with something that depends on what point of view you approach it.

"Question. Or who made the ground rules for the scoring, yes.

"Mr. SYLVESTER. Well, there were 220-some officers involved in the evaluation. Not all of them were unanimous. Neither were the two services unanimous. So this isn't quite as simple as it appears. And obviously you will hardly get a judicial rendering by a committee in which there are various Senators with State self-interest in where the contract goes. So far there is only one Senator I have seen on the committee, Senator MUSKIE, who hasn't got an interest in it.

"Question. Do you have any rough feel for when you might be able to turn some of this stuff loose?"

"Mr. SYLVESTER. Sooner rather than later. Question. Like the latter part of next week?"

"Mr. SYLVESTER. Oh, no, I won't be waiting that long. I hope to very shortly."

"Question. Saturday?"

"Mr. SYLVESTER. It just depends on how fast I can digest and get my hands on this. News is what we are interested in. We don't want it managed. All right, we will manage to hold it until Monday."

"Question. On the National Guardsmen, can we put in a query concerning the other 47 states that haven't been considered?"

"Mr. SYLVESTER. I can tell you right now that there were no members of the National Guard, and you can go down the list. In the operation."

"Question. In or out of uniform?"

"Mr. SYLVESTER. In or out of uniform, on or off duty."

"Question. There must be something here. Say that again, Arthur. There must be something in the wording."

"Mr. SYLVESTER. I am not being subtle in any sense of the word. I am just saying that there were no members of the National Guard, and you can go down the list."

"Question. Who took part in any phase of the Bay of Pigs operation. Is that what you are saying?"

"Mr. SYLVESTER. I didn't say that."

"Question. There is the key word, combat."

"Mr. SYLVESTER. Well, it was a combat, wasn't it? It was a combat and I am talking—"

"Question. There was a training period before that."

"Mr. SYLVESTER. I don't know anything about the training period. I am talking about the combat operation. You asked me if there were any National Guardsmen, and I am saying that outside of the State of Alabama, and I am—you can look at the records of the four fellows. Whether they were in the National Guard or not, I don't know, but you can look and see. But I know as to the others there were none who took part in the combat operation."

"Question. Other than those four, then, you are categorically denying anything else."

"Mr. SYLVESTER. Yes."

"Question. Well, how far does the combat zone extend?"

"Mr. SYLVESTER. I am talking about flying operations."

"Question. Seriously."

"Mr. SYLVESTER. I am very serious."

"QUESTION. These Alabama fellows were not actually in the combat zone. They were not getting shot at. They crashed apparently for other reasons. And I think it has been said in any event, there was no American air cover in the combat zone."

"Mr. SYLVESTER. As I understand the question that is being asked, the first thing I responded to was Governor Faubus' statement that there were members of the Arkansas National Guard who flew combat operation. The answer to that is there were none."

The CHAIRMAN. That was not presented to the staff until this morning, was it?"

Mr. SYLVESTER. I brought it up with me this morning."

The CHAIRMAN. Just this morning."

Mr. SYLVESTER. That is correct."

The CHAIRMAN. I am trying to find the pertinent part of it."

Mr. SYLVESTER. I think it begins on 20 or 21 at the bottom of the page."

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Secretary, I find on page 25 a question and answer as follows:

"Question. Or who made the ground rules for the scoring. Yes."

"Mr. SYLVESTER. Well, there were 220-some officers involved in the evaluation. Not all of them were unanimous. Neither were the two

services unanimous. So this isn't quite as simple as it appears."

I call your specific attention to the following sentence:

"And obviously you will hardly get a judicial rendering by a committee in which there are various Senators with State self-interest in where the contract goes. So far there is only one Senator I have seen on the committee, Senator MUSKIE, who hasn't got an interest in it."

Mr. Secretary, I wanted to ask you about that. I am not at all disturbed about your statement that: "Obviously you will hardly get a judicial rendering by a committee." I am not concerned with that part of the statement."

But I would like primarily to know—well, I say I am not concerned about, I mean you are entitled to have any opinion like that that you may wish to retain. You have written a letter saying that you were sorry, that it may have been misinterpreted. But you do say that, "A number of the various Senators have a State self-interest in where the contract goes."

I wanted, in view of that having been published, to ascertain if Arkansas does have any such interest, because if it has, I do not know about it, and if it doesn't have, I want the record corrected."

I don't want that in the record, that I might be influenced in my rendering a decision by the fact that my State has some interest as a State in where the contract goes. If Arkansas has such interest, I want the record to reflect it. If it doesn't have such interest of a nature where such motives could be ascribed to me from that standpoint, I would like the record to show that."

So, if you will, just tell us what you had in mind with respect to Arkansas in making that statement."

Mr. SYLVESTER. Mr. Chairman, you will notice in the transcript I made no reference to any Senator, his fairness, no discussion of fairness, there isn't any word about anybody's being fair or unfair. I did state what seemed to be a fact, that this is not a court of law, nor is any other senatorial hearing. It is a very important function of our Government and does very fine work. That was the point I was making, and that was what I was really addressing my letter to you about. But there seemed to be a confusion in some of the reports about this distinction between a court of law which renders or gives a traditional rendering and an important committee which has a Senate inquiry, there is a real distinction."

I made no reference whatsoever to any Senator's fairness or any suggestion about it. I think it is on the record that there are some Senators who have natural and correct interest in the contract going to their State. If I were a Senator, I would be out struggling as hard as I could for my State. And I would not expect, if I were on a committee, to change my view since I already believed in my case. That is what I was talking about. I know of no interest that the State of Arkansas has in it."

(Senator JACKSON and Senator SYMINGTON entered the room.)

The CHAIRMAN. Sir?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I know of no interest that the State of Arkansas has in it."

The CHAIRMAN. That is all I am interested in. Your view as to whether there would be a judicious rendering of opinion by the committee is not of any great concern to me. I would be concerned if you felt that the committee would be motivated by anything other than proper considerations, but the thing is, I want the record clear as to Arkansas. If there is anything or any contract or anything that Arkansas, as far as you know, would be calculated or expected to receive as any benefit from the contract going to either Boeing or General Dynamics, I would like to have it placed on the record."

Mr. SYLVESTER. I don't know that there are any subcontracts in the State of Arkansas, and I know the main contract is not."

The CHAIRMAN. Then would you include in your statement when you say, "So far there is only one Senator I have seen on the committee, Senator MUSKIE, who has not got an interest in it." Would you include any other Senators on the committee, or would you exclude all of the others except Senator MUSKIE?"

Mr. SYLVESTER. I think that I said so far from a truncated transcript what is going on, and I have not made a critical analysis of the transcript. I read it as quickly as possible to see the sort of questions the newsmen are going to come to us with, and I simply meant from what I read in the transcript up to that time, which was last Friday, that Senator MUSKIE's questioning, and I don't know anything more about it than what I read, his questioning seemed to me to be in an effort to keep the thing, so far as the Defense Department was concerned, in a larger frame of reference than some of the other questions seemed to be. This is an impression I have. This is only an impression."

The CHAIRMAN. All I want to do is to get the record straight. You say Arkansas, so far as you know, has no interest in the contract either way. Insofar as it is getting any subcontracts or furnishing any materials or anything. So far as you know, it has no connection with either contractor?"

Mr. SYLVESTER. No, sir. As a matter of fact—

The CHAIRMAN. Either Boeing or General Dynamics."

Mr. SYLVESTER. Mr. Chairman, in the first book of testimony I looked at page 86. You yourself qualified some of the questioning by the counsel, as I read the testimony quickly, seeming to get some factors in which gave a more balanced approach than the questioning at that point seemed to indicate. So I would certainly include you in that."

The CHAIRMAN. Well, would you not agree that one reading a press report of your comments at this press conference, if one read, "And obviously you will hardly get a judicial rendering by a committee in which there are various Senators with State self-interest in where the contract goes," and then read further, "So far there is only one Senator I have seen on the committee, Senator MUSKIE, who hasn't got an interest in it"—wouldn't that imply to you that the person making such a statement to convey the impression that all of the other Senators except Senator MUSKIE, did have such a State interest in it?"

Mr. SYLVESTER. No, it would not, because I would not put any such version on it, Mr. Chairman."

The CHAIRMAN. It is hard for me to see how any other interpretation could be given it. I want you to understand, I am not sensitive. I simply want to clear up the record so far as Arkansas is concerned. I did not know of any interest it had in it, and I wanted the record to be clear as to that."

As to any further implication in it, if such is interpreted and read out of it, I am not particularly concerned."

All right, are there any other questions?"

Senator MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to relay the same question to Mr. Sylvester. On this basis, it isn't so much what interpretation you place on the language, "Obviously you hardly get a judicial rendering by a committee in which there are various Senators with State self-interest in where the contract goes. So far there is only one Senator I have seen on the committee, Senator MUSKIE, who has not got any interest in it."

It isn't so much your interpretation of that, our ours, but the fact that the press generally has certainly interpreted it as

meaning that you felt that only Senator MUSKIE came from a State which did not have an interest in it.

So I wanted to direct the same question to you, first of all, concerning South Dakota. Have you any good news or anything about any of these contracts that might involve South Dakota?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I am hopeful I will have for you, Senator, but I can't hold out anything more than that. I have no evidence.

Senator MUNDT. I don't know of any subcontractor, and I don't know of any major contractor in the State which has any remote interest in the TFX, and I was shocked when I found that I was included among those who came from States which did have a self-interest. If you have got some secret information, don't withhold it, and I would like to know what it is.

Mr. SYLVESTER. Unfortunately I am not an expert in this field, Senator. I would only read to you the sort of thing that is disturbing. For instance, in the Chicago Daily News on the 4th of March, Mr. Jim McCarty, whom I know, wrote as follows, and this is the thing that disturbs me and has disturbed me. He writes as follows:

"Senate investigators have come to the conclusion"—that means that they have made up their minds in this, a judgment has been made—"that the Defense Department signed a \$6.5 billion fighter plane contract for a second-rate airplane. They believe the plane that was rejected by Defense Secretary Robert McNamara in a 'highly unusual' bidding procedure, is better than the plane that McNamara purchased."

Now, this to my mind is the important part:

"As one investigator put it"—and this is a quotation—"If the Russians could build the plane that was rejected, they could shoot down the fleet of planes that the United States is planning to build."

This is attributed to an investigator of this committee.

Now, you read this, and you read the beginning, a conclusion has already been made, and it certainly leaves me with questions in my mind. And, Mr. Chairman, the United Press in what they said was an interview with you, quoted you as saying, "poor judgment had been used," in a quotation, and the case is hardly in.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Sylvester, may I say to you, if there was not a question raised as to poor judgment, inefficiency, extravagance, or some other question before us, if that were not true, we would not be investigating. These questions are raised somewhat like a complaint in court. You file these or charges are made, or there is information that indicates this may have happened or may not have happened, and the purpose of an inquiry is to ascertain. I have never said positively. I don't know yet. I am trying to reserve a decision until we get all of the evidence. Some evidence so far indicates poor judgment has been used, and if we stopped with the evidence as of now, I would so conclude. But we are in a hearing, and we can't put on all of the evidence in one day. We have to take it as we can and then weigh it all at the end.

I have entered into hearings where I may have been under an impression, not an irrevocable conclusion, but under an impression that possibly this is the situation or that is the situation, and after hearing all of the testimony I may have changed my mind about it. I got the full information. That is the purpose of this. I want to say to you, and I say it for the record, and I say it for the entire Pentagon and everybody else in it, I have no desire on earth to do anything here except get the facts. Over and over again I have said here in this committee, with the representative of the Defense Department present, if there are any figures, or if there are any documents, or if there is any evi-

dence that you have that will throw light on this, that the committee does not have, and particularly any that sustains the actions taken by the Defense Department in this matter, we want to get it in the record. I can't get it all in one day.

Mr. SYLVESTER. No, Mr. Chairman, I have covered your hearings, and I know your fairness, and it was hard for me to believe that UP story, because it did not sound like you.

The CHAIRMAN. The papers don't always quote us accurately, and they don't always put the qualification that we may express at the time.

Mr. SYLVESTER. It does not sound like you.

The CHAIRMAN. I don't remember that particular incident, but whatever I said, I meant it at the time in the context that I have given you. I am sure you know that.

Now, you have here, we are not quoting here from what the press asked in interrogating you, and we are not quoting from what the press published, so much as from what you say you actually said.

Senator MUNDT. I was relating my questions at the moment to South Dakota, and we have gotten off on a digression. May I have from you categorically, Mr. Sylvester, an answer now as to whether you know of any contract or subcontract involving South Dakota insofar as this investigation is concerned?

Mr. SYLVESTER. No, I don't have any knowledge of that.

Senator MUNDT. Senator CURTIS expected to be here, so I think I should ask you the same question with respect to Nebraska.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I have no first-hand information on Nebraska.

Senator MUNDT. Have you any second-hand information?

Mr. SYLVESTER. Yes, but I wouldn't be prepared to talk about that under oath. I think the answer should be I have no evidence.

Senator MUNDT. You have no evidence. All right.

Now, you say on page 21, "I have read the testimony. It sounds to me as if I were reading the counsel for Boeing."

I wish you would elaborate on that. I am not talking about newspaper stories, but what you read in the transcript.

Mr. SYLVESTER. What I read in the transcript.

Again, this is an impression. I have the impression that you come out of this, as you read this, that the Boeing plane should have been the choice, because it is a wonderful choice, and I find just from what I read very little material balancing that on what motivated and what the choices were of the Secretary of Defense.

Senator MUNDT. You realize, Mr. Sylvester, up until now most of the time has been spent in interrogating Pentagon witnesses, two colonels who were on the evaluation team, and we have been checking on the figures which they have presented. It is not the committee's fault that the figures up to now seem to indicate that Boeing was a better plane, and it is not the committee's fault that the figures up to now indicate that General Dynamics was the more expensive plane. So on the basis of the facts they gave us as to questions trying to arrive at their basis for making their determination, obviously we have to relate our questions to the evidence, and I don't see why you should attribute improper motives or prejudices to the committee because we were confronted with the evidence which, on the face of it, seemed to favor the Boeing proposition. We are trying to find out how they built up the figures, what was behind them. The chairman has said, I have said, and other members of the committee have said, that these very competent colonels, who made splendid witnesses, may I say, were asked if they had any evidence that indicated somewhere along the line General

Dynamics was cheaper or better. We asked them to stick it in.

You found that, if you read the transcript as carefully as you say, that the invitation was there. And how in the face of that you can say it sounds like we were counsel for Boeing perplexes me. It needs some explanation, it seems to me.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I think you and I are exactly on the same ground, that only the Boeing story has been brought in. The Defense Department people who initiated this contract—I think inevitably, as I suggested in my letter, if we proceed from this basis down at the bottom, where the people do not know necessarily what the purpose was, rather than at the top, you probably come out with this sort of thing. I think you said the same thing, that the only side so far has been the Boeing side. From the Defense Department point of view, it seems to me that we are dealing with national defense.

Senator MUNDT. That is right, because at any time the Defense Department has submitted some valid evidence, we have put it in. We put in a letter by Secretary Zuckert. It wasn't our fault that the letter was improperly stated and the figures were inaccurate and the facts were wrong and he had to write a second letter apologizing for the first one. That wasn't our fault.

Secretary McNamara has said he would like to present an affidavit without being questioned, because he has other duties. That is a bit unusual, but we think it is fair. We will have him back some other time for questioning. We are just trying to find out the facts and we have to pick up the story as presented to us by the Government witnesses.

These are not our witnesses. We don't run the Air Force; we don't run the evaluation board. They are your witnesses. So I don't think you should attack us because the evidence they present has been, up until now, detrimental to General Dynamics and preferential to Boeing.

I would like to ask you this question: You have been quoted in the press as saying or you concluded generally in the press that you believed that Government has the inherent right to lie to the people.

Mr. SYLVESTER. This I have never said.

Senator MUNDT. No, I said you have seen it in the press. I am not questioning you about that, except I want to be sure that if you hold that position you don't carry it to the point that it would involve your testimony under oath to this committee. You wouldn't hold that position, I am sure, and we could rely on what you are telling us.

Mr. SYLVESTER. There is rather an insult implied in that.

Senator MUNDT. Not at all. If you said that statement, I want to be sure. If you have not said the statement—I have read it in the press many, many times.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I am not clear of the relationship of your question to when I take an oath.

Senator MUNDT. The question is that if you believe that Government has a right to lie to the people, you are speaking as a Government witness, I want to be sure that you don't carry that philosophy to the point of testifying before us under oath.

Mr. SYLVESTER. Senator, you are making a quotation to me which you attribute to nobody, some faceless accuser which you are using, and you have not quoted anything I have said.

Senator MUNDT. If I have not, if you said you did not make it, that is one thing. I have read it a dozen times in the paper that you made that statement. I am not quarreling with you about that point of view at this time.

Mr. SYLVESTER. Obviously no Government information program can be based on lies. It must always be based on truthful facts.

But when any nation is faced with nuclear disaster, throughout history, and I conceive of our Government to be the people, because they determine the Government which is their Government, and they get rid of it when it doesn't suit them, at certain times when you are faced with life and death of your Nation, you do not tell all the facts to your enemy. I am sure you are not suggesting that you could want to tell the Russians all the facts, all the facts they would want to know, of Cuba, or, for instance, after this Government was attacked at Pearl Harbor that we should have then told the Japanese the extent of the damage. I am sure you don't mean that. That is what I am talking about only.

Senator MUNDT. I am not suggesting anything. I am not even quarreling with you if you made the statement. But if you want to know my opinion, I certainly do not believe the Government has a right to lie to the people. I think withholding certain information is one thing in times of a crisis, but to deliberately lie to the people, I think is something else.

Mr. SYLVESTER. The Government does not have a right to lie to the people, but it does have a right in facing an enemy, if information is not accurate and is intended to mislead the enemy, I think that any people will support their government in not putting out information that is going to help the enemy. And, if necessary, misleading them.

I noticed only recently General Eisenhower on a television program expressed this very same idea. I am sure you would not suggest that you would put out to the Communists in the sort of situation we had in Cuba, information which would help them.

Senator MUNDT. As I say, I am not suggesting anything. I am simply basing the question on what has been said many times in the press. If you have stated it, as you have said here, for the press, it has not been reported to me. Maybe this is a good opportunity for you to get across exactly what you had in mind in view of the fact that I am sure, Mr. Sylvester, you have read what I have read, attributed to you the fact that you said the Government has the inherent right to lie to the people. This is not the first time you have heard of it.

Mr. SYLVESTER. No. As the chairman said a while ago in relation to a quotation to him, not all quotations in the papers are correct.

Senator MUNDT. I have just one other question.

We don't have page 28 of the transcript. I don't know what was in that.

The CHAIRMAN. Here it is. (Senator CURTIS entered the room.)

Mr. SYLVESTER. Senator, I think you have every page in the original that I brought.

Senator MUNDT. It wasn't your fault. You gave us the pages, but I don't have it in the duplication.

Have you any other criticism now that you want to ventilate concerning the conduct of this committee? If so, I would like to have you do it now instead of at the press conference at noon.

Mr. SYLVESTER. Well, reserving my right to do that, I have nothing further to say. As I said, I do not regard, and I don't think it can be read by any fair reporter, that I was criticizing any Senator personally in any way or suggesting he was unfair. If you will notice, I state very clearly this is not—I think it is quite clear in there.

Senator MUNDT. I can't go along with that. Maybe Senator MUSKIE can feel that way about it, but I don't see how anyone else can feel that way about it.

Senator JACKSON. Are you really serious about this, Mr. Sylvester?

Senator MUNDT. You say here: "And obviously, you will hardly get a judicial rendering by a committee," except MUSKIE. Now, you haven't named any of those Sena-

tors yet that have a self-interest. You have eliminated three, McCLELLAN, CURTIS, and MUNDT, and I will watch with interest how many others you eliminate from this blanket attack.

Mr. SYLVESTER. Senator, I would like the record to show that I did not say anything about any Senator's self-interest.

Senator MUNDT. State interest.

Mr. SYLVESTER. That is an entirely different thing.

Senator MUNDT. No, it is pretty close to a Senator's self-interest.

Senator JACKSON. State self-interest is what you said.

Mr. SYLVESTER. From my point of view, the Senator's duty obviously, having covered the Senate for many years, must represent his own people, his own State, and this seems to me completely legitimate. This is what seems to me to be completely misrepresented in what I said.

Senator MUNDT. I am not questioning the legitimacy, but I can see if you had this whole committee stacked from a State that wanted the contract or got the contract, or didn't get involved in the contract, that would be one thing. But at least for three of us you have no evidence that we have any State self-interest; that is correct. OK.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Secretary, before we ask others to question you, before I yield to them, will you state with respect to the State of North Carolina, Senator ERVIN's State, and he is a member of the committee, and also the State of New Hampshire, since Senator MCINTYRE is a member of the committee, and Senator BREWSTER, of Maryland, who is a member of the committee? Senator MCINTYRE and Senator BREWSTER are new members of the committee, but I believe they came on the committee the day or the day before the committee started the hearings.

Since we have questioned or interrogated you about the others, and they are not present, I think we ought to make the record clear with respect to them. Do you know of any contracts or interest in the State of North Carolina?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I know of none in North Carolina.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know of any in New Hampshire?

Mr. SYLVESTER. There may be subcontracts going to some of those other States. I would have to check with people who know.

Senator CURTIS. Will the Senator yield at that point?

The CHAIRMAN. One moment. How about Senator BREWSTER of Maryland? Anything in Maryland?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I have no firsthand knowledge of any of those.

The CHAIRMAN. Then your statement did not apply, I assume, to all of those you have named.

Mr. SYLVESTER. Not unless there are subcontracts that I do not know of, which may be. I don't know.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator CURTIS. Senator CURTIS. I will just ask one question: Isn't it true that the subcontractors' interest in many situations were unaffected regardless of whether General Dynamics or Boeing got the contract?

Mr. SYLVESTER. It may well be, Senator. I am not an expert in this field.

Senator CURTIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The CHAIRMAN. Do you know about New York? Senator JAVITS is not here.

Mr. SYLVESTER. Yes, I think there is an interest in Long Island. I think Grumman is.

The CHAIRMAN. I am not asking that with any implication.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I am not making it.

The CHAIRMAN. I am not asking with any implication that it would influence Senator JAVITS, but I think in fairness to him we ought to ask. I don't think Senator JAVITS

would be influenced by that, if he thought that the Government's interest was in the other contractor. I don't think he would.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I wouldn't impute anything to any Senator. I think that is the difference, though, between a court of law and a Senate hearing. Were these things in a court of law, I think people then, of course, would remove themselves from a hearing, in a court of law. I don't think you would expect Senators to do it; I don't think they should do it. But that is the difference I was trying to make, between a court of law and a Senate hearing.

The CHAIRMAN. I suppose every Member of Congress has an interest in Government because he pays taxes, and you might say he has an interest from a tax standpoint as well as from getting some business in his State, to have it both ways.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I quite agree with you. I wasn't suggesting otherwise. Here they may be trying to break the contract, though, and I think that is a little different.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to make this record clear with you, so far as I am concerned. Your freedom of speech and your right to say and your right to conclusions, and your thinking that possibly somebody might be influenced, or that they could not render a judicious opinion or conclusion, that is all right. That is your individual right. I reserve the right to myself, and I accord it to you just as freely as I take it for my own purposes. But I wanted to get clear whether Arkansas really had any interest that you knew of, and I thought that might, of course have the record made clear as to the other States, the other Senators.

Mr. SYLVESTER. Mr. Senator, may I merely say that I do not regard I have any right to cast any aspersion on any member of any committee. I have not exercised that right nor used it. I think I do have a right to state the facts. But I cast no aspersion on anybody.

The CHAIRMAN. It would be a different interpretation, I think, of this language, then. I said if you thought the committee would not be able because of some reason to render a judicious opinion about it, that is your right to say it. I am not quarreling with that. I only wanted to get the record straight as to whether there was a basis for that where my State and I were involved.

Senator JACKSON.

Senator JACKSON. We come to a State that does have an interest, the State of Washington, headquarters for the Boeing Co. I want to ask you, Mr. Sylvester, do you think I have been unfair in these hearings?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I have not read enough of your cross-examination to really have any opinion.

Senator JACKSON. How did you really come to the conclusion that you came to in the statement that you made to the press?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I said I have the impression, having read the transcript casually and quickly in order to meet the news queries, of exactly what I said before, Senator, that so far the basic Defense point of view and the Defense aims in this as established by the Secretary of Defense and the Deputy Defense Secretary and the services, have not come forth in this hearing.

Senator JACKSON. Let me ask you, sir, did you ever make a request to this committee for information that should be submitted to it to carry out what you have in mind? Did you or any of your associates?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I am not the proper official to do that anyway, Senator. I would not be the one who would make that request. But certainly I would—

Senator JACKSON. Well, isn't it a fact that no such request has been made?

Mr. SYLVESTER. Mr. McNamara, I think, made one over the weekend last Saturday, and I am very anxious that that should be made.

Senator JACKSON. Hasn't that request been honored?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I believe the chairman announced last night that he would so honor the request.

The CHAIRMAN. I announced it, yes, and I understand that we were somewhat expecting the statement to be read today, this morning, but it is not. I understand that it is in the process of preparation. Again I say to you that the committee will receive that under its rules whenever the Secretary wishes to present it.

Senator JACKSON. Mr. Sylvester, wouldn't it have been wiser to defer the comments that you made until you were sure that the statements that you had given the press were not borne out by the facts?

Mr. SYLVESTER. Senator, I deferred any comment for more than 10 days in answering questions of newsmen, on what do we have to say to the charges coming out of the committee. Again I read you this one. "As one investigator puts it, if the Russians could build a plane that was rejected, they could shoot down the fleet of planes that the United States is planning to build."

The story begins, and Jim McCartney is an excellent reporter, "Senate investigators have come to the conclusion"—

The CHAIRMAN. Is that a quote?

Mr. SYLVESTER. That is an attribution without a quote in it.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not a quote?

Mr. SYLVESTER. It is Mr. McCartney's reporting of a conversation with Senate investigators. "Senate investigators have come to the conclusion that the Defense Department signed a \$6.5 billion contract for a second-rate airplane."

The CHAIRMAN. That is a conclusion quoted by the press.

Mr. ADLERMAN. Who is that attributed to?

The CHAIRMAN. It is not a quote of any individual.

Mr. SYLVESTER. He has: "As one investigator put it, if the Russians could build a plane that was rejected, they could shoot down the fleet of planes that the United States is planning to build."

This is attributed to one of the investigators of the committee.

It goes on. I will be glad to read the rest of it.

"This is the heart of the fantastic story that the Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee, headed by Senator JOHN McCLELLAN, is attempting to prove in secret hearings."

The CHAIRMAN. Said what?

Mr. SYLVESTER. "Is attempting to prove."

The CHAIRMAN. That is a reporter's writing.

Senator JACKSON. Do you really want us to manage the way they write in their stories? Is that what you are suggesting or asking?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I know Mr. McCartney, and I am satisfied that he talked to people here and in fact he assured me that he did.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I think that you know enough about this. People talk about this as "If this is a fact," "If this other situation prevails or is established as a fact, such conclusion might be justified."

Mr. SYLVESTER. It may very well be.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not know; in the course of these things the press asks many things, but here you are giving a press conference and making these statements. And apparently this statement was somewhat gratuitously made and not in answer specifically to a question.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I think you have to go back, Mr. Chairman, for 10 days and some of the questions that were asked not at the press briefings.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I think we withheld any comment.

The CHAIRMAN. I am not concerned about your impression, particularly, or your want-

ing or your desire to criticize the record or your implication, but I wanted to get at the basis upon which the criticism was premised, insofar as it related to my statement and to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. SYLVESTER. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me a statement like that is very damaging to our defense, and suggested to the Russians that the Defense Department of the United States is buying a plane that they can shoot down. I just can't see any good from that.

The CHAIRMAN. You are complaining about a statement somewhere in the press. We are asking you about your statement, if you had any justification for making the statement, and to cast that aspersion on the Senator from Arkansas. That is what I am asking about, on the basis of what you said you premised it on.

Did you have any such basis?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I explained that to you.

Senator JACKSON. How can you complain about other former colleagues in the press, about what they are writing, when you have admitted before this committee that the statement that you made to the press was not correct?

Mr. SYLVESTER. First off, Senator, I don't think I am complaining about any of my colleagues. I have said nothing in complaint against any of my colleagues.

Senator JACKSON. You said, or you referred to their article and the conclusion that they may have come to, and how can you really complain based on your own statement that you now admit was wrong?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I am a little mixed up.

Senator JACKSON. Or are you denying it?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I am a bit mixed up in what you are saying.

Senator JACKSON. Let me read this, and is this statement true or false, and are you standing by it and I want to ask you, and I quote directly from the tape, as I understand it, has been printed:

"And obviously, you will hardly get a judicial rendering by a committee in which there are various Senators with State self-interest in which the contract goes." Is that statement correct or isn't it correct?

Mr. SYLVESTER. The statement is correct.

Senator JACKSON. Do you stand on that statement?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I made the statement and it shows in the record, Senator.

Senator JACKSON. Well, are you still saying this is true, despite your testimony here this morning?

Mr. SYLVESTER. My testimony has been, Senator, that I make a distinction, and a very clear one, between a judicial rendering in a court of law and a Senate committee investigation. I did not cast any aspersion on the fair-mindedness of any member of that committee in that transcript. I did make a distinction between a court of law.

Senator JACKSON. Well, you are applying this statement to the Senators then on this committee, were you not? What were you applying it to?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I was applying it to the fact that we are dealing here with two great contestants. A contract has been let, and an effort is being made by the disgruntled losers to knock the contract down.

Senator JACKSON. Now wait a minute, just get something clear, sir. The Boeing Co. never asked for this hearing. Do you understand that? I asked for it. They did not ask me.

Now what information do you have that they have asked for this investigation?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I have no suggestion, and I have never made any.

Senator JACKSON. You are just making one, you said a disgruntled loser in effect asked for it.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I did not say "asked for it."

Senator JACKSON. Well, then, read the transcript.

(The above proceedings were read by the reporter.)

Senator JACKSON. Will you explain what effort is being made by the disgruntled loser?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I will simply have to refer you, Senator, to my impression that I got from the testimony to date. I would say from my reading it, only one side has been put in.

Senator JACKSON. That isn't what I said. You just got through saying that an effort is being made by a disgruntled loser to knock this contract down. Back that statement up.

Mr. SYLVESTER. It is a judgment on my part.

Senator JACKSON. What is your evidence?

Mr. SYLVESTER. From reading the transcript to date.

Senator JACKSON. Has the Boeing Co. testified in here?

Mr. SYLVESTER. No; but all of the testimony has been on the beauties of their plane, and knowing that I can read it has been the other.

Senator JACKSON. Now, wait a minute. Does it come from Boeing?

The CHAIRMAN. The second exhibit we put in was the justification.

Senator JACKSON. From the Department of Defense. Now state where in any part that you can refer to in this transcript indicates that this stems from the Boeing Co.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I haven't suggested that it stems from the Boeing Co.

Senator JACKSON. You said that it is an effort on the part of the disgruntled loser. I think this all brings out something, that you are a little careless with words. This is where you get in trouble, Mr. Sylvester. This isn't the first time.

I would like to have an answer to that question.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I would like to make reference here to some notes I have.

Senator JACKSON. All right.

Mr. SYLVESTER. Again I am not an expert in this field and I don't pretend to be. I have read the transcript. I notice in the very first book that a Mr. Stack, whom I don't know from anyone else, I know he was offered as an expert in this field. I think the testimony shows that he said he had not seen the last two versions of the design competition.

Senator JACKSON. Do you know who Mr. Stack is?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I see in the testimony he is offered as an expert in the field.

Senator JACKSON. You had better do your homework. Mr. Stack, as the testimony brought out, is practically "Mr. TFX," as I understand it.

Mr. ADLERMAN. He was the expert for NASA who was loaned to the Air Force as their expert, and he was attached to the source selection board as the expert on TFX from the NASA organization.

Senator JACKSON. As a matter of fact, he had been with the original National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics dating back to the late twenties, and then went with NASA. He twice won the Collier Award, Mr. Sylvester.

Now, I get back to my question. You referred to the effort on the part of a disgruntled loser, or whatever the exact quote was, and you see, again you make these statements and you don't have anything to back them up. You are in here complaining about news stories when you admit now that you did not intend what you said. I gather you are saying this. I don't know whether you are or not, and you wonder why your colleagues write a news story based on the statement you made.

This is not the first time you have had this trouble, and I would not be in here complaining about your other colleagues in the press, sir.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I don't think that there is anything in the record in which I have.

Senator JACKSON. That is all I have.

Senator MUSKIE. I suppose I ought to defend myself here this morning. At the very least I ought to try to find out how I can get a piece of this contract in my State.

The CHAIRMAN. Apparently from what I learn now, I have overlooked or neglected to put forth any effort heretofore.

Senator MUSKIE. We have been neglecting our duties.

I would like to say, I think at least the comment from me is due, that I have no questions for the witness, but it has been my privilege to serve on this committee for almost 5 years, now, and it has always been my impression, despite the fact that we have had to hear controversial matters from time to time, that it is the objective of the chairman and of this committee to find the truth about any matter or any issue that comes before it. And despite the fact that from time to time I have held different views about some of these matters than other members of the committee, I have never been under the impression that any member of the committee seems to be anything but objective and fair in his search for the truth.

I suppose I ought to consider it a compliment that my purity has been held up to public view, but this has been done in a way to cast discredit upon my colleagues, and to the extent that it does, I think it casts discredit on me, because we have been a team now for these years, and I have been proud to serve on the committee.

I must say, Mr. Sylvester, I think whatever may have been your intention, and you have tried to clarify that this morning, that it is most unfortunate that the statement should have been made. I am confident that out of the hearings by this committee the truth will emerge, and an objective judgment will be achieved. If the judgment to be made by this group is discredited in advance, then this is a disservice to everybody involved, including the Department of Defense.

I hope that out of this testimony this morning, it will be clear that it did not intend this discredit, whatever your words may have suggested, and obviously they suggest different things to different members of the committee.

So I hope that this hearing will clarify it in order that we may continue these hearings in a climate that is objective, and which is devoid of recrimination and that is conclusive to the development of the truth. I am sure that that is the committee's objective.

Senator CURTIS. I have been informed that in answer to a question as to whether or not the junior Senator from Nebraska now has had any state of self-interest in this issue, you replied that you had no firsthand knowledge of such. Is that correct?

Mr. SYLVESTER. That is correct.

Senator CURTIS. What secondhand knowledge do you have?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I have no second-hand knowledge, and I am not an expert in this contract business at all, Senator.

Senator CURTIS. So a more correct statement would have been that you had no such knowledge, rather than limiting it to firsthand knowledge, which might imply that you had some knowledge.

Mr. SYLVESTER. No implication was intended.

Senator CURTIS. Now, do you believe that the military authorities all of the way from the evaluation board through the selection board, the individuals and the generals and admirals through which this selection passed, and the Air Force Council and Admiral Anderson and General LeMay, were any of them motivated by any State self-interest or any interest of any kind?

Mr. SYLVESTER. Certainly not.

Senator CURTIS. Would you regard them as "losers" in this?

Mr. SYLVESTER. Certainly not, in the sense of a conflict, of course not.

Senator CURTIS. The position you have taken is in contradiction of all of the military individuals and groups, is it not?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I don't think that I understand your question.

Senator CURTIS. Well, you have been critical of this investigation, as I understand it, because you contended that it is supporting the military authorities.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I think what I said and what I have intended to say is that the material coming out so far is largely and almost completely against the decision made by Mr. McNamara, and Mr. Gilpatric, the service secretaries, and there has been nothing of their statements so far. I think this is probably inevitable in the way the witnesses are put on. As a consequence, Mr. McNamara has to be heard. What I have said is not different from what Mr. Gilpatric said on the "Meet the Press" program or what Mr. McNamara said in his letter, that the picture that has come out is certainly not an overall picture that the people are getting, and it certainly has distortions in it from our point of view.

Senator CURTIS. What are those distortions?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I have not said anything different from what they are saying.

Senator CURTIS. What are the distortions?

Mr. SYLVESTER. Well, I think one of the distortions is that the General Dynamics plane is more expensive or would be more expensive, tremendously more expensive than the other plane. I am, again, not an expert in this field. I am not prepared to argue the case. I leave that to the Secretary of Defense.

Senator CURTIS. Is that a distortion?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I think it will appear in the end that it is; yes. I think you can't tell until all of the evidence is in, and I think after Mr. McNamara appears, I think the thing will get in a better balance than it is now, and I would withhold any comment. I am not qualified to talk about it, but I think a better balance will come out after he appears. A very much better balance.

Senator CURTIS. Now, as to your statement that it was a distortion to imply that the Boeing product was less expensive; I wish you would give us some facts and figures to prove that.

Mr. SYLVESTER. As I say, Senator, I am not an expert on it and I am not prepared to argue the case, and it is not in my field whatsoever. With Mr. McNamara's statement coming and with him and others coming, I will leave it entirely to them. I said I don't think that you can—

Senator CURTIS. But you don't leave it to them. You told us right here this morning that there were distortions.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I think that there are up to date.

Senator CURTIS. Now, name the next one, Mr. SYLVESTER. I think I will rest on that one.

Senator CURTIS. Oh, no, you said distortions. You did not make it singular.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I did not say—I said that the picture coming out by reason of the fact that it is fragmentary, and it comes out twice a day, and inevitably there is material for various reasons, for security reasons, not in the transcript, and can't be, the fact that the newsmen have to report and are reporting a very important thing on a "trigger" basis, which any man covering this has to do, that you do not get a balanced overall picture of what the Department and the Secretary of Defense, and the deputy were trying to do in this contract. That is all I have said.

Senator CURTIS. Name some more distortions.

Mr. SYLVESTER. In the picture that is coming out?

Senator CURTIS. Yes, name them.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I would say the idea that the boards were unanimous throughout probably will be shown to be a distortion.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I am not competent to argue this case, and I am not making any—

The CHAIRMAN. Will you yield there? Do you really mean "distortions", or do you mean "divergent opinions", differences of opinion, where one might have one opinion and one another.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I am talking about the reports in the press.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you mean that the word "distortion" is a proper term for it?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I think that the picture being presented, not by the committee, but by the reports on the basis of the testimony, is distorted in the sense that if you drew a picture of it, it would be this way, and I don't think it is a rectangular picture.

The CHAIRMAN. Would that mean the press is distorting it? You said not as presented by the committee.

Mr. SYLVESTER. On the basis of the evidence, their reading of it, since it is fragmentary, and since it is incomplete, and since it has not been presented, I think that you get this sort of a picture.

The CHAIRMAN. If the Senator will yield further, you speak of it being fragmentary. Would you not say that the record, placing in the record the memorandum of Secretary Zuckert of November 21, signed by Secretary McNamara, and Secretary Korth and Zuckert, present the other side of the picture, and that that has gone out to the public? There is stated in this presumably the reasons why, in making comparisons, the reasons why the General Dynamics Co. was selected over Boeing.

Now, we can't put everything in the record in one day, but don't you think that putting this in the record immediately in the beginning of the hearings was to put somewhat in perspective the issue, and the issues and the facts in controversy, so that the committee could proceed to examine them?

Mr. SYLVESTER. Mr. Chairman, I think that the way you would normally—not from the committee point of view, and I am not taking any statement on your decision, but it was the Secretary of Defense and the Deputy Secretary who initiated the idea of the TFX in this contract. It would seem to me that you would start with them, and see what they were attempting to do, and then you would find out where they failed to do it.

This way, it has not happened this way. You start not saying "you," but the fact of the matter is we start at the bottom here, and gradually work up, and you therefore don't get at the start the overall picture which the Defense Department was aiming at, and what their overall intent was.

The CHAIRMAN. You say we should have had the Secretary of Defense on the stand first?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I am not making any comment of what you should or should not have done. I am simply saying that to my mind, in watching these things, that the overall picture, the basic reasons, are known to the men at the top, and not to the men at the bottom.

The CHAIRMAN. I don't want to belabor this. I just want to ask you one or two other questions.

I may say this for the record, I was informed, through the staff and through the liaison man for the Defense Department, that the Secretaries did not want to go on first. They wanted us to present it and they wanted to come on last.

I thought, in arranging the schedule of witnesses up until the day or two ago that I had arranged it, insofar as they were concerned, to accommodate them, that they would come on last, so they could refute and explain any testimony that had been given.

I have always, since I have been chairman of this committee, any time a Cabinet official—and even others representing agencies of Government, the heads of Government—felt that anything was being presented here that they wanted to correct or that they wanted to comment on or testify about, they have been welcome, they have been received, first, last, in the middle, wherever they wanted to come. That certainly would be true in this instance. I have promptly accorded the Secretary, Secretary McNamara, the opportunity that he made to present an affidavit, a statement, which he proposes will put the thing in what he terms proper perspective. He would be here testifying today, if it were convenient for him. We do not want, and have never tried, to suppress anything. I have tried to lean over backward in trying to get the truth. That is what we are going to seek to do.

Again, I want to assure you that your opinion, your expression of opinion that you don't believe the committee will be judicious or something, gives me no concern except when it is based on a false premise or on an erroneous premise. That is the only thing I wanted to clear up, so far as I was concerned.

Here is one other thing I wish you would help us with a little, since this statement has gone out to the press. You say on page 21:

"Well, I expect to have some"—talking about some figures.

"I would only say you are getting a lot of figures out of this committee after the fact."

I don't know what you mean by figures after the fact. I suppose that would be we are going out and making some new figures. I don't understand the meaning of that. I want you to explain that. You say "They have obtained," meaning the committee, "which did not bear and were not available at the time and were not under consideration at the time."

I think you should explain that, what figures we are getting. We are not getting any figures that I know of from the Defense Department. What figures do you have in mind that we are taking that were not available at the time?

Mr. SYLVESTER. As I recall, Mr. Gilleas testified on figures, and my recollection is, and also I was advised by some of our people who read that testimony, that he brought in what he called recomputations.

The CHAIRMAN. On what?

Mr. SYLVESTER. On apparently certain figures, on costs figures, as I understand. There were some recomputations that were not the figures used at the time the decision was made.

The CHAIRMAN. I don't know that I understand fully what you mean.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I beg your pardon?

The CHAIRMAN. Do you mean we have made some calculations, the committee staff has?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I think Mr. Gilleas testified on figures involved in the contract. Reading this quickly—

The CHAIRMAN. Reading what?

Mr. SYLVESTER. Reading the testimony. I believe he said in there since the time the contract had been let, recomputations had been made.

The CHAIRMAN. Recomputations had been made?

Mr. SYLVESTER. That is as I recall his testimony.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, is that true?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I don't know whether it is true or not.

The CHAIRMAN. What is wrong with it if they were made, to check on errors?

Mr. SYLVESTER. Nothing wrong with it, other than if there were such recomputations, they were not the figures on which the decision was based.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you say, then, the figures that were considered and upon which the decision was made were correct figures?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I am not an expert in this field, Mr. Chairman, I haven't any idea. I presume they were, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The point is all of this is simply that the committee is not getting the facts or we are using figures that were not facts and not pertinent to the consideration or in consideration of the contract at the time the award was made. If we are using any figures here that are not figures from the records of the Pentagon, what it had, I don't know what they would be, unless they would be a compilation or finding of errors in the figures that were used then.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I wouldn't know either.

Mr. ADLERMAN. May I straighten out one more thing.

Mr. Gilleas testified as to the commonality figures quoted in the memorandum of November 21, 1962, signed by Secretary Korth and Secretary Zuckert and Secretary McNamara, where he cited the commonality figure was 85 percent and 60 percent. The record, both of General Dynamics Co. and the Defense Department show that these figures are not accurate, and so Mr. Gilleas testified. He testified that the figure of 85 percent attributed to General Dynamics was, in truth, in one part, 80 percent and in other part 83 and some fraction.

Am I correct on that, Mr. Gilleas?

Mr. GILLEAS. That is correct.

Mr. ADLERMAN. These are not figures after the fact. They are not recomputations. These are the actual figures which were incorrectly stated in the memorandum.

Now as to the figure of 60 percent, if they used the figure of 85 percent in Mr. Zuckert's memorandum, then you have to include in that certain items which were called similar but not identical. If you are going to use 85 percent in one company, General Dynamics, call it 85 percent common, if you are going to use the same rule on Boeing, you would have to include the similar but not identical there, and that would make it 80 percent instead of 60 percent.

Those are the figures that Mr. Gilleas brought out. These are the official figures in the Defense Department's memorandum, and they come right out of the books of the General Dynamics Co. They were available to the Defense Department and Mr. Zuckert. Your implication that any of these figures come after the fact is not true.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I think probably if you look at the comparison by weight it was 92 percent for General Dynamics.

Mr. ADLERMAN. I don't know what it is by weight, but I can find out for you, and if that is the case, maybe it ought to be looked at that way.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I am sure if you have followed this, you must have come across that figure.

Mr. ADLERMAN. Have you read all the testimony in this hearing?

Mr. SYLVESTER. No, I have not.

Mr. ADLERMAN. And still you feel free that you can criticize the figures in this without reading all of the testimony?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I am simply saying as I read the testimony there are different figures in there than I am aware of.

Mr. ADLERMAN. And you are able to criticize the facts brought before the committee without reading the testimony, that we are presenting a one-sided picture without reading the testimony?

Mr. SYLVESTER. In my own mind I am clear when new figures are brought in after the decision was made, if such figures were.

Mr. ADLERMAN. Are your conclusions based upon fact or are they based upon prejudice?

Mr. SYLVESTER. Well, of course, I think the proper decision was made.

Mr. ADLERMAN. Are they based upon the facts that you read in the testimony?

Mr. SYLVESTER. If it is prejudice, then I am certainly guilty of being prejudiced. I think the right decision was made and when the full facts are—

Mr. ADLERMAN. I am not asking you that. I am asking are your conclusions based upon the testimony or upon your prejudice.

Mr. SYLVESTER. No; my conclusions, I think, will be verified when the full testimony comes out. They are not based on a partial presentation.

The CHAIRMAN. He said he did not read the testimony when he made these statements.

Would you say the figures that you are referring to are not accurate or not correct?

Mr. SYLVESTER. No, I did not say that. I said my reading of that indicated—

The CHAIRMAN. Were they before the fact or after the fact? You don't say they are not correct?

Mr. SYLVESTER. No, I have no knowledge that they are not correct at all. I have not suggested that. I am only saying, Mr. Chairman, I think when the full facts come out that a lot more material will be shown, that the thing will be in much better perspective, and that the committee will be led as Fortune Magazine was, to a decision that the right decision was made.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Secretary, I may say that you may be correct. We may come to that conclusion, despite the fact that one or two States may have a little interest in it. I think it is possible for this committee to render a judicious opinion. I don't agree with you on that, though I respect your right to disagree.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I have such high regard for this committee and its fairness that the facts will lead them to the conclusion that the Secretary of Defense was right.

The CHAIRMAN. But that does not answer the question, when you say that you think it is going to come out all right. Frankly, I hope it does. There is no pleasure, I get no pleasure out of these investigations. I hope everything is right, with the crossing of every "t" and the dotting of every "i." But we have a duty to perform here, and I am simply trying to do that, and that is all.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I respect this committee very highly.

The CHAIRMAN. These statements that tend to reflect upon the committee are not calculated to be helpful. I may say that in all candor. But, again, I wanted for the record whether you premised your statement insofar as it applied to the Senator from Arkansas, whether you premised it upon fact, and whether the statement you premised it upon was correct.

Mr. SYLVESTER. Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate that. You, I am sure, will grant me that in the job that I have, that when I see quotations from investigators, "If the Russians could build a plane that was rejected, they could shoot down the fleet of planes that the United States is planning to build"

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Sylvester, I am not here to defend some reporter, what his error may have been, or anything else. You never took that up with me before. You never inquired whether it was accurate or true. You simply picked that up. I don't know now whether a reporter correctly reported that or not. We are not talking here about you, about what some reporter said. We are talking about what you said and gave to the press.

I don't know anything about the accuracy of that statement. I doubt that it is accurate. I don't mean by that that reporters deliberately distorted it, but in conversations often you use some illustration and some interpretation is made of it which may not be the interpretation actually intended, as

you say about yours. You say you did not intend this to reflect upon anybody.

Mr. SYLVESTER. Jim McCartney told me that this is an accurate representation.

The CHAIRMAN. If you want to take that and rely on that, all right. Yours is accurate, and you could not draw any other conclusion from your statements here that you gave to the press, except that you intended to reflect on this committee.

Now, I have been patient and you keep insisting on that. You know that the statement you gave was intended to reflect on this committee, don't you?

Mr. SYLVESTER. No, not at all.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, it did, and you know that it did, don't you?

Mr. SYLVESTER. No, I don't think it did in any way.

The CHAIRMAN. You don't think it did?

(At this point Senator JAVITS entered the room.)

Senator MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I have to go to another meeting, but I have one question on procedure.

These hearings have been held in executive session. The question was raised this morning as to whether this particular one, since it deals with what the public reaction is to the hearings, should be open to the press, I thought it should be. The majority of the committee thought otherwise.

You heard the Chairman's statement at the beginning, however, that he hoped he could release this to the press immediately at the conclusion of the hearings. I certainly hope so, too, so my question to you, Mr. Sylvester, is this: Is there anything in today's hearing that you want to withhold from the press, or is it all right with you if the entire transcript is released to the press, as I think it should be.

Mr. SYLVESTER. It is quite all right. As I indicated at the beginning, I had no objection at the start of these hearings to having it open.

Senator MUNDT. No, we had a committee rule. You are willing to make the full transcript available to the press as soon as possible?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I see no reason why not.

Senator MUNDT. Thank you.

Senator CURTIS. When I yielded, I had asked you to name the distortions. You named one. You named the costs.

Now name the others.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I think that in the stories that have come out, and the reports of the meeting, it has not been made clear that the Boeing plane relies upon procedures and materials that, so far, are apparently not proved, and that they will require, according to the Defense Department's point of view, a great deal of experimental work that will increase the costs.

It seems to me this is for the Secretary of Defense. I am not the expert on this whatsoever, Senator.

(At this point Senator MUNDT left the room.)

Senator CURTIS. I ask you to name another distortion. Will you read the answer, Mr. Reporter?

(Record read by the reporter.)

Senator CURTIS. Do you regard that as a distortion?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I do, yes. Not that I— Senator CURTIS. Do you imply by that that either plane has been built and proven?

Mr. SYLVESTER. Senator, I am not an expert on the planes, and I am not qualified to discuss the planes.

Senator CURTIS. But you do all the time.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I am simply discussing it from the point of view of what I understand from the Defense Department. I am not the expert on it.

Senator CURTIS. You understand that that is a distortion. Who told you that in the Defense Department?

Mr. SYLVESTER. This is my judgment in reading the material that has come out.

Senator CURTIS. You just got through saying that you were relying on the Defense Department.

Mr. SYLVESTER. Not as to the general— Senator CURTIS. Who in the Defense Department regards it as a distortion that the public were advised that the Boeing product had not been proven when the facts are that neither plane has been built and flown. (At this point Senator McCLELLAN left the room.)

Senator CURTIS. Who in the Defense Department contends that is a distortion?

Mr. SYLVESTER. The distortions, Senator, are that the whole story has not come out, and this does not give a full and balanced picture of the issues involved.

Senator CURTIS. You can't expect that to stand. Suppose a given witness testifies truthfully about a detail with which he is familiar. The fact that he does not know about all the other details that might be involved—is his testimony a distortion?

Mr. SYLVESTER. The fact, Senator, that you start with details and try to build up a picture, rather than with the overall picture, and then go into the details, that would be, by technique, at least, a distortion, until you get away down to the end of the line.

Senator CURTIS. I can't agree that either of the two you have named are distortions. I do not think they would support the facts. But what other distortions do you identify?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I have no further ones to discuss, Senator.

Senator CURTIS. I did not ask you if you wanted to discuss them. I want to discuss them. What further ones do you have.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I haven't any.

Senator CURTIS. Has anyone besides the members of this committee had any State self-interests in this controversy?

Mr. SYLVESTER. It may well be. I don't know of anybody.

Senator CURTIS. That is all, Mr. Chairman. Senator MUSKIE (presiding). Senator JAVITS?

Senator JAVITS. Mr. Sylvester—

Mr. SYLVESTER. Good morning, Senator.

Senator JAVITS. I have noted your statement with considerable interest. I have been a trial lawyer long enough to know that sometimes the most careful witness says things he wished he had not said. I gather this was an untoward statement on your part, the statement about the committee, self-interest, and so forth.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I did not get the word.

Senator JAVITS. An untoward statement. You wish you had not made it, whatever may be the merits of it.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I certainly wish that the point I was trying to make had been made clearly enough so that no Senator here would feel that I was trying to reflect on his fairness, because I think it is quite clear through that that I did not discuss fairness in any way.

Senator JAVITS. Would you tell me—had you finished?

Mr. SYLVESTER. And I did feel that since this is a question of a contract which has been decided upon, any action, I would assume, going to that must be intended to break the contract. All the ramifications of such a complicated matter as is being investigated here, and, of course, very properly investigated here, are not the same as a court of law. That is the point I was trying to make.

Senator JAVITS. You are clear that we have no judicial function in this matter?

Mr. SYLVESTER. Correct.

Senator JAVITS. And even if a major found, and perhaps even all of us found, that this contract was improper, unwise, should never have been made, that nothing could be done about it if the Defense Department did not want to do it unless there was showing

of fraud, which I gather has not even been mentioned and should not be.

Mr. SYLVESTER. That was my point.

Senator JAVITS. In view of the fact that there is Grumman in my State, for instance, which you mentioned, I might have an interest in the fact that it would be a great idea if New York could get some business. I hasten to affirm to you that I have that much of an interest.

Mr. SYLVESTER. Senator, I testified that if I were a Senator, I would work very hard to get every contract. I don't raise any question about it. I respect every Senator's right and I am sure duty to do that. That seems to me basic in our system, in our way of life.

Senator JAVITS. I will tell you, Mr. Sylvester, for myself, that I am well aware of these pressures. I don't believe they would affect my judgment as to what I would finally determine, which I think will have the paramount desire to serve our Nation's interest that best. I really feel, in all sincerity, that that is true of every other Member, including our distinguished colleague from Washington, who is a very good personal friend of mine.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I am sure.

Senator JAVITS. I would be the first to affirm, and he does not have to say a word, that he would feel the same way. If it were the country or the State of Washington, there would be no question about that. I do think it was most unfortunate, because people don't analyze and scrutinize these things carefully as to what you mean by a judicial finding, and the fact that the committee could not make one anyhow. There was an implication, I must say, that our interests of our State would override our interest in our country.

I would think, Mr. Sylvester, because I would like to be constructive, that what I am concerned about is that these peripheral issues, like what you say, may tend to cloud the public understanding of what is going on here and how important it is, and what the evaluation and weight are to be given to the advisory conclusions of the facts to the people.

(At this point Senator McCLELLAN entered the room.)

Senator JAVITS. I would hope, and I express this hope to you, that you will take an opportunity, perhaps as a result of this hearing, to place this matter in a complete focus in the sense of only to be sure that such factual recommendations we may make or points of view that we may express may be properly evaluated, whatever may be the concern of our States, and express the confidence of a high Government official that he feels, and I am sure you do, that our patriotism for our Nation is far superior, as it must be, to any devotion which we have to the interests of our States.

I would feel that, though I assume by implication that I am one of those people concerned with this question of interests. I would hope very much that after thinking it through, it takes a big man to say when he is wrong, and I think you were wrong in this, considering how the public would receive it. I would hope that you would help us all to put it in focus in the interests of the country, not in any of our own personal interests.

I think my reputation and that of Senator JACKSON and others will stand up to this matter very adequately, and I think that is true of all my colleagues.

Mr. SYLVESTER. That was the purpose of my letter to the chairman yesterday, Senator JAVITS. I, of course, too, am an interested party, in that I feel very strongly, as a representative of the Defense Department, that the proper judgment was made, and I don't make any pretense at all that I am dispassionate about it at this point. I am interested. I think the Secretary and

the top officials made the right decision. I think the facts, when they come fully out, will confirm that. I think we would not have been in such a difficult position as we are today had the story been told from the overall to begin with, one, that a TFX plane would increase our capability; two, that it would create a great safety; and three, that in the fourth evaluation report, the military judgment was that either plane would do the job. Therefore, it then became a matter of judgment on the part of the constituted authorities, and it is this that I think is at stake. I think what is at stake is a civilian judgment which, under the setup of the law, and the Defense Department, must always be a civilian judgment. Had this started from that way, I think the overall picture would have been quite clear and quite in focus. And then testimony would have then either shown that the top people did not testify correctly; they overlooked certain things; they made a bad decision; but building it up bit by bit at every point from the beginning makes it very difficult to give that overall picture.

Senator JAVITS. Mr. Sylvester, do you feel that your statement in any way changed that situation, that is, your statement that is being referred to here, the statement that "Obviously you will hardly get a judicial rendering by a committee in which there are various Senators with State self-interest in where the contract goes?"

Do you think your statement helped to accomplish the very thing that you want to accomplish, which is to see that all the facts come out on a balanced way?

Mr. SYLVESTER. If it had any effect, I would hope that it would make newsmen covering the hearing, reading the truncated and fragmentary twice-a-day reports, to hold in suspension a little bit any final conclusions and keep in mind that these witnesses, most of whom have appeared so far, have not had access to the basic decision-making and are not aware of the factors which motivated the decisionmakers.

Senator JACKSON. Will the Senator yield for a moment?

Senator JAVITS. Certainly.

Senator JACKSON. Mr. Sylvester, we all make mistakes. I make a lot of mistakes, I am sure, every day. I know I make them at least every other day. I hesitate to offer you any advice, but I must say that I think we could have saved virtually this whole morning's session if you had come in here and said, "I erred. I made a mistake, and I am sorry." That is all you would have needed to have said. You failed to do that. This is the reason you are having difficulty this time. This is why you have had trouble in the past.

I have always found that it is hard for all of us to admit error, but I must comment that I don't think you have helped the situation here this morning by getting yourself deeply involved in matters that you admit now you have no knowledge about. If you had just come in and admitted that you had made a mistake, that would be it.

We are mortals. We are fallible. I am not infallible. I admit I make mistakes. I merely observe to you for what it is worth that if you had come in and just admitted error, this session would have been over in about 15 minutes. So here we are, and it is now 12:10.

I want to compliment my colleague from New York for his advice and counsel to you, but I am afraid that none of this has had its effect.

Senator JAVITS. Mr. Sylvester, may I ask you another question?

Of course, as I indicated, I couldn't join more sincerely with Senator JACKSON. I think that is the simple and best way to do this, and I think it is deserving. I would even like to see you give such observations

as you may feel advised to give on reconsideration as to the main points about Senators. The fact is that we do have State interests, but that all of our lives are lived in meeting those very blandishments. Generally speaking, I think, I depict the Senate in totality, and it represents on the whole a small fact, certainly very much smaller than is indicated by your statement which implants, I think, in the public mind, a confirmation of a suspicion which is undeserved in most cases, in the overwhelming majority of cases.

Perhaps I might just terminate my questioning of you by just asking you whether you consider that you are an expert witness, able to testify on the merits or demerits, either from the point of view of the facts and figures, or from the point of view of the policy of civilian versus military control of the final placements of these contracts?

Do you feel you are the man to testify on those two issues in respect to these contracts?

Mr. SYLVESTER. No, Senator. I am amazed that I was called to testify, because I am not an expert.

Senator JAVITS. I would like to join with Senator JACKSON in the great display of bipartisanship, of which we have had the virtue before, and urge you either now or deliberately when we are through, that you really owe it to yourself and to this controversy, which will be much better off unencumbered by any such conclusion by a high official of the Department of Defense, to clear the record by saying, as Senator JACKSON and I have both tried to say to you, we all do it, I do, he does, some more frequently than others, but that is not material.

It was too bad it was misunderstood. Perhaps you projected what you had in mind inartistically. It had better just be off the record, withdrawn, properly apologized for, and the sooner forgotten the better.

Mr. SYLVESTER. Senator JAVITS, I am happy to repeat my letter to the Senator, to the chairman. I am deeply sorry for any remarks of mine that reflected in any way on any member of this committee in any form whatsoever. I am happy to repeat that. I would not in any way reflect on them, and I tried not to reflect on them.

I find from the reaction of the Senators that I was not successful in that, and that I have apparently caused you the sort of pain that I had no intention of doing. I have covered the Congress too long not to know that there is no basis for reflection on any person individually. I accept your judgment that the message did not come clear. I was not reflecting on anybody's integrity or fairness. In fact, the question never came up. It was never discussed. Some of the stories written have used the word "fairness," that I had doubted this group could be fair. I have never had such a doubt, nor have I implied it.

Senator JAVITS. Mr. Sylvester, may I say to you that I am not hurt or upset, I never was by this statement, and that I feel completely capable of making a dispassionate evaluation of the situation, notwithstanding the interest of my State and notwithstanding the statement which you have made.

I don't feel my judgment would be colored at all. I feel calm, serene, full of loving kindness for all mankind. I just thought it would be good for the country for that remark, as it were, to be stricken so that it would not color the public judgment as to the ultimate results of our findings in this investigation.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator CURTIS. Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Senator CURTIS?

Senator CURTIS. Mr. Witness, are you familiar with a document called "Memorandum for the Record," dated November 21, 1962, signed by the Secretary of the Air Force, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of Defense, in reference to this matter?

Mr. SYLVESTER. Is that the November 21 memorandum?

Senator CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I have read the memorandum; yes, Senator.

Senator CURTIS. I believe that is identified as exhibit 2. That is exhibit 2. The record indicates that this was presented the first day of the hearings. You would accept that to be a fact?

Mr. SYLVESTER. Certainly.

Senator CURTIS. I have understood you to say that this investigation should have begun with the total picture and then proceeded to the details, and if we started out with details that was wrong.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I made no value judgment, Senator. I said that trying to be descriptive, I thought if it had been done that way certain results which are unhappy from our point of view might not have followed. I made no suggestion that it should have been.

Senator CURTIS. That led me to this question. Here this statement of the Secretary of Defense, Air Force, and Navy which was introduced into the record the first day of the hearings sets forth their reasons.

Now, I ask you to give this committee now any other reasons not mentioned in here, in this exhibit 2, why this contract should not have been awarded to Boeing.

Mr. SYLVESTER. Senator, I have no competency in this matter whatsoever. I think this is the question that will take up unquestionably with the Secretary of Defense and the Deputy Secretary. I have no competency in this field.

Senator CURTIS. Is it your statement, then, that exhibit No. 2 does not fully set forth the reasons?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I make no comment on the statement and characterize it in anyway whatsoever, Senator.

Senator CURTIS. But you have. You have. You have criticized the procedure of this committee for not getting the reasons for the Department's decision at the very first of the hearings. Here is what purports to be them, in Exhibit 2, and my question is quite simple: Are there other reasons not set forth in here?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I haven't any idea, Senator, and I am not a competent person to respond to that question, unfortunately I do not know. I would assume that Mr. McNamara and Mr. Gilpatric will have their own statements to make, and I can't foreshadow them in any way.

Senator CURTIS. Then when you said that this committee, or said in essence that this committee proceeded in a wrongful manner by not getting the total picture first, you did not know what you were talking about, is that correct?

Mr. SYLVESTER. No, I would not say that. I think what I have said is the same as Mr. Gilpatric said Monday, and the same as the Secretary of Defense said in his letter to you.

Senator CURTIS. What was that?

Mr. SYLVESTER. That as the picture has come out, it has come out in fragmentary form and it has not given the overall picture, and I think that that is inevitable.

Senator CURTIS. Of course you have not been content with that. Here today you have made accusations of distortions.

Mr. SYLVESTER. No, I made no accusation. I think it is inevitable.

Senator CURTIS. Well, the record will speak for itself.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I would like to make the record clear that if you analyze the news stories throughout the country, that the picture presented on the basis of the testimony that has come out, is not the picture that we think it is, in the Defense Department.

Senator CURTIS. Well, the record will speak for itself. I did not put the word "distortion" in your mouth.

I will ask you one thing that maybe you are qualified to answer because all you need to know is how to read a calendar.

When do you say that the decision was made?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I have no first-hand knowledge when it was made.

Senator CURTIS. Do you have any second-hand knowledge?

Mr. SYLVESTER. No.

Senator CURTIS. Do you have any knowledge at all of when it was made?

Mr. SYLVESTER. None of which I could testify under oath.

Senator CURTIS. Well, then, you have some knowledge.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I have no knowledge.

Senator CURTIS. Do you have any information?

Mr. SYLVESTER. No, I have not.

Senator CURTIS. What do you mean by implying that some information has come to you but which you can not testify to under oath?

Mr. SYLVESTER. No, I have seen stories that the decision was made at various times, and that is my only knowledge of it.

Senator CURTIS. Where did you see those stories?

Mr. SYLVESTER. In the press.

Senator CURTIS. Have you any other information, not based upon the press?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I have no first-hand knowledge of what day or when the decision was made.

Senator CURTIS. This document of the 21st, of November 1962, would imply it was made some time before the document was written.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I beg your pardon, sir.

Senator CURTIS. This document, exhibit 2, a literal reading of it would indicate that the decision was made some time before the decision was made, because the next to the last paragraph said "The final considerations stem from the fact," and so on.

I have nothing further.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything further?

Thank you very much, Mr. Sylvester. We appreciate your presence and we are glad to have your testimony.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

TO PROVIDE FOR MEMBERS ON THE PART OF THE SENATE OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING AND THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 15, Senate Resolution 107.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 107) providing for Members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the resolution be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 107) was considered and agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following joint committees of Congress:

Joint Committee on Printing: Mr. HAYDEN, of Arizona; Mr. JORDAN, of North Carolina; and Mr. SCOTT, of Pennsylvania.

Joint Committee of Congress on the Library: Mr. JORDAN, of North Carolina; Mr. PELL, of Rhode Island; Mr. CLARK, of Pennsylvania; Mr. COOPER, of Kentucky; and Mr. SCOTT, of Pennsylvania.

STUDY BY COMMITTEE ON AERONAUTICAL AND SPACE SCIENCES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business 16, Senate Resolution 74.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 74) authorizing the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences to make a study of matters pertaining to aeronautical and space activities of Federal departments and agencies, which had been reported from the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences with amendments, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration without additional amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, with amendments, on page 2, line 4, after the word "from", to insert "March 1", and on page 3, line 2, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$90,000" and insert "\$82,500"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the aeronautical and space activities of departments and agencies of the United States, including such activities peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations.

Sec. 2. (a) For the purposes of this resolution the committee is authorized, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, inclusive, to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable, (2) employ upon a temporary basis and fix the compensation of technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants, and (3) with the prior consent of the head of the department or agency of the Government concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any department or agency of the Government.

(b) The minority is authorized to select one person for appointment as an assistant or consultant, and the person so selected shall be appointed. No assistant or consultant may receive compensation at an annual gross rate which exceeds by more than \$1,600 the annual gross rate of compensation of any person so selected by the minority.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$82,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 17), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Rules and Administration, to whom was referred the resolution (S. Res. 74) authorizing the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, to investigate the aeronautical and space activities of the Federal departments and agencies, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without additional amendments, and recommend that the resolution as amended be agreed to by the Senate.

Senate Resolution 74 as amended would authorize the expenditure of not to exceed \$82,500 by the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of "any and all matters pertaining to the aeronautical and space activities of departments and agencies of the United States, including such activities peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations."

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorization are shown through December 31, 1962:

Committee and purpose	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
	Aeronautical and Space Sciences: Aeronautical and space activities of the Federal departments and agencies.	\$225,000		
	135,000 90,000	39,717.70 48,977.49	Jan. 31, 1961 Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 45. S. Res. 234.

The purposes of the resolution are more fully detailed in a letter to Senator B. EVERETT JORDAN, chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, from Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, chairman of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, which letter (with accompanying budget and statement of expenditures during the last session) is as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON AERONAUTICAL
AND SPACE SCIENCES,
March 1, 1963.

HON. B. EVERETT JORDAN,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee has unanimously reported out Senate Resolution 74, with amendments, on February 28, 1963, which has been referred to your committee.

This resolution would authorize an expenditure not to exceed \$82,500 by the committee for the period beginning March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964. The two amendments made by the committee reflect the suggestions made by the Rules Committee that (1) the total amount originally requested should be reduced by one-twelfth, and (2) that the period under which the resolution would operate begin with March 1, instead of February 1.

This resolution, which substantially conforms to the suggested draft for resolutions of this nature, would permit the committee to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the aeronautical and space activities of departments and agencies of the United States, including such activities which are peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations.

In compliance with Senate Resolution 77 of the 79th Congress, there is also enclosed in duplicate a budget breakdown with respect to the use of these funds.

The amounts set forth in the budget breakdown are based in part on last year's activities by the committee with estimations projected for this calendar year. During the past year the committee has, under Senate Resolution 234, done a considerable volume of work. It has, for example, published or is in the process of printing five reports encompassing a broad spectrum in the space field. These reports involve studies concerning communications satellites, meteorological satellites, space activities of the U.S.S.R., as well as a study and report on the international organization for outer space.

While the amount that was expended during the past year did not reach the total amount authorized, we felt that inasmuch as this committee was a fairly new committee, we should make more of a general survey to create a foundation from which to pinpoint our activities for 1963. Last year, Senator Kerr, as chairman of the Space Committee, stated that the amounts of money expended pursuant to the provisions of Senate Resolution 234, would be carefully supervised. As the new chairman of the Senate Space Committee, I would like to agree completely with this statement. As the attached report of expenditures indicates, nearly \$24,000 of the \$90,000 authorized under Senate Resolution 234, will be returned unexpended. At least \$3,000 of this expenditure has been expended pursuant to Senate Resolution 88 of the 88th Congress, so that except for the present circumstances, the committee would have returned approximately \$28,000.

The committee would like to point out that its activities involve matters that are technical in nature requiring the use of expert technical consultants in order that the committee can be properly informed to carry

out its duties under its legislative jurisdiction. Because of the highly knowledgeable and competent employees required in this area, we are requesting this year the same, salary ceilings as last year in order to attract and retain this caliber of employees.

In view of our experience during the past 2 years, we believe that there is a great deal more that should be done in order to acquaint committee members and the public with our overall space and aeronautical problems. Having in mind the rapidly expanded efforts of this Nation and others, as evidenced by the proposed budget for NASA of nearly \$6 billion for the next fiscal year,

there is a constant and continuing requirement that we keep abreast of activities enumerated in the resolution. We believe that the enclosed budget reflects a realistic approach to accompany this undertaking.

Should the Rules and Administration Committee feel that it needs additional information in connection with their consideration of this resolution, I would be pleased to personally appear before the committee in order to answer any questions which its members might have.

Sincerely yours,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman.

Budget

Position	Number	Base per annum	Base per annum	Gross monthly	Gross 12 months	Gross 11 months
STAFF						
Staff member.....	1	\$8,000	\$17,230.10	\$1,435.84	\$17,230.10	\$15,794.26
Do.....	1	7,380	16,064.19	1,338.68	16,064.19	14,725.51
Clerk.....	4	2,640	6,475.75	539.64	25,903.00	23,744.42
Total.....						54,264.19
ADMINISTRATIVE						
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960).....						446.16
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6 1/4 percent of total salaries paid).....						3,527.14
Contribution to employees Federal employees' group life insurance (27 cents per month per \$1,000 coverage).....						187.11
Reimbursable payments to agencies.....						17,874.87
Travel (inclusive of field investigations).....						4,583.30
Stationery, office supplies.....						458.33
Communications (telephone, telegraph).....						916.67
Newspapers, magazines, documents.....						242.23
Total.....						28,235.81
Grand total.....						82,500.00

Funds requested, Senate Resolution 74,
\$82,500.

Funds approved by Committee on Rules
and Administration, \$82,500.

Actual and estimated expenditures under S. Res. 234

	Authorized	Actually expended through Jan. 31, 1963
Salaries.....	\$55,324.61	\$32,719.13
Contributions to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382).....	486.72	¹ (138.65)
Contributions to civil service retirement funds (6 1/4 percent of total salaries paid).....	3,596.11	¹ (740.99)
Contributions to employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per \$1,000).....	197.64	¹ (90.05)
Reimbursable payments to agencies and consultants.....	20,000.00	23,993.39
Travel.....	3,000.00	4,777.82
Hearings.....	2,000.00	
Witness fees, expenses.....	2,000.00	
Stationery, office supplies, postage.....	1,000.00	674.29
Communications (telephone and telegraph).....	1,500.00	
Newspapers, magazines, documents.....	500.00	
Contingent fund.....	394.92	
Total.....	90,000.00	62,164.63

¹ Items in parentheses included in salaries total.

INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION, OPERATION, AND ENFORCEMENT OF INTERNAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business No. 34, Senate Resolution 62. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] wants to offer some comment on it and, I believe, an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 62) to investigate the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, on page 2, line 10, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 3, line 2, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$360,000" and insert "\$333,880"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections

134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, insofar as they relate to the authority of the committee, to make a complete and continuing study and investigation of (1) the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act of 1950, as amended; (2) the administration, operation, and enforcement of other laws relating to espionage, sabotage, and the protection of the internal security of the United States; and (3) the extent, nature, and effect of subversive activities in the United States, its territories and possessions, including, but not limited to, espionage, sabotage, and infiltration by persons who are or may be under the domination of the foreign government or organization controlling the world Communist movement or any other movement seeking to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$333,880, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, there was a disparity between the amount carried in the resolution and that inserted in the report. I think the committee has agreed that the item on page 3, in italics, \$333,880, is the correct amount.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, the figure of \$333,880 in the printed resolution is a typographical error. The figure of \$310,880 specified in the report is the correct amount reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration. However, at the request of the minority leader and the chairman of the committee involved, I will offer no objection to the consideration by the Senate of the \$333,880 figure carried in the printed resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there agreement on the amendment?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the amount is carried in the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 2, line 10.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment on page 3, line 2.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the re-

port (No. 35), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Rules and Administration, to whom was referred the resolution (S. Res. 62) authorizing an investigation of the administration of the national security law and matters relating to espionage, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the resolution as amended be agreed to by the Senate.

Senate Resolution 62 as amended, would authorize the expenditure of \$310,880 by the Committee on the Judiciary for the continuance of its standing Subcommittee on Internal Security from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to make a complete and continuing study and investigation of—

Committee and purpose	87th Cong.		Date	Authority
	Amount			
	Authorized	Expended		
Judiciary: Internal security	\$645,000	\$564,283.62		
	300,000	} 285,545.84	[Jan. 31, 1961 Sept. 15, 1961 Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 49 S. Res. 201 S. Res. 264
	20,000			
	325,000			

Senate Resolution 62 as referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration would have authorized the expenditure of \$360,000 for the 12-month period from February 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, an amount \$35,000 in excess of that authorized by the Senate for the same purpose during the last session of Congress.

At its meeting on March 6, 1963, the Committee on Rules and Administration amended Senate Resolution 62 by effecting the following reductions:

(1) A reduction of the requested amount by \$25,000, to conform it more nearly to the corresponding 1962 authorization; and

(2) A further reduction of the requested amount by one-twelfth of that portion of the reduced amount representing salaries and employee benefits, to compensate for funds made available to the committee during February 1963 by Senate Resolution 88, agreed to February 19, 1963.

By this action the Committee on Rules and Administration reduced the amount specified in Senate Resolution 62 as referred by \$49,120—from \$360,000 to \$310,880.

The investigative authority was correspondingly reduced to an 11-month period commencing March 1, 1963.

Mr. DIRKSEN subsequently said: Mr. President, was action taken on Calendar No. 34?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution was agreed to without amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which action was taken.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

RESOLUTION OVER TO TUESDAY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think it is agreed that on the resolution dealing with antitrust monopoly, by

(1) the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act of 1950, as amended;

(2) the administration, operation, and enforcement of other laws relating to espionage, sabotage, and the protection of the internal security of the United States; and

(3) the extent, nature, and effect of subversive activities in the United States, its territories and possessions, including, but not limited to, espionage, sabotage, and infiltration by persons who are or may be under the domination of the foreign government or organizations controlling the world Communist movement or any other movement seeking to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence.

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorizations are shown through December 31, 1962.

agreement with the chairman of the subcommittee, it will go over until next Tuesday.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That was the understanding.

SEVEN MORE STATES RATIFY ANTI-POLL TAX AMENDMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] had indicated to a number of Senators earlier today that he had a statement to make at about this hour. I would suggest that the Senator from Florida might proceed now. Then we could go back to the calendar call.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished acting majority leader.

Mr. President, I am happy to announce to the Senate that seven more States have ratified the antipoll tax amendment to the Constitution which would eliminate the prerequisite that a poll tax or any other tax be a requirement for voting in a Federal election.

The 7 new or additional States, Mr. President, are Idaho, Hawaii, New Mexico, Utah, Minnesota, North Dakota, and Colorado, bringing to 20 the total number of States which have ratified this important amendment to date.

Thus, Mr. President, we are past the halfway mark—20 of the 38 States required by the Constitution having ratified the amendment. It is my expectation that we will receive favorable news in the next few days from several additional States whose legislatures are presently meeting.

Mr. President, I wish to express my profound appreciation to the Senators who represent the seven additional States which have ratified the amendment, which I have mentioned.

I am informed that the Legislature of the State of Idaho ratified the amendment on March 8, the Idaho Senate by

a vote of 35 to 1, and the Idaho House by a vote of 55 to 2. I wish to express my grateful thanks to both Senators CHURCH and JORDAN who have vigorously supported this amendment to the Constitution and each of whom recommended ratification by their legislature.

I am especially pleased, Mr. President, that our 50th State, Hawaii, represented so ably by my distinguished friends, Senator FONG and Senator INOUE, ratified the amendment on March 6 when the Hawaii House approved the Hawaii Senate concurrent resolution endorsing the amendment, but I do not have the votes by which the action was taken.

It is interesting to note that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Monday of this week, March 11, which was distributed the following date, March 12, contained on page 3855 Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 1 of the Hawaii General Assembly which ratified the proposed amendment to the Constitution. This is interesting to me because that date, March 12, was the fourth anniversary of the date that the Congress passed the enabling legislation authorizing the admission of the Territory of Hawaii as the 50th State of the Union.

I salute and congratulate both of the distinguished Senators from Hawaii for their strong support of the amendment which I am discussing, and also upon Hawaii's having attained its fourth anniversary as a new State.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Hawaii. I have expressed what I feel in my heart, namely great gratitude toward the 50th State for this being the first resolution which was adopted by the legislature of that State now in session, and for the very active support which the two Senators, sitting on opposite sides of the aisle, have given to the amendment in their State legislature.

Mr. FONG. I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida. I should like to express my deepest appreciation to the distinguished senior Senator from Florida for his very kind remarks toward my colleague and me and toward the people of Hawaii. I thank him for reporting to the Senate the ratification of the proposed 24th amendment to the Constitution of the United States by the Second Legislature of the State of Hawaii.

I congratulate him for the effective leadership he has rendered over the past 14 years in painstakingly guiding to passage the joint resolution on the poll-tax. I was most happy to join with my friend, the diligent Senator from Florida, in cosponsoring the measure which has just been ratified by my State.

It is indeed a happy coincidence that ratification by the State Legislature of Hawaii should occur during the fourth anniversary of the month in which the U.S. Congress approved the Statehood Act of Hawaii. It seems somehow symbolic of the aloha spirit which has prevailed between the Congress and our Island State during these years.

I may say that in my opinion one of the greatest exponents of the aloha spirit is the senior Senator from Florida. He has certainly proven himself a firm and faithful friend of Hawaii. He helped us to attain statehood and he has helped us in many significant ways since that momentous day in March 1959. He supported establishment of the East-West Center in Hawaii and in the Appropriations Committee supported the necessary funds to get this fine institution under way. He was a key figure in the establishment of a Department of Commerce field office in Hawaii to assist Islanders in their export-import trade. I have always found the senior Senator from Florida to be most sympathetic to the needs of the people of Hawaii.

It is a kind of poetic justice that the people of Hawaii should reciprocate through their State legislature by ratifying the poll tax amendment to the Constitution which the distinguished Senator from Florida sponsored.

May I also say that I am extremely well pleased that Hawaii may be the 17th State to ratify the amendment on the basis of incomplete data filed with the National Archives and Records. The State of Hawaii would have undoubtedly been the first to ratify the amendment, if the legislature had been in session on September 14, 1962, when the amendment was submitted by the General Services Administration to the Governors of the 50 States; for Hawaii is rightfully proud of its tradition of national leadership in the field of civil rights.

I am proud to affirm the language of the concurrent resolution of the Hawaii State Legislature, which has thus acted to preserve the great traditions nurtured and passed on by our forefathers in ratifying this amendment.

No poll tax should abridge the right to vote. Yet, this archaic system of restricting the right to vote in the imposition of an artificial barrier still survives in five States of the Union.

By encouraging wider voter participation in the election of Federal officials, the amendment is an important contribution to good government. Our faithfulness to the precepts and principles contained in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and our standards of decency and justice impels legislative bodies of all States in their present or ensuing sessions to discard speedily the poll tax as an obstacle to democracy.

Mr. President, inasmuch as the text of the resolution of the Hawaii State Legislature is printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Senate proceedings for Monday, March 11, I shall not ask that it be duplicated here.

I thank the distinguished Senator for his very kind remarks and for yielding to me.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. Mr. President, I am highly appreciative of the kind and generous statement of the Senator from Hawaii. He and his colleague from Hawaii have been untiring in their efforts in this matter.

Mr. President, the State of New Mexico ratified the amendment on March 5, 1963, the vote in the New

Mexico Senate being 18 to 10 and in the New Mexico House, 63 to 0. I express my sincere appreciation to Senators ANDERSON and MECHEM, both of whom so ably represent that great State and have taken such a dedicated interest in ratification of the amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I want the Senator from Florida to know that the people of my State have felt that the Senator from Florida and those who have supported him have been correct in their position. Our State legislature has approved the amendment. I have had requests from members of the State legislature to express their appreciation to him for having had the matter brought before them for ratification.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for his gracious remarks.

The Legislature of the State of Utah approved the amendment on February 23, the vote in the Utah Senate being 20 to 0 and in the Utah House, 51 to 4. Mr. President, I wish to express my sincere appreciation to my distinguished colleagues, Senators BENNETT and MOSS, who ably represent the State of Utah and who have vigorously supported the submission and ratification of this important amendment.

The fifth new State to ratify the amendment is Minnesota. The house approved the amendment on February 19 and the Minnesota Senate, February 27, the Governor officially certifying the legislature's action to the General Services Administration on March 6. I express my deep appreciation to both of the able Senators from Minnesota—Senator HUMPHREY and Senator MCCARTHY—both of whom, this year and last year, worked so hard to obtain this most gratifying action.

The sixth new or additional State ratifying the anti-poll-tax amendment is North Dakota, which is ably represented in this body by my distinguished friends, Senators YOUNG and BURDICK. I understand that the Senate of North Dakota took affirmative action on its resolution on February 25 by a vote of 27 to 20, the North Dakota House completing necessary action by that State by a vote of 77 to 29 on March 12.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished friend and colleague from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I am very happy that my State of North Dakota saw fit to approve the joint resolution. I believe this is meaningful civil rights legislation. The opposition in North Dakota was based largely on the issue of States' rights. I may point out that it is a rather conservative Republican legislature that adopted the joint resolution. We are all grateful to the Senator from Florida for the work he has done on the joint resolution.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my distinguished friend from North Dakota for these gracious words. I do not believe that any Senators were confronted by

a more difficult situation in their States than were the Senators from North Dakota in connection with this subject. I am sure that ratification would not have been accomplished in that good State but for the strong efforts of the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] and the distinguished junior Senator from that State [Mr. Burdick].

Likewise, Mr. President, it should be noted that in this case, as in four other cases reported today, the Senators representing those States come from different parties, from opposite sides of the aisle. We have again illustrated in the most perfect way the fact that the support for this amendment has been from the beginning bipartisan, and it is still bipartisan; furthermore, that the Senate as a whole has regarded this matter as not at all more closely connected with one party than with the other. I very strongly thank my distinguished friend the senior Senator from North Dakota.

The seventh and last additional State is Colorado. I was informed late yesterday that both houses of the Colorado Legislature have acted affirmatively upon the resolution ratifying the amendment but as yet, I do not have the dates or the votes by which either house ratified. I wish to express my warm appreciation to my distinguished colleagues representing the State of Colorado, Senators **ALLOTT** and **DOMINICK**, for their support in obtaining ratification by their good State of the anti-poll-tax amendment.

Mr. **DOMINICK**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **HOLLAND**. I am very happy to yield to my friend the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado.

Mr. **DOMINICK**. I thank the Senator from Florida for his congratulations to the Colorado Legislature on the ratification of the anti-poll-tax amendment. In our new leadership in both the Governor's office and in both houses of our State legislature, prompt action has been taken to solve many pressing problems confronting our State. I am happy indeed that approval has been given to the anti-poll-tax amendment. Such approval was included in the overall program.

I am happy to say that my senior colleague [Mr. **ALLOTT**] and I had an opportunity to urge this action on the State legislature. However, we well know that the support and enthusiasm of the various States in favor of the joint resolution can be attributed to the untiring efforts of the distinguished senior Senator from Florida.

Mr. **HOLLAND**. The Senator from Colorado is most gracious. However, I know perfectly well, and so do the other Senators, as well as the American public, that without the followthrough which has been evidenced so clearly in this matter by Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle in behalf of strongly supporting ratification of the amendment in their State legislatures, we would not have had these 20 ratifications. Certainly that is true with respect to the State of Colorado. I warmly thank the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado and his colleague for their untiring work in this matter.

Mr. **INOUE** subsequently said: Mr. President, I am most grateful for the kind words of the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. **HOLLAND**] in commending the State of Hawaii for ratifying the anti-poll-tax amendment. I assure the distinguished Senator from Florida that the people of Hawaii were proud and privileged to support the great constitutional amendment. The final ratification of the Holland anti-poll-tax amendment to the Constitution will be a great and significant step toward achieving a true and living democracy for the people of our Nation.

Mr. **HOLLAND**. Mr. President, I want to express my very deep appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Hawaii for the kind words he has spoken relative to the anti-poll-tax amendment and to say for the record that he has been most active, most diligent, and most helpful in having this matter considered by and approved and ratified by the legislature of his State of Hawaii as one of their first items, I believe, as Joint Resolution 1.

May I say it seems to me that we Senators and citizens generally who come from States that have been in the Union very much longer could very profitably look at the record of our 50th State with reference to its recognition of the responsibility of voters.

In their very first election, their voting record surpassed any that I have seen recorded for any other State in the Union in any other election. I may have missed some, but that election showed that 92 percent of the registered electors of the State voted for the candidates in that election.

In the recent action in approving the proposed constitutional amendment on a priority basis, due to the efforts of our two friends the Senators from Hawaii, and of the Governor, the people of the State again have shown an appreciation for the right, the responsibility, and the privilege of voting and for the preservation of that right and for the making of the exercise of voting as nearly a universal matter among our citizens as possible.

So I pay tribute to the fine work of my friends from Hawaii. I am going to point out to the citizens of my own State—in fact, I have already called it to their attention in various appearances in my own State—that here is a lesson we could learn from the citizens of a new State, the people of which have shown in great measure appreciation of their privilege and responsibility of voting, because it is only when citizens vote almost unanimously that we get the full expression of the people of any State.

Before I take my seat I should like to discuss briefly one point, brought out by the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. **Young**] and by other Senators who have talked with me during the course of my remarks, to the effect that some members of State legislatures have objected to the amendment because they believe it is an infringement upon States rights.

To the contrary, an amendment of this type, submitted to the jury of the States, and requiring, first, approval by

two-thirds of the membership of each body of Congress, and later approval by three-fourths of the States, is the finest and highest recognition of the rights of the several States that is found in the Constitution.

The right of a State to have a fundamental matter of this kind submitted to the jury of all the States is one of its most precious rights under the Federal Constitution. It is in recognition, rather than in violation, of that principle that this matter is submitted as a constitutional amendment, where there is no question at all about its validity or about its having to be the expression of a great majority of the people of the States and of the Nation before it can become controlling.

I yield the floor.

Mr. **HUMPHREY** subsequently said: Mr. President, I commend the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. **HOLLAND**] upon his message today and upon his dedication, persistence, and hard work in bringing about, first of all, the adoption by Congress of the constitutional amendment to outlaw the poll tax, and then his followup of the many State legislatures, working with his colleagues in the Senate and in the other body, to encourage prompt action by the State legislatures to eliminate the requirement of a poll tax in order to exercise the franchise.

This is a very important constitutional amendment. As I understand, 22 States have now ratified it. Ratification by 38 States is needed to make the amendment a part of the U.S. Constitution. I am hopeful that this year—if not this year, then by next year—the required number of 38 States will have acted affirmatively to place the amendment in the Constitution.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO INVESTIGATE CERTAIN MATTERS RELATING TO NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 17, Senate Resolution 75.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The resolution will be stated by title.

The **LEGISLATIVE CLERK**. A resolution (S. Res. 75) authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to investigate certain matters relating to national defense.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration without further amendment.

The amendments of the Committee on Armed Services are as follows:

On page 2, line 22, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 3, line 12, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$190,000" and insert "\$175,000"; so as to make the resolution read: "Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections

134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

- "(1) common defense generally;
- "(2) the War Department and the Military Establishment generally;
- "(3) the Navy Department and the Naval Establishment generally;
- "(4) soldiers and sailors' homes;
- "(5) pay, promotion, retirement, and other benefits and privileges of members of the Armed Forces;
- "(6) selective service;
- "(7) size and composition of the Army and Navy;
- "(8) forts, arsenals, military reservations, and navy yards;
- "(9) ammunition depots;
- "(10) maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal, including the administration, sanitation, and government of the Canal Zone;
- "(11) conservation, development, and use of naval petroleum and oil shale reserves;
- "(12) strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense;
- "(13) aeronautical and space activities peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations.

"Sec. 2. For the purpose of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

"Sec. 3. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$175,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to make a statement which may affect this and subsequent resolutions which are to be considered.

We are again engaged, as we have been yearly, in providing funds with which to operate special committees. I call attention to the fact that the Senate is about to consider 23 resolutions which have been actually reported and 2 more resolutions which are at the desk, making a total of 25 so-called money resolutions.

With the exception of two or three, these resolutions refer to special committees which have been created by the standing committees. The total amount of these 25 requests aggregates \$4,200,333. Actually, the amount should be \$4,582,182.

About a month ago it was necessary for the Senate to adopt a continuing resolution to permit the use of funds with which to pay the staffs of those subcommittees through the month of February. If we consider that the 25 resolutions provide funds on a 12-month basis, it will be noted that the increase

for carrying on the work of the subcommittees amounts to \$132,682.

Considering this, I do not want the Senate to overlook the fact that although the amounts provided in a few of the resolutions have been reduced somewhat—the overall picture as to the 25 resolutions shows an increase over last year of \$132,682. Therefore, the total amount provided by the 25 resolutions for this year, on a 12-month basis, is \$4,582,182, compared with \$4,449,500 last year.

I am glad that up to now, I have detected that no new subcommittees are in the process of formation. However, I wish to emphasize that these subcommittees still thrive and are still loaded down with many employees—actually, with many more employees than are on the staffs of the regular standing committees.

As all Senators know, each standing committee is entitled to employ 10 persons—6 clericals and 4 specialists—by the Reorganization Act of 1946.

At the close of business December 31, 1961, the number of employees of the special committees was 314, as compared with about 150 employees of the regular standing committees.

As of December 31, 1962, the number of employees of special committees had increased to 338. In large measure, that increase accounts for the pressing need for space which has faced the Senate in the past, and is once again facing the Senate today.

I can well remember the time, several years ago, when some of us were opposed to the construction of a new Senate Office Building. We knew it would be quite expensive. We also felt that if it were necessary to obtain more space in order to provide accommodations for Senators from the larger States, that space probably could be obtained by an extension of the east wing of the Capitol itself. I argued for that position for several years, but I was defeated, and we ended by constructing not only a new Senate Office Building, but also an extension of the east front of the Capitol.

Today, not only are all the offices which were provided in the New Senate Office Building occupied; not only are all the offices in the Capitol extension occupied; but every nook and corner in the Old Senate Office Building which can possibly house anybody has been utilized. The number of offices which are set aside principally for committee work in the Capitol and the two Senate Office Buildings total 358. Of that number, 106 offices are occupied by the employees of the subcommittees. Of course, many of those employees also occupy some of the rooms which are assigned to the regular standing committees.

Thus, much of the space which is now being occupied in the Capitol and the two Senate Office Buildings is being occupied by employees of the subcommittees. If this practice is continued, I foresee a time in the near future when the Senate may be compelled to have more facilities constructed for its employees. When the New Senate Office Building was constructed, many persons felt that it would suffice for many years to come.

But all the space in that building is now occupied, and it will be very difficult to remove the committees and their employees after they have been stationed there.

Mr. President, I also wish to say a few words regarding the amounts appropriated in recent Congresses for this special work—that is, the work done by subcommittees created by the standing committees and also the work done by special committees created by the Senate itself. During the 87th Congress, there was authorized for all committees—that is, for the standing committees, the special committees, and the subcommittees of the various standing committees—\$9,355,500 for these special inquiries and investigations; and at least \$10,000 was authorized for routine expenditures. In other words as all of us know, under the Reorganization Act, each committee is allowed a certain amount. The amount for routine expenditures during the 87th Congress was \$283,000.

As I said, the amount authorized for the inquiries was \$9,355,000.

This amount shows a decrease of almost \$1 million from the corresponding amount allowed during the 86th Congress. I tried to find how that decrease came about. In examining the expenditures of the various committees, we notice that during the 86th Congress the Commerce Committee spent considerably more money than that committee spent during the 87th Congress. That was partly due because of the investigations it made in regard to railroad rates, air travel rates, and so forth. The committee used a little less than \$500,000 during the 87th Congress, as compared to the \$913,000-plus it used during the 86th Congress.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs spent considerably less under the able leadership of my good friend, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. Prior to his tenure as chairman, the committee spent approximately \$435,000 to \$450,000 annually; but during the last Congress, only \$177,000 was spent by the committee.

The same is true of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Its investigations during the 87th Congress required much less than was required by its investigations during the 86th Congress.

However, when we consider the average performance of the committees, without considering the special investigations to which I have referred, we find that the amounts spent have increased, and no saving has been made.

I was very hopeful that the Committee on Rules and Administration would attempt to make some cuts in the amounts allowed for these investigations, and thus would reduce somewhat the payrolls. It is my judgment that when we try to reduce the amounts appropriated for the various departments, we stand in a bad position if we do not reduce the amounts spent by our own committees. It seems to me that most of these committees, and particularly the Internal Security Subcommittee could reduce their expenditures.

Nevertheless, for many, many years, they have had a growing number of employees. I believe that savings can be made as to that subcommittee and to a number of other subcommittees.

I expect to ask questions about practically all these resolutions as the calendar is called, and particularly in regard to the Subcommittee To Study Juvenile Delinquency. That subcommittee was established years ago, in the

hope that its work could be completed within a year, and given a budget of approximately \$75,000. But up to now we have spent well over \$1 million on it. To my way of thinking, very little good, if any, has been accomplished by the expenditure of that huge sum of money.

So, Mr. President, as I have said, as each resolution is called up I expect to ask some questions about the work done

by the subcommittees and about what is in the offing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following my remarks, a summary of table 1 in the Senate inquiries and investigations brochure which was presented to the Senate today.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—Summary

Committee	87th Congress		86th Congress		85th Congress	
	Authorized	Expended	Authorized	Expended	Authorized	Expended
All committees.....	\$9,638,500.00	\$6,838,310.96	\$10,758,231.37	\$7,839,298.44	\$8,283,830.08	\$5,916,015.68
Routine expenditures.....	283,000.00	215,059.62	300,000.00	214,389.96	320,000.00	210,475.89
Inquiries and investigations.....	9,355,500.00	6,623,251.34	10,458,231.37	7,624,908.48	7,963,830.08	5,705,539.79
Standing committees.....	9,268,500.00	6,532,779.93	9,228,520.00	6,718,396.24	6,660,541.45	4,397,126.65
Routine expenditures.....	283,000.00	215,059.62	300,000.00	214,389.96	320,000.00	210,475.89
Inquiries and investigations.....	8,985,500.00	6,317,720.31	8,928,520.00	6,504,006.28	6,340,541.45	4,186,650.76
Aeronautical and Space Sciences.....	235,000.00	94,474.57	10,000.00	6,781.00	10,000.00	90.10
Routine expenditures.....	10,000.00	5,779.38	10,000.00	6,781.00	10,000.00	90.10
Inquiries and investigations.....	225,000.00	88,695.19				
Agriculture and Forestry.....	10,000.00	8,237.61	25,000.00	15,489.14	25,000.00	13,543.71
Routine expenditures.....	10,000.00	8,237.61	25,000.00	15,489.14	25,000.00	13,543.71
Inquiries and investigations.....						
Appropriations.....	826,000.00	170,715.12	810,000.00	238,687.94	805,000.00	138,947.88
Routine expenditures.....	66,000.00	57,011.47	50,000.00	39,514.55	45,000.00	35,137.89
Inquiries and investigations.....	760,000.00	113,703.65	760,000.00	199,173.39	760,000.00	103,809.99
Armed Services.....	575,000.00	433,666.56	400,000.00	322,516.87	412,000.00	250,627.80
Routine expenditures.....	20,000.00	16,141.99	20,000.00	11,394.75	20,000.00	16,049.27
Inquiries and investigations.....	555,000.00	417,524.57	380,000.00	311,122.12	392,000.00	234,578.53
Banking and Currency.....	384,000.00	330,514.82	350,000.00	283,285.75	360,000.00	278,312.84
Routine expenditures.....	10,000.00	8,562.96	10,000.00	9,098.47	10,000.00	9,009.86
Inquiries and investigations.....	374,000.00	321,951.86	340,000.00	274,187.28	350,000.00	269,302.98
Commerce.....	650,000.00	469,823.40	1,161,020.00	913,664.15	635,000.00	393,889.75
Routine expenditures.....	20,000.00	14,917.09	20,000.00	15,326.18	10,000.00	8,242.21
Inquiries and investigations.....	630,000.00	454,906.31	1,141,020.00	898,337.97	625,000.00	385,647.54
District of Columbia.....	10,000.00	5,631.29	10,000.00	4,354.48	10,000.00	5,330.44
Routine expenditures.....	10,000.00	5,631.29	10,000.00	4,354.48	10,000.00	5,330.44
Inquiries and investigations.....						
Finance.....	22,000.00	14,597.71	10,000.00	5,491.56	20,000.00	12,922.38
Routine expenditures.....	22,000.00	14,597.71	10,000.00	5,491.56	20,000.00	12,922.38
Inquiries and investigations.....						
Foreign Relations.....	380,000.00	222,438.44	705,000.00	484,807.65	629,000.00	146,751.85
Routine expenditures.....	10,000.00	9,958.18	20,000.00	19,819.29	40,000.00	27,320.73
Inquiries and investigations.....	370,000.00	212,480.26	685,000.00	464,988.36	589,000.00	119,431.12
Government Operations.....	1,270,000.00	1,065,223.22	915,000.00	693,064.62	450,000.00	418,584.43
Routine expenditures.....	10,000.00	4,427.57	20,000.00	8,469.34	10,000.00	5,376.11
Inquiries and investigations.....	1,260,000.00	1,060,795.65	895,000.00	684,595.28	440,000.00	413,208.32
Interior and Insular Affairs.....	280,000.00	177,999.94	450,000.00	435,387.04	398,750.00	389,662.04
Routine expenditures.....	20,000.00	19,766.59	30,000.00	26,586.19	30,000.00	25,566.88
Inquiries and investigations.....	260,000.00	158,233.35	420,000.00	408,800.85	368,750.00	364,095.16
Judiciary.....	3,541,500.00	2,880,192.64	3,192,500.00	2,585,334.33	2,188,291.45	1,821,792.19
Routine expenditures.....	10,000.00	9,976.33	10,000.00	5,817.41	20,000.00	7,762.86
Inquiries and investigations.....	3,531,500.00	2,870,216.31	3,182,500.00	2,579,516.92	2,168,291.45	1,814,029.33
Labor and Public Welfare.....	145,000.00	120,019.90	265,000.00	214,292.46	20,000.00	16,741.40
Routine expenditures.....	25,000.00	18,663.23	25,000.00	24,057.26	20,000.00	16,741.40
Inquiries and investigations.....	120,000.00	101,356.67	240,000.00	190,235.20		
Post Office and Civil Service.....	160,000.00	126,191.67	175,000.00	123,617.84	120,000.00	92,144.54
Routine expenditures.....	10,000.00	8,242.76	10,000.00	9,613.24	20,000.00	15,617.38
Inquiries and investigations.....	150,000.00	117,948.91	165,000.00	114,004.60	100,000.00	76,527.16
Public Works.....	260,000.00	100,293.39	260,000.00	58,014.71	160,000.00	97,417.53
Routine expenditures.....	10,000.00	4,834.93	10,000.00	3,558.58	10,000.00	25.00
Inquiries and investigations.....	250,000.00	95,458.46	250,000.00	54,456.13	150,000.00	97,392.53

TABLE 1.—Summary—Continued

Committee	87th Congress		86th Congress		85th Congress	
	Authorized	Expended	Authorized	Expended	Authorized	Expended
Standing committees—Continued						
Rules and Administration.....	\$260,000.00	\$100,117.06	\$245,000.00	\$117,957.57	\$220,000.00	\$129,650.37
Routine expenditures.....	10,000.00	2,411.96	10,000.00	3,992.25	10,000.00	3,384.83
Inquiries and investigations.....	250,000.00	97,705.10	235,000.00	113,965.32	210,000.00	126,265.54
Small Business (Select) ¹	200,000.00	212,642.59	245,000.00	215,709.13	197,500.00	190,717.40
Routine expenditures.....	10,000.00	5,898.57	10,000.00	5,026.27	10,000.00	8,354.84
Inquiries and investigations.....	250,000.00	206,744.02	235,000.00	210,682.86	187,500.00	182,362.56
Joint committees ²			280,000.00	266,833.64	130,000.00	78,888.10
Economic.....			200,000.00	192,173.80		
Washington Metropolitan Problems.....			80,000.00	74,659.84	130,000.00	78,888.10
Select committees ²			1,114,711.37	755,141.92	1,298,288.63	1,297,418.76
Labor-Management.....			789,711.37	663,854.05	1,298,288.63	1,297,418.76
National Water Resources.....			325,000.00	91,287.87		
Small Business. ¹						
Special committees ²	370,000.00	305,531.03	135,000.00	98,926.64	195,000.00	142,582.17
Aging.....	370,000.00	305,531.03				
Astronautics and Space Exploration.....					50,000.00	30,090.75
Foreign Aid Program.....					75,000.00	68,217.74
Political Activities, Lobbying, and Campaign Contributions.....					60,000.00	44,273.68
Preservation of Senate Memorabilia.....			10,000.00	35.10	10,000.00	
Unemployment Problems.....			125,000.00	98,891.54		

¹ For the purposes of this compilation the Select Committee on Small Business, because of the nature of its organization and the duration of its authority, is included with the standing committees of the Senate, even though it lacks legislative jurisdiction.

² All funds shown for joint, select, and special committees are in the category "inquiries and investigations."

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I merely wish to express the view that the proposals to make a general cut in expenditures will be decided by the action we take on the proposals which will be made by the Senator from Louisiana. If we do not reduce our own expenditures, we shall be defenseless in our efforts to try to cut the expenditures of the other branches of the Government. So, in my opinion, the action to be taken today by the Senate will be determinative of this issue, about which so much has been said—in other words, that if there is to be tax reduction, there must be, accompanying it, a reduction of expenditures.

I think Parkinson's disease—or whatever is the economic term for this situation—has been characteristic of the topsy-turvy growth of these departments, and I believe something must be done about this situation.

So I shall give support to the Senator from Louisiana in the fight he is making on this issue.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, growing concern in the United States over annual increases in the total budget and in deficit spending has been expressed in all corners of this Nation.

Among those who have voiced their concern are Members of Congress, including the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] who now has the floor and has been kind enough to yield to me.

Yet, the Congress itself is contributing to the overall problem by voting larger sums each year to meet operating expenses.

On the Senate side, the appropriations which are approved for the use of committees and subcommittees grow generally larger in every succeeding Congress.

Naturally, enough money must be appropriated for each committee to permit the proper processing, study, and reporting of proposed legislation referred according to jurisdiction.

However, some effort ought to be made by the legislative branch, which has the power to cut the amount of the national budget, to show restraint in the use of money for its own purposes.

If we are to begin our efforts to reduce annual spending, we ought, for the sake of our integrity, to begin to do it here in the Senate.

For that reason, Mr. President, I attempted to reduce by approximately 10 percent the appropriations requested by committees which asked for substantial increases over the amounts allowed them last year. I feel sure that each committee so affected will not be hampered in performing its normal functions, and the saving to the Senate will be sufficient to demonstrate an honest intent to economize in its own backyard.

For the benefit of committee chairmen who would be affected by the application of my motion, I say that it will not preclude them from returning at a later time before the Committee on Rules and Administration—or, at least, it is not my intention to preclude them from doing so—if they actually require additional funds. But I believe it will be helpful to everyone if we take a second look at the expenditures being made and

if we begin to do some economizing right now.

It is my hope that the Senate will support my thoughts and efforts in connection with this matter; and I thank the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] for his support.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am glad to hear that an effort was made before the committee to cut back the proposed expenses. Evidently my good friend did not succeed too well, because the increase involved in the same 25 subcommittee resolutions over what was authorized last year is \$132,682. I am hopeful that other Senators will join me, my good friend from Nevada, and my good friend from Ohio in curtailing the proposed expenses.

I wish to make one further observation. Let us not forget that the amount of money of which we are now speaking is money which would be spent for the special committees only. Let us not forget that, in addition, every standing committee has available \$142,500 in order to meet the ordinary routine expenditures of those committees. What is proposed is the expenditure of extra or additional money.

As I said a while ago, the amount of this extra money has been increasing year by year. Over the past 15 years, in order that we might conduct certain investigations the amount allotted has increased from about \$140,000 or \$200,000 per year to an amount now in excess of \$4 million.

I point out also that the amount of which I am now speaking would not include the printing of the reports which would be made by the various subcommittees. I was unable to obtain the exact amount of that cost, but it would amount to hundreds of thousands of dollars.

That should be added to what we are spending merely to hold hearings and to pay those who serve the various subcommittees.

I hope that at a future time I shall be able to obtain that information and present it to the Senate. I was unable to get it because I was told that it would require much more than a couple of days or even a week to find out exactly the amount of money that is spent for printing the reports of the various subcommittees.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. As a new member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, I should like to support in general what my friend from Louisiana has said. I wish particularly to commend the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] for the action he took in attempting, at least, to hold down the proposed increase in some of the committee appropriations.

The business of subcommittees, in my opinion, requires the careful scrutiny of the Committee on Rules and Administration. As the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has said, the number of employees on subcommittees presently exceeds the total number of employees for full committees as authorized by the Reorganization Act.

Another aspect of the problem which I hope will be looked into before too long is the overlapping jurisdiction of committees. The subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee which deals with anti-trust investigations and legislation has 44 employees. That subcommittee proposes to make an investigation of the procedures in the Common Market which might affect the trade and commerce of the United States, and particularly that portion of it which comes within the antitrust laws and regulation of monopoly. I have no doubt that within the broad grant of authority to the Judiciary Committee, that subcommittee is entitled to make such an investigation. As a new member of the Committee on Rules and Administration I had not intended to object to that particular request, but I find, on examining the rules, that an investigation of the same subject; namely, the monopoly characteristics of the Common Market, could have been undertaken by the Committee on Finance, the Committee on Foreign Relations, or the Committee on Commerce, just as reasonably as by the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.

I make those few comments now—and I thank my friend for yielding—because they emphasize to me one more area in which senatorial reorganization is badly needed, and that has to do with the entire committee structure, the overlapping jurisdiction of committees, the proliferation of such committees, and the requests for appropriations, which in my opinion are treated on a somewhat helter-skelter basis. I congratulate my friend the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] for raising the question again, as he has done so often in the past, and also to congratulate my

colleague the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] for the interest that he has taken in this subject and for the very keen efforts I know he will make to bring this problem under control.

Mr. President, as I understand, the pending resolution is Senate Resolution 75.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. The amount requested under Senate Resolution 75 is \$175,000. As I understand, from that amount would be deducted the appropriations for 1 month—the month of February—but no effort has been made to reduce the amount from last year's appropriation. The appropriation for last year was \$190,000; the appropriation for this year is \$175,000, which is an appropriation for an 11-month period.

When my good friend the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] finishes his statement, I desire to offer an amendment which would cut back the sum which the resolution would authorize.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, on the subject of money for special committees and staffs, I am generally in accord with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. Over a period of years his effort to cut the amounts which would be authorized by the resolutions has proven very discouraging and quite futile. Even though a cut may be adopted at one point in the procedure, somehow the amount is restored. Another resolution comes before the Committee on Rules and Administration a few months later, and no real saving results.

The money is the result and not the cause. The cause is too many committees. The Reorganization Act that went into effect in 1946 had as one of its basic purposes a reduction in the number of committees. That has been circumvented by giving to subcommittees separate identity, separate staffs, separate amounts of space in the two Senate Office Buildings and in the Capitol.

I wish to point out that this is a problem we cannot solve by a broadside attack. There are some committees which never make requests for money from the contingent fund.

The Senate Committee on Finance had as heavy a load of proposed legislation to consider in the last Congress as had any other committee. It has no subcommittees, as such. It has no special assignment of rooms. It did not request money from the contingent fund.

I would not say that there is a desire in every Senator's breast to be a chairman of a committee. I would not say that it is necessary for a Senator to be a chairman of a committee for the news media of the country to find out he is doing something. I would not say that if someone is only a good Senator, attending committee meetings, asking questions, reading the hearings, that that Senator would be denied his full share of publicity.

I would not say those things—but, Mr. President, I have thought about them.

One of our problems is that too many people have been desirous of heading subcommittees to do something. The result is that we do not have sufficient

space. Mr. President, as of now there are Senators who do not have their own rooms contiguous to each other, we are so crowded for space. These buildings are so filled by staffs of subcommittees it is sometimes difficult to go up and down the corridors.

What has been the result? The result has been that when a committee has a staff of 20, or 25, or 30, the members cannot keep up with what the staff is doing. Pretty soon my friends on the minority come in to say, "If this thing is going to go on, and if there are to be 30 staff members digging up stuff and sending out questionnaires and making studies, we must have 4 or 5 people to keep up with them to find out what is going on, so that they can tell us."

There is no reasonable answer to that argument.

Pretty soon there will be such a volume of committee studies, reports, inquiries, and hearings going on that we shall find it necessary to increase the number of staff members in our own offices. So we shall need more staff to find out what some other staff is doing.

The result will be that the legislative body will cease to be a body of Members deliberating on broad national issues. It is fast becoming a legislative bureaucracy, with the legislative factfinding and determination being done on a staff level.

These are fine individuals. They are worthy individuals. I do not question their competence. I merely point out that there are so many of them we cannot keep track of what they are doing, and not one of them has ever been elected to the position he holds.

Under our system of government the people expect us to legislate, not to be administrative officers who run a huge bureau.

Frequently my constituents get in touch with me and point out that they have received questionnaires on some fancy stationery from a subcommittee or a special committee, or from this or that, asking a lot of things about their business. I pick up my telephone. I try to find out about it. I ask, "Did the committee ever authorize such a study?" I get the answer, "It has not. This has been a staff project."

There is prying into the affairs of our citizens, in regard to private information, trade secrets, and everything else. This place is crawling with individuals imbued with the idea that the Government knows best, that we could regulate everything, that we should get all the information, that we should decide how people shall conduct their businesses, and how they shall spend their old age and their youth and all the years in between.

Again I point out that it is rather unwise and dangerous to make these accusations generally, and I do not do so.

If I may have the attention of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] I believe my memory is correct when I say that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which the Senator is the chairman, has not made a request for additional staff over the years.

Mr. ELLENDER. It has not. The committee does not need more technical

people on the staff. Of course, that means a lot more work for the chairman. Mr. CURTIS. We have a very able chairman.

Mr. ELLENDER. There are many good members on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Since I have been chairman of the committee I believe there has been only one request for additional money. The committee got \$25,000, which was to enable it to investigate the CCC. The remainder of the work has been done by our committee staff.

Mr. CURTIS. The point is that the more staff we employ the less time Members will have for their real duties. Someone must give the administrative time necessary to run this bureaucracy. Someone must read what the staff has prepared.

I pay tribute once more to the distinguished American who heads the Senate Committee on Finance, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. That committee has a tremendous load, covering a wide jurisdiction including controversial matters, yet the committee does not have subcommittees filling up the buildings.

Let us consider that a little. Suppose there were subcommittees of the Senate Committee on Finance; and that a subcommittee on excise taxes was holding hearings in San Francisco, while a subcommittee on corporate taxes was holding hearings in Atlanta, and while some other subcommittee was holding hearings on the taxes on small businessmen in Chicago or some other place. That would keep our economy in such a state of turmoil that no one would have any idea what the taxes really were or what was the tax program.

The point I wish to make, Mr. President, is that the Congress should not be a propaganda agency for more government, for promoting ideas to build up an appetite and a demand in the country for more programs which the people back home have not thought about and do not want. That serves no lawful purpose.

As to the resolution now under consideration, the Committee on Armed Services has a very heavy load. I have no way of knowing about all the intricate problems involved. I believe there is a clash going on between the military and civilian heads in the Pentagon. I think the work of our Armed Services Committee is of supreme importance. After all, if the security of our country does not head the list of things the Congress must consider, I cannot make a list.

So I am not going to single out the resolution which is now pending for any chastisement of a committee, but I wish to say that the Committee on Rules and Administration cannot do anything about the problem until the committees themselves do something. I ask, Senators, "Did you ever see a piece of proposed legislation defeated when no one appeared to oppose it?"

The Committee on Rules and Administration holds a hearing and the chairman and the ranking member and other Senators all appear. It is said, "We

want to do this. We want to save the people. We want to do their thinking for them. We want to pry into their affairs. Give us this."

No one appears in opposition. In addition to those who appear, it is not unusual for a member of the Rules Committee to get a telephone call or some other communication saying, "We are interested in this."

The point I am interested in making is, Are we running a bureaucracy in which Senators are administrative people and legislation is handled by the unelected, and are we confining our efforts to those things which are essential for the security and survival of this country, as well as the payment of debts?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments have not yet been stated.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to propose my amendment to Senate Resolution 75.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to have the clerk state the first amendment.

The legislative clerk read the amendment on page 2, line 22, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March."

The amendment was agreed to. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 12, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$190,000" and insert "\$175,000."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on page 3, line 12, I offer an amendment to that amendment. I propose that the figure "\$175,000" be reduced to "\$150,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 12, strike out "\$175,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$150,000."

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I suggest the vote taken on the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana be recorded by the yeas and nays. I seek support for that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is not a sufficient second.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll to determine if a quorum is present.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be suspended.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment to the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the resolution (S. Res. 75) to which an amendment is proposed to reduce the amount requested, provides funds for

the operations of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services. I ask the indulgence of the Senate. I ask the Chair to maintain order in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). The Senate will be in order.

Mr. STENNIS. This is a matter of some consequence. The resolution provides the operating expense money for the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, which last year had a resolution of like nature for \$190,000. The resolution approved for this year by both the Armed Services Committee and the Committee on Rules and Administration provides for \$175,000 for an 11-month period, which is, in corresponding figures, the same amount as allowed for last year.

Last year the subcommittee failed to use between \$30,000 and \$40,000 of these funds. I will explain briefly the operations of the committee. First I should like to give the membership of the subcommittee. It is composed of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. I have the privilege of being its chairman.

We have a normal staff of six men and four secretaries. That is our staff at the moment. However, we have just employed, on a temporary basis, an additional man who is versed with reference to matters and proposals regarding the ban on nuclear testing. It is a matter that we have gotten into in connection with the military program.

We had last year, at one time, a peak of 19 people. We conducted an investigation with reference to the so-called muzzling of the military. None of that money for last year was used in paying traveling expenses—not a dollar of it—of any member of the subcommittee or any other expense in connection with its operations. There was something like three or four thousand dollars spent in connection with travel for staff members, which is a relatively small amount.

The subcommittee operates for the Armed Services Committee, which, considers a budget of around \$50 billion a year.

Several members of the subcommittee also serve on the Appropriations Committee. We bring to these operations of the subcommittee several matters of some magnitude for primary consideration, and follow up in some cases, matters that really arise in the Appropriations Committee, with reference to military matters. This whole matter is scrutinized by the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I can assure the Senate that it is given individual attention by the chairman, and that the cost of operating any subcommittee with which the Senator from Georgia is connected, whenever he approves it, is very much the rock-bottom figure.

We expect to operate this year just as frugally as we operated last year. I cannot tell, and no one can tell, what we may get into, and how quickly an investigation will have to be made or how necessary it will become to increase the number of our staff. This we do on a reimbursable basis with men from the General Accounting Office, who are trained in this kind of work. There is no favoritism shown with respect to this matter. These are men who are already trained.

Incidentally, there has been only one man who has been added to the staff in the last 2 or 3 years, since I have been chairman, who had not already served on it. These are professional men, who have been there for years. We get them on a temporary basis. We have two men now from the General Accounting Office, and they are doing excellent work. We do not want to be stripped down just because we have been frugal and thrifty. We do not want to strip down to the last bottom dollar and not be given any discretion, or no running room of any kind, and forced to decide what we shall take up and investigate only after we have come here to get more money.

We receive dozens of interesting letters during the course of the consideration of any particular matter in this body, inquiring about the military program. We are able quickly to run down and give the answer immediately. Perhaps a staff member can do it, or a staff member can get the information out quickly.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, as a member of Senate Preparedness Subcommittee I have watched its operations under the able chairmanship of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. To this subcommittee in effect is assigned by the chairman of the full committee, the senior Senator from Georgia, the job of being the watchdog of the full committee.

In my opinion, this subcommittee is one of the most important committees functioning in the Senate today. As the able Senator from Mississippi has pointed out, its prime mission is to watch over military procurement and operations which involve more than \$52 billion a year. At least that is the figure this year. The subcommittee conducts extremely important investigations, some are going on right now. We are conducting an investigation of the facts with respect to Cuba. We also have an investigation going on with respect to the techniques incident to the proposed nuclear test cessation ban. In addition if any Member of the Senate or possibly a constituent of any Member of this body has a request or a complaint, it generally ends up as a problem for this Military Preparedness Subcommittee.

I say in all sincerity to the Senator from Mississippi that I have been in the Senate for some years, and during all that time I have never seen a subcommittee operate with more light and less heat than his subcommittee.

As the chairman pointed out, there has been only one member added to the staff since he took over the chairmanship. In itself this is a great tribute to the wisdom and efficiency and economy-minded aspect of the way he has handled the work of the committee. The amount he now requests is considerably less than one one-thousandth of 1 percent of what the military is asking for. Surely, we can afford to have one subcommittee in the Senate operating with the primary mission of investigating just where the largest portion of the taxpayer's dollar goes, whether these vast sums are really needed, and whether they are being utilized in the best interest of the people.

I hope that my able friend, the Senator from Louisiana, will give consideration to these observations. At the same time, I wish him to know that I join him and other Members of the Senate in recognition of the fact this problem of subcommittees is one that should be given very serious attention by the Senate. Obviously, in some cases it would seem to be getting out of hand. I do feel, however, that if there is any exception which proves the rule, the modest request of the Preparedness Subcommittee is the exception. I hope not one cent considered necessary by one of the ablest Members of this body, the Senator from Mississippi, will be taken from this subcommittee at this time.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Missouri. He lends a great deal of his time and valuable counsel to the operation of this subcommittee. I am delighted publicly to thank him for his assistance.

I should like to make a correction. The total amount allowed last year for the subcommittee really came to \$220,000, because with reference to the so-called muzzling hearing which was conducted, there was an added amount credited over to the subcommittee of \$30,000. We conducted an investigation which cost more than that, but we used the regular staff.

I yield to the Senator from Florida. Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in the main I am in complete accord with the position taken by my distinguished friend, the Senator from Louisiana. I serve as chairman of a subcommittee appointed by him, which has never asked for a dollar, which has never asked for an office, and which thoroughly approves of his principle of handling the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry so as to avoid that course whenever possible.

I serve as chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, and I can make the same comment with reference to that particular subcommittee. But I believe we would be penny wise and pound foolish if, in the pending matter, we cut off \$25,000 of the amount requested for the operations of this subcommittee. In my own State there is more concern at present about one of the subject matters being examined by this able subcommittee than there is about any other one thing in our Government, and that is the question of what is the Soviet buildup, and what is the Cuban buildup of arms in the Republic of Cuba, what is our posture in respect to our

ability effectively and completely to meet that threat in every respect?

I would feel that I was ignoring the hundreds of letters from the good citizens of my State, who have expressed great interest in this particular investigation relative to Cuba, if I assumed to challenge the judgment of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the judgment of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] and his associates, who so ably handle the Committee on Rules and Administration—and I believe this is their first report which is attempted to be corrected on the floor. I would feel that I was, indeed, penny wise and pound foolish if I stood here and opposed such an array of judgment in a situation so important as this, and insisted on cutting \$25,000 from their year's allowance for investigating the many important subjects, which they must investigate, particularly the one subject which I have just mentioned.

I congratulate the able Senator from Mississippi upon his heading of that investigation. As he knows, I have furnished him, from my own files, certain material bearing on that subject, and I shall continue to do so. We are intensely interested in having him press to the very end the question of just what has been built up in Cuba, and in resolving the confusion which exists throughout our country, especially in the State which I represent, in part, and which is so close to the Republic of Cuba.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida. I point out in connection with the Cuban matter—and it is a large matter—that, very fortunately, we have been able to conduct the investigation so far with the staff we already have. But as we go further into the question—and we expect to have the problem under surveillance for some time, because it is not an "overnight" proposition—we want to have a little freedom to be able to employ, on a reimbursable basis, personnel from the General Accounting Office to make quick investigations which may become necessary.

I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I am very happy that the distinguished Senator from Mississippi corrected the RECORD to show that the Committee on Rules and Administration authorized \$220,000 for the subcommittee last year, during the second session of the 87th Congress. During that period, we conducted extensive investigations. Of the total amount authorized, the committee expended, in the 12-month period, approximately \$160,000. Congress last year authorized a 7-percent pay increase and certain additional benefits. So if the committee spent on the same basis this year as it spent last year, taking into account the salary increases, it would spend roughly \$175,000.

I do not attempt to apply the formula I previously stated was applied in the committee—and I generally support the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], for the very reason that this committee requested this year a total of \$45,000 less

than it requested during the second session of the 87th Congress.

I think this shows the high degree of responsibility which the committee through its distinguished chairman, is exercising and the close attention the committee is paying to the expenditure of funds. I, for one, hope that the Senate will not unduly penalize this committee, which, to me, has taken a step in right direction, so far as economy is concerned, and which is performing important work in connection with the preparedness of the United States, an area which involves by far the greatest percentage of expenditure of our defense dollar.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield, that I may ask a question of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Do the Senator's figures show that there are committees which have asked for increases in funds, thus bringing them into a category different from the one occupied by the Committee on Armed Services?

Mr. CANNON. It is true that a number of committees or subcommittees requested increases in the funds for their operations this year. Some of the increases were modest and resulted from the increases in pay for which Congress voted last year. In those instances, I did not attempt to apply my formula. But, as I previously stated, when a subcommittee requested additional money in an amount which was much in excess of the amount necessitated by reason of the pay increases and the additional benefits voted by Congress, I attempted to apply a reduction of 10 percent to the total amount requested, if it did not bring the amount below the amount requested last year, plus the additional funds necessitated by the pay increase.

As I stated heretofore, this subcommittee requested \$45,000 less for this year than the Senate authorized during the 2d session of the 87th Congress.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nevada for his explanation. That \$45,000 would be approximately a 22½ percent reduction from the amount provided last year.

I should like to say one further word for the benefit of Senators who have recently entered the Chamber. I deeply appreciate the helpfulness of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], not only on this subject, but on others, as well. He does splendid work for the country and for the Senate. However, I feel that in this instance he did not, perhaps, have an opportunity to give sufficient time to follow through with these figures and see what a large percentage reduction this committee has already taken compared with the amount which it actually spent last year.

It so happens that Senators who are members of this subcommittee from the other side of the aisle are not in the Chamber at the moment. However, I can assure the Senate that the resolution has the support of the Republican members

of the subcommittee. I wish that at least one of them were here now.

I trust that the Senate will sustain the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I wish to say that I recognize the position of our good friend, the Senator from Mississippi, in connection with the pending proposal; but I join the Senator from Louisiana in urging adoption of this amendment.

At this time much is being said about the necessity to cut the Federal budget. Although I recognize that this item is a very small one in comparison with the overall \$98 billion budget, nevertheless we must begin somewhere; and if we in Congress are not willing to start tightening the purse strings and controlling our own expenditures in the legislative branch we shall not be very effective in the future in reducing the expenditures of the executive branch. The only way we shall trim the budget is by recognizing that there are no sacred items in it, either as it affects the Members of Congress, our own committees, or any of the agencies in the executive branch.

I shall support the Ellender amendment to cut this appropriation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to the committee amendment on page 3, line 12.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, of course, I have complete confidence in my good friend, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. I know that, as chairman of the subcommittee, he will continue to conduct hearings of that subcommittee as he has in the past. He has indicated that the committee will be so conducted under his able leadership.

Although last year \$220,000 was appropriated to operate the subcommittee, only \$145,680 of that amount was used. My amendment does not provide for only the \$145,000 that the subcommittee used last year for the 12 months, but \$150,000 for 11 months.

As was stated a while ago, if any subcommittee becomes in dire need of additional funds, I would be the last to deny the granting of such funds. Since the subcommittee spent but \$145,000 in 12 months last year, it strikes me that for 11 months the committee could certainly do a good job with the \$150,000 which would be provided under my amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. In order that the RECORD may be straight, I direct the attention of the Senator to the fact that the report of expenditures for last year submitted by the Preparedness Subcommittee covers only an 11-month period—to the end of December—so that his figure of \$145,680.33 is only for 11 months and not for 12 months. If the Senator would add a one-twelfth pro rata to that amount, it would come roughly, in round figures, to \$160,000. That amount would be exclusive of the 7-percent increase, plus the payments to agencies, which was approved by the Congress.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I did not take that into consideration. I was

informed that the amount was for the full 12 months. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to modify my amendment by changing the figure of \$150,000 to \$162,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to have the request restated.

Mr. ELLENDER. The amendment would provide \$162,000 for a period of 11 months in contrast to \$160,000 for 11 months last year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, as I understand, the proposal would modify the \$25,000 reduction that the Senator from Louisiana had proposed earlier.

That would make a great deal of difference on this particular vote. The subcommittee is a very important one. I had not intended to get involved in this particular debate, but the proposed reduction of \$12,500 might do about as much damage to the work of the committee as would a reduction of \$25,000.

I should like to have the chairman of the subcommittee, who has done such an admirable job, and one to whom we owe a great debt for his faithful and loyal service, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] make his own decision on the matter. It seems to me that if we are going to tamper with the limited amount of money to be authorized for a subcommittee considering a \$50 billion defense budget, we might get ourselves into serious trouble. It is my view that the subcommittee is not overstuffed or overfinanced. In fact, I think taxpayers might well ask the question, "Why is the Congress of the United States not taking a greater interest in a budget item of \$50 billion for defense?" I do not believe that the Pentagon is that good. They can make mistakes of more than \$175,000 by dropping a decimal point—and they have made such mistakes.

I think the Senator from Mississippi should be very careful.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I will answer his question.

The figure in the resolution, as approved by the committee, is already at the rock bottom of the amount which will be actually needed under all foreseeable circumstances. My judgment is that we shall have to ask for additional sums to take care of matters which are partly contemplated now.

As I pointed out to the Senate heretofore, we do not carry a large staff. We have access to the General Accounting Office, which has paid investigators we can obtain on a reimbursable basis. At present, as an illustration, we are confronted with the Cuban problem, which could take a new turn at any time. Certainly I would not wish to see this trimmed down to the bare bones in the midst of that, by shaving the amount a few thousand dollars.

We stand on the minimum figure, which has been presented, and I hope

that the Senate will sustain our recommendation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it not a fact that the amount the Senator is asking is the same as the amount asked last year, insofar as the particular work of the committee is concerned?

Mr. STENNIS. We had an additional sum last year.

Mr. ELLENDER. But that was for another subject.

Mr. STENNIS. No. It was for the same committee and the same staff, except for one additional member.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I remember the situation, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] desired an investigation. That is why the \$30,000 was added.

Mr. STENNIS. The Preparedness Subcommittee, plus the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] as an additional member, conducted that investigation, for which the \$30,000 was allowed, but that did not pay for all of it. We were eligible to spend our own money for it, so we had that as an added expense.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was informed that, of the \$30,000 especially appropriated for the investigation, some \$15,000 or \$16,000 was spent.

As I said a while ago, the amount which the Senator would receive under the proposed appropriation would give him \$162,000 for 11 months, while the expenditures for the 12 months of last year were approximately \$160,000, using round figures.

I believe the Senator would have ample funds.

As I said a while ago, if perchance there should be a need for more, I am sure the Senate would grant it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I do not see how we could be expected to plan for our program, if we are circumscribed by the latitude of a few thousand dollars in relation to military defense. I hope the Senate will not trim the amount.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. CURTIS. I did not rise for the purpose of making objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a unanimous consent request pending.

Mr. CURTIS. I do not know what the unanimous-consent request involves, but reserving the right to object, Mr. President, I retreat from nothing that I said about the number of subcommittees and the abuses which are arising and the injury being done to the Senate of the United States.

However, I shall not support the amendment to cut. I said in my statement a few minutes ago that this was not a problem which could be resolved by a broadside.

I also said, with reference to the pending resolution, that if anything had a prior claim on us it was the defense and security of this Republic. Not only is that a matter of priority, but also it is the opinion of the junior Senator from Nebraska that not all the facts are being told or have been told to the American people or to the Congress about Cuba and Castro and a great many other vital points in regard to the security and defense of this country.

I am also of the opinion that civilian influences in the Pentagon are thwarting the efforts of dedicated men who are in a position to guide the defense of this country.

I think this is one case in which the Senate is justified in granting the amount requested. I also think we have a responsibility to support this committee.

I do not do this easily, Mr. President. It is not easy for me to vote against an amendment to cut anything. I think this resolution involves the security of our country, and I shall oppose the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the Presiding Officer state, for the information of the Senate, what is the unanimous-consent request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has made a unanimous-consent request that he be permitted to modify the amendment to provide that the figure of \$150,000, as it appears on page 3, line 12, be changed to \$162,000.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I gather that the net effect of the modification, if consent is granted, would be that the amendment would propose to cut the amount allowed to the committee by \$12,500.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By \$13,000.

Mr. DIRKSEN. By \$13,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to make an inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. STENNIS. The amendment would then still be pending, would it not, in a different form?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, which heard the testimony from representatives of the Committee on Armed Services, including the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], as was pointed out awhile ago by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], I wish to say that we heard every request which

came before us for money, which included the entire list of resolutions to come before the Senate this afternoon, including the pending resolution.

The chairman of each one of the committees came before us, along with the ranking member on the minority side, and in addition there was the endorsement from the main committee. The Armed Services Committee unanimously endorsed the request.

The Committee on Rules and Administration considered what the chairmen of the committees said they needed. We were not in a position to say, "You do not need this secretary; you do not need that secretary; you do not need something else."

Information was given to us, which we took at face value. The amounts in five or six of the resolutions were reduced.

In each case when there was additional money asked, compared to last year, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], made his motion, which was carried.

It is the position of the chairman of the committee that the resolutions ought to be agreed to in exactly the amounts provided by the committee, for the simple reason that the committee heard every single request and had information with respect to each request. We had no information stating that the amounts should be either less or more.

I am as much in favor of economy as any other Senator. I should like to see that obtained.

As my able colleague from Nebraska said a while ago, if anything is to be done about reducing the costs for the subcommittees, it will have to be done by the chairmen of the committees or by the committees themselves. The Committee on Rules and Administration cannot and should not take it upon itself to reduce what is asked by a committee, when information is shown that that is what is needed.

I have no way of knowing what the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] needs with respect to this particular committee, involved in the resolution the Senate is now debating. I took the information furnished by them at face value. I believe they need every bit of the money for which they have asked. I expect to support that, and I expect to support the other resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection to the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Louisiana; so, without objection, the request is granted.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask for recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, first let me make inquiry: Have the yeas and nays been ordered on the pending amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have been.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So the Senate is confronted with a yea-and-nay vote on a \$13,000 cut?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I trust the yeas and nays may be withdrawn on this amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I asked the distinguished Senator to yield further in order to have the yea-and-nay vote withdrawn, and I do so on the basis of the presentation that has been made and the fiscal facts applicable to this committee. I do so also on the basis of my faith that the men who are heading this committee are attempting to exercise economy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to having the order for the yea-and-nay order withdrawn? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I note that with the greatest impunity we will spend \$10 million for an airplane and think nothing of it. Yet we do hassle a little about an item of \$175,000 which embraces every activity prescribed in the rule under which the Armed Services Committee has been created. It embraces everything in the common defense. It embraces the Army and the Navy. It now embraces matters that stem from the Cuban situation. It embraces our security. And what a minimum amount it is when all things are said and done.

I think we have that much money to spend for this purpose, when we look over some of the other committees—and those of which I am a member, as a matter of fact—for which larger amounts have been authorized. This is an important field, with the world so full of fever. In fact, if I were doing anything, I think I would rather increase the moneys involved, rather than reduce them.

I say one other thing: Every Member of the Senate knows what a frugal and high-spirited public servant JOHN STENNIS, of Mississippi, is. He husbands the funds. He makes every dollar do double duty. I think the country can be assured that, for the money which is involved here, it will result in a good survey and a good investigation that will be at once instructive and objective.

I trust the amount reported by the committee will be agreed to.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad the request for the yeas and nays has been withdrawn. I hope the next step will be the withdrawal of any proposed cut in the amount asked for by the subcommittee. I think nobody in this Chamber has stood more than I do for cutting the budget in the past, and I will in the future, but there is such a thing as being pennywise and pound foolish.

I happen to be a member of this subcommittee. I have served on many subcommittees, but I have never served on one that has had a more efficient chairman or one that is doing more admirable service for our country. At the present time we are delving into the whole question of Cuba. We are going into the question of the intelligence services. We are concerned with proposals for dis-

armament and activities in that direction. We confer constantly with leaders of the military services.

Mr. President, I know every subcommittee that does investigating work thinks its work is the most valuable to the Senate, but I can think of no subcommittee in this body that is performing a more needed and valuable task than this subcommittee.

Instead of seeking to cut the amount requested, I would vote for an increase. I can assure the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that there is no subcommittee in this body whose funds are watched more carefully. It is staffed very economically. The staff works admirably and the committee works efficiently under the capable leadership of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

I hope the Senator from Louisiana, whose frugality I admire, will direct his frugal gun at some other measure that will accomplish some good, and not do harm to this country by this cut.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask for a vote, and I yield the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arizona will stay around, he is going to hear the same argument made by the chairman of every subcommittee.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I have heard them before. I have heard them from the Senator's own lips. I think I have voted with the Senator on 90 percent of his proposals to cut items out of the budget, but this is one that it is not wise to cut.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield the floor and ask for a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], as modified, to the committee amendment on page 3, line 12.

The amendment, as modified, to the amendment, was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on agreeing to its resolution, as amended.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Rules and Administration, to whom was referred the resolution (S. Res. 75) authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to investigate certain matters relating to the national defense, and providing additional funds therefor, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without additional amendments, and recommend that the resolution, as amended, be agreed to by the Senate.

Senate Resolution 75, as amended, would authorize the expenditure of \$175,000 by the Committee on Armed Services, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters within its jurisdiction as specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate. The funds would be utilized principally by the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee for the purposes of overseeing the common defense and surveying the policies of the Department of Defense insofar as they affect the security of the Nation.

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorization are shown through December 31, 1962.

Committee and purpose	87th Cong.			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Armed Services: Preparedness.....	\$440,000.00	\$323,123.49		
	190,000	177,443.16	Jan. 31, 1961	S. Res. 43.
	30,000		Sept. 23, 1961	S. Res. 215.
	220,000		Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 270.

The purposes of the resolution are more fully detailed in a letter to Senator B. EVERETT JORDAN, chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, from Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, which letter (with accompanying budget) is as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
February 25, 1963.

HON. B. EVERETT JORDAN,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It will be appreciated if the Committee on Rules and Administration will give prompt consideration to approval of Senate Resolution 75, which has been approved unanimously by the Senate Committee on Armed Services. This resolution provides spending authority to the committee or any authorized subcommittee, during the 11-month period March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, for the examination, in-

vestigation, and study of matters within the jurisdiction of the committee, as specified in rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate. Resolutions similar to this have been approved by the Senate during each session of the last six Congresses, except that they have usually been submitted and approved on an annual basis.

The total authorization requested by the committee under this resolution is \$175,000, which is \$45,000 less than the amount approved on an annual basis for each of the last 2 years. Copies of the proposed budget are being submitted along with copies of the resolution. These funds will be used for the continued operation of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, which, as you know, is an investigative arm of the Committee on Armed Service. The functions of the subcommittee include the responsibility of maintaining surveillance over policies, operations, and expenditures relating to the National Defense Establishment.

The committee feels that the Preparedness Investigation Subcommittee made significant and valuable contributions last year. The subcommittee is now engaged in a number of extensive studies and reviews of major aspects of our defense program. I feel that

these and other matters programed for investigation by the subcommittee more than justify its continued existence.

Sincerely,

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman.

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative:					
Chief counsel.....	1	\$8,000	\$17,230.10	\$1,435.84	\$15,794.24
Professional staff members.....	4	6,000	13,469.14	1,122.42	49,386.48
Professional staff member.....	1	5,580	12,679.93	1,056.61	11,622.71
Do.....	1	5,100	11,757.41	979.78	10,777.58
Administrative and clerical:					
Clerical assistant.....	1	2,640	6,475.75	539.64	5,936.04
Do.....	1	2,400	5,955.67	496.30	5,459.30
Clerical assistants.....	2	2,340	5,825.64	485.47	10,680.34
Do.....	2	2,280	5,695.63	474.63	10,441.86
Total.....					120,098.55
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960).....					966.68
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6 1/2 percent of total salaries paid).....					7,806.41
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per \$1,000 coverage).....					403.92
Reimbursable payments to agencies.....					9,908.75
Travel (inclusive of field investigations).....					9,450.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees).....					3,744.60
Witness fees, expenses.....					2,224.30
Stationery, office supplies.....					707.84
Communications (telephone, telegraph).....					338.95
Newspapers, magazines, documents.....					190.00
Contingent fund.....					7,400.00
Consultants and staff advisers.....					11,800.00
Total.....					54,901.45
Grand total.....					175,000.00

Funds requested, Senate Resolution 75, \$175,000.

Funds approved by Committee on Rules and Administration, \$175,000.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO MAKE A STUDY OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL STOCKPILING

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 18, Senate Resolution 79.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 79) to authorize a study by the Committee on Armed Services on strategic and critical stockpiling, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an additional amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committees on Armed Services and Rules and Administration, as follows:

The amendment of the Committee on Armed Services was on page 2, line 4, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March".

The amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration was on page 2, line 14, after the word "exceed", to

strike out "\$6,500" and insert "\$10,000"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services, or its Subcommittee on the National Stockpile and Naval Petroleum Reserves, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the acquisition, storage, and disposal of strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense.

Sec. 2. For the purpose of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to May 1, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$10,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I understand, this sum of money is to close out the work of this committee.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I shall be happy to answer in the absence of the chairman. I am a member of the committee. The money is to close out the work of the committee. The hearings have been completed. Last year

the committee had in the neighborhood of \$115,000 authorized. Our request here is for \$10,000 to complete the report. This will cover the majority representation and the minority representation for the conclusion of the report only. The business of the committee, except for finalizing the report, has been concluded.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator tell me why the amount of the resolution has been changed from \$6,500 to \$10,000?

Mr. CANNON. Yes. The original request was for \$6,500 to cover the majority representation, and there was unintentionally omitted provision for the minority representation which is needed in connection with finalizing the report. That was the reason for the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO MAKE CERTAIN INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 19, Senate Resolution 14.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BREWSTER in the chair). The resolution will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 14) authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to make certain investigations, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with amendments, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration without additional amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment, on page 2, line 12, after the word "from", to strike out "February 1" and insert "March 1".

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to ascertain how the amount asked for last year contrasts to the request for this year. Has any effort been made to reduce the amount?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the amount authorized last year was \$80,000. This year it is \$91,000. The increase is explained in this way: We allowed 7 percent to take care of the pay increase that was voted by the Congress. Then we allowed an increase of \$5,000 to take care of an unusual situation. We had been using a man who was retired as editorial and printing on the staff; therefore, we had to pay only a part of his salary. At the end of last year he finally retired and now we must pay the full salary for his replacement. That accounts for the \$5,000 increase.

Mr. ELLENDER. The same number of employees is involved?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The same number of employees exactly. We are having to pay about \$5,000 more to one of them by reason of the change I just explained.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the Committee is providing for that increase in pay?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Is this request for a staff engaged in all phases and jurisdictions of the Committee on Banking and Currency?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct. It reinforces the general staff of the committee.

Mr. CURTIS. This does not deal with housing.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; it covers all the work of the committee except housing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 2, after the word "exceed," it is proposed to strike out "\$86,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$83,700."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement in support of Senate Resolution 14.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SPARKMAN

Senate Resolution 14 would authorize the Banking and Currency Committee to spend up to \$83,700 to investigate a number of subjects within the jurisdiction of the committee—everything but public and private housing which is covered by Senate Resolution 15—during the 11 months from March 11, 1963 to January 31, 1964.

The resolution covers the same number of employees as did Senate Resolution 233 in the last session of Congress. The budget form sets forth the expenditures for 12 months at \$91,000. This is an increase from the \$80,000 covered by Senate Resolution 233 for two reasons: first, an increase of \$6,000, or approximately 7 percent, to cover last year's pay raise; and second, an increase of \$5,000 by reason of the fact that the former editorial clerk had been receiving a substantial part of his salary in the form of retirement income while the committee's new editorial clerk will receive his full salary from the committee in accordance with the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee. This \$91,000 figure was reduced by one-twelfth of the salaries and related expenses by reason of the adoption of Senate Resolution 88 covering salaries for February 1963.

During the present session of Congress the committee expects to devote considerable attention to problems in the field of securities and financial institutions. As you may know, the Securities and Exchange Commission is filing a report in April showing the result of a 2-year study of the securities business. In addition, as the result of the studies of financial institutions by the Commission on Money and Credit and a number of governmental and trade associations, a great many proposals have been made to revise the laws relating to financial institutions of all sorts. It is impossible to

tell at the present time how much work may result from these or other aspects of the committee's jurisdiction. Our experience has been, however, that every year some substantial new matter arises.

Accordingly, the Banking and Currency Committee, without objection, approved Senate Resolution 14. The Committee on Rules and Administration has also approved this resolution, and I, therefore, ask that it be adopted by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended. The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

- (1) banking and currency generally;
- (2) financial aid to commerce and industry;
- (3) deposit insurance;
- (4) the Federal Reserve System, including monetary and credit policies;
- (5) economic stabilization, production and mobilization;
- (6) valuation and revaluation of the dollar;
- (7) prices of commodities, rents, and services;
- (8) securities and exchange regulation;
- (9) credit problems of small business; and
- (10) international finance through agencies within the legislative jurisdiction of the committee.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration,

to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$83,700, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 20), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Rules and Administration, to whom was referred the resolution (S. Res. 14) authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to make a complete study of certain matters within its jurisdiction, and providing additional funds therefor, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without additional amendments and recommend that the resolution as amended be agreed to by the Senate.

Senate Resolution 14 as amended would authorize the expenditure of not to exceed \$83,700 by the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

- (1) Banking and currency generally;
- (2) Financial aid to commerce and industry;
- (3) Deposit insurance;
- (4) The Federal Reserve System, including monetary and credit policies;
- (5) Economic stabilization, production, and mobilization;
- (6) Valuation and revaluation of the dollar;
- (7) Prices of commodities, rents, and services;
- (8) Securities and exchange regulations;
- (9) Credit problems of small business; and
- (10) International finance through agencies within the legislative jurisdiction of the committee.

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorization are shown through December 31, 1962:

Committee and purpose	87th Cong.			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Banking and Currency: General.....	\$160,000.00	\$147,322.55	-----	-----
	80,000.00	76,647.70	Feb. 13, 1961	S. Res. 44.
	80,000.00	70,674.85	Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 233.

Additional information relative to the purposes of Senate Resolution 14 is contained in the report of the Committee on Banking and Currency (S. Rept. 10, 88th Cong. 1st sess.) and in a letter to Senator B. EVERETT JORDAN, chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, from Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which letter (with accompanying budget) is as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
February 28, 1963.
HON. B. EVERETT JORDAN,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Banking and Currency Committee has agreed to report

Senate Resolution 14, introduced on January 14, 1963, by myself and Senator BENNETT.

In view of the passage of Senate Resolution 88 on February 19 this resolution has been amended to cover the 11 months from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964. The enclosed budget form shows the expenses for the full year originally contemplated at \$91,000, but the amount shown in the resolution has been reduced from this figure to \$83,700 to eliminate one-twelfth of the salaries and related contributions shown in the budget.

Senate Resolution 14 would authorize this committee or any of its duly authorized subcommittees to employ on a temporary basis, such technical, clerical, and other

assistance as may be necessary to investigate and make studies of a number of matters within the jurisdiction of the committee.

For a number of years resolutions similar to this have been approved for this committee on an annual basis. We have introduced and reported this resolution because of our need to retain additional personnel as we have done for the past several years to supplement the permanent staff and to cover other expenses incident to our committee responsibilities.

The workload of the committee in dealing with legislative matters which recur year after year is extremely heavy. Experience has shown that we must anticipate during each session some special study or legislation making it necessary to employ additional staff and to incur additional expenses.

It is difficult at this time to predict with any degree of precision the legislative and investigative activities which the committee will undertake this year. However, there are areas within our jurisdiction which can be expected to call for greater attention than usual.

For example, the committee expects to receive by April 3 the report of the Securities and Exchange Commission on the year-long study of the securities business undertaken by it under Public Law 87-196. This report can be expected to cover such matters as securities exchanges, over-the-counter markets and unlisted securities, and many other aspects of the securities business.

The committee also expects to receive during the coming year many legislative and administrative proposals relating to financial institutions as a result of the report of the Commission on Money and Credit and the many supplementary governmental and industry recommendations following the Commission's report.

In addition to its legislative responsibilities, the committee can expect, in the course of the coming session, to receive requests from Senators, either formally or informally, to make special studies of various problems in the economic field. While these studies may never reach the stage of formal hearings or investigations, they do require a great deal of staff work. Increased attention which problems of monetary policy are receiving creates an additional burden on the staff.

Of the \$80,000 authorized for the last 12-month period under Senate Resolution 233, expenditures through January 31, 1963, amounted to \$76,147.35, leaving a balance of \$3,852.65. This, of course, does not include the amount spent in February under Senate Resolution 88 which authorized an additional \$2,500 in order to cover salaries in February.

I enclose a copy of Senate Resolution 14. It is in the usual form prescribed by the sample resolutions, except that section 3, requiring that findings and recommendations be reported by the expiration of the resolution, is omitted.

I enclose the completed standardized budget form showing expenses for a 12-month period totaling \$91,000. The budget calls for no additional staff personnel, and the amounts for committee expenses other than salaries have been left unchanged from last year. The amount shown in the budget form has been increased from the \$80,000 authorized last year to \$91,000 for two reasons: (1) the pay increase of 7 percent effective in 1962 increased the salaries of continuing personnel, and (2) the committee's editorial clerk, who had received a partial salary from the committee in addition to a civil service annuity, retired and is being replaced by an editorial clerk, all of whose salary will be paid by the committee, in accordance with the recommendation of the Appropriations Committee (S. Rept. 1835, 85th Cong., 2d sess., p. 5).

By reason of the adoption of Senate Resolution 88 and the consequent reduction of the period covered by Senate Resolution 14

from 12 months to 11 months, approximately one-twelfth of the salaries and related contributions shown in the budget form (\$87,228.86), or \$7,300, has been subtracted from the total amount shown in the budget form,

and the resolution has been amended to provide funds in the amount of \$83,700.

Sincerely yours,

A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman.

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative:					
Assistant counsel.....	1	\$5,460	\$12,453.66	\$1,037.80	\$12,453.66
Do.....	1	4,980	11,509.18	959.09	11,509.18
Editorial and research:					
Research director (economist).....	1	8,460	18,095.12	1,507.93	18,095.12
Staff member.....	1	8,000	17,230.10	1,435.84	17,230.10
Do.....	1	4,740	11,012.73	917.73	11,012.73
Administrative and clerical: Assistant clerk (record).....	1	4,680	10,888.64	907.38	10,888.64
Total.....					81,189.43
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960).....					486.72
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid).....					5,277.31
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per \$1,000 coverage).....					275.40
Travel (inclusive of field investigations).....					1,700.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees).....					1,100.00
Witness fees, expenses.....					300.00
Stationery, office supplies.....					125.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph).....					200.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents.....					175.00
Contingent fund.....					171.14
Total.....					9,810.57
Grand total.....					91,000.00

Funds requested, Senate Resolution 14, \$91,000.

Funds reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency for an 11-month period, and approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration, \$83,700.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. CLYDE DOYLE, late a Representative from the State of California, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO INVESTIGATE MATTERS PERTAINING TO PUBLIC AND PRIVATE HOUSING

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 20, Senate Resolution 15.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 15) authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate matters pertaining to public and private housing, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with amendments, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without additional amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, on page 2, line 1, to strike out "February 1, 1963," and insert "March 1, 1963," and on line 20 to strike out "\$115,000," and insert "\$106,000," so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to public and private housing.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$106,000, shall be paid from the contingent

fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first amendment of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 1, after the word "from", it is proposed to strike out "February 1, 1963" and to insert in lieu thereof "March 1, 1963."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 20, after the word "exceed", it is proposed to strike out "\$115,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$106,000".

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment, on page 2, line 20, to strike out the figure "\$106,000" and to insert in lieu thereof the figure "\$95,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana to the committee amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I shall support the amendment. I shall vote against the resolution. This is one thing we can do without. Housing is a private matter under our economic system. Investigations as to where people live have continued for a long time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should like to be heard on this question. The amount represents exactly what we had last year, plus 7 percent, to take care of increases in salary, minus one month's pay, which was carried over under the special resolution adopted a short time ago. There is no other increase whatever. We have the same number of employees. We have seven employees. In proportion to the amount of work done and the responsibility of the subcommittee, this is one of the most modest and moderate and frugal subcommittees of Congress.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I was startled a moment ago when the Senator from Nebraska said that housing was a private matter. I wonder whether my friend from Alabama remembers what percentage of the housing built in this country last year required some form of government aid through VA or FHA, or was built as the result of some government aid.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I would say that it comes to about 50 percent.

Mr. CLARK. About half of all the housing built in this country requires some kind of government aid. Is that correct?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. I am a member of the subcommittee headed by the Senator from Alabama. I can testify from personal experience that every nickel of the amount requested is required.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Government's commitments and tangible liabilities with respect to housing now approximate \$100 billion.

This is not primarily an investigating subcommittee, as such, although it is charged with the responsibility of keeping an eye on the massive program underway. Our subcommittee does this with continuous studies. In addition, we hold hearings and handle the many pieces of legislation that are reported. We report bills to the full Committee on Banking and Currency. This appropriation is a very low premium to pay on the amount of insurance resulting from having this watchdog subcommittee to look at the housing programs. I do not believe it would be in the national interest to cut it by 10 percent. I am opposed to the amendment, and I hope it will be defeated.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, when I first came to the Senate it was my privilege to do a great deal of work on committees with respect to housing. I took a great deal of interest in the subject. This subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency has been in existence for many years. I cannot for the life of me see what can be accomplished by continually looking into housing and investigating housing. Certainly the subcommittee cannot go any further than it has in the past in looking into housing design. I understand a great deal of that was done in the past.

However, the subcommittee always finds something to do. I believe that here is an opportunity to reduce the amount by 10 percent, the amount that my friend from Nevada said he had tried to obtain in the full committee by way of a cut. The effect of my amendment is simply to cut the amount back by 10 percent. I hope that the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask a question of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield the floor.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Did the Senator from Nevada attempt to get this request reduced by 10 percent in committee?

Mr. CANNON. The Senator from Nevada did not attempt it in this particular instance, as was previously stated. The application of my formula was only against increases which involve more than a 7 percent increase over last year to cover salaries plus commitments to agencies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana to the committee amendment on page 2, line 20.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays. I agree with the Senator from Louisiana that we must start cutting these expenditures. This is a very nominal amount which we are asking to cut.

Otherwise we will be adopting a formula that will approve a 7 to 10 percent increase for the congressional branch; then we would have no argument against granting similar increases to the executive agencies. That would mean an increase of from \$7 to \$9 billion in total expenditures.

If we are going to cut expenses, we should start at home. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The chief clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I renew my request for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What is the pending amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to the committee amendment to section 4, on page 2, of Senate Resolution 15, to reduce the amount from \$106,000 to \$95,000.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll, to ascertain the presence of a quorum.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. What was the ruling of the Chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent the order for the quorum call has been rescinded.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, before the Senate votes on the amendment, I should like to make one more statement. As chairman of the committee, I said previously that we heard the chairman of every subcommittee, and representatives of the majority and the minority. We considered every request with the greatest of care. Our committee reported favorably every resolution. I hope the amendment will be rejected. Such a vote would uphold the committee in reporting the resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I point out to my good friend, the Senator from North Carolina, that my amendment would provide more money than the committee spent last year.

For a period of 12 months last year the committee spent \$92,000. If the resolution as amended is agreed to, the expenditure of \$95,000 for 11 months will be authorized. Ample funds will be available. I hope the amendment is adopted.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, we could argue the question for a long time, but I point out that no committee operates within as close a limitation as does the committee for which an appropriation is now being considered. We cannot predict exactly the amount which the subcommittee would require in any particular year. There is a great deal of variation in our work. For example, the subcommittee is now studying the FHA foreclosure program. There have been complaints about certain programs going bad. We have sent investigators to Houston, Fort Worth, Los Angeles, and other areas. Last year we had none of that to do.

Mr. President, we ask for the same amount of money that we had available last year, plus 7 percent, minus a pro rata share for one month, which was provided in the resolution agreed to in February. That is exactly the amount of money the committee allowed us. I challenge anyone to show that any committee has operated more carefully and more frugally than has this subcommittee. I do not believe that it is in our national interest for us to agree to the amendment. I hope that it will be rejected.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana to the committee amendment on page 2, line 20. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the

Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ABBOTT], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 61, as follows:

[No. 26 Leg.]

YEAS—18

Aiken	Ellender	Mechem
Boggs	Hickenlooper	Miller
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Prouty
Carlson	Hruska	Simpson
Cotton	Kuchel	Thurmond
Curtis	Lausche	Williams, Del.

NAYS—61

Anderson	Gruening	Morse
Bartlett	Hayden	Moss
Bayh	Hill	Muskie
Beall	Humphrey	Nelson
Bennett	Inouye	Pearson
Bible	Jackson	Pell
Brewster	Javits	Proxmire
Burdick	Johnston	Randolph
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Robertson
Cannon	Jordan, Idaho	Scott
Case	Keating	Smathers
Church	Long, Mo.	Smith
Clark	Long, La.	Sparkman
Cooper	Mansfield	Stennis
Dodd	McCarthy	Symington
Douglas	McGee	Tower
Eastland	McGovern	Williams, N.J.
Engle	McIntyre	Young, N. Dak.
Fong	McNamara	Young, Ohio
Fulbright	Metcalf	
Gore	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—21

Allott	Hartke	Neuberger
Dirksen	Kefauver	Pastore
Dominick	Kennedy	Ribicoff
Edmondson	Magnuson	Russell
Ervin	McClellan	Saltonstall
Goldwater	Morton	Talmadge
Hart	Mundt	Yarborough

So Mr. ELLENDER's amendment to the committee amendment to section 4, or page 2 of Senate Resolution 15, was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 15), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to public and private housing.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$106,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Rules and Administration, to whom was referred the resolution (S. Res. 15) authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate matters pertaining to public and private housing, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without additional amendments and recommend that the resolution as amended be agreed to by the Senate.

Senate Resolution 15 as amended would authorize the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to public and private housing.

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorization are shown through December 31, 1962.

Committee and purpose	87th Congress			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Banking and Currency: Housing	\$214,000	\$174,629.31		
	107,000	89,944.10	Feb. 13, 1961	S. Res. 25.
	107,000	84,685.21	Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 244.

USE OF FORCE BY METROPOLITAN POLICE IN APPREHENSION OF A FELON

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I rise to commend the new evidence in the Metropolitan Police of a willingness to enforce a law that has long been on our statute books, namely, the duty of a police officer to use force, if necessary, in the apprehension of a known felon. Robbery, by force, has always been a felony in all of the States and also in the District of Columbia, but unfortunately in recent years it has become more prevalent in the District of Columbia than in any other city in the United States.

There have been two major contributing factors to that unenviable crime record for our National Capital: First, a substantial percentage of robbers in the District are not apprehended; and second, District courts have been notoriously lenient in the punishments they have meted out to convicted felons. As I have indicated, it is the duty of every police officer to shoot, if necessary, to apprehend a known felon who has refused to obey a command to halt. Why is it that so many robbers in the District have refused to halt when commanded by a police officer to do so? The answer is simply this: They are under the impression that if any policeman in the District shoots a Negro, the Washington Post will criticize the policeman, if it does not actually ask for his dismissal from the police force.

The editorial in the Washington Post of today entitled, "Sudden Death," is a typical example of that attitude. A Negro with a long criminal record robbed, by force, in broad daylight, a young pregnant woman.

While the editorial's heart was bleeding for the felon who had committed robbery by force, and was shot by an officer because he refused to halt when the officer sought to apprehend him, not one salty tear was shed for the young woman who might have been caused a miscarriage because of her horrible experience. But, for the Negro criminal, the Washington Post editor said he "was a victim not alone of police efficiency but of community neglect." The police efficiency of course related to the way police in all of our cities except the District of Columbia have been enforcing the law with respect to the arrest of known felons.

Of course, all honorable men regret the needless waste of human possibilities which this incident reflects and the tragedy of such a violent death. And all honorable men will, of course, regret the shock and peril to the victim of the robbery.

The criminal's record seems to make it clear that he did not take advantage of whatever talent, whatever ability, he may have had. The Post blames the criminal's failure to make anything useful of himself on "community neglect" and the fact that he "was a product of this city's slums." I do not think this conclusion is either necessary or correct.

I have spent much time in the District during the past 30 years and have been familiar with District conditions ever since I served at Fort Myer in World War I. The slums in the District 30 years ago were far worse than any we have had since the lavish expenditure on public housing and urban renewal, totaling about \$32 million. Thirty years ago, the crime rate in the District was below the national average; now it is about the highest. Thirty years ago, when schools were segregated and only about 20 percent of the pupils were nonwhite, the District schools were rated as among the best in the Nation. Now, integrated, and about 80 percent nonwhite, the District schools are rated about the poorest in the Nation. In the rate of illegitimate births, of syphilis, and in many other undesirable trends, the District can put in a claim for rating above the national average.

So, Mr. President, regardless of the bleeding heart of the Post editor for District felons who may get killed resisting arrest, I give thanks that the Metropolitan Police have at long last acted like the police in all other big cities in the apprehension of felons who attempt to escape arrest.

AUTHORITY FOR THE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE TO MAKE CERTAIN STUDIES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, so that the Senate may proceed with a little dispatch, I announce that it is my understanding that on the next resolution, which was reported only today, and which is the resolution relating to the Commerce Committee, Senate Resolution 29, there may be a request for a yea-and-nay vote. I put Senators on notice that, if they will remain in the Chamber, I am sure our objective can be accomplished very shortly.

This resolution is not on the calendar. I refer to Senate Resolution 29.

I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 29.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. What number on the calendar is it?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is not on the calendar. It was reported today from the Committee on Rules and Administration. It involves a rather substantial amount. I wanted to bring it before the Senate while a large number of Senators were present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 29) authorizing the Committee on Commerce to make a study of certain matters under its jurisdiction.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 13, it is proposed to strike out "February 1, 1963" and insert in lieu thereof "March 1, 1963."

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

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 8, after the word "exceed", it is proposed to insert the figure "\$330,000."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the figure on line 8, page 3, be changed from "\$330,000" to "\$297,000." That will make a 10-percent reduction.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, this resolution can be carried over for one week in order to have a study made by the Committee on Rules and Administration. The chairman of the committee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] appeared before the committee and offered a thorough explanation of why this amount was needed. The Committee on Commerce expects to take care of considerably more work than it did last year. We did not change the figure of \$330,000 for 11 months. It is the same amount that was contained in the resolution as it was brought to our committee. The amount would include the 7 percent pay increase. The committee approved the resolution unanimously, and we recommend that it be agreed to as reported by the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the record shows that last year the Senate provided \$315,000 for the use of this subcommittee. During the 12 months of last year and out of that amount \$228,411 was spent.

The amendment that I propose would reduce the entire amount which is included in the bill by 10 percent. Should the amendment be adopted, it would mean that the committee would have for expenditures during 11 months of the year, \$297,000. That is \$71,000 more than was spent last year for the 12 months. It is my belief that this is a good place to make a cut. I hope the Senate will sustain my position.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. What subcommittee does this refer to? The resolution is not on the calendar, and we have been unable to find out.

Mr. ELLENDER. This is for investigations by the whole committee. As I pointed out, the full committee has \$144,500 to spend, aside from the amount requested here.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in committee I offered an amendment to reduce the amount that was asked for. In addition to the employees of the regular committee, there were 19 employees on the temporary list. The Senator from Louisiana has correctly pointed out that for 11 months there was spent \$208,000 and for 12 months there was spent \$228,000. With the allowance of \$297,000, there will be \$70,000 more than is needed if we use last year's expenditures as a standard

for determining what will be spent in this year.

Some new work will come to the Committee on Commerce. The President's recommendation for a change in the control of rates and the control of utilities is one of them. I respectfully submit to the Senate that with 19 employees on the temporary list, and with the employees on the regular list, we have more than we need, and there is no need to say, because of the new work, that we might need \$70,000 more.

Let me say to Senators who are talking about reducing the budget—and I heard various figures cited in the past 2 weeks—that today we are challenged to cut our own expenditures. I say to Senators that if we do not have nerve enough to cut these expenditures, we should throw overboard any boast that we may make about any contemplated cut in the budget which would come from the various departments of the administrative branch of the Government. We cannot treat the administration differently than we propose to treat ourselves. We cannot indulge in extravagant expenditures in our own divisions and then cry aloud to the people of the country what we are going to do about the \$98,800 million budget.

I respectfully suggest that if we do not clean our own house we should not talk about cutting the budget later with respect to the administration's requests.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I regret that the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], is unavoidably absent at this moment. It is a trifle curious that it should fall to the ranking minority member of the Commerce Committee to present to the Senate in his absence and in his behalf a few facts that I believe should be taken into consideration before passing on the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana to reduce the allowance for the committee.

In the first place, I believe that my record for fighting for economy is about as consistent and strong as that of any other Member of the Senate. I do not want any rule applied to anybody downtown or to any other committee of the Senate which is not applied here or not applied to my committee, and there are no additional employees for the minority, or any particular thing for the minority specified in this resolution.

The distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], for whom I have profound respect and regard, and who is a stalwart fighter for his principles now and always, if my recollection serves me correctly, was the only Member on the committee who, when the time came, after careful discussion, to vote on this amount, opposed it.

I have sometimes observed, as I believe other Members have observed also, that there is a tendency downtown to try to spend all the money that is appropriated, because it is sometimes feared by the bureaus and departments, who in complete sincerity do not want their work neglected, that if they return some money to the Treasury, the Appropriations Committees of the House and the

Senate will decide that they do not need as much the next time. Therefore, it seems a better system to spend all they get, because if they do not spend all of it, it will somehow or other militate against them. I believe that a great amount of money is spent in this Government on that principle.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the chairman of the committee, has an enviable record in returning every year during his chairmanship of this committee a substantial amount of the appropriation that has been allocated to the Committee on Commerce. When he feels it is necessary to have a reasonable amount for the activities of the committee in the coming year, he should not be penalized because of his faithfulness in returning money not needed.

The crux of the situation is that under the purview of the Commerce Committee are many judicial and quasi-judicial activities of the Government. Many Senators who have served on it realize that under its tent are an amazing number of Government activities. It falls to the lot of the Committee on Commerce and its subcommittees to supervise and observe the activities and the expenditures of many independent agencies of the Federal Government. Let me mention just a few of them. The Federal Communications Commission is a key regulatory agency. In 1963 it spent more than \$14 million. Its employees numbered 1,400.

The Federal Power Commission comes under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Commerce. That Commission spent \$10 million in fiscal 1963, and employed 1,178 persons.

The committee's jurisdiction includes the manifold activities of the Interstate Commerce Commission, which spent \$23 million in fiscal 1963, and employed 2,500 persons.

I could go down the whole list, mentioning the Maritime Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Trade Commission and others. There are 8 administrative agencies which had in fiscal 1963 combined expenditures of \$1,219 million, and which had more than 56,000 employees. It is the responsibility of the Committee on Commerce to supervise their expenditures, legislate their functions, and watch their operations.

In reply to the very pertinent observation of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], I should say that if we are to secure economy in Government, the first thing that must be done is to make certain that the committees of Congress and especially of the Senate, are properly equipped to follow through and to exert economy in the executive departments and agencies. Any Senator who has served here for a few years has, I believe, walked through the departments and agencies and has seen, in room after room after room, numerous employees, not all of whom were very busy. The departments and agencies have all the personnel they need. They are staffed, overstaffed, and superstaffed.

But up here, on Capitol Hill, the Senate is comprised of only 100 Members

who serve a population of 180 million. We have the responsibility and try our best to see to it that the Government is conducted carefully, frugally, and effectively. Yet there are those who carp about the authorization of a few thousand dollars which probably will not be spent anyway.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. COTTON. Of course; I am always glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have been requested to attend a meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations, at which some guests are present. I should like to ask for a ye-and-nay vote on this question, if the Senator will permit me to make that request.

Mr. COTTON. Certainly; provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. Mr. President, on this question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, in the coming year some very important recommendations of the President of the United States will fall within the purview of the Committee on Commerce. Probably one of the most difficult, complex, and controversial issues that will be before the 88th Congress will be the question of transportation. The President has made certain recommendations concerning a reduction of control or a reduction of regulation of transportation in this country. This involves every railroad, motor carrier, and airline in the United States. The President has also made recommendations which involve the merchant marine. I point out that this legislation could have major effect on the whole. The transportation industry of this country—a \$100 billion industry.

Furthermore, Congress will be considering this year the mass transportation problem, the proposal to solve the commuter problem in the cities of the country, and the part the Federal Government will play in it. It is absolutely inevitable that the Committee on Commerce, through its subcommittees and special committees, will have to deal with those problems. They will require expert assistance. In addition, problems affecting the entire communications industry, include satellite communications, and a host of other matters come before this committee.

I submit that the record of the distinguished Senator from Washington, the chairman of the committee, is such that the Senate can trust him not to expend a single dollar uselessly or needlessly.

I could speak at greater length, although I shall not do so, discussing the activities in which the Committee on Commerce will engage. Before I finish, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire. As a rather junior member of the Committee on Commerce, I have a very special interest in the subject.

First, I congratulate the Senator from New Hampshire for stating the case

factually, and stating it so well. Congress is coming under increasing criticism from the public and the press. In some quarters it is said that Congress is not doing its job; some say the job is becoming too big for us. I do not subscribe to that opinion. I notice that it is being stated with increasing frequency that the executive department has become so vast and overwhelming that Congress no longer is in a position to "ride herd" on it, as it were.

As the Senator from New Hampshire has stated so factually, the Committee on Commerce has a great responsibility. To discharge that responsibility effectively, the committee, as well as the executive departments, must have trained technicians and professional staff personnel, not only for day-to-day operations, but for special studies, as well. It must have in its service persons who are knowledgeable and expert in their fields.

The Senator from New Hampshire has alluded to the vast areas of responsibility which fall within the purview of the Committee on Commerce. He referred to transportation. The Subcommittee on Air Transportation, headed by the able senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has jurisdiction of a field of transportation which requires close supervision. Surface transportation in all forms, including the vast merchant marine, fall within the legislative jurisdiction of the Committee on Commerce, as do the Coast Guard, the Federal Power Commission, and various other regulatory agencies. These examples merely begin to denote the areas in which the committee moves, as it fulfills its legislative functions and other duties.

I agree wholeheartedly with the Senator from New Hampshire that the country and the Senate can very well trust the chairman of the committee, the able Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], to spend effectively and carefully the money which is granted to the committee. If all the money is not required, the chairman can be relied upon to return the sums which are not used. He will not spend money which is not absolutely needed. I think it would be a disservice to the public if the Committee on Commerce were not granted all the money which is required to do the very essential work which is entrusted to it.

I thank the Senator from New Hampshire, my fellow committee member, for providing me this opportunity to express my opinion on a subject which is of such great importance.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. President, at this time I remind Senators that the question of the consolidation and merger of railroads and airlines is a new problem which has not previously been dealt with in the committee. In view of this record, I sincerely hope this modest amount, to be used by a committee headed by a Senator who has such an excellent record of faithfulness and of using only what is necessary, will be given to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to the committee amendment on page 3, in line 8, of Senate Resolution

29—namely, to strike out \$330,000 and insert \$297,000.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. If the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senators from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and Mr. DOMINICK, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 15, nays 58, as follows:

[No. 27 Leg.]

YEAS—15

Aiken	Ellender	Lausche
Boggs	Hickenlooper	Mechem
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Miller
Carlson	Hruska	Simpson
Curtis	Jordan, Idaho	Williams, Del.

NAYS—58

Anderson	Fulbright	Morse
Bartlett	Gore	Moss
Bayh	Gruening	Muskie
Beall	Hayden	Pell
Bennett	Hill	Prouty
Bible	Humphrey	Proxmire
Brewster	Inouye	Randolph
Burdick	Jackson	Scott
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Smathers
Cannon	Johnston	Smith
Case	Jordan, N.C.	Sparkman
Church	Keating	Stennis
Clark	Kuchel	Symington
Cooper	Mansfield	Thurmond
Cotton	McCarthy	Tower
Dodd	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Douglas	McIntyre	Yarborough
Eastland	McNamara	Young, Ohio
Engle	Metcalf	
Fong	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—27

Allott	Kennedy	Neuberger
Dirksen	Long, Mo.	Pastore
Dominick	Long, La.	Pearson
Edmondson	Magnuson	Ribicoff
Ervin	McClellan	Robertson
Goldwater	McGovern	Russell
Hart	Morton	Saltonstall
Hartke	Mundt	Talmadge
Kefauver	Nelson	Young, N. Dak.

So Mr. ELLENDER's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution is open to further amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Delaware will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the appropriate place in the resolution, it is proposed to add the following language:

Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Commerce of the Senate and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code: *Provided*, (1) That no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence an amount in excess of the maximum per diem rates approved for overseas travel as set forth in the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as revised and amended by the Bureau of the Budget; (2) that no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

That each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Secretary of the Senate and shall be open to public inspection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I shall be brief.

The amendment is the same as those offered in the House of Representatives under date of January 31 to various resolutions to provide funds for its committees. The House amendments offered at that time were intended to safeguard expenditure of committee funds and to require a detailed accounting. I believe that we in the Senate have a similar responsibility. We owe it to the taxpayers to make sure that all our expenditures are in line and are open for inspection. The amendment is copied verbatim from the House-approved amendments.

The House is to be complimented for the action which it has taken in this connection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it the understanding of the distinguished Senator from Delaware that, so far as amounts spent are concerned, the amendment would apply the same limits and standards on counterpart funds that are now applied with respect to dollars?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes; it would provide the same per diem allowance as is available to the executive branch. In addition, it would require a detailed accounting, open for inspection.

Mr. CURTIS. But the amendment relates to the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. The amendment would put the expenditure of counterpart funds under such restrictions. Some are under the impression that the counterpart funds are not of any use. That is far from true; most of these counterpart funds are convertible into dollars. They can certainly be used by the Federal Government. As the Secretary of the Treasury has pointed out, counterpart funds are the property of the American taxpayers and should be spent with the same degree of prudence as are any other funds. It is my understanding that similar amendments were approved practically unanimously by the House of Representatives to their money resolutions.

I think the Senate should do no less than approve this amendment.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I promised to yield first to the Senator from New Hampshire. Then I shall yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Delaware a question. I feel that the amendment would apply a perfectly fair, legitimate and reasonable rule, I would in no way be embarrassed by it. But I should like to know whether the Senator from Delaware is singling out the Committee on Commerce for his proposed restriction. I wonder whether the Senator will see to it that the same amendment is offered to the authorizations for other committees and subcommittees whose members may have occasion to

travel outside the United States. If he does not intend to do so, I for one would feel that the amendment would reflect on a committee which, to my knowledge, has had a fine record in the use of counterpart funds. I would resent having the Committee on Commerce selected for the proposed action. If the Senator intends to treat every committee and subcommittee in the same way, I am all for the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from New Hampshire had made a very good point. I have no intention of casting any reflection on this particular committee. I intend to offer a similar amendment to all of the resolutions which deal with travel by any congressional committee. This amendment will be offered in connection with all such resolutions considered here today.

I did not offer the amendment with respect to those resolutions which deal with matters 100 percent within this country because the amendment deals with the question of expenditure of foreign currencies used in connection with foreign travel.

But I will promise that the amendment will be offered to all similar resolutions which deal with foreign travel. No committee is being singled out.

Mr. COTTON. Can the Senator also give me some information as to what other committees he believes use the foreign currencies? I should like to know exactly which resolutions for which committees are involved, and to which resolutions the amendment will be offered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I would not wish to give the Senator an answer at this moment and claim it to be all inclusive since there are many resolutions on the calendar and I could miss one, though I do not intend to miss one. To be specific, I notice that the next resolution which is to be considered is the one relating to work by the Committee on Foreign Relations. I have already told the chairman of the committee that I intend to offer a similar amendment to that resolution.

Then there is another resolution which will come before the Senate which deals with Judiciary Committee funds for a proposed antitrust investigation in Europe. The amendment will be offered to that resolution.

The amendment will be offered to any of the resolutions for any of the committees which involve travel outside this country. It is my intention to be all inclusive. To make sure I do not miss one I would appreciate it if the Senator from New Hampshire would help me watch. I can assure the Senator that it is my desire to offer the amendment with respect to all of them. That is my intention. It would be most unfair to single out any committee, and I certainly would not single out the Commerce Committee.

Mr. COTTON. I asked the Senator from Delaware to consider the fact that there are committees of the Senate which, very properly, because of the nature of their jurisdiction, have access to travel and subsistence not available, for

example, to members of the Commerce Committee.

I refer, for instance, to the Committee on Armed Services, the members of which, very properly, on official business frequently travel in planes of the Air Force and are furnished with a good deal of subsistence.

I have no knowledge of this, but I presume that members of the Committee on Foreign Relations are very properly entertained many times at embassies and consulates. By "entertained" I do not mean to refer to parties; I mean they actually are quartered in such buildings.

I say again that I think the Senator is correct in principle. I have no idea of opposing his amendment. However, when one considers the entire field, I sometimes wonder how we can ever expect the people of the United States to trust the U.S. Senate and to trust us, if we do not have confidence in ourselves. I sometimes wonder if a great deal of damage is not done to the influence and prestige of this body in which we serve and of which we are justly proud by such a constant attempt to do something which indicates that somebody has his nose in the public trough.

This is not a question of travel. It is a question of the dignity of the Senate and the dignity of its committees.

So far as the Senator from New Hampshire is concerned, I am perfectly willing to support the amendment, which I know is offered sincerely by the Senator from Delaware, for it is characteristic of his meticulous regard for the integrity of himself and of all his colleagues.

However, if the amendment is agreed to, no matter how hard we try to do otherwise, we will draw distinctions among the committees in the Senate. I am a member of the Appropriations Committee. Does the Senator intend to offer the amendment with respect to the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes, and all other committees authorizing foreign travel.

Mr. COTTON. That is interesting. Does the Senator intend to offer any amendment to prevent members of the Committee on Armed Services from having meals and subsistence furnished to them while they are abroad?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, if a Member of Congress is traveling by transportation furnished to him by the U.S. Government and if he is fed and housed by the U.S. Government at one of its embassies he would not collect the subsistence payment. Why should he? Certainly he would not be entitled to dual allowances.

The Senator from New Hampshire has suggested that we "cover the waterfront" by making this one amendment cover all committees. I would be willing to suggest the absence of a quorum and then join the Senator in drafting an amendment broad enough to cover all committees. That would be a quick way to solve the whole problem.

Mr. COTTON. I say to the Senator from Delaware that I would not join in the offering of the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Oh; I thought that was what the Senator wished to do.

Mr. COTTON. No; I do not. I happen to have enough confidence in every Member of the Senate on both sides of the aisle that I am not going to offer any amendments to put them on some subsistence basis, which I believe the Senator's amendment seeks to do. I have no objection to the Senator from Delaware offering the amendment. I have no objection to it being done to me. I recognize that the distinguished Senator is doing this with the utmost of sincerity.

I dislike to see the Senate take a leaf out of the book of the other body. I may be violating the rules by mentioning the other body. It is a wonderful body. Many of us served in it and are proud of our service there. However, merely because such a provision was offered somewhere else is not proof that we must accept it.

There are distinguished men serving as chairmen of the committees of the Senate. I can say this with propriety, because unfortunately not one of them is a Republican. They are all Democrats. Everyone knows that the Democrats are fundamentally honest, and every chairman in this body, so far as I know, is a man of complete and unimpeachable integrity.

However, if it is advisable to establish some safeguard of this kind, that will be perfectly fine, and I am willing to vote for it.

I think, before the Senator plunges in too deeply, before he puts every Member of the Senate in such a position that if he votes against the amendment the word will go out to the country that he is afraid to vote for it because he wants a big, lush traveling account, the Senator should weigh very carefully the rather delicate and intricate situation which is presented when one deals with the Armed Services Committee, with the Appropriations Committee, and with other committees which have access to subsistence allowances which some of the committees do not have.

I wish to ask the Senator a question about his amendment. The Senator knows I am speaking in the best possible spirit, for I have great admiration for him. If the Senator's amendment were adopted, could I, as a member of the Commerce Committee, concerning which it is being offered, if I wished to travel somewhere and have available certain funds, get the chairman of the committee—and he certainly ought to do it, in view of my stalwart defense of his budget this afternoon—to put me on his expense account, so that I could spend any amount I wanted of the committee funds, so long as I did not use counterpart funds? Is that a correct understanding?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No. There would be an accounting of all the Senator spent filed with the Chairman and these expenditures would be limited to the same per diem allowances as provided for the executive branch.

Mr. COTTON. How many dollars a day could I spend to live abroad?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The same amount the Senator and I allow

for any member of the executive branch under similar travel arrangements.

Mr. COTTON. How much is that?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not have the exact figures available, but I would say it would be the same allowance as provided on a per diem basis for members of the executive branch. Why should it be any more? Also, the amendment provides for an itemized accounting of expenditures by each member. Congress passed a bill last year which required that every American businessman who wanted to deduct any amount of his expenses from his tax return had to itemize his accounts carefully and submit such report to the Treasury Department. That does not mean we distrust the taxpayers, but that is a law. Why should Members of Congress be subject to any less restrictions?

I merely say that in fairness, I think the rules should be applied to all.

Do not forget that as Members of Congress traveling abroad we would be spending the taxpayers' money. The businessman is spending his own. This is all the more reason why we should be willing to limit our expenditures and render an accurate accounting. Certainly we should be willing to abide by the same rules we lay down for the executive branch and all other taxpayers.

Mr. COTTON. So far as accounting is concerned, the Senator is quite correct. So far as the committee is concerned, every Senator is required to account for every cent he spends.

I thank the Senator for his courtesy. I am perfectly willing that this rule shall apply to the Commerce Committee, and I shall expect the Senator to offer such a proposal with respect to every committee of the Senate whose members have occasion to travel abroad.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is my intention. I thank the Senator for his support of the amendment. If he wishes to cosponsor it I shall be glad to have him as a cosponsor.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me before he sits down?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am in thorough sympathy with what the Senator is attempting to do. He knows I have discussed this subject with him. Some time ago the Senator from Mississippi probably had about as good a proposal as any when he offered to place the allowance on a flat per diem basis, without complications.

It seems to me that the Senator ought to do one of two things: Either put such a provision in the foreign aid bill or some other legislative measure, or else let it be a legislative measure, on which there would be a conference between the House and the Senate, so there would be uniformity and so there would be a law which had been signed by the President. I wish very much that he would not proceed in this piecemeal manner, but would seek to have such a provision adopted in a way that would make it a binding law.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I appreciate the Senator's remarks. I offered

this provision as an amendment to the Foreign Aid Act a few years ago, and if I recall correctly the Senator from Alabama supported it. The bill went to the House, and the provision was changed somewhat in conference. I regretted this modification, but I did thank the committee, for bringing back what they were able to obtain from the conference. I agree that the additional provisions suggested here today would be better if they were general law, but we are dealing today with money for the Senate committees. When the Senator speaks of making the application of the provision uniform, I point out that such a broad proposal may be subject to be a point of order. Today we are dealing with Senate expenditures only.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We cannot do it. That is the fatal defect in the proposal.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Except that the House has already acted on the proposal. Our action would have the result of making it uniform for both Houses.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The House has acted on it. A bill is coming to the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No. The House passed its money resolutions on January 31. It included such a provision in its resolutions.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I had understood that the House had passed a separate resolution.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. There has been a broader resolution introduced.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think there is a great deal of merit in what the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] has said about the differences among the different committees.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I make a point of order that this is an effort to amend the law while the Senate is considering a simple resolution.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, it is my understanding this is a restriction on an appropriation, and therefore it seems to me the amendment is in order.

I hope the Senate will at least take this necessary step to guarantee an accurate accounting of our expenditures as Members of Congress. Certainly the limits on such expenditures as provided in this amendment are in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is ready to rule. Under the practice of the Senate, resolutions are not used for the purpose of legislative enactment. That is done by a bill or joint resolution. This amendment in effect makes certain action in order, notwithstanding the provisions of any law in conflict with it, and therefore it is not in order under Senate procedure.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I was about to join in raising the point of order. I want the RECORD to show that I was seeking recognition in order to raise the point of order. I think the point the Senator from Delaware is raising should be in bill form or resolution form and be referred to the appropriate committee for study and hearings.

I am well aware of the fact that this proposal is supposed to have great political sex appeal, but, so far as I am concerned, it is a barren proposal.

I think we ought to take a look at the practice that prevails in the Senate. I happen to be a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I am advised that every dollar of counterpart fund expenditures is reported to the Foreign Relations Committee and is reported by the Foreign Relations Committee.

I speak on this subject on the basis of a little experience, because several years ago the Senator from Oregon set a precedent in the Foreign Relations Committee. In one of the official trips of the Foreign Relations Committee I found that in many counterpart countries many of our ambassadors, ministers, or attachés had been out of representation money for months before our Senate delegation reached the particular country. Nevertheless, the visitation of the delegation had greatly increased the cost of the embassies, consulates, or attachés.

My first experience with this problem was in Madras, India, where the supreme court of that state of India made clear to our consul general that it would be agreeable if there were a state dinner for the visiting congressional delegation. I am sure no Senator is surprised when I tell him that it was expected that the expense of the dinner would be paid by the consulate. It was an important dinner so far as our foreign relations in India were concerned.

When I discovered that that very expensive dinner was to be paid for out of the pocket of the consul general, I drew on the counterpart funds, for I could do so, and the consul general could not.

In my judgment, that expenditure was money well spent in behalf of furthering our foreign relations in that state.

I reported it to the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, and I was advised at that time that this was the precedent case; that there was no record of such a thing ever having been done before by a member of the committee.

That was not the only time on the trip that I did it. I drew on counterpart funds in consultation with our ambassadorial or consulate staff, and I drew on them when I realized that they were expected to spend representation funds in behalf of this visiting congressional delegation, but that they did not have any funds. I want to state for the record that at no time did any member of our Foreign Service ever intimate to me that I might use my authority to draw on those funds. In fact, in some instances there were some protests from them.

They were apparently afraid that if I did it, they might find themselves in a position in which they would have to explain to the State Department how it came about. I made it clear that I was acting on my own responsibility. I rendered a value judgment as to whether or not the expenditure of those counterpart funds for official functions—and these were the only times that I drew on such

funds—would be in the best interest of my country.

Let me add that in my judgment there should be more drawing on counterpart funds, and not less. In my judgment, there are great sums of counterpart funds in "cold storage" in many areas where counterpart funds exist that ought to be spent in the interest of strengthening American foreign policy in those countries. The test is the test of accounting. That is the test, and not a prohibition which prevents the expenditure of funds. That is why I hope the Senator from Delaware will introduce his amendment as a bill or submit it as a resolution, so that we can make a record on it, and so that we can find out under what terms and circumstances the funds should be spent. To limit it to a per diem basis does not make good sense.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. After I have finished my argument, I will be glad to yield. I believe we should make a careful study of the use of counterpart funds. The Senator's resolution or bill could lead to such a study. However, there has developed around these precincts the idea that drawing on counterpart funds by visiting senatorial delegations in various countries involves some kind of shady practice.

Of course, if a Member buys pearl necklaces or diamond rings or material goods for his personal use, no one would deplore it more than would the Senator from Oregon, and no one would more enthusiastically support a prohibition against it. I know some charges are made along that line, and there may be some abuses in this regard, to the effect that counterpart funds have been used for personal aggrandizement of a Member of Congress.

I am also satisfied that such cases are so few and the exceptions are so de minimis that it is unfortunate that the entire Congress should be smeared with regard to the expenditure of counterpart funds.

As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, let me say that in my judgment we have not spent the counterpart funds that ought to be spent. They ought to be spent in carrying out the foreign policy of this country. If an official delegation of Congress in carrying out the purposes of its mission finds that it will be in the best interest of our foreign policy to draw on counterpart funds, I do not want any prohibition written into the law that will deny to that delegation the right to draw on counterpart funds.

No one will go farther than I in requiring a detailed minutiae accounting, in regard to expenditure of counterpart funds. However, I will not support a resolution which would prohibit a Member of Congress from drawing on counterpart funds if in his judgment the funds should be drawn upon in carrying out the purpose of his official mission.

I now yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I point out to the Senator from Oregon—as I am sure he as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations will recall—that the first amendment which I offered, a couple of years ago, did not deal with per diem allowances but was based on the theory that an accurate and public accounting would prevent abuse. Such an itemized accounting, open for public inspection, would solve the purpose the Senator from Oregon has in mind. The full committee supported that proposal. However, it was changed, to my regret, in conference. The Senator from Alabama, who was in charge of the conference, did the best he could. If we could obtain a detailed and public accounting of the expenditures of all dollars and/or counterpart funds it would go far toward correcting any abuse. I assure the Senator that a resolution to accomplish that will again be submitted, and it will be submitted at a time when it will not be subject to a point of order.

Mr. MORSE. I have made my case, and the Senator from Delaware has made his case. On the basis of the resolution that he will submit, we can proceed with the hearings that I believe should be held on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 29) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

- (1) interstate commerce generally;
- (2) foreign commerce generally;
- (3) maritime matters;
- (4) interoceanic canals;
- (5) transportation policy;
- (6) domestic surface transportation, including pipelines;
- (7) communications, including a complete review of national and international telecommunications and the use of communications satellites;
- (8) Federal power matters;
- (9) civil aeronautics;
- (10) fisheries and wildlife;
- (11) marine sciences; and
- (12) Weather Bureau operations and planning, including the use of weather satellites.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963 to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$330,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 71), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INVESTIGATIONS BY THE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

The Committee on Rules and Administration to whom was referred the resolution (S. Res. 29) authorizing the Committee on Commerce to investigate certain matters within its jurisdiction, and providing additional funds therefor, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without additional amendment and recommend that

the resolution, as amended, be agreed to by the Senate.

Senate Resolution No. 29 as amended would authorize the expenditure of not to exceed \$330,000 by the Committee on Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, from March 1, 1963 to January 31, 1964, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

1. Interstate commerce generally;
2. Foreign commerce generally;
3. Maritime matters;
4. Interoceanic canals;
5. Transportation policy;
6. Domestic surface transportation, including pipelines;
7. Communications, including a complete review of national and international telecommunications and the use of communications satellites;
8. Federal power matters;
9. Civil aeronautics;
10. Fisheries and wildlife;
11. Marine sciences; and
12. Weather Bureau operations and planning, including the use of weather satellites.

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorization are shown through December 31, 1962.

Committee and purpose	87th Congress			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Commerce: General.....	\$630,000	\$454,906.31		
	315,000	246,493.11	Feb. 13, 1961	S. Res. 74
	315,000	208,413.20	Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 251.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS TO CONTINUE STUDY OF ACTIVITIES OF NONDIPLOMATIC REPRESENTATIVES OF FOREIGN PRINCIPALS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 26.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 26) authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations to continue its study of the activities of nondiplomatic representatives of foreign principals.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments on page 2, line 1, after the word "party", to insert "or any other foreign principal,"; in line 12, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March"; and on page 3, line 2, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$48,600"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance

with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to continue its study of the activities of nondiplomatic representatives of foreign principals including, without limitation, foreign governments, foreign political parties, and individuals, partnerships, associations, corporations, organizations or other combinations of individuals, whether foreign or domestic, acting in the place of, or in the interests of, or on behalf of a foreign government or foreign political party, or any other foreign principal, tending or intended to influence the foreign or domestic policies or interests of the United States.

Sec. 2. The committee is further authorized under sections 134 and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to give thorough consideration to existing and proposed legislation relating to the activities of nondiplomatic representatives of foreign principals, as aforesaid, and to make such recommendations with respect thereto as may be found by it to be appropriate.

Sec. 3. For the purposes of this resolution the committee is authorized from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, (1) to make such expenditures; (2) to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate; (3) to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; (4) to take such testimony; (5) to employ, upon a temporary basis, such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (6) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and person-

nel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government as it deems advisable.

Sec. 4. The expenses of the committee under this resolution which shall not exceed \$48,600 for the period ending January 31, 1964, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Sec. 5. The committee shall complete its study and submit to the Senate not later than January 31, 1964, such results of the study herein authorized together with such recommendations as to existing or proposed legislation as herein authorized as may be found by it to be appropriate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the resolution deals with the present investigation on lobbying activities as it relates to lobbyists for foreign countries. That investigation is now underway. The request is for \$48,600. This is a very important study and inquiry, and the amount will therefore be required, according to the information that was presented to the committee. I understood there was very good documentation for the request in committee.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, it was thoroughly justified.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, we provided last year \$50,000. I am wondering why only \$6,686.70 was spent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Last year we got started on the investigation, but the investigation is now in full swing. I recognize that the investigation was in progress most of last year, but I am talking now in terms of staff and activity. If there is any money left, it will be returned. No one will put the money in his pocket or run away with it. It will go back into the Treasury.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. It is never drawn unless it is spent.

Mr. ELLENDER. The distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] said that with \$50,000 last year he would be able to complete the investigation. Does the Senator confirm that fact, that if we provide \$48,600 for the remaining 11 months, the committee will be able to do that?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am not at all sure about it. I would not want to make that statement. I do not know how far this investigation will go. Some people are of the opinion that this is an investigation of very great importance. I have the utmost confidence in the chairman of the committee. I do not know of any Senator who more jealously guards the dollar or more fully and comprehensively conducts a hearing than the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. The amount he asks is well deserved.

Mr. ELLENDER. This is a new committee, and that is why I suggested last year that there be a limitation. I was under the impression that the Senator from Arkansas said that he thought \$50,000 would be sufficient. I may be in error.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe I recall that the Senator from Arkansas said that. However, the truth is that this investigation has revealed a considerable amount of activity which the committee

believes ought to be investigated. Any money that is not needed will not be drawn on or expended. The committee has a very small staff.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I believe that the committee barely got into this subject last year. It did not get into it very deeply, at any rate. It is now getting into a great many situations that it did not realize existed before, and it is believed that this study will last for several months, perhaps for the remainder of the year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I said earlier that I would offer my amendment to this resolution as well as several others on the calendar. However, in view of the fact that the point of order has been made and sustained by the Chair that such an amendment is not in order at this time I will not offer the amendment now. I will wait for the appropriate time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 22), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 26 as amended would authorize the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, to expend not to exceed \$48,600 from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to continue its study of the activities of non-diplomatic representatives of foreign principals including, without limitation, foreign governments, foreign political parties, and individuals, partnerships, associations, corporations, organizations, or other combinations of individuals, whether foreign or domestic, acting in the place of, or in the interests of, or on behalf of a foreign government or foreign political party, tending or intended to influence the foreign or domestic policies or interests of the United States.

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorization are shown through December 31, 1962.

Committee and purpose	87th Congress			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Foreign Relations: Activities of nondiplomatic foreign principals.....	\$50,000.00	\$6,686.79	-----	
	50,000.00	6,686.79	July 12, 1962	S. Res. 362.

Due to the delay in the organization of the Senate and in order that the subcommittees could meet their February payrolls, the Senate on February 19, 1963, approved Senate Resolution 88, which continued for 1 month—through February 28, 1963—the investigative and expenditure authorizations granted to Senate committees during the 87th Congress, 2d session, and in certain instances provided additional funds for the purpose.

Since most of the resolutions which would authorize inquiries and investigations during the present session had already been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration prior to the adoption of Senate Resolution 88, and consequently were on a 12-month basis, the committee at its meeting on February 27, 1963, adopted the following formula to reduce each such request to an 11-month basis:

"A reduction by one-twelfth of that portion of the total request representing salaries and agency contributions to employee retirement, health benefits, and group life insurance."

On this basis the expenditure authorization contained in Senate Resolution 26 was reduced \$1,400, from \$50,000 to \$48,600.

The investigative authority was correspondingly reduced to an 11-month period commencing March 1, 1963.

An additional amendment adopted by the Committee on Rules and Administration, at the request of the Committee on Foreign Relations is as follows:

On page 2, line 1, after the word "party," insert "or any other foreign principal."

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS TO INVESTIGATE MATTERS PERTAINING TO FOREIGN POLICIES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 22, Senate Resolution 25.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 25) authorizing the committee on Foreign Relations to examine, investigate, and make studies of matters pertaining to the foreign policies of the United States and their administration.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments, on page 1, line 10, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 2, line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$150,000" and insert "\$143,000"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections

134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make complete studies of any and all matters pertaining to the foreign policies of the United States and their administration.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; (3) to hold such hearings, to take such testimony, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, and to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; and (4) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government, as the committee deems advisable.

Sec. 3. In the conduct of its studies the committee may use the experience, knowledge, and advice of private organizations, schools, institutions, and individuals in its discretion, and it is authorized to divide the work of the studies among such individuals, groups and institutions as it may deem appropriate and may enter into contracts for this purpose.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$143,000 for the period ending January 31, 1964, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. The amount requested by the Committee on Foreign Relations was reduced by the amount it received last year, and 7 percent was then applied to that amount. So the committee then recommended that the resolution be adopted as reported. The committee asked for \$10,000 less than it received last year, and we took \$7,000 more from that amount.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does that amount to about 10 percent less than was received last year?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. It is \$17,000 less than the committee received last year.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is about 10 percent?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 25), as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 23), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 25, as amended, would authorize the expenditure of \$143,000 by the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, from

March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, "to examine, investigate, and make complete studies of any and all matters pertaining to the foreign policies of the United States and their administration."

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorizations are shown through December 31, 1962.

Committee and purpose	87th Congress			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Foreign Relations: U.S. foreign policy	\$320,000	\$205,793.47		
	160,000	98,523.16	Jan. 31, 1961	S. Res. 41.
	160,000	107,270.31	Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 246.

Due to the delay in the organization of the Senate and in order that its subcommittees could meet their February payrolls, the Senate on February 19, 1963, approved Senate Resolution 88, which continued for 1 month—through February 28, 1963—the investigative and expenditure authorizations granted to Senate committees during the 87th Congress, 2d session, and in certain instances provided additional funds for the purpose.

Since most of the resolutions which would authorize inquiries and investigations during the present session had already been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration prior to the adoption of Senate Resolution 88, and consequently were on a 12-month basis, the committee at its meeting on February 27, 1963, adopted the following formula to reduce each such request to an 11-month basis:

"A reduction by one-twelfth of that portion of the total request representing salaries and agency contributions to employee retirement, health benefits, and group life insurance."

On this basis the expenditure authorization contained in Senate Resolution 25 was reduced \$7,000, from \$150,000 to \$143,000.

The investigative authority was correspondingly reduced to an 11-month period commencing March 1, 1963.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO MAKE STUDIES OF OPERATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 23, Senate Resolution 17.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 17) authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to make certain studies as to the efficiency and economy of the operations of the Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, on page 1, at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "February" and insert "March"; on page 2, line 20, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March"; on page 3, line 12, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March"; on page 4, line 21,

after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March"; and on page 5, line 20, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$490,000.00" and insert "\$458,300"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to make investigations into the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches of the Government, including the possible existence of fraud, misfeasance, malfeasance, collusion, mismanagement, incompetence, corrupt or unethical practices, waste, extravagance, conflicts of interest, and the improper expenditure of Government funds in transactions, contracts, and activities of the Government or of Government officials and employees and any and all such improper practices between Government personnel and corporations, individuals, companies, or persons affiliated therewith, doing business with the Government; and the compliance or noncompliance of such corporations, companies, or individuals or other entities with the rules, regulations, and laws governing the various governmental agencies and its relationships with the public: *Provided*, That in carrying out the duties herein set forth, the inquiries of this committee shall not be deemed limited to the records, functions, and operations of the particular branch of the Government under inquiry, and may extend to the records and activities of persons, corporations, or other entities dealing with or affecting that particular branch of the Government.

Sec. 2. The Committee on Government Operations or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is further authorized from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, to conduct an investigation and study of the extent to which criminal or other improper practices or activities are, or have been, engaged in in the field of labor-management relations or in groups of organizations of employees or employers, to the detriment of interests of the public, employers, or employees, and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect such interests against the occurrence of such practices or activities. Nothing contained in this resolution shall affect or impair the exercise by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of any power, or the discharge by such committee of any duty, conferred or imposed upon it by the Standing Rules of the Senate or by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

Sec. 3. The Committee on Government Operations or any duly authorized subcom-

mittee thereof is further authorized and directed from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, to make a full and complete study and investigation of syndicated or organized crime which may operate in or otherwise utilize the facilities of interstate or international commerce in furtherance of any transactions which are in violation of the law of the United States or of the State in which the transactions occur, and, if so, the manner and extent to which, and the identity of the persons, firms or corporations, or other entities by whom such utilization is being made, what facilities, devices, methods, techniques, and technicalities are being used or employed, and whether or not organized crime utilizes such interstate facilities or otherwise operates in interstate commerce for the development of corrupting influences in violation of the law of the United States or the laws of any State, and further, to study and investigate the manner in which and the extent to which persons engaged in organized criminal activities have infiltrated into lawful business enterprise; and to study the adequacy of Federal laws to prevent the operations of organized crime in interstate or international commerce; and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect the public against the occurrences of such practices or activities. Nothing contained in this resolution shall affect or impair the exercise by the Committee on the Judiciary or by the Committee on Commerce of any power, or the discharge by such committee of any duty, conferred or imposed upon it by the Standing Rules of the Senate or by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

Sec. 4. The Committee on Government Operations or any of its duly authorized subcommittees shall report to the Senate by January 31, 1964, and shall, if deemed appropriate, include in its report specific legislative recommendations.

Sec. 5. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized, as it deems necessary and appropriate, to (1) make such expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate; (2) hold such hearings; (3) sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate; (4) require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; (5) administer such oaths; (6) take such testimony, either orally or by deposition; (7) employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (8) with the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, employ on a reimbursable basis such executive branch personnel as it deems advisable; and, further, with the consent of other committees or subcommittees to work in conjunction with and utilize their staffs, as it shall be deemed necessary and appropriate in the judgment of the chairman of the committee: *Provided further*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment and the person selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee.

Sec. 6. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$458,300, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, can the chairman of the committee or some other Senator tell us how much more money is included in the resolution for this year's operation than was provided last year?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. My recollection is that the amount provided for this year is \$10,000 less than was provided last year. I am now informed that that is a correct statement.

Mr. ELLENDER. Last year, as I see the figures before me, the Senate appropriated \$500,000. Of that sum, the amount of \$452,000 was spent over a period of 12 months. The committee is now asking for \$458,000 for 11 months. It seems to me that the amount asked for is about \$18,000 more than the committee received last year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The chairman of the committee will give the details, but again I should like to say that this is an investigation committee.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I so understand.

Mr. HUMPHREY. All of the money being asked for will not necessarily be expended; but the chairman of the committee, in a very detailed analysis presented to the Committee on Rules and Administration, according to his conversation with me, felt that the request that he made of the Committee on Rules and Administration was a relatively conservative, well-documented request.

Last year the committee returned \$48,418. It may very well be that the committee will return a substantial sum this year, as well. But this investigating committee is too important not to have it properly staffed and not to have the funds which are necessary to conduct the work which Senator McCLELLAN's committee undertakes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not question that at all.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I know that.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was merely trying to show that the moneys which are now to be provided are in excess of the amount which was provided last year.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not have the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. The committee actually spent its entire appropriation last year. The amount shown there was the amount spent through December, and we have continued the authority through February. The committee spent all the money which was appropriated to it last year.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was over a period of more than 12 months.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. It was 13 months.

Mr. ELLENDER. So it is proposed to provide them, for 11 months, more money than was provided for 12 months last year. That is the point I am making.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. We have provided only \$458,000. Last year the committee received \$500,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; but this amount is for 11 months.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. We reduced the amount by \$31,200.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have pointed out that last year, for 12 months, \$452,000 was spent.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. No; the committee spent more than that.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then the information which was furnished by the committee is in error. It is bound to be in error, because from the investigation made at that time, which I placed in the RECORD, as appears on page 22 of this document, the amount of money appropriated last year was \$500,000, and over a period of 11 months \$412,033 was spent. Am I correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. If we add 10 percent of that amount for another month, it would amount, in round figures, to \$41,000. Adding \$41,000 to \$412,000 makes a total of \$453,000 which was spent for 12 months last year.

It is proposed to provide \$458,800 for 11 months for this year. So we are providing, in that particular, more money on a yearly basis than was provided last year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Except for one thing: In January of this year the committee spent much more money than it spent in December. It did not have enough money to continue through February, so it was necessary to secure an additional appropriation to operate through February. Is that not correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. The committee's spending in January was greater than it had been in other months. The amount of money which is now sought is the best calculation that the chairman, the committee, and the staff could outline in order to complete the undertaking of the work which is scheduled.

Mr. ELLENDER. How was the extra money obtained?

Mr. HUMPHREY. By a resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator mean the continuing resolution?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. The continuing resolution—Senate Resolution 88.

Mr. ELLENDER. Am I to understand that the committee received more than \$500,000 for 12 months of last year?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator should know that we had \$500,000 for 12 months, but the amount for the 13th month was covered by the continuing resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. But last year the committee started spending its money in February. In other words, in each year the amount for January is included in the previous year's appropriation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. We start in February and continue through the following January 31.

Mr. ELLENDER. But this year, through a continuing resolution, an ap-

propriation was made for February. Do I correctly understand that the extra money was obtained in February?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. The committee did not spend the entire \$500,000. Some of it was left over. They spent that and got \$15,000 extra for February, if my recollection of the figures is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I still contend—and I think I am correct—that the amount of money which is being made available for 11 months is more than the amount which was provided for last year. That is the point I am making.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is my view that the amount of money made available for the coming 11 months is more than the amount made available for 12 months of last year; but it is the amount which is being requested because of the amount of work which the committee has outlined. I cannot imagine how anyone could feel that the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations has not done a good job and does not need money.

Why has the committee asked for additional funds a little later under a special resolution, when we can now authorize the money and have it available? It will not be put into Senator McCLELLAN's pocket, in case he happens to need a little extra spending money during the days ahead. But it will be there for him to draw on, and it will be drawn on only in the form of vouchers which are filed against that fund. That is all there is to it. It would not make any difference if we appropriated \$700,000; only the amount of money which will be needed will be drawn. These resolutions are authorizations for withdrawals. The chairmen of the committees will conduct the investigations.

Let us assume that something happened which would require a doubling of the committee's staff. The Senate would authorize that action. Let us assume that some unbelievable graft were found in a particular department of the Government and that it was necessary to increase the activities of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. The amount of spending would have to be increased.

All we are doing in these resolutions is putting a ceiling on the amounts of authorizations, saying that the committees cannot draw more than they are authorized to draw. If they need more money and can justify it, they can request it of the Senate and will get it. If they cannot justify it in terms of the work proposed to be done, they will not get additional funds.

These authorizations do not mean that committees are being rewarded for not being frugal. The committees will get only what they can justify spending in accordance with the terms of the programs they submit.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. One of the investigations I think the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations will conduct this year, according to what was developed in the hearings, will be

the use of narcotics by juveniles. This is becoming an acute problem in the United States. It is a situation which the committee will investigate thoroughly.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Committee on the Judiciary has a special subcommittee which is studying juvenile delinquency. My point is that there are many duplications in these fields.

If that is what the subcommittee is going to do, it will be a duplication of what other subcommittees are doing. Of course the fields are green, if there is a desire to investigate everything. But as will be shown in a few minutes, there is a special committee of the Judiciary Committee for the purpose of doing what the distinguished Senator from North Carolina is now requesting; and the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee is doing the same thing. So this would be just duplication.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But the committee report states, on page 9:

The subcommittee staff currently has underway three major preliminary inquiries in addition to the continued surveillance of work stoppages in national defense facilities hereinbefore discussed.

1. A study of an award by the Department of Defense of a contract for the development and production of a supersonic airplane designated as the TFX, to be used by the Air Force and the Navy.

I am sure Senators have heard about that.

I read further from the report:

2. A broad inquiry into narcotics: This will encompass (1) a study of illicit narcotics traffic from both a national and international standpoint; (2) distribution of narcotics in the United States; (3) the relationship of organized crime to the distribution of illicit narcotics; and (4) dangerous drugs, particularly as to their ready accessibility to juveniles and more effective controls at the manufacturing source.

3. Sports bribery: Based on a recommendation made by the subcommittee in its 1962 report on gambling and organized crime, the staff is inquiring into bribery of athletes by organized gamblers to influence the outcome of sports contests. Preliminary work indicates interstate ramifications in this area, suggesting the need of Federal legislation.

Some Senator may think some of these items should not be handled by this subcommittee; but this is the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, of the Committee on Government Operations; and I believe the subcommittee should be properly staffed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGovern in the chair). If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to Senate Resolution 17, as amended.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 24), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 17 as amended would authorize the expenditure of not to exceed

\$458,300 by the Committee on Government Operations for the continued operation of its Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964:

"(1) To make investigations into the efficiency and economy of operation of all branches of the Government, including the possible existence of fraud, misfeasance, malfeasance, collusion, mismanagement, incompetence, corrupt or unethical practices, waste, extravagance, conflicts of interest, and the improper expenditure of Government funds in transactions, contracts, and activities of the Government or of Government officials and employees and any and all such improper practices between Government personnel and corporations, individuals, companies, or persons affiliated therewith, doing business with the Government, and the compliance or noncompliance of such corporations, companies, or individuals or other entities with the rules, regulations, and laws governing the various governmental agencies and its relationships with the public;

"(2) To conduct an investigation and study of the extent to which criminal or other improper practices or activities are, or have been engaged in in the field of labor-management relations or in groups or organizations of employees or employers, to the detriment of interests of the public, employers, or employees, and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect such interests against the occurrence of such practices or activities; and

"(3) To make a full and complete study and investigation of syndicated or organized crime which may operate in or otherwise utilize the facilities of interstate or international commerce in furtherance of any transactions which are in violation of the law of the United States or of the State in which the transactions occur, and, if so, the manner and extent to which, and the identity of the persons, firms, or corporations, or other entities by whom such utilization is being made, what facilities, devices, methods, techniques, and technicalities are being used or employed, and whether or not organized crime utilizes such interstate facilities or otherwise operates in interstate commerce for the development of corrupting influences in violation of the law of the United States or the laws of any State, and further, to study and investigate the manner in which and the extent to which persons engaged in organized criminal activities have infiltrated into lawful business enterprise, and to study the adequacy of Federal laws to prevent the operations of organized crime in interstate or international commerce, and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect the public against the occurrences of such practices or activities."

PROVISION OF FUNDS FOR STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO INTERAGENCY COORDINATION, ECONOMY, AND EFFICIENCY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 24, Senate Resolution 27, to provide funds for the study of matters pertaining to interagency coordination, economy, and efficiency.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 27) to provide funds for the study of matters pertaining to interagency coordination, economy, and effi-

ciency, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, on page 1, line 10, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 2, line 20, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$95,000" and insert "\$88,000"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to interagency coordination, economy, and efficiency.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized at its discretion to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the department or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings upon the study and investigation authorized by this resolution, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$88,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations is requesting \$95,000, through the pending resolution. This is \$5,000 more than last year, but is less than the 7-percent rise in employee salaries.

The subcommittee now has nine members. It formerly had six members.

FOUR MAJOR ISSUES

It has been active on no fewer than four major issues and a number of minor ones. The major fronts have included:

First. Interagency coordination of Federal drug policies.

Second. Coordination of Federal scientific research policies.

Third. Coordination of international technical assistance programs.

Fourth. Coordination of Federal information policies.

Next week, we are resuming our drug hearings.

OVER \$150 MILLION IN DRUG EXPENDITURES

We are going to find out more facts on why various agencies of the U.S. Government spent over \$150 million for support of drug research, for conduct of drug regulation and for purchases of drugs—without consulting one another.

This is not just a matter of economizing; it is a matter of protecting the health of the American people.

CALENDAR NO. 24, SENATE RESOLUTION 27

I should like to point out several instances where the Senate Reorganization Subcommittee has saved the taxpayers of the United States sums which are many times larger than the amount which we are requesting today:

(1) ENDING WASTE IN "BURIED" DEFENSE REPORTS

As a result of this subcommittee's efforts, the Department of Defense has suddenly discovered literally hundreds of thousands of research reports prepared by one or more of the individual services—the Army, Navy, or Air Force—which were never before made available to the other services.

In a single major Air Force research installation, no less than 100,000 reports were discovered which had never been circulated to the rest of the Defense Department.

The cost of any one of these reports may have been \$5,000, \$100,000, or more. In some fields, the cost runs far larger.

The fact of the matter is that the Defense Department has received on a central basis only around one out of every five reports prepared by prime contractors.

No one knows the investment which the taxpayers made for the research and development which went into the reports which have been buried in one of the military services.

(2) NEW PUBLICATION OF CENTRAL INDEXING OF NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH GRANTS

As a result of this subcommittee's efforts, the National Institutes of Health have for the first time published a Central index of over 13,500 extramural grants, involving around one-fourth of a billion dollars.

Never before have the researchers of this country had available in published form a handy summary of research now in progress.

Never before could a researcher, before deciding on his own project, check with a guide so as to make certain that the same project or something fairly similar to it was not already being done elsewhere.

This is the first such publication and I am glad to say that it is going to be put on magnetic computer tape so that it can be maintained currently henceforth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 25), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Rules and Administration, to whom was referred the resolution

(S. Res. 27) authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to make a study of interagency coordination, economy, and efficiency, and providing additional funds therefor, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments, and recommend that the resolution as amended be agreed to by the Senate.

Senate Resolution 27 as amended would authorize the expenditure of not to exceed \$88,000 by the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, "to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to interagency coordination, economy, and efficiency."

AUTHORITY TO STUDY INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND STATES AND MUNICIPALITIES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 45, to authorize a study of intergovernmental relationships.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 45) authorizing a study of intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, on page 2, line 5, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 3, line 2, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$115,000" and insert "\$97,290"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by subsection 1(g)(2)(D) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities, including an evaluation of studies, reports, and recommendations made thereon and submitted to the Congress by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 86-380, approved by the President on September 24, 1959.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$97,290, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.
Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to ask some questions. I understand that this subcommittee was a new one last year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.
Mr. ELLENDER. The amount requested was \$40,000; and I understand that the subcommittee spent approximately \$21,000.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Maine is the chairman of the subcommittee, and he is familiar with the details.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand the subcommittee is now asking for \$97,290, for 11 months. Why is the increase requested?

Mr. MUSKIE. The original request last year was for \$40,000, which was to cover a period of operations of 5 months. We tried to estimate it as accurately as we could. The resolution was approved by the Senate on July 12, 1962. We undertook the staffing of the committee, and we completed much of it about Labor Day, and worked for approximately 5 months. However, the staffing really was not completed until October.

The actual expenditures during the 5-month period ending January 31, 1963, were in excess of the figures set forth in the report.

Mr. ELLENDER. They amounted to \$21,000—plus, did they?

Mr. MUSKIE. The actual cash balance as of January 31, 1963, was \$15,057.07.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is that the amount which remained from the \$40,000?

Mr. MUSKIE. Yes. So we spent approximately \$25,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. What did the subcommittee do with the \$25,000? Did it begin hearings of any kind?

Mr. MUSKIE. Yes, we held hearings. If the Senator from Louisiana will refer to report No. 26, on page 3 he will find that the nature of the activities we undertook at that time is spelled out. I shall be glad to review them briefly now.

First of all, our activities in that period fell into three categories. In the first place, several bills in the intergovernmental field, which were referred to the subcommittee, had been pending in the full committee, but had not been attended to, because no subcommittee for the purpose of studying them had been available. That had been the case for the last 4 years in the committee. Largely because no subcommittee had been specifically assigned to that area, such legislative measures had been referred from time to time to ad hoc subcommittees.

One of the reasons for the establishment of the subcommittee was to provide a forum in which to consider such proposed legislation.

The principal measure on which we held hearings last fall had to do with the disposition of Ellis Island, which has been surplus, as the Senator probably

knows, since 1954 or 1955. The executive agencies have been struggling with that problem over much of that time. Many proposals for the disposition of the island have been advanced, but there has not been a meeting of the minds in regard to the question of what to do with it. So we held those hearings last fall, and invited testimony by those who had proposals to make regarding the disposition of the island. At the hearings we heard from all persons who had proposals to make in regard to the disposition of the island. We learned that the disposition of the island is clearly in the interest of many millions of Americans, who regard it as a national shrine, and would like to see it disposed of in a way which will fit in with that situation.

It was also our purpose to pinpoint the proposals in the intergovernmental field, in accordance with the mandate of the committee. We did two things to implement that mandate of the committee: First, during the fall we held hearings to which we invited witnesses from all levels of government to express their views on the nature of the prob-

lems confronting us in the intergovernmental field. I think those hearings were very worthwhile and constructive, and I have the reports here.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has the Senator from Maine been adding new fields in which to investigate, since the original resolution was adopted?

Mr. MUSKIE. No.

Mr. ELLENDER. How long will this investigation continue?

Mr. MUSKIE. The subcommittee is set up as a permanent subcommittee to deal with problems in this field.

Mr. ELLENDER. So it would be another permanent subcommittee, with no end to it?

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator from Louisiana is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the budget for this—shall I say—new subcommittee, which the Senator from Maine says will be another permanent subcommittee.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 26) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative:					
Staff director.....	1	\$7,680	\$16,628.34	\$1,385.69	\$16,628.34
Chief consultant.....	1	7,140	15,612.88	1,301.07	15,612.88
Editorial and research: Research assistants.....	2	6,840	15,048.73	1,254.06	15,048.73
Administrative and clerical:					
Chief clerk.....	1	4,320	10,116.37	843.03	10,116.37
Assistant chief clerk.....	1	3,360	8,036.03	669.66	8,036.03
Assistant clerk (secretary to director).....	1	2,460	6,085.68	507.14	6,085.68
Assistant clerk (file).....	1	2,460	6,085.68	507.14	6,085.68
Total.....	8	34,260	77,613.71	6,467.79	77,613.71
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960).....					648.96
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid).....					5,044.89
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per \$1,000 coverage).....					268.92
Reimbursable payments to agencies.....					15,000.00
Travel (inclusive of field investigations).....					10,000.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees).....					3,000.00
Witness fees, expenses.....					500.00
Stationery, office supplies.....					750.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph).....					1,500.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents.....					500.00
Contingent fund.....					173.52
Total.....					37,386.29
Grand total.....					115,000.00

Funds requested, Senate Resolution 45, \$115,000.

Funds approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration, \$97,290.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 45), as amended, was agreed to.

STUDY OF CERTAIN ASPECTS OF NATIONAL SECURITY OPERATIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 26, Sen-

ate Resolution 13, to study certain aspects of national security operations.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 13) to study certain aspects of national security operations, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, on page 1, at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "February" and insert "March"; on page 2, line 10, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March"; and on page 3, line 1, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$110,000" and insert "\$92,250"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to make studies as to the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches and functions of the Government with particular reference to:

(1) the effectiveness of present national security methods, staffing, and processes as tested against the requirements imposed by the rapidly mounting complexity of national security problems;

(2) the capacity of present national security staffing, methods, and processes to make full use of the Nation's resources of knowledge, talents, and skills; and

(3) legislative and other proposals or means to improve these methods and processes.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized—

(1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable;

(2) to employ upon a temporary basis and fix the compensation of technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority of the committee is authorized at its discretion to select one employee for appointment; and

(3) with the prior consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize on a reimbursable basis the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any department or agency of the Government.

Sec. 3. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$92,250, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to. Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, am I correct in my understanding that the committee is comparatively new?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The committee is the successor of another committee, but the work of the committee has been the same for at least 4 years.

Mr. ELLENDER. What is the main purpose of the committee?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The purpose of the committee for some time has been to carry on a study of the executive branch offices that relate to national security and the improvement of the machinery for decisionmaking in the executive branch on national security matters. In the report I think the effectiveness of the committee is stated quite succinctly. The report states:

The purpose is to make studies as to the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches and functions of the Government with particular reference to:

(1) The effectiveness of present national security methods, staffing, and processes as tested against the requirements imposed by the rapidly mounting complexity of national security problems;

(2) The capacity of present national security staffing, methods, and processes to make full use of the Nation's resources of knowledge, talents, and skills; and

(3) Legislative and other proposals or means to improve these methods and processes.

Actually the committee has done some outstanding work. I think the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], who is chairman of the committee, has, with his committee and staff, produced some very important proposals, many of which have already been adopted in the executive branch, for the improvement of our national security machinery. I might add that the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] is a member of the Committee on Armed Services and also the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Therefore he finds himself in an enviable position, because he is so intimately acquainted with the security program for the country.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is there any conflict between the work done by that committee and the Preparedness Subcommittee, which is headed by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not think so.

Mr. ELLENDER. The committee would have to do with security. I cannot understand it. In my opinion, it is another duplication.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I can assure the Senator from Louisiana it is not a duplication. It is complementary, but not duplicating.

Mr. ELLENDER. It operates in the same field, however.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In the same field.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 13) as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 27), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 13 as amended would authorize the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, to expend not to exceed \$92,250 from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to make studies as to the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches and functions of the Government with particular reference to:

(1) The effectiveness of present national security methods, staffing, and processes as tested against the requirements imposed by the rapidly mounting complexity of national security problems;

(2) The capacity of present national security staffing, methods, and processes to make full use of the Nation's resources of knowledge, talents, and skills; and

(3) Legislative and other proposals or means to improve these methods and processes.

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorization are shown through December 31, 1962.

Committee and purpose	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
	Government Operations: National security operations...	\$70,000	\$27,709.27	-----
	70,000	27,709.27	May 17, 1962	S. Res. 332

Senate Resolution 13 as referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration would have authorized the expenditure of \$110,000 for the 12-month period from February 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, an amount of \$40,000 in excess of that authorized by the Senate for the same purpose during the last session of Congress.

At its meeting on March 6, 1963, the Committee on Rules and Administration amended Senate Resolution 13 by effecting the following reductions:

(1) A reduction of the requested amount by 10 percent, to conform it more nearly to the corresponding 1962 authorization; and

(2) A further reduction of the requested amount by one-twelfth of that portion of the reduced amount representing salaries and employee benefits, to compensate for funds made available to the committee during February 1963 by Senate Resolution 88, agreed to February 19, 1963.

By this action the Committee on Rules and Administration reduced the amount specified in Senate Resolution 13 as referred by \$17,750—from \$110,000 to \$92,250.

The investigative authority was correspondingly reduced to an 11-month period commencing March 1, 1963.

Additional information relative to the proposed inquiry is contained in a letter to Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, former chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administra-

tion, from Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security Staffing and Operations of the Committee on Government Operations, which letter (with accompanying budget) is as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS,
January 15, 1963.

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to Senate Resolution 13, 88th Congress, 1st session, which was introduced in the Senate on January 14, 1963, requesting funds for studies as to the effectiveness of present national security methods, staffing, and processes as tested against the requirements imposed by the rapidly mounting complexity of national security problems. The requested funds would cover the period from February 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964. Prior to submitting this resolution to the Senate, it was reported favorably by the Committee on Government Operations.

Attached hereto is an estimated budget for the period. It is estimated under this budget that it will require \$110,000 to carry on the inquiry during the present year.

As you know, the Subcommittee on National Security Staffing and Operations is now studying the administration of national

security at home and in the field with a view to making findings and proposals for improvement where appropriate.

The subcommittee, which began its inquiry in May last year, has devoted the initial period of its activities to a thorough and careful analysis of the basic problems in its study, in order to lay a sound foundation for hearings.

To date, we have held more than 300 discussions with present and former Government officials, military leaders, and expert students of national security operations. These consultations have ranged from talks with Cabinet officers of this and previous administrations to discussions with officials in the middle and lower echelons of the Government.

In addition, members of the staff have taken a firsthand look at the staffing and operations of U.S. missions and military establishments in Asia and Europe.

The discussions held and on-the-spot inquiries made have resulted in a great many thought-provoking and helpful ideas.

The staff is preparing a number of background studies in cooperation with the Legislative Reference Service and the executive branch. Two of these, "Selected Papers" relating to the administration of foreign and defense affairs, and "A Bibliography" on the administration of national security have been printed.

An initial staff study analyzing the basic issues to be explored in hearings is in an advanced stage of preparation.

I am pleased to report that of the \$70,000 authorized for the subcommittee for the 8½-month period ending January 31, 1963, we expect to return approximately \$30,000 to the Senate contingent fund. This saving reflects the fact that we were able to obtain the services of our chief consultant and research assistant on a part-time basis and operate the subcommittee during this first phase with only one administrative staff.

During the coming period of accelerated activity, including hearings, we shall need to budget additionally for a secretary, and for further research assistance.

Beginning next month, we plan to hold a major set of hearings which will continue through the present session. These hearings will bring the best minds of our country to bear upon the basic issues of administration of national security.

We expect that a series of specific findings and recommendations relating to national security staffing and operations will emerge from our studies and hearings.

The executive branch has extended its cooperation to the subcommittee.

As you know, my colleagues and I are approaching the problems before us in a non-partisan and professional way.

The study is being made by the Government Operations Committee in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, providing that the committee shall have the duty of—

B. studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency;

C. evaluating the effects of laws enacted to reorganize the legislative and executive branches of the Government.

I shall be available to give the committee any further information desired.

Thanking you for your cooperation and with kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
U.S. Senator, Chairman, Subcommittee on National Security Staffing and Operations.

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative:					
Staff director.....	1	\$8,040	\$17,305.31	\$1,442.10	\$17,305.31
Chief consultant.....	1	8,040	17,305.31	1,442.10	17,305.31
Consultants, including the consultant to the minority.....	4-6				28,000.00
Editorial and research: Research assistants.....	2	3,720	9,579.42	798.28	9,579.42
Administrative and clerical:					
Chief clerk.....	1	2,760	6,735.82	561.31	6,735.82
Stenographer.....	1	2,400	5,955.67	496.30	5,955.67
Total.....					84,881.53
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960).....					450.00
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid).....					5,525.00
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per \$1,000 coverage).....					315.00
Reimbursable payments to agencies.....					5,000.00
Travel (inclusive of field investigations).....					4,500.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees).....					5,000.00
Witness fees, expenses.....					2,000.00
Stationery, office supplies.....					700.00
Communications, (telephone, telegraph).....					1,300.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents.....					250.00
Contingent fund.....					78.47
Total.....					25,118.47
Grand total.....					110,000.00

Funds approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration, \$92,250.

AUTHORITY AND EXPENDITURES FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS TO INVESTIGATE MATTERS WITHIN ITS JURISDICTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 27, Senate Resolution 16.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 16) authorizing the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to investigate certain matters within its jurisdiction and authorizing certain expenditures therefor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment on page 2, line 1, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to Indian affairs; irrigation and reclamation; minerals, materials, and fuels; public lands; and territories and insular affairs.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to Janu-

ary 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, last year the committee spent \$67,000. I notice that no effort was made by the Committee on Rules and Administration to cut back the requested \$100,000, although a full month has gone by.

I offer an amendment that, on page 2, line 16, the figure "\$100,000" be made "\$90,000", so that the amount requested will be in keeping with what the committee requested, that is, on a 12-month basis. Since the remaining time is only 11 months, it seems to me that a 10 percent cut would give the committee the amount requested for operations of the committee within the next 11 months.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I rise to speak in opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana in the absence of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. I hope that the recommendation of the Committee on Rules and Administration will be followed.

Briefly, I point out that the amount proposed represents a very sizable reduction in the amounts that have been spent over the years by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It is a realistic budget. It is a request that has been decreased from \$135,000, which was the total amount authorized in three resolutions by the committee at the last session, to \$100,000. That reduction in itself represents a saving of \$35,000. The \$100,000 figure does not reflect specifically the 7-percent salary increase voted by the Congress last year. This amount was absorbed within the \$100,000. In addition the committee will require these funds to accomplish a number of very important investigations relating to matters within our jurisdiction. The amount is very realistic, and I hope that the recommendation of the Committee on Rules and Administration will be followed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BIBLE. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I stated in the early part of the afternoon, under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, the committee has shown quite a reduction in the amount that was formerly appropriated for the operation of that subcommittee. It strikes me that since the request for \$100,000 covered a period of 12 months, and the committee will operate only 11 months under the appropriation, it would certainly be in order to reduce the appropriation 10 percent so that the committee would receive for 11 months what it would have received for 12 months had the \$100,000 been made available.

Mr. BIBLE. As my friend, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana knows, we have a new chairman of the Interior Committee—the distinguished junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

After he became chairman, which event followed the submission of the original budget by the Senator from New Mexico, the Senator from Washington appointed a new professional staff member to the committee. His salary was not included in the first budget.

Among other things, the committee plans to investigate the public land problems of the entire United States, which is a large and complex field. We have yet to make a final disposition of our fuels study. Although a year ago an appropriation of \$25,000 was secured for this fuels study, I am advised that only about half of that amount was used.

There was an additional appropriation of \$10,000, to study resource revenues, none of which was used. The work relating to this study will be absorbed by our staff and the cost will be absorbed within the \$100,000 requested.

Over the period of an entire year the total turnback was approximately \$47,000 out of a total authorized of \$135,000. So I can assure my friend from Louisiana that if the funds are not

needed, they will certainly be turned back.

Mr. President, I hope that the amendment is rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution (S. Res 16) as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report—No. 28—explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 16, as amended, would authorize the expenditure of \$100,000 by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to Indian affairs; irrigation and reclamation; minerals, materials, and fuels; public lands; and territories and insular affairs.

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorizations are shown through December 31, 1962.

Committee and purpose	87th Con.			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Interior and Insular Affairs: General.....	\$200,000.00	\$145,727.91		
	100,000.00	84,582.61	Jan. 31, 1961	S. Res. 47.
	100,000.00	61,145.30	Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 242.

Senate Resolution 16 as referred would have authorized the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to expend not to exceed \$100,000 from February 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964. In view of the adoption of Senate Resolution 88, agreed to February 19, 1963, which continued the authority for all Senate investigations through February 1963, the Committee on Rules and Administration has reduced the investigative authority contained in Senate Resolution 16 to an 11-month period commencing March 1, 1963. However, the committee has in effect increased the expenditure authorization by \$7,000 by approving for an 11-month period the amount of \$100,000 originally stipulated for a full year.

This action was taken at the request of Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, newly elected

chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Senator JACKSON's statement before the Senate Rules Committee justifying his request (with accompanying revised budget) is as follows:

"Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. I have a brief statement in regard to Senate Resolution 16, the money resolution to support investigations for the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

"The committee's budget, which was submitted under my predecessor this past January, called for a total sum of \$100,000. Pursuant to your committee's announced policy you have reduced this amount by \$7,000 since it is an 11-month budget, leaving a total of \$93,000.

"However, I would like to request to your committee that the amount of \$100,000 be

retained for the utilization of the Interior Committee for the rest of the budgeted year. My reason for requesting this is threefold:

"During last year the committee had the benefit of an additional resolution (S. Res. 269) which was utilized for a study of fuels and energy. We spent approximately \$12,500 of the \$25,000 allotted under this resolution. Our regular investigation resolution (S. Res. 242) for \$100,000 was thereby lightened by this amount. This year the committee may have further work in completing our fuels study and report, but I have not asked for an additional resolution. I intend to absorb any expenditures from Senate Resolution 16.

"Secondly, the committee's budget request under Senate Resolution 16 did not reflect the 7-percent increase in employees' salaries which went into effect last October.

"Thirdly, an additional professional staff member has been retained by me since I became chairman of the committee and since the budget was submitted by my predecessor. I would like to point out to the committee that at present this is the only person I have hired, and in order to adequately cover this additional cost I request that the full amount of \$100,000 be retained under Senate Resolution 16.

"I have prepared a new budget based upon my present request of the committee, and I would now like to submit it for the committee's consideration."

Funds requested, Senate Resolution 16, \$100,000.

Funds approved by Committee on Rules and Administration, \$100,000.

STUDY OF ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 28, Senate Resolution 55.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 55) to study administrative practice and procedure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments on page 2, line 4, after the word "from", to strike out "March", and in line 23, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$120,000" and insert "\$110,600", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a full and complete study and investigation of administrative practice and procedure within the departments and agencies of the United States in the exercise of their rulemaking, licensing, and adjudicatory functions, including a study of the effectiveness of the Administrative Procedure Act, with a view to determining whether additional legislation is required to provide for the fair, impartial, and effective performance of such functions.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems ad-

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative:					
Special counsel.....	3	\$7,680	\$16,628.34	\$1,385.69	\$49,885.02
Investigator.....	1	6,960	15,274.41	1,272.86	15,274.41
Do.....	1	4,080	9,596.30	799.69	9,596.30
Administrative and clerical:					
Stenographer.....	1	2,820	6,865.81	572.15	6,865.81
Do.....	1	2,580	6,345.74	528.81	6,345.74
Total.....					(87,967.28)
Minus 1/2 for 11-month budget, total.....					80,636.62
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960).....				\$295.72	
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6 1/2 percent of total salaries paid).....				5,717.87	
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per \$1,000 coverage).....				278.04	
Minus 1/2 for 11-month budget.....					5,767.33
Travel (inclusive of field investigations).....					7,000.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees).....					3,000.00
Witness fees, expenses.....					1,000.00
Stationery, office supplies.....					1,000.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph).....					200.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents.....					1,396.05
Contingent fund.....					
Total.....					19,363.38
Grand total.....					100,000.00

visible; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$110,600 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed

in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 29), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 55 as amended would authorize expenditure of \$110,600 by the Committee on the Judiciary, acting through its Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, "to make a full and complete study and investigation of administrative practice and procedure within the departments and agencies of the United States in the exercise of their rulemaking, licensing, and adjudicatory functions, including a study of the effectiveness of the Administrative Procedure Act, with a view to determining whether additional legislation is required to provide for the fair, impartial, and effective performance of such functions."

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorizations are shown through December 31, 1962.

Committee and purpose	87th Cong.			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Judiciary: Administrative practice and procedure.....	\$230,000	\$127,263.95		
	115,000	68,400.98	Jan. 31, 1961	S. Res. 51.
	115,000	58,862.97	Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 256.

Due to the delay in the organization of the Senate and in order that its subcommittees could meet their February payrolls, the Senate on February 19, 1963, approved Senate Resolution 88, which continued for 1 month—through February 28, 1963—the investigative and expenditure authorizations granted to Senate committees during the 87th Congress, 2d session, and in certain instances provided additional funds for the purpose.

Since most of the resolutions which would authorize inquiries and investigations during the present session had already been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration prior to the adoption of Senate Resolution 88, and consequently were on a 12-month basis, the committee at its meeting on February 27, 1963, adopted the following formula to reduce each such request to an 11-month basis:

"A reduction by one-twelfth of that portion of the total request representing salaries and agency contributions to employee retirement, health benefits, and group life insurance."

On this basis the expenditure authorization contained in Senate Resolution 55 was reduced \$9,400, from \$120,000 to \$110,600.

The investigative authority was correspondingly reduced to an 11-month period commencing March 1, 1963.

AUTHORITY TO STUDY MATTERS PERTAINING TO CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 29, Senate Resolution 57.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 57) authorizing a study of matters pertaining to constitutional amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments on page 1, line 9, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 2, line 17, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$51,500" and insert "\$54,423," so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommit-

tee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to constitutional amendments.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its activities and findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$54,423, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to. The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 30), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 57, as amended, would authorize the expenditure of \$54,423 by the Committee on the Judiciary, through its Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to constitutional amendments.

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorizations are shown through December 31, 1962.

Committee and purpose	87th Cong.			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Judiciary: Constitutional amendments.....	\$81,000.00	\$68,386.62		
	32,500.00	28,610.21	Jan. 31, 1961	S. Res. 59.
	48,500.00	39,776.41	Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 259.

Due to the delay in the organization of the Senate and in order that its subcommittees could meet their February payrolls, the Senate on February 19, 1963, approved Senate Resolution 88, which continued for 1 month—through February 28, 1963—the investigative and expenditure authorizations granted to Senate committees during the 87th Congress, 2d session, and in certain

instances provided additional funds for the purpose.

Since most of the resolutions which would authorize inquiries and investigations during the present session had already been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration prior to the adoption of Senate Resolution 88, and consequently were on a

12-month basis, the committee at its meeting on February 27, 1963, adopted the following formula to reduce each such request to an 11-month basis:

"A reduction by one-twelfth of that portion of the total request representing salaries and agency contributions to employee retirement, health benefits, and group life insurance."

On this basis the expenditure authorization contained in Senate Resolution 57 was reduced \$3,700—from \$51,500 to \$47,800—and the legislative authority was correspondingly reduced to an 11-month period commencing March 1, 1963.

At its meeting on March 6, 1963, the committee increased the latter amount to \$54,423 to provide \$6,623 (11-month basis) for a clerical assistant to the minority.

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 30, Senate Resolution 58.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 58) to investigate matters pertaining to constitutional rights.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, on page 1, line 10, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 2, line 18, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$165,000" and insert "\$152,300", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to constitutional rights.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$152,300, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have carefully examined this subject and I think an amendment to the resolution is required, unless we are given some better idea than we have been given as to the way in which the funds will be administered.

Mr. President, I regret that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], a very distinguished Member of the Senate, who is chairman of the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, is necessarily absent today; and I am satisfied that he is necessarily absent. I regret that in his absence I must raise a question which he might settle himself, as the chairman of the subcommittee in the absence of a rule of the subcommittee.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President—
Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am not quite prepared to yield.

Therefore, I make this statement in advance. Should the managers of this measure on the floor feel that they would rather consider it tomorrow, or some other day, certainly I would have no objection to that.

Mr. President, I wish to state the point I have in mind. I have examined very carefully the proposed agenda of the subcommittee, which seeks the not inconsiderable sum of \$165,000 reduced to \$152,300.

I understand—and I am quite sure this is correct—that this is a very able subcommittee, which certainly has a very distinguished lawyer as its chairman. I understand the subcommittee has a good staff.

Yet, as we look over the work which the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights proposes to do we find the following matters will be considered by it: First, the constitutional rights of the American Indian.

I am very deeply solicitous of the constitutional rights of the American Indian, but I point out that one of the very critical areas of constitutional rights is quite excluded from everything the committee is going to do.

I shall read the list, so that my colleagues can understand what this is all about.

The subcommittee will consider the constitutional rights of the American Indian. Then it will consider the constitutional rights of military personnel. Then it will consider the constitutional rights of the mentally ill. Then it will consider constitutional rights in the administration of criminal justice. It will consider constitutional rights regarding citizenship, and also regarding the right to counsel, primarily in Federal criminal trials.

All those matters are important, Mr. President, but I do not believe that they are superior in importance to the constitutional rights of Americans who are denied those rights on the basis of racial discrimination in respect to schools, or in respect to voting, or in respect to places of public accommodation, or in respect to any one of a dozen other areas

covered by the 27 legislative recommendations to the Congress by the U.S. Civil Rights Commission in its last comprehensive reports in 1961.

Mr. President, obviously a proposal which is of a substantive legislative character, on such a measure as is pending, which has been ruled by the Presiding Officer to be a measure for the appropriation of money, would not be in order, and I would not offer it, ordinarily. But, Mr. President, if the chairman of the subcommittee has laid this down as his subcommittee's agenda, before the Senate votes on the money for that agenda, I see no reason why we should not open up the possibility that the agenda perhaps might be improved at the behest of the full committee or of the subcommittee itself.

I therefore have in mind offering an amendment on page 1 at line 8 of the resolution, which would read as follows:

Provided, however, That the committee or such duly authorized subcommittee shall determine the matters to be studied by majority vote.

If the committee had a rule which so provided, or if the chairman of the committee would assure the Senate that the administration of the work of the committee, the selection of matters to be studied, their priority or order, or anything else of this nature, would be committed to a vote of the committee itself, there would be no need for any such amendment or for any such action by the Senate. That is why I suggest that if there is no particular desire to deal with the matter at this moment, in the absence of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], I would be perfectly willing to postpone any action I have in mind until such time as the Senator is available.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I apologize for the fact that I did not hear all the able Senator from New York was saying. Did the Senator say that he was willing not to take action until some subsequent date with respect to the amendment?

Mr. JAVITS. I think, if the Senate is to act on the resolution, it would be necessary to act on the amendment. If it is the disposition of the Senators in charge of the measure on the floor to put the resolution over for a day, that is satisfactory to me.

Mr. SMATHERS. Does the Senator know whether the Senator from North Carolina will be present tomorrow?

Mr. JAVITS. I do not know. As I stated, I did not have any idea in advance that he would not be present, but he is not, and I think it is the sort of thing he ought to consider.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I make the suggestion that the resolution relating to the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary has already been put over until Tuesday because of the necessary absence of the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Perhaps this resolution also should be put over until the same day.

Mr. SMATHERS. It is apparently the disposition of Senators, as I take a little temperature reading, to have the able Senator from New York proceed to offer his amendment at this particular time, and to have the Senate make some disposition of it.

Mr. JAVITS. Very well. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 8, it is proposed to strike out the period and to insert a colon and the following: "Provided, however, That the committee or such duly authorized subcommittee shall determine the matters to be studied by majority vote."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, as I said before, I offer the amendment because of the way in which the agenda is set up to justify the amount of money which the Senate is asked to appropriate and the specification which is made as to the items which would be investigated or the matters which would be considered by the subcommittee; these exclude, it seems to me, one of the most critical issues before the Nation regarding constitutional rights.

In the absence of any assurance whatever on that score—that at least the subcommittee itself, by a majority vote, could determine priority in the selection of matters to be studied—I should be derelict in my duty if I sat silent while the money was voted to the subcommittee which is charged with that particular responsibility and made no effort whatever, in the absence of any assurance by any member of the subcommittee or of the committee, to at least open up the proposal to the possibility that this critically important issue of constitutional rights which is called civil rights might be considered.

I do not think that the amount of money proposed to be provided the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee is exorbitant or out of line. I am completely in favor of voting for it. I shall be happy to vote for it. I raise no issue whatever as to the finances.

I raise only the issue that, from the report which accompanies the measure, it is very clear that the fundamental constitutional rights of the great body of Americans are not scheduled to be considered, although there are serious charges—including the charges of a commission of the Federal Government itself, the U.S. Civil Rights Commission—that such rights are being denied. When we look at the specification of what the subcommittee is supposed to deal with in respect to constitutional rights, we find there is no mention whatever of the prospect of taking up this subject.

I cannot compel, nor could even the Senate compel, the subcommittee to consider something which it did not want to consider; but at least we could open

up the possibility that, if a majority of the subcommittee, or the full committee, desired it to be done, at least it would be done.

That is all my amendment proposes to do. Indeed, I respectfully submit that it is the kind of amendment as to which any committee chairman or subcommittee chairman could readily say, "Well, that is not necessary at all. I fully intend, if there is any difference in my committee as to priorities or as to particular matters which will be subject to my subcommittee, to submit it to a majority vote of the committee."

In that case I would withdraw the amendment. I have no desire to press for an amendment, provided that assurance is available, but obviously it is not; nor is there any desire to defer the matter until the chairman himself decided whether he would wish to give such assurance.

As this is final action in the Senate, I have no alternative but to press the point. That is the reason for which I submit the amendment. I hope it will have the favorable consideration of the Senate, as indeed I think it must, in good conscience and in good faith.

I challenge any Member of the Senate, whether he is from the North or from the South, in good conscience to say that the civil rights issue is not one of the major constitutional questions before us and that he could in fairness and decency vote \$152,300 to a subcommittee which does not even carry that item on its agenda.

Mr. President, let us grow up, and let us be adult. The notion of the Senate as a great club is fine if we deal with the problems of the country.

My concern is as follows, and I shall always try to maintain it: I make no criticism of any Member of the Senate whatsoever, but we must do our duty. We cannot sit around with our hands folded while the things being done determine the course that the Congress shall take for the next 2 years. This resolution is one of the things being done which have such an effect. It is one of the doors being closed. It is not one of the most important doors. We could do something about civil rights if we wanted to, if, as we know, an adequate majority, sometimes two-thirds, decided to do it. But this is a door by means of which these rights could and should be considered, and to sit by and let it ride because one wants to be a good fellow and does not want to raise any question about the matter, when the most hotly controverted civil rights question in the United States is omitted from the matters this subcommittee tells the Senate, in its own report, it is going to take up, is not my idea of being a good Senator of the United States.

That is why, in the absence of any other assurance—in the absence even of agreement to let the resolution go over until next Tuesday—I felt it my duty to seek a vote on the amendment. For the information of the Senate, I shall seek a yea-and-nay vote, if I can get one.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ER-

VIN] has been chairman of this subcommittee for a number of years. I have heard an undercover attack, a devious attack, on his character and integrity tonight. That is what it means. No one has ever questioned the way he conducted that subcommittee. No one has ever accused him of sitting on or squatting on or holding up a bill.

I am not trying to get my name in the newspapers, but nobody has ever done that. He has been a responsible subcommittee chairman, and I do not think a subcommittee can be run from the floor of the U.S. Senate. We must rely upon the integrity of the committee chairman.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] has certainly met all the tests. He is a great lawyer. He has made an able chairman of that subcommittee. I do not think anybody, in his wildest dreams, even if he had a shot of opium, could say he attempted to sit on anything.

I think the resolution should be adopted.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in response to the statement of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, I cannot allow the matter to be placed upon that basis, nor would I permit the Senator from Mississippi by his speech to wish it on me. I am not questioning the integrity of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] at all. On the contrary, I have the greatest faith in him. I want the matter to go over for a day or so in order that he can be here and explain what he plans to do with the subcommittee and the agenda and the matters it is to take up—about which, incidentally, the Senator from Mississippi has said absolutely nothing.

So I think my good faith, in regard to the integrity and distinction of the chairman of the subcommittee, who is a very honored Member of this body, is completely unimpaired. As a matter of fact, I ask the opportunity to put it over until Tuesday, as another resolution for a subcommittee was put over. Let the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] be here. Let him express himself on these matters. I shall be delighted to have that done, and I hope it will not be necessary to press the amendment. In the absence of that assurance, I do not see any reason why I should be talked out of it or that the Senate should be talked out of it on the assertion that it impugns the reputation or standing of the Senator from North Carolina. It does no such thing. It is clear that it does not do that.

Let us understand exactly what the fundamental problem here is. It is that it is extremely difficult to get any consideration in the Judiciary Committee of matters of this character. The Judiciary Committee considers civil rights bills only when we, by action in the Senate, compel a report by a day certain, and even then, if my memory serves me correctly, they have come back without taking a position pro or con. We understand what the situation is with respect to civil rights legislation. So when we have an opportunity to do something in trying to open up, as it were, the door for

consideration of matters in the subcommittee, it seems to me, in all decency, we ought to do it.

We know too well the history and the background; for example, the situation which exists on a motion to take up civil rights legislation. For that reason, I am attempting to amend the resolution.

I respectfully submit it does not represent impugning in any manner whatever the dignity or standing or capacity of the chairman of the subcommittee. Indeed, I here affirm what I have said many times before. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] is one of the most distinguished and able men to serve in the Senate, a man of the highest integrity and standing.

We are talking about matters which the subcommittee will consider, the basis upon which those matters may be determined, by whom they will be determined, and about the absence of the Senator from North Carolina. He is being denied the opportunity to express himself on this subject, which, in my opinion, he should be asked to do and permitted to do in all deference to his dignity and standing, by the fact that it is insisted that this resolution be dealt with tonight.

I think it is a great mistake to have it dealt with tonight. I have no choice, in view of the way matters stand, but to offer the amendment. There is nothing else I can do about it. The only way to change or to have a hope of changing the way in which these matters will be submitted to the subcommittee, in view of the way we are being asked to act on this matter tonight, is by my offering the amendment which I have offered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is a fairminded man. I am recollecting now from my memory, and I may be in error; the Senator is knowledgeable enough so that if I am in error he will correct me. It is my recollection that when the literacy test voting bill was before us in the last Congress, it was referred to the subcommittee under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN]. It is my further recollection that at that time it was stated by the Senator from North Carolina that, even though civil rights bills had been referred to his committee, none of those who had introduced those civil rights bills had asked for hearings up to that time. He was asked on that occasion if he would hold hearings on the literacy test voting bill. He said he would, and he did.

I may say that this subcommittee, to my knowledge, only this past week, on the initiative of the Senator from North Carolina, held a meeting with Indian groups relative to civil rights affecting that part of our population.

Therefore, I would hope most sincerely that the Senator from New York would not press for a yea-and-nay vote on his amendment, because I believe that if he will go back in his memory he will recall—and this is subject to correction—that at any time when a civil rights bill

was introduced which had been referred to that subcommittee, hearings were held if the person who introduced the bill requested hearings. Am I correct?

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to agree with the Senator from Montana, for whom I have the deepest affection. However, I must call attention to the fact that that very question was controverted on the floor by none other than my colleague from New York.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I did not recall that.

Mr. JAVITS. The same question was raised by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN]. I recall, however, that the matter was controverted by my colleague from New York, specifically and directly, according to my recollection. He is on the floor. If I am in error, the Senator from New York will correct me.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator's word is good enough for me.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. KEATING. The difficulty which those of us who are interested in this field have is that there is no disposition on the part of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary to report on civil rights bills whether or not they are referred by the main committee to this particular subcommittee for consideration. That is something which some of us have suffered from over the years. The distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] takes a different view in this field from the view taken by some of the rest of us. He may have a certain reluctance to refer bills on civil rights to the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, but the real problem is getting action on these measures whether or not they are referred.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. What bills is the Senator speaking about?

Mr. KEATING. I am speaking about the package of civil rights bills.

Mr. EASTLAND. What bills is the Senator talking about?

Mr. KEATING. There are none this year that I know of.

Mr. EASTLAND. Before that. The Senator said that the Senator from Mississippi had a reluctance, if I understood the Senator correctly, to refer bills to the subcommittee. Is that correct?

Mr. KEATING. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. All right. What bills? What are those bills?

Mr. KEATING. I hope the reluctance—

Mr. EASTLAND. Wait a minute. I challenge the accuracy of the statement the Senator has made. What are the bills?

Mr. KEATING. Do I have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senior Senator from New York has the floor. He has yielded to the junior Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. If the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, will give assurance that civil rights bills will be immediately referred to the Sub-

committee on Constitutional Rights and given proper consideration, that may dispose of the matter before us.

Mr. EASTLAND. I know; but the truth is that that has always been the policy.

Mr. JAVITS. I ask for the regular order, Mr. President.

Mr. KEATING. The distinguished Senator from North Carolina last year indicated that he had not scheduled hearings on civil rights measures because none had been requested by the sponsors of the bills. I pointed out, at that time, that I had urged the subcommittee to give a higher priority to civil rights legislation on many occasions. Subsequently I addressed a letter to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee which reads, in part, as follows:

Thank you for sending me a copy of the draft of the annual report of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights.

I have reviewed the report, and it has my approval as a summary of the subcommittee's work to date.

As the report notes, 15 civil rights bills were referred to the subcommittee in 1961. Except for three of these bills relating to the life of the Civil Rights Commission, the subcommittee has not conducted any hearings on this legislation. As you know, I have requested at several of our meetings that civil rights legislation be given a higher priority in the work of the subcommittee. In view of the colloquy on the Senate floor the other day, I would like to reiterate for the record my particular desire for early hearings on the following bills which I have either sponsored or cosponsored:

S. 480 (literacy), S. 481 (civil injunctive suits), S. 482 (enforcement of 14th amendment), S. 484 (school assistance), S. 1254 (protection of Armed Forces), S. 1255 (conspiracies) and S. 1256 (antilynching).

Later in the session, we did have hearings and did report a bill dealing with voting rights, but despite my request there were no other hearings, to the best of my recollection, on the other bills.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. If the package of bills which may be introduced this year—

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from New York has the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. Does the Senator wish me to yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. I am glad to yield, but first I have yielded to my colleague from New York.

Mr. EASTLAND. I thought the Senator had yielded to me.

Mr. KEATING. Regardless of the practice last year, if the Senator from Mississippi will give us assurance that civil rights bills will be promptly referred to the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, it will then be up to the members of the subcommittee to obtain hearings and action on these bills in the subcommittee. In my judgment, the distinguished Senator from North Carolina would hold hearings on these bills whether or not he agreed with them.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I wish to make this statement. Any implication that the Senator from Mississippi has not speedily referred bills is not borne out by the record. That is an inaccurate statement. The only assurance that I must give to anyone is that I will do my duty as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, without fear or favor of anyone. Any implication that I have not done my duty in the past by referring bills as they should be referred is utterly false. The record bears me out.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it is always important to cut through obscurities. The distinguished Senator from Mississippi says he will do his duty as he sees it. That is all right. We all understand that. That may be consistent with the way the Senator from Mississippi does or does not feel he must run his office. Then my very distinguished colleague in the Senate, the majority leader, says that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] said he would grant hearings on any bill that was referred to him. I heard him say that. There was some dispute about that.

However, even laying that aside, we are granting money in this resolution, not for the consideration of particular bills, but we are granting more than \$150,000 for certain investigations in the constitutional rights field. That is what this money is for. These investigations are spelled out for us specifically. I should like to read them again. They are:

The constitutional rights of the American Indian. The constitutional rights of military personnel. The rights of the mentally ill. Constitutional rights and the administration of criminal justice. Citizenship. Right to counsel.

I say that we cannot ask for a substantial sum of money from Congress for a Constitutional Rights Subcommittee which is telling us in advance that it is not going to consider the question of the denial of rights under the 14th and 15th amendments, especially with the record of the Civil Rights Commission before us, and with a report before us, which I recently put into the RECORD, from the Civil Rights Commission's advisory committee in the State of Mississippi itself, which indicated the most widespread and flagrant violations of the 14th and 15th amendments.

Again I say—

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I will yield in a minute.

Mr. EASTLAND. I would like to say—

Mr. JAVITS. I ask the Senator to let me finish my statement.

Mr. EASTLAND. I beg the Senator's pardon. I thought he had yielded to me.

Mr. JAVITS. The question always comes up, Shall we just sit silently by and say nothing? That is always a question of degree. It seems to me that where it is so very clear that there is no intention of considering what many of us here believe to be some of the most fundamental questions of constitutional rights in the country, it is our duty to rise and try to do something about it.

In the only way open to me, I have tried to do that. I now yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. I have been challenged that bills were not promptly referred to subcommittees. Here is docket No. 572, S. 1254, Senators HUMPHREY, BURDICK, CANNON, and others. March 8, 1961. Referred on March 10, 1961.

Docket No. 573, S. 1255, HUMPHREY, BURDICK, DOUGLAS, and others. March 8. Referred March 10, 1961.

Here is another one. This deals with the denial of certain rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, and for the protection of such persons from lynching, and for other purposes. Introduced by Senators HUMPHREY, ALLOTT, BURDICK, and others, on March 8, 1962. Referred on March 10, 1962.

Here is another one. Referred to the subcommittee, not to the committee. Docket No. 575, S. 1257, to indefinitely extend the Civil Rights Commission. It was introduced on March 8, and referred on March 10.

That is what the record is.

Mr. JAVITS. I have the calendar of the Committee on the Judiciary before me, and it does indicate a considerable number of references, which does not mean, by any means, that all the bills were referred. I think it bears somewhat upon the controversy which existed last year, when the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] indicated that he granted a hearing on any bill on which a hearing was requested, because there are a good many bills, for example, as to which my colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING] was himself responsible for requesting action. That was the reason for the controversy, which occurred at that time, as to whether that had actually been the practice of the subcommittee.

I have before me one document, the report of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights for the 1st session of the 87th Congress, which relates to that issue. On page 18, the report reads:

During the session there were referred to the subcommittee 15 bills dealing with the further preservation and protection of the constitutional rights of all persons within the United States. Of these bills the subcommittee considered and acted upon three bills to extend the operation of the Commission on Civil Rights.

I point that out merely to show the small number, out of the total volume of these bills which were submitted to the subcommittee, that were acted upon. However, I think these arguments are not germane to this money resolution. Whatever may be the pros and cons on that issue, as they have been discussed here, what is germane to this money resolution is that we be told what investigations will be conducted under it.

It is very clear, from a reading of these specifications, that there is not included any consideration of what we call civil rights.

Therefore, I respectfully submit that the job which the subcommittee should be doing will not be done. They tell us so themselves. It is for that reason that, at the very least, I wished at least to

open the question to a majority of the subcommittee as to what matters they would consider. Perhaps in its good judgment the majority of the subcommittee would decide that they wanted to consider civil rights issues, in which case that should be done. In any case, the door should not be clanged shut, as would be done if the Senate acted on the resolution today without discussion.

Mr. EASTLAND. I call attention to docket No. 1613, S. 2750, introduced by Messrs. MANSFIELD and DIRKSEN, on January 30, 1962, which is the bill to protect the right to vote in Federal elections free from arbitrary discrimination by literacy tests or other means.

That bill was referred to the committee on January 31, 1962. It was referred to the subcommittee automatically on the day following its introduction.

Mr. JOHNSTON. To keep the record straight, I think the Senator should read the paragraph just preceding what he read. He will find that it goes into other questions besides those he mentioned. It reads:

The proposed agenda for this session includes studies of vital areas of constitutional law which stand in need of examination by Congress. At the present rate of expense, the proposed budget should permit the subcommittee, in addition to dealing with legislation referred to it, to continue or initiate work on the following subjects.

Then the report states what the Senator has read to the Senate, showing that that will be done after we have gone into the other questions in regard to civil rights.

Mr. JAVITS. I am sorry I cannot agree with that interpretation. Certainly in the absence of the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] we are lashed to the words which are in the report; and the report, it seems to me, makes it very clear that, as it says:

At the present rate of expense, the proposed budget should permit the subcommittee, in addition to dealing with legislation referred to it, to continue or initiate work on the following subjects.

It is very clear to me, at least, that the design of this request details what subjects will be considered, in addition to dealing with proposed legislation referred to the subcommittee. In regard to legislation, again, we get into the controversy as to what is referred to the subcommittee, when it is referred, and whether, even if it is referred, it will be considered.

The important point is that this money is requested principally for study. But the studies do not include the study of the question of constitutional rights known as civil rights.

What am I trying to do about that? I am not trying to write in a charge or a direction to the subcommittee to consider that question. I am only trying to keep that door open by giving the majority of the subcommittee the right to have that subject studied, if it chooses to do so. It seems to me that this is an extremely mild approach to the problem, but at least it is something which might have some basis in the intention of the Senate in voting this money.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. As the ranking Republican member of the subcommittee, I should like to say that the chairman of the subcommittee has held executive meetings and that the subcommittee has, from time to time, considered bills which are before it. If a majority of the subcommittee will vote for the consideration of and hearings on any of the so-called civil rights bills to which the Senator from New York refers, they will be held.

I assure the Senator from New York that meetings are held. The majority of the committee are the ones who determine whether meetings shall be held. I suggest to the Senator from New York that there have been, so far as I know—I stand correction at the hands of the clerk of the committee—no requests filed for hearings on the bills which were referred to the subcommittee. There were no requests for hearings.

I further suggest that the administration was somewhat laggard in suggesting that these bills even be introduced and considered. Based upon the message which came to Congress a little earlier this session, I assume that the attitude has changed somewhat. But I venture to say that the type of amendment which the Senator from New York suggests for this resolution will be of no effect and of no avail to get the job done which he seeks to have done.

Mr. JAVITS. That is the reason why I said when I began that I hoped this question would be deferred until the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] could say what the Senator from Nebraska has said as to the past and as to the future concerning the role which will be played by the committee under this appropriation which is requested. Unfortunately, that opportunity is being denied, so all the extrapolation which any of us might indulge in as to what the chairman may or may not do with the subcommittee's money for the next 2 years is, I respectfully submit, not dispositive.

The fact is that the specifications of this report do not include any investigation of any such matters as I have described.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. On that score, it is true that there are five or six items of that type listed on the agenda, but the money is being allowed for the purpose of maintaining a staff and conducting hearings on bills which are referred to the committee, including civil rights bills, and by procedures which are provided in the subcommittee. Whenever there is a majority vote to take up a bill, that is the bill on which hearings are scheduled and hearings are had. But in the absence of any plain desire on the part of either the introducer of the bill or any group of Senators interested in it, of course there will not be any hearings. All of us know that many bills are introduced on which it is not expected that any hearings will be held, nor are hearings desired to be held. It is on that basis that the subcommittee acts.

Mr. JAVITS. I cannot accept that statement; I am sorry. I was here and

heard challenged the indication by Senator ERVIN last year that he granted a hearing on any civil rights bill when requested to do so. A request was made by my colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING]. I do not wish to embarrass the Senator from New York, because he is a member of the subcommittee. I shall not ask him any questions. I will state of my own knowledge that this question was challenged.

Various Senators, including the Senator from New York, are sponsors of a half a dozen bills which were referred to this very subcommittee, bills upon which no hearings have been held.

It simply taxes my credibility—I speak personally—to assume that no request was made for hearings on the most obvious civil rights bill before the subcommittee, where all that was necessary, according to what has been said, was to ask for hearings and hearings would be granted. I simply think that that would really be impugning the good faith of so many of us who have introduced civil rights bills. It is simply inconceivable to me.

This is the only chance we will have to take action of this kind, so I have offered a most mild amendment. It would open up the procedure to provide the very thing which the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] says took place. In the absence of the chairman of the subcommittee to give us that assurance, and the unwillingness to put this resolution over for 2 or 3 days, as was done in the case of another subcommittee resolution, just for that purpose alone I wish to get his assurance.

Mr. President, I do not think that is the way Senators should act with each other; and if for no other reason, we should vote on this matter tonight, on the RECORD. Let us test that out and find out why this particular resolution must be singled out tonight, and must be voted on tonight, and cannot be put over until Tuesday. Why not put it over, in the absence of the subcommittee chairman? I think this demands a record vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, neither do I see why this resolution should be singled out by the Senator from New York. I do not contest the credibility of any Senator. I certainly would take the word of the Senator from Nebraska, the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, as to the procedure followed, when he says that whenever a majority of the subcommittee seeks to hold a hearing on a bill introduced by a Member, a hearing is held.

Let me corroborate what the Senator from Nebraska has said—namely, that bills which have been introduced have gone to that committee and to other committees, and the sponsors of those bills have never asked for hearings. That is the way such things work in this body, and I think we might as well recognize that fact. It is not a matter of personalities, or a matter of having the word of one Senator attacked. It is a matter of fact, and we cannot gainsay it.

The chairman of the Judiciary Committee has stated that when bills on

civil rights are referred to that committee, he will refer them to the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I should like to make this statement: The clerk of the committee has instructions immediately to refer every bill to the appropriate subcommittee; and the records bear out that they have been so referred—not just civil rights bills, but all the bills which go to the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The chairman of the Judiciary Committee now has stated again that the bills which are introduced and are referred to the Judiciary Committee are to be immediately referred to the appropriate subcommittees. Is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct in all instances.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Very well. And the Senator from Nebraska has said, as the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, that whenever a majority of that subcommittee desires to hold a hearing on such a bill, a hearing will be held.

I hope this will be taken into consideration by the Senator from New York, so that we can settle this question, and can proceed with our business.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I will take the assurance of the majority leader and I will take the assurance of the chairman of the committee, because they are the ones who are vested with the authority.

So far as the Senator from Nebraska is concerned, after all he has to rely upon what took place before. He does not run the subcommittee, and I would not wish to tax him with that responsibility or to ask of him anything which in my heart I knew he could not do or say.

Both the assurances by the majority leader and the chairman of the committee are satisfactory to me. They are, first, that bills referred to the Judiciary Committee will be automatically and promptly referred to the appropriate subcommittees; second, that the practice of the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee will be to grant a hearing on referred bills on the request of the sponsor or the cosponsor. If I have those assurances, I will withdraw this amendment.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Let me make the matter plain. I am not making any commitment or promise to the Senator from New York. I am simply stating a fact, namely, that the clerk of the committee has instructions immediately to refer every bill which goes to the committee to the appropriate subcommittee. That has been the policy in the past, and it is going to be the policy in the future; and I do not want the Senator from New York to get on the floor and leave the impression that he has dragged some concession from the Senator from Mississippi, because he has not. What has happened in the past will happen in the future, namely, the clerk has instructions immediately to refer every bill; and that is going to prevail in the future as it has in the past; and no one has

dragged any concession from the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let me say that I am sure that was not the intention of the Senator from New York. But he has requested assurance of what has, in fact, been the operation in the committee in the past in regard to the reference of bills to the appropriate subcommittees; and on that we have the word of the Senator from Nebraska, the ranking minority member of the subcommittee—and I trust him completely—that whenever a majority of the subcommittee seeks a hearing, one is held.

So I think the requests of the Senator from New York have been met.

Mr. EASTLAND. I repeat that the clerk of the committee has instructions to carry on in the future as he has in the past.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is all the Senator from New York wants to know; and no one is saying that anything has been dragged out of the Senator from Mississippi, but only that the policy which has been followed in the past will continue to be followed.

Mr. JAVITS. But the point that is missing is whether there will be a hearing on a bill which is referred. Let us assume that what has been stated will be done. I am not dragging any concession out of any Senator; that is not at all my purpose. We can just proceed to vote on this matter.

I appreciate the reluctance of the Senate to get into a rollcall vote at 10 minutes after 7 in the evening.

But the problem which is not covered is this: The statement which it is alleged the chairman of the subcommittee has made—he is absent at this time—is that if the sponsor of a civil rights measure—which is automatically referred, according to the practice of the committee, as explained by the Senator from Mississippi, to the subcommittee—requests a hearing, it is represented here that the chairman of the subcommittee will grant one. If that is going to continue to be the practice, I think we have to have that statement from some Senator who can make that statement of fact; and, in my judgment, the only Senators now present who can do that are either the majority leader—not that he has the direct authority, but I would be perfectly willing to accept that assurance from him—or the chairman of the committee; and all of us heard the statement that the chairman of the committee will not make such a statement; and the majority leader will decide as to precisely what he wishes to do. In the absence of that, I do not feel that in good conscience I can abandon the little struggle we have had here.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Well, Mr. President, if the Senator from New York will allow me to do so, I will take that responsibility and will give him my assurance, and I do it on behalf of the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I should like to point out that the Senator from New York stated that if the sponsor of the bill states to the chairman

of the subcommittee that he wishes to have a hearing held on the bill, a hearing will be held on it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Oh, no.

Mr. HRUSKA. But that is my understanding of what the Senator from New York said.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Then he has changed his tune, because he said "a majority of the committee."

Mr. HRUSKA. Yes, that is my understanding. But the different statement does not coincide with what I heard stated. I did not hear the majority leader make such a statement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I said "on the basis of a majority."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to make the matter crystal clear. It was represented that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] said last year—and I regret his absence—that when a sponsor requested a hearing, he gave him one. I think I understand the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] and the majority leader. If the assurance which the majority leader is willing to give is that when a sponsor requests a hearing, and if the request is approved by a majority of the subcommittee, a hearing will be held, I would only ask one other assurance, and that is the assurance that the question would be promptly submitted to the subcommittee.

If that is given, then I am perfectly content, and I will withdraw the amendment.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. On the subject of obtaining a hearing, there would be a majority vote of the subcommittee. I would not countenance any other course. I do not believe that any chairman of a subcommittee is so autocratical or dictatorial as to take action on his own. I would be willing to join the majority leader in such assurance.

Mr. JAVITS. And the request of the sponsor would be promptly submitted to the subcommittee?

Mr. HRUSKA. I am not chairman of the subcommittee. I could not do it.

Mr. JAVITS. That is just the point.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We must trust our colleagues. There is not a committee to which I could go with a bill, the chairman of which committee would not grant me a hearing. What the committee would do for me on my measure it would do for other Senators on any other measure.

Mr. HRUSKA. At the request of a Senator who had introduced a bill that the bill be considered by the subcommittee and a vote taken, I am willing to give assurance that such a motion would

be made. I do not know that it would be passed, but at least I would be willing to make the motion if no other Senator would.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I believe the Senator would agree that there has never been an occasion when a member of a subcommittee made a motion in the committee to take up a bill, the majority voted to take it up, and it was not taken up.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, unfortunately, we are speaking in the absence of the subcommittee chairman. I am perfectly willing to accept the assurance of the majority leader precisely as he stated it, that is, that if a sponsor of a bill referred to the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights requests a hearing—and we have the statement that the practice in the past of automatic referral will continue—and if a majority of the subcommittee sustains that request, the Senator will get a hearing. That is all fine, provided that there is added to the statement that the question for the majority of the subcommittee will be promptly submitted to the subcommittee. It seems to me that is inherent in what we are talking about.

If the question is not submitted, the majority may never get an opportunity to decide whether it does or does not wish to grant a hearing. I know that the majority leader is not the chairman of the subcommittee, but I trust him completely. With the majority leader's assurance that he will use his best efforts to that effect, I shall withdraw the amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I will make that promise.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 31), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 58 as amended would authorize the expenditure of \$152,300 by the Committee on the Judiciary, acting through its Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, "to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to constitutional rights."

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorizations are shown through December 31, 1962.

Committee and purpose	87th Cong.			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Judiciary: Constitutional rights.....	\$280,000	\$231,119.92		
	140,000	113,940.26	Jan. 31, 1961	S. Res. 53.
	140,000	117,179.66	Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 200.

Due to the delay in the organization of the Senate and in order that its subcommittees could meet their February payrolls, the Senate on February 19, 1963, approved Senate Resolution 88, which continued for 1 month—through February 28, 1963—the investigative and expenditure authorizations granted to Senate committees during the 87th Congress, 2d session, and in certain instances provided additional funds for the purpose.

Since most of the resolutions which would authorize inquiries and investigations during the present session had already been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration prior to the adoption of Senate Resolution 88, and consequently were on a 12-month basis, the committee at its meeting on February 27, 1963, adopted the following formula to reduce each such request to an 11-month basis:

"A reduction by one-twelfth of that portion of the total request representing salaries and agency contributions to employee retirement, health benefits, and group life insurance."

On this basis the expenditure authorization contained in Senate Resolution 58 was reduced \$12,700, from \$165,000 to \$152,300.

The investigative authority was correspondingly reduced to an 11-month period commencing March 1, 1963.

The purposes of the resolution are detailed in a letter from Senator SAM J. ERVIN, Jr., chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, to Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, which letter (with accompanying budget) and letter of transmittal from Senator EASTLAND to Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, former chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, are as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.

Re Senate Resolution 58.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am enclosing the budget approved by the Committee on the Judiciary for work of the standing Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights for the period February 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964. The committee authorized reporting of an original resolution, Senate Resolution 58, to provide the amount of \$165,000 for the work of the subcommittee during the period February 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964.

Also enclosed for the information of the Committee on Rules and Administration in considering the resolution is a letter to me from the subcommittee chairman summarizing the proposed program for the subcommittee.

With kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely,

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS,
January 24, 1963.

Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The members of the standing Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights have approved the following program and budget for the subcommittee during the 1st session of the 88th Congress. As subcommittee chairman, I should therefore like to submit these plans, with a draft resolution, for the consideration of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The new resolution which we are submitting proposes a sum of \$165,000 (an increase of \$25,000 over the amount authorized last year) to cover legal, investigative, and administrative expenses anticipated by the subcommittee in its study of matters pertaining

to constitutional rights during the period from February 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964.

It is my belief that the increased appropriation is amply justified in light of the salary increase given to Senate employees and the corresponding increase in the subcommittee's contribution to the various employees benefit programs, in light of the subcommittee's activities during the past year as described in our annual report, in view of our proposed agenda for this session, and the increasing work of the subcommittee.

During the first 6 months of the past year two lawyers were assigned to the subcommittee by the Richardson Foundation. These lawyers, in their congressional internship capacity, performed, for the most part, the duties of assistant staff counsel. The foundation discontinued this program in July and salaries for these two positions have since that time, been paid by the subcommittee.

During the last Congress, especially during the second session, the subcommittee found itself faced with an ever-increasing number of complaints, inquiries, and requests for information and assistance from other Members of Congress. Last year the subcommittee received over 2,500 actual complaints, an increase of 68 percent over the year before. In all over 10,000 pieces of correspondence left the subcommittee office during 1962.

Also during the past session the subcommittee conducted 16 days of public hearings to consider three bills concerning literacy tests; a bill to protect the rights of the mentally ill in the District of Columbia, the constitutional rights of the American Indian, and the constitutional rights of military personnel. In addition to these hearings, a number of staff conferences were held and field trips made by representatives of the subcommittee in furtherance of various studies.

The proposed agenda for this session includes studies of vital areas of constitutional law which stand in need of examination by Congress. At the present rate of expenses, the proposed budget should permit the subcommittee, in addition to dealing

with legislation referred to it, to continue or initiate work on the following subjects:

(1) The constitutional rights of the American Indian.—The subcommittee began its study of this long-neglected area of law 2 years ago. The study will continue to encompass a review of laws and regulations affecting Indian citizens; the administration of law for Indians by Federal, State, and tribal governments; and the status of constitutional rights under the tribal court system. The subcommittee survey should be completed this year, and legislation in this area, already is contemplated.

(2) The constitutional rights of military personnel.—Thousands of complaints have been received and analyzed, and initial hearings have been completed on the subcommittee's study. In addition, staff conferences have been held with representatives of the various services, military personnel, attorneys specializing in military law, and innumerable other interested parties. The subcommittee's investigation continues to focus on the extent to which due process of law is being observed in the Armed Forces. Special emphasis is being given to the administration of the Uniform Code of Military Justice and to administrative discharge.

(3) The rights of the mentally ill.—Although the subcommittee's broad study of this area of the law has been completed, current developments are under constant review. During the last session several of the subcommittee members cosponsored legislation to better protect the rights of those alleged to be mentally ill in the District of Columbia. Although other pressing business of the Senate precluded our holding more than 1 day of hearings, legislation is being drafted for this session at which time further hearings are in order.

(4) Constitutional rights and the administration of criminal justice.—Preliminary work is continuing in an effort to determine how effectively constitutional rights are protected in Federal criminal trials. The study is concentrating on the operation of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, and deals with such problems as venue, bail, arrest and interrogation, double jeopardy, discovery procedures, and search and seizure.

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal:					
Counsel and staff director.....	1	\$8,040	\$17,305.31	\$1,442.10	\$17,305.31
Minority counsel.....	1	6,720	14,823.08	1,235.25	14,823.08
Counsel.....	2	4,080	9,596.30	799.69	19,192.60
Assistant counsel.....	2	3,300	7,906.00	658.83	15,812.00
Editorial and research:					
Professional staff member.....	1	4,140	9,726.31	810.52	9,726.31
Do.....	2	3,720	8,816.15	734.67	17,632.30
Research assistant.....	2	2,220	5,565.59	463.79	11,131.18
Administrative and clerical:					
Chief clerk.....	1	3,720	8,816.15	734.67	8,816.15
Secretary.....	2	3,420	8,166.04	680.50	16,332.08
Do.....	2	2,280	5,095.63	424.64	11,391.26
Total.....					142,162.27
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382).....					1,296.00
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid).....					9,240.55
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per \$1,000 coverage).....					479.52
Travel (inclusive of field investigations).....					4,000.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees).....					3,000.00
Witness fees, expenses.....					2,500.00
Stationery, office supplies.....					1,000.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph).....					700.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents.....					500.00
Contingent.....					121.66
Total.....					22,837.73
Grand total.....					165,000.00

(5) Citizenship.—The rights, privileges, and duties of American citizenship and the issues arising through loss of citizenship and citizenship rights is another subject which the subcommittee is continuing to study.

(6) Right to counsel.—In addition to its continuing interest in and survey of the right to counsel in Federal criminal trials, the subcommittee is making an investigation of the right to counsel before various Federal agencies. This study, given impetus by several complaints, includes both direct and indirect restrictions on this basic right by regulatory agencies.

In all of these areas, it is the subcommittee's intention to determine the need for remedial legislation and to recommend it where necessary, to further protect constitutional guarantees. In view of the importance to every citizen of the subcommittee's work on these problems, I request on behalf of the subcommittee that our program and budget for 1963 be approved.

With all kind wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,

SAM J. ERVIN, JR.,
Chairman.

Funds requested, Senate Resolution 58, \$165,000.

Funds approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration, \$152,300.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 58), as amended, was agreed to.

GOVERNMENT CHARTERS, HOLIDAYS, AND CELEBRATIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 31, Senate Resolution 59.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 59) to consider matters pertaining to Government charters, holidays, and celebrations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments on page 1, line 9, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 2, line 8, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$7,500" and insert "\$7,000"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to consider all matters pertaining to Federal charters, holidays, and celebrations.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants

and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$7,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report—No. 32—explaining the purposes of the resolution.

Committee and purpose	87th Cong.			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Judiciary: Federal charters, holidays, and celebrations...	\$15,000	\$12,011.83	-----	
	7,500	6,202.20	Feb. 13, 1961	S. Res. 75.
	7,500	5,809.63	Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 261.

Due to the delay in the organization of the Senate and in order that its subcommittees could meet their February payrolls, the Senate on February 19, 1963, approved Senate Resolution 88, which continued for 1 month—through February 28, 1963—the investigative and expenditure authorizations granted to Senate committees during the 87th Congress, 2d session, and in certain instances provided additional funds for the purpose.

Since most of the resolutions which would authorize inquiries and investigations during the present session had already been referred to the Commission on Rules and Administration prior to the adoption of Senate Resolution 88, and consequently were on a 12-month basis, the committee at its meeting on February 27, 1963, adopted the following formula to reduce each such request to an 11-month basis:

"A reduction by one-twelfth of that portion of the total request representing salaries and agency contributions to employee retirement, health benefits, and group life insurance."

On this basis the expenditure authorization contained in Senate Resolution 59 was reduced \$500, from \$7,500 to \$7,000.

The investigative authority was correspondingly reduced to an 11-month period commencing March 1, 1963.

The purposes of the resolution are specified in a letter from Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, chairman of the Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations, to Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, which letter (with accompanying budget) and letter of transmittal from Senator EASTLAND to Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, former chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, are as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
January 24, 1963.

Re Senate Resolution 59.

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am enclosing copy of an original resolution for the standing Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations, which today was approved by the Committee on the Judiciary.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 59 as amended would authorize the expenditure of not to exceed \$7,000 by the Committee on the Judiciary from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, for the consideration of all matters pertaining to Federal charters, holidays, and celebrations. The funds would be utilized to provide the Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations with required clerical assistance.

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorizations are shown through December 31, 1962.

Committee and purpose	87th Cong.			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Judiciary: Federal charters, holidays, and celebrations...	\$15,000	\$12,011.83	-----	
	7,500	6,202.20	Feb. 13, 1961	S. Res. 75.
	7,500	5,809.63	Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 261.

During the 1st session of the 87th Congress, Senate Resolution 75, agreed to February 13, 1961, appropriated the sum of \$7,500 for the operation of this subcommittee due to the fact that the number of legislative proposals referred had increased to such an extent that the activities of this subcommittee required the services of a clerical assistant. The Committee on the Judiciary, therefore, approved the sum of \$7,500 in order to afford one clerical assistant.

In the 2d session of the 87th Congress, Senate Resolution 261, agreed to by the Senate on February 7, 1962, granted the sum of \$7,500 for the activities of the Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations, for that session.

The committee has decided that it is necessary to provide the same sum to this subcommittee in order to afford a clerical assistant to assist the subcommittee during the 1st session of the 88th Congress.

I believe it most appropriate that this resolution to provide modest funds for the Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations, should be approved by the Senate at an early date.

With kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
January 24, 1963.

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: During the 2d session of the 87th Congress, Senate Resolution 261, agreed to February 7, 1962, appropriated the sum of \$7,500 for the operation of the standing Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations.

On the basis of the subcommittee's activities of the past year, I urge favorable consideration of an original resolution appropriating \$7,500 for the Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations, for the 1st session of the 88th Congress. I deem it most appropriate that this resolution be speedily approved.

With kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN.

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Administrative and clerical: Clerk.....	1	\$2,700	\$6,605.79	\$550.48	\$6,605.79
Total.....	1				6,605.79
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960).....					47.28
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid).....					429.78
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per \$1,000 coverage).....					22.80
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees).....					394.65
Total.....					894.21
Grand total.....					7,500.00

Funds requested, Senate Resolution 59, \$7,500.

Funds approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration, \$7,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

STUDY AND EXAMINATION OF FEDERAL JUDICIAL SYSTEM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 32, Senate Resolution 61.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 61) to study and examine the Federal judicial system.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, on page 2, line 4, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and in line 23, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$92,200"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to conduct a study and examination of the administration, practice and procedures of the Federal judicial system with a view to determining the legislation, if any, which may be necessary or desirable in order to increase the efficiency of the Federal courts in the just and expeditious adjudication of the cases, controversies, and other matters which may be brought before them.

Sec. 2. For the purpose of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis professional, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not

be less by more than \$1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of departments and agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

Committee and purpose	87th Cong.			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Judiciary: Federal judicial system.....	\$190,000.00	\$102,740.96		
	100,000.00	56,022.87	Jan. 31, 1961	S. Res. 56.
	90,000.00	46,718.09	Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 262.

Due to the delay in the organization of the Senate and in order that its subcommittees could meet their February payrolls, the Senate on February 19, 1963, approved Senate Resolution 88, which continued for 1 month—through February 28, 1963—the investigative and expenditure authorizations granted to Senate committees during the 87th Congress, 2d session, and in certain instances provided additional funds for the purpose.

Since most of the resolutions which would authorize inquiries and investigations during the present session had already been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration prior to the adoption of Senate Resolution 88, and consequently were on a 12-month basis, the committee at its meeting on February 27, 1963, adopted the following formula to reduce each such request to an 11-month basis: A reduction by one-twelfth of that portion of the total request representing salaries and agency contributions to employee retirement, health benefits, and group life insurance.

On this basis the expenditure authorization contained in Senate Resolution 61 was reduced \$7,800, from \$100,000 to \$92,200.

The investigative authority was correspondingly reduced to an 11-month period commencing March 1, 1963.

Additional information relative to the proposed inquiry is contained in a letter to Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, former chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, from Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, transmitting a letter from Senator OLIN D.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$92,200, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report—No. 33—explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 61 as amended would authorize the Committee on the Judiciary to expend not to exceed \$92,200 from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to conduct a study and examination of the administration, practice, and procedures of the Federal judicial system with a view to determining the legislation, if any, which may be necessary or desirable in order to increase the efficiency of the Federal courts in the just and expeditious adjudication of the cases, controversies, and other matters which may be brought before them.

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorizations are shown through December 31, 1962.

JOHNSTON, chairman of the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, which letters (with accompanying budget) are as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
January 24, 1963.

Re Senate Resolution 61.

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee on the Judiciary today ordered reported an original resolution authorizing funds for the operation of the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, which is conducting a study of the Federal judicial system. This resolution proposes that the amount of \$100,000 be allocated for the conduct of business for the budget period 1963-64.

The types of studies being conducted by this subcommittee have been of great value in producing results of a beneficial nature to the Federal courts in the problems confronting them. The Committee on the Judiciary is in agreement with the chairman of the subcommittee, Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, that the studies and inquiries should be continued. A letter to me from him outlining the proposed areas of concentration for this session is enclosed for your information.

Also, for your further information and consideration, please find enclosed copies of the proposed resolution and budget request for 1963-64. It is sincerely hoped that these

requests will meet with your approval and that of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely,

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMPROVEMENTS
IN JUDICIAL MACHINERY,
January 21, 1963.

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery presents herewith the attached budget and the proposed resolution requesting the sum of \$100,000 for the study and examination of the administration, practice, and procedures of the Federal judicial system with a view to determining the legislation, if any, which may be necessary or desirable in order to increase the efficiency of the Federal courts in the conduct of business brought before them.

The subcommittee during 1962 had 30 legislative bills pending before it dealing with the various phases of judicial administration and procedures of the Federal courts; 11 of these bills were reported by the subcommittee, and 19 were undisposed of at the end of the session. Two days of intensive hearings were held on one of the bills reported,

whereat members of the judiciary appeared and offered their views as to the merit of the legislation.

The various judicial circuits have issued invitations to the members and staff of the subcommittee to visit these circuits to obtain from the judges firsthand information as to the needs of their courts. Such field studies have been initiated and others are planned for the near future. The quality of information received and the enthusiastic cooperation of the judges and court personnel have made this method of inquiry most effective.

The judicial conferences and committees have been most helpful in assisting the subcommittee in its efforts and staff representatives have participated in several meetings of these groups during the past year.

By reason of careful handling of funds, certain unanticipated savings in staff expenses and vacancies, the subcommittee has not expended the full amount appropriated last year, and the sum of approximately \$40,000 will be returned to the contingent fund of the Senate at the expiration of Senate Resolution 262, on January 31, 1963.

Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Committee on the Judiciary act favorably on this budget request of \$100,000 for 1963-64.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely,

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Chairman.

tion Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$124,200, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative:					
Chief counsel.....	1	\$5,040	\$17,305.31	\$1,442.10	\$17,305.31
Assistant counsel.....	1	7,380	16,064.19	1,338.68	16,064.19
Investigator.....	2	4,140	9,726.31	810.52	19,452.62
Minority counsel.....	1	7,260	15,838.54	1,319.87	15,838.54
Administrative and clerical:					
Chief clerk.....	1	3,420	8,166.04	680.50	8,166.04
Stenographer.....	2	2,280	5,695.63	474.63	11,391.26
Total.....	8				88,217.96
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960).....					375.00
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid).....					5,727.02
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per \$1,000 coverage).....					221.40
Travel (inclusive of field investigations).....					3,000.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees).....					1,000.00
Witness fees, expenses.....					300.00
Stationery, office supplies.....					400.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph).....					400.00
Contingent fund.....					358.62
Total.....					11,423.42
Grand total.....					100,000.00

Funds requested, Senate Resolution 61, \$100,000.
Funds approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration, \$92,200.

STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 33, Senate Resolution 60.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 60) to study matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, on page 1, line 10, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 2, line 18, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$135,000" and insert "\$124,200"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganiza-

THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Calendar No. 34, Senate Resolution 62, was agreed to earlier today.

INVESTIGATION OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 35, Senate Resolution 63.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 63) to investigate juvenile delinquency.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, is this the resolution relating to a Committee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President—
Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.
Mr. HUMPHREY. I withdraw that resolution for a moment. We will take up some other resolutions so that we may move along a little more rapidly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

INVESTIGATION OF NATIONAL PENITENTIARIES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 36, Senate Resolution 64.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 64) to investigate national penitentiaries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment, on page 1, line 9, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and inspect national penitentiaries.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 37), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 64 as amended would continue until January 31, 1964, the study being made of national penitentiaries by the Committee on the Judiciary, and authorize expenditures in the amount of \$5,000 therefor.

The investigative authority contained in the resolution was amended to conform to the 11-month period commencing March 1, 1963, being stipulated for all resolutions of this type.

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorizations are shown through December 31, 1962.

Committee and purpose	87th Cong.			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Judiciary: National penitentiaries.....	\$10,000	\$1,023.50		
	5,000	-----	Jan. 31, 1961	S. Res. 57.
	5,000	1,023.50	Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 266.

The purposes of the resolution are more fully stated in a letter to Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, former chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, from Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, which letter (with accompanying budget) is as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
January 25, 1963.

Re Senate Resolution 64.
Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: I am enclosing a copy of an original resolution and a budget for the standing Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries, which has been approved by the committee.

The standing Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries has been in existence since the 80th Congress. While its needs have always been modest, as is shown by the fact that appropriations for it have ranged between \$5,000 and \$8,600 during its existence, its effectiveness in building morale among inmates and administrative personnel in our Federal penal institutions has been considerable. The subcommittee affords the personnel of our Federal penal institutions an opportunity to bring their problems in regard to discipline, food, health, and recreation for inmates directly to the attention of the Senate. It further provides Members of the Senate an opportunity to speak directly to inmates and to hear any grievances which the inmates may feel they have. The

subcommittee believes that this has been a factor in deterring riots, attempted escapes, and the like, as it provides a real opportunity for inmates to tell their stories to an outside observer. It is gratifying to the subcommittee that since its establishment no serious riot has occurred at any Federal penal institution.

The subcommittee has incurred no expenditures for staff personnel during the past session, and the proposed budget which is submitted for the present session does not anticipate any expenditures for staff. The modest appropriation which has been recommended by the committee is designed to provide only for travel, hearings including reporters' fees, witnesses' fees, and incidental expenses.

With kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman.

Budget

Staff expenses.....	None
Administrative:	
Travel.....	\$3,500
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees).....	1,000
Witnesses' fees, expenses, communications, supplies, incidental expenses.....	500
Total expenses.....	5,000
Funds requested, Senate Resolution 64,	\$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.
The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

EXAMINATION AND REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATION OF THE PATENT OFFICE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 37, Senate Resolution 65.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 65) to examine and review the administration of the Patent Office.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, on page 1, line 11, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 2, line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$125,000" and insert "\$115,800"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to conduct a full and complete examination and review of the administration of the Patent Office and a complete examination and review of the statutes relating to patents, trademarks, and copyrights.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$115,800, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report—No. 38—explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 65 as amended would authorize the expenditure of \$115,800 by the Committee on the Judiciary, acting through its Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964—"to conduct a full and

complete examination and review of the administration of the Patent Office and a complete examination and review of the statutes relating to patents, trademarks, and copyrights."

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorization are shown through December 31, 1962.

Committee and purpose	87th Cong.			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Judiciary: Patents, trademarks, copyrights.....	\$255,000.00	\$155,523.14		
	135,000.00	84,087.42	Jan. 31, 1961	S. Res. 55.
	120,000.00	71,435.72	Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 267.

Due to the delay in the organization of the Senate and in order that its subcommittees could meet their February payrolls, the Senate on February 19, 1963, approved Senate Resolution 88, which continued for 1 month, through February 28, 1963, the investigative and expenditure authorizations granted to Senate committees during the 87th Congress, 2d session, and in certain instances provided additional funds for the purpose.

Since most of the resolutions which would authorize inquiries and investigations during the present session had already been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration prior to the adoption of Senate Resolution 88, and consequently were on a 12-month basis, the committee at its meeting on February 27, 1963, adopted the following formula to reduce each such request to an 11-month basis: "A reduction by one-twelfth of that portion of the total request representing salaries and agency contributions to employee retirement, health benefits, and group life insurance."

On this basis the expenditure authorization contained in Senate Resolution 65 was reduced \$9,200, from \$125,000 to \$115,800.

The investigative authority was correspondingly reduced to an 11-month period commencing March 1, 1963.

Additional information relative to the purposes of the resolution is contained in a letter from Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN, chairman of the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights, to Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, which letter (with accompanying budget) and letter of transmittal from Senator EASTLAND to Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, former chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, are as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
January 23, 1963.

Re Senate Resolution 65.
Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am enclosing the budget which was approved by the Committee on the Judiciary at its meeting on Thursday, January 24, 1963, for the work of the standing Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights.

The committee authorized the reporting to the Senate of an original resolution (S. Res. 65) to provide the amount of \$125,000 for the work of the subcommittee for the period from February 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964.

The program of the subcommittee is fully set for in a letter to me from Hon. JOHN L. McCLELLAN, chairman of the subcommittee. I am forwarding this letter to you, herewith, with the proposed budget, for the information of the Committee on Rules and Administration for consideration at its forthcoming meeting.

With kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely,

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON PATENTS,
TRADEMARKS, AND COPYRIGHTS,
January 23, 1963.

Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: During the 2d session of the 87th Congress, Senate Resolution 267, agreed to February 7, 1962, appropriated the sum of \$120,000 for the operation of the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights for the examination and review of the administration of the Patent Office and the laws relating to patents, trademarks, and copyrights. Upon the basis of the work of the subcommittee in 1962, and planned operations for 1963, I urge the appropriation of \$125,000 to continue the subcommittee during the period February 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964.

One of the most important matters presently under consideration by the subcommittee is legislation to establish a uniform Government patent policy. The need for a decision by the Congress as to the nature of a Government patent policy is made clear by the rapid rise of research expenditures by the various Federal agencies. A recent survey by the National Science Foundation discloses that the Federal Government plans to obligate \$14.7 billion for research and development during the 1963 fiscal year. This is an increase of \$3.5 billion—or 31 percent—over the \$11.2 billion spent for the same purpose during fiscal 1962. Of the

\$14.7 billion to be obligated for research and development in fiscal 1963, \$7.4 billion (estimate), will go to the Department of Defense—an agency which has no statutory policy for the disposition of rights in the inventions arising from such expenditures. The subcommittee has carefully considered a number of proposals as to a uniform patent policy and hopes to report during the first session of the present Congress, legislation to establish a uniform policy which will both protect the public interest and be equitable to Government contractors.

The subcommittee in recent years has had occasion to view with concern the critical situation facing the U.S. Patent Office. During the past year the subcommittee published the Patent Office Management Survey, which makes recommendations to improve Patent Office procedures in many areas previously studied by this subcommittee.

Another subject which currently is occupying the attention of the subcommittee is the question of whether Patent Office fees are adequate in relation to the current expenses of the Office. While the operating costs of the Patent Office have substantially increased in the past decade, and show promise of continued increase in the future, the basic fees of the Patent Office have not been changed since 1932. During the 2d session of the 87th Congress, the subcommittee favorably reported legislation to revise the fee structure of the Patent Office and it is anticipated that similar legislation will be considered during the current session of the Congress.

Progress was made during 1962 on preliminary measures leading to a general revision of the copyright laws. It is anticipated that during the 88th Congress the subcommittee will devote considerable attention to study and hearings on copyright revision legislation.

The subcommittee also is engaged in investigating the practical effects of the patent contracting practices of the various Government departments and agencies and whether inventions and technical information arising out of Government-financed research are being reported in all areas. In addition, the subcommittee is considering an investigation to determine whether additional legislation is required to protect inventors from misleading advertising by unqualified and/or

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative:					
Chief counsel.....	1	\$8,040	\$17,305.31	\$1,442.10	\$17,305.31
Special counsel.....	1	8,040	17,305.31	1,442.10	17,305.31
Assistant counsel.....	1	5,700	12,004.99	1,007.41	12,004.99
Do.....	1	4,680	10,888.64	907.38	10,888.64
Do.....	1	3,360	8,036.03	669.66	8,036.03
Administrative and clerical:					
Chief clerk.....	1	5,880	13,243.46	1,103.62	13,243.46
Assistant clerk.....	1	3,360	8,036.03	669.66	8,036.03
Secretary.....	2	3,120	7,515.94	626.32	15,031.88
Total.....	9				102,751.65
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960).....					730.08
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid).....					6,678.85
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per \$1,000 coverage).....					349.92
Reimbursable payments to agencies.....					2,000.00
Travel (inclusive of field investigations).....					4,500.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees).....					4,500.00
Witness fees, expenses.....					1,500.00
Stationery, office supplies.....					500.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph).....					200.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents.....					300.00
Contingent fund.....					989.50
Total.....					22,248.35
Grand total.....					125,000.00

unscrupulous persons who seek to exploit the development of their inventions. The subcommittee also has other miscellaneous patent, trademark, and copyright matters under consideration and study.

By reason of careful handling of funds and certain vacancies on the staff, the subcommittee has not expended the full amount appropriated during the 2d session of the 87th Congress, and the sum of approximately \$42,000 will, at the expiration of the resolution on January 31, 1963, be returned to the contingent fund of the Senate. Accompanying this letter is a report of the subcommittee's expenditures for the period February 1, 1962, through January 31, 1963.

A copy of the annual report of the subcommittee will be made available to anyone who is interested in a more detailed account of the subcommittee's work during the past year. On behalf of the subcommittee, I urge approval of the attached budget.

With kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. McCLELLAN,
Subcommittee Chairman.

Funds requested, Senate Resolution 65, \$125,000.

Funds approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration, \$115,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS CREATED BY FLOW OF ESCAPEES AND REFUGEES FROM COMMUNISTIC TYRANNY.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 38, Senate Resolution 66.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 66) to investigate problems created by flow of escapees and refugees from Communistic tyranny.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, on page 1, line 11, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 2, line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$87,500" and insert "\$81,000"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the problems created by the flow of escapees and refugees from Communist tyranny.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less

by more than \$1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

SEC. 4. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$81,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed

Committee and purpose	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
	7th Cong.			
Judiciary: Refugees and escapees	\$137,500.00	\$104,954.58		
	50,000	37,539.79	Jan. 31, 1961	S. Res. 50.
	75,000	67,414.79	Feb. 22, 1962	S. Res. 293.
	12,500		Oct. 2, 1962	S. Res. 406.

Due to the delay in the organization of the Senate and in order that its subcommittees could meet their February payrolls, the Senate on February 19, 1963, approved Senate Resolution 88, which continued for 1 month—through February 28, 1963—the investigative and expenditure authorizations granted to Senate committees during the 87th Congress, 2d session, and in certain instances provided additional funds for the purpose.

Since most of the resolutions which would authorize inquiries and investigations during the present session had already been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration prior to the adoption of Senate Resolution 88, and consequently were on a 12-month basis, the committee at its meeting on February 27, 1963, adopted the following formula to reduce each such request to an 11-month basis:

"A reduction by one-twelfth of that portion of the total request representing salaries and agency contributions to employee retirement, health benefits, and group life insurance."

On this basis the expenditure authorization contained in Senate Resolution 66 was reduced \$6,500, from \$87,500 to \$81,000.

The investigative authority was correspondingly reduced to an 11-month period commencing March 1, 1963.

The purposes of the resolution are more fully stated in a letter from Senator PHILIP A. HART, chairman of the Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees, to Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, which letter (with accompanying budget) and letter of transmittal from Senator EASTLAND to Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, former chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, is as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
January 25, 1963.

Re Senate Resolution 66.

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: I am enclosing the budget which was approved by the Committee on the Judiciary at its meeting on

in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 39), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 66 as amended would authorize the expenditure of not to exceed \$81,000 by the Committee on the Judiciary, acting through its Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees, to continue from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, its inquiry into difficulties created by the flow of refugees and escapees from Communist tyranny.

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorizations are shown through December 31, 1962.

January 24, 1963, for the work of the Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees.

The committee authorized the reporting to the Senate of an original resolution, Senate Resolution 66, to provide the amount of \$87,500 for the work of the subcommittee from February 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964.

The program of the subcommittee is fully set forth in a letter to me from Hon. PHILIP A. HART, chairman of the subcommittee. I am forwarding this letter to you herewith with the proposed budget for the information of the Committee on Rules and Administration for consideration at its forthcoming meeting.

With kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman.

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON THE
JUDICIARY, SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PROBLEMS CONNECTED
WITH ESCAPEES AND REFUGEES,
January 23, 1963.

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Enclosed is the recommended budget for the Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees for the period beginning February 1, 1963, and extending through January 31, 1964, and also a suggested draft of the new resolution for the subcommittee. The suggested language of this draft is identical with the current resolution.

The subcommittee continues to approach its work with the firm conviction that the moral and political considerations attending the refugee problems, make it incumbent upon the United States to help ameliorate these problems and seek out a reasonable solution. A major portion of the subcommittee's work during the past year has concerned the Cuban refugee problem in this country. Considerable attention was also given to the Chinese refugee problem in Hong Kong and Macao, and the operations of the U.S. escapee program.

A full statement of these activities and those planned for the coming year is included in the subcommittee's annual report. A special report on the Chinese refu-

gee problem is in preparation. It is my belief that the subcommittee's work provides useful information to the American people, but especially to the members of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Senate in their

consideration of legislative matters pertaining to refugee problems.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP A. HART,
Chairman.

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative:					
General counsel or staff director.....	1	\$8,040	\$17,305.31	\$1,442.10	\$17,305.31
Chief counsel.....	1	7,260	15,838.54	1,319.87	15,838.54
Assistant chief counsel.....	1	7,260	15,838.54	1,319.87	15,838.54
Editorial and research: Research director.....	1	4,620	10,764.52	897.04	10,764.52
Administrative and clerical:					
Chief clerk.....	1	3,480	8,296.07	691.33	8,296.07
Assistant clerk (record).....	1	2,100	5,305.58	442.13	5,305.58
Total.....					73,348.56
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960).....					392.16
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6 3/4 percent of total salaries paid).....					4,767.66
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per \$1,000 coverage).....					258.24
Travel (inclusive of field investigations).....					2,500.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees).....					1,500.00
Witness fees, expenses.....					2,500.00
Stationery, office supplies.....					1,000.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph).....					800.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents.....					300.00
Contingent fund.....					133.38
Total.....					14,151.44
Grand total.....					87,500.00

Funds requested, Senate Resolution 66, \$87,500.

Funds approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration, \$81,000.

The amendments were agreed to. The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

STUDY OF REVISION AND CODIFICATION OF STATUTES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 39, Senate Resolution 67.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 67) to study revision and codification of the statutes of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments on page 1, line 10, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 2, line 17, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$30,000" and insert "\$27,700"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to revision

and codification of the statutes of the United States.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and

consultants: *Provided*, That if more than one counsel is employed, the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,600 than the highest rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$27,700, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 40), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 67 as amended would authorize the expenditure of \$27,700 by the Committee on the Judiciary, through its Subcommittee on Revision and Codification, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to revision and codification of the statutes of the United States.

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorizations are shown through December 31, 1962:

Committee and purpose	87th Congress			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Judiciary: Revision and codification (U.S. Statutes).....	\$52,000	\$12,494.88		
	26,000	5,786.96	Jan. 31, 1961	S. Res. 54.
	26,000	6,707.92	Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 257.

Due to the delay in the organization of the Senate and in order that its subcommittees could meet their February payrolls, the Senate on February 19, 1963, approved Senate Resolution 88, which continued for 1 month—through February 28, 1963—the investigative and expenditure authorizations granted to Senate committees during the 87th Congress, 2d session, and in certain instances provided additional funds for the purpose.

Since most of the resolutions which would authorize inquiries and investigations during the present session had already been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration prior to the adoption of Senate Resolution 88, and consequently were on a 12-month basis, the committee at its meeting on February 27, 1963, adopted the following formula to reduce each such request to an 11-month basis: A reduction by one-twelfth of that portion of the total request representing salaries and agency contributions to employee retirement, health benefits, and group life insurance.

On this basis the expenditure authorization contained in Senate Resolution 67 was reduced \$2,300, from \$30,000 to \$27,700.

The investigative authority was correspondingly reduced to an 11-month period commencing March 1, 1963.

The purposes of the resolution are more fully detailed in a letter from Senator SAM J. ERVIN, JR., chairman of the Subcommittee on Revision and Codification, to Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, which letter (with accompanying budget) and letter of transmittal from Senator EASTLAND to Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, former chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, are as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
January 25, 1963.

Re Senate Resolution 67.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am enclosing the budget approved by the Committee on the Judiciary for work of the standing Subcommittee on Revision and Codification for the period February 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964. The committee authorized reporting of an original resolution, Senate Resolution 67,

to provide the amount of \$30,000 for the work of the subcommittee during the period February 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964. The amount agreed to is \$4,000 in addition to the amount approved last year. This is requested primarily to take care of the pay raises in the recent pay bill.

Also enclosed for the information of the Committee on Rules and Administration in considering the resolution is a letter to me from the subcommittee chairman summarizing the proposed program for the subcommittee.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
January 19, 1963.

Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The standing Subcommittee on Revision and Codification has approved the following program and budget for the subcommittee's activities during the 1st session of the 88th Congress. As chairman of the subcommittee I take pleasure in submitting these plans for the draft resolution for the favorable consideration of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The resolution for the 1st session of the 88th Congress which is being submitted for the proposed budget of \$30,000 to cover legal and administrative expenses anticipated by the subcommittee during the period February 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, is enclosed. The amount set forth is \$4,000 in excess of the subcommittee budget for the 2d session of the 87th Congress. This increase is primarily made in order to take care of the various pay raises and contributions necessitated by the passing of the pay raise bill in the 2d session of the 87th Congress.

During the 2d session of the 87th Congress revision and codification matters were referred to the subcommittee from the House of Representatives. All bills referred to the subcommittee were processed and referred to the Senate. They eventually were enacted and became public laws. These bills were as follows:

H.R. 10431: To revise, codify, and enact title 37 of the United States Code, entitled, "Pay and Allowances of the Uniformed Services." Passed by the Senate on August 20, 1962, and signed by the President on September 7, 1962. Public Law 87-649.

H.R. 10432: To amend title 39, United States Code, to codify certain recent public laws relating to the postal service and to improve the code. Passed by the Senate on August 20, 1962, and signed by the President on September 7, 1962. Public Law 87-646.

H.R. 10433: To amend title 10, United States Code, to codify recent military laws, and to improve the code. Passed by the Senate on August 20, 1962. Signed by the President on September 7, 1962. Public Law 87-651.

H.R. 10931: To revise and codify the general and permanent laws relating to and in force in the Canal Zone and to enact the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes. Passed by the Senate on August 20, 1962. Signed by the President on October 18, 1962. Public Law 87-845.

Although the subcommittee budget for the 2d session of the 87th Congress was \$26,000, there was only expended in the work of the subcommittee in processing all of the above bills, less than \$9,000. It is anticipated that on January 31, 1963, there will be returned to the contingent fund of the Senate approximately \$17,000.

The subcommittee is enabled to return such a substantial portion of its appropria-

tion for last year simply because the subcommittee did not have a subcommittee counsel during most of the year, and the chairman of the subcommittee neglected other important matters in order to do a portion of the work which would otherwise be done by the counsel himself, and called upon overworked members of the full Judiciary Committee staff and his own personal staff to assist him in so doing. The subcommittee has now employed a counsel because of its conviction that it is unwise for the chairman to neglect other matters to do work properly belonging to the office of counsel, and because it is unjust for the chairman to ask overworked members of the full Judiciary Committee or his own personal staff to do such work, and because the work of codification of the laws is most exacting in nature and requires the services of a highly expert legal craftsman.

As you are aware, various titles of the United States Code have been codified in previous Congresses and an examination of the titles of the code will reveal the great importance of these codifications. It is anticipated that before the work of the subcommittee is completed that all of the titles of the United States Code will be codified as well as other special revisions and codifications.

It is impossible to overmagnify the importance of the codification bills handled by the subcommittee. These bills bring together under proper titles and categories the laws enacted in times past by the Congress, and require the checking and rechecking of the prior laws in their original form as well as in subsequent codifications. When codification bills are enacted and approved they become

law instead of prima facie evidence of the law. For this reason, it is absolutely essential that they be accurate in all details—a thing which necessitates most exacting labor.

This work is so detailed that it oftentimes takes 3 or 4 years to modify a particular title. It can readily be seen that a project of this magnitude must carry a cutoff date for the laws which are to be taken care of by a so-called cleanup bill. The element of time then enters into the picture for the reason that when the bill has received approval of the House and has been sent to the Senate it almost of necessity must be passed in that Congress or the entire work on that legislation is for naught and must be commenced again in the next succeeding Congress. This causes a great deal of waste in the matter of time and expense. It also means that a great amount of work must be taken on faith because without a staff the Committee on the Judiciary does not have the facilities to recheck 4 or 5 years of work within a single session. When this is realized, it becomes apparent why a staff for this most important legislative function be provided for this subcommittee.

The subcommittee anticipates that during this session of the Congress several codifications will be referred to the subcommittee, and will probably include the following:

Part II of the District of Columbia Code; The Uniform Commercial Code in the District of Columbia; and

Title 5 of the United States Code.

With all kind wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

SAM J. ERVIN, Jr.,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Revision
and Codification.

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative: Chief counsel and staff director.....	1	\$8,040	\$17,305.31	\$1,442.10	\$17,305.31
Administrative and clerical: Stenographer....	1	3,600	8,556.11	713.00	8,556.11
Total.....					25,861.42
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960).....					162.24
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid).....					1,680.99
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per \$1,000 coverage).....					87.48
Travel (inclusive of field investigations).....					840.69
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees).....					819.22
Witness fees, expenses.....					150.00
Stationery, office supplies.....					100.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph).....					100.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents.....					50.00
Contingent fund.....					147.96
Total.....					4,138.58
Grand total.....					30,000.00

Funds requested, Senate Resolution 67, \$30,000.

Funds approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration, \$27,700.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 40, Senate Resolution 68.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 68) to investigate the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments on page 1, line 11, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 2, line 19, after the word "exceed", to

strike out "\$60,000" and insert "\$55,400"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to conduct a further examination and review of the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, and the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, and consider proposed legislation affecting said Acts.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; and (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$55,400, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 41), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 68 as amended would authorize the expenditure of not to exceed \$55,400 to enable the Subcommittee on Trading With the Enemy Act of the Committee on the Judiciary from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to conduct hearings, conferences, and discussions and to reach areas of agreement in various matters with the executive branch.

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorizations are shown through December 31, 1962:

Committee and purpose	87th Cong.			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Judiciary: Trading With the Enemy Act.....	\$90,000.00	\$71,756.92		
	45,000.00	38,202.31	Feb. 13, 1961	S. Res. 60.
	45,000.00	33,554.61	Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 268.

Due to the delay in the organization of the Senate and in order that its subcommittees could meet their February payrolls, the Senate on February 19, 1963, approved Senate Resolution 88, which continued for 1 month—through February 28, 1963—the investigative and expenditure authorizations granted to Senate committees during the 87th Congress, 2d session, and in certain instances provided additional funds for the purpose.

Since most of the resolutions which would authorize inquiries and investigations during the present session had already been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration prior to the adoption of Senate Resolution 88, and consequently were on a 12-month basis, the committee at its meeting on February 27, 1963, adopted the following formula to reduce each such request to an 11-month basis: A reduction by one-twelfth of that portion of the total request representing salaries and agency contributions to employee retirement, health benefits, and group life insurance.

On this basis the expenditure authorization contained in Senate Resolution 68 was reduced \$4,600, from \$60,000 to \$55,400.

The investigative authority was correspondingly reduced to an 11-month period commencing March 1, 1963.

Additional information relative to Senate Resolution 68 is set forth in a letter from Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, chairman of the subcommittee, to Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, which letter (with accompanying budget) and Senator EASTLAND's letter of transmittal to Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,

former chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, are as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
January 24, 1963.

Re Senate Resolution 68.
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee on the Judiciary today ordered reported an original resolution providing funds for a continuation of the study, examination, and review of the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act and the War Claims Act of 1948.

This work has been carried on since the 2d session of the 82d Congress by the Subcommittee on Trading With the Enemy Act. Under the provisions of Senate Resolution 268, agreed to February 7, 1962, the authority for the study will expire on January 31, 1963. The new resolution proposes a budget of \$60,000 for the period ending January 31, 1964. The reasons for the request are detailed in the attached letter from the chairman of the subcommittee.

The subcommittee's work has greatly increased due to the enactment last year of various comprehensive amendments to both the Trading With the Enemy Act and the War Claims Act of 1948.

With respect to the amendments to the War Claims Act, an entirely new and broad program was inaugurated for the payment of the claims of American citizens for losses suffered during World War II. An estimated 35,000 claimants are involved, with claims approximating \$300 million. In the interest of these many claimants and the amount of funds involved it is extremely important

that the subcommittee closely watch this new program.

Amendments were adopted last year to the Trading With the Enemy Act which (1) permit the sale of General Aniline & Film Corp.; (2) authorize the use of \$500,000 of the vested assets funds in the rehabilitation and resettlement in the United States of certain persecutees; (3) divest to the former individual owner certain properties now held by the Attorney General; and (4) close out the administration of vested assets consisting of copyrights, trademarks, and motion picture film.

All of these new programs will require additional review and examination by the subcommittee. Particularly with reference to the authority to sell General Aniline, the committee wants to be kept currently apprised of all developments in the sale and the settlement of the litigation. A sale of the asset could eventually increase the war claims fund, or it could create a substantial liability on the American taxpayers should the Swiss prevail in their suit and the courts determine a fair market price to be in excess of the sale price. The chairman of the subcommittee assures me that he is to be kept advised by the Attorney General on all aspects of this case.

In addition to the letter from the chairman of the subcommittee, there is enclosed for your information the proposed budget for the coming year. It is sincerely hoped that these requests will meet with the approval of your committee.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman.

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON THE
JUDICIARY, SUBCOMMITTEE ON
TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT,
January 15, 1963.

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR EASTLAND: The examinations and reviews assigned to be performed by the Subcommittee on Trading With the Enemy Act have been successively continued from the 2d session of the 82d Congress until January 31, 1963. For the period covered by Senate Resolution 268, which expires January 31, 1963, \$45,000 was authorized, of which approximately \$7,000 will be returned as unexpended balance. A new resolution proposing that the work of the subcommittee continue until January 31, 1963, would authorize the expenditure of \$60,000.

Under the authority of our resolution the subcommittee is concerned with the operation of the War Claims Act of 1948, as administered by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States. In this respect, the responsibilities of the Commission—and thus of the subcommittee—have greatly increased following the enactment in the last session of the 87th Congress of amendments to the War Claims Act. These amendments are the first comprehensive legislation dealing with the claims of American citizens arising out of World War II. It is estimated that some 35,000 American citizens hold claims coming under the provisions of these amendments. It is further estimated that approximately \$300 million will be required in the payment of the claims.

Many of the amendments added to the War Claims Act last year did not have the benefit of committee study or recommendation; consequently, the subcommittee should watch very carefully the effect of these amendments on the war claims fund and on the claims of our citizens. It has already been necessary to pass corrective legislation because of the inadequacy of one of the

adopted amendments which was offered from the floor.

When the amendments were adopted to the War Claims Act last year, the Committee on Conference recommended that the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission make a study to arrive at an estimate of the amount of claims that would be involved in legislation to include late nationals as eligible claimants for war damages. The subcommittee will want to follow this study in considering new amendments to embrace this group of claimants.

The Commission has not received an appropriation for the newly authorized claims program, but such an appropriation is expected this session. Presently the Commission is in the process of formulating rules and procedures for the handling of the claims. It is extremely important that the subcommittee watch this operation in the interest of the Congress and the numerous American citizens involved.

It should be pointed out that the war claims amendments enacted last year carry no directive or authority for the Commission to report to the Congress on its activities under the new program. In view of this, it is all the more important for the subcommittee to currently review and examine the Commission's operation under the new amendments.

The subcommittee will observe the new procedures, conduct inquiries, and study individual claims to determine whether the handling of the claims is in accordance with the intent of the Congress. The subcommittee is presently drafting legislation to provide judicial review of the Commission's decisions, since under present procedure there is no appeal.

The subcommittee is charged with the examination and review of the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act, which is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice. This act is concerned with the blocking, vesting, and liquidation of assets seized from our enemies during and after World War II.

The review and investigative work of the subcommittee has tremendously increased with the enactment of several amendments to the Trading With the Enemy Act during the previous session of the Congress. One such amendment which places additional responsibility on the subcommittee is the provision authorizing a sale of the General Aniline & Film Corp., the largest single vested asset, valued at approximately \$200 million. Title to this asset has been in litigation for a number of years and the new amendment could conceivably add more years to the case. In any event—sale or further litigation—there is urgent necessity for the Congress to be kept currently advised of all developments concerning this valuable asset in which every taxpayer of the country has an interest.

This corporation, presently valued at approximately \$200 million, continues to expand and develop new products. For the first 9 months of 1962 sales amounted to \$135,034,000, an increase of 11.5 percent over the first 9 months of 1961. Net income for the first 9 months amounted to \$6,754,000, or 57.1 percent higher than the same period in 1961.

The interest of our Government in General Aniline belongs to every taxpayer of our country. Furthermore, there is a potential liability if Interhandel subsequently prevails in their suit and a fair market value is determined by the courts which exceeds the sale price received by the Attorney General.

Because of these considerations and the amount of money involved, it is most important that the subcommittee continue to watch closely the activities and developments. Following the enactment of the sale amendment, I requested that the Attorney General keep me advised of all developments

in the General Aniline case. I have received the Attorney General's reply in which he assured me that the subcommittee would be fully informed in this matter.

Another amendment to the Trading With the Enemy Act adopted last year authorizes the use of \$500,000 of the vested assets funds by designated organizations in the rehabilitation and resettlement of persecuted persons. The subcommittee will need to observe the operation of this new program, which is administered by the Department of Justice.

Further amendments to the Trading With the Enemy Act accepted last year authorize the divestiture of certain rights and interests of individuals in estates, trusts, insurance policies, annuities, remainders, pensions, workmen's compensation, and veterans' benefits vested under this act after December 17, 1941, which have not vested in possession or become payable to the Attorney General prior to December 31, 1961. A number of individual claimants are affected by this amendment and it is the subcommittee's intention to follow closely the policies and procedures for carrying out the divestiture.

Still further new amendments authorize the divestiture of certain interests in copyrights and trademarks which were vested by the Attorney General. The purpose of these amendments is to close out this phase of the work of the Department since the revenue

from the properties is steadily decreasing and would eventually be below the cost of administering the program. The subcommittee will maintain close contact with the closing out of this operation.

In addition to the new legislation, the Department has pending several suits involving the Trading With the Enemy Act. Further, the Department is charged with the blocking and administering of property in the United States owned by the governments or nationals of Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania.

No extensive hearings are planned by the subcommittee at this time. However, it is felt that some executive hearings may be necessary in order to have the benefit of the agencies' feelings on the operation of the new programs and on some suggested legislation.

In conducting this work, the subcommittee seeks the assistance of a counsel, minority counsel, clerk, assistant clerk, and a stenographer.

It has always been my policy to operate as economically as possible, and I can assure you that I will continue to do so. I trust the committee will act favorably on our budget request for \$60,000 for the coming year.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Chairman.

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative:					
Counsel.....	1	\$8,040	\$17,305.31	\$1,442.10	\$17,305.31
Special counsel (minority).....	1	7,200	15,725.71	1,310.47	15,725.71
Administrative and clerical:					
Clerk.....	1	3,420	8,166.04	680.50	8,166.04
Assistant clerk.....	1	1,920	4,915.49	409.62	4,915.49
Stenographer.....	1	2,640	6,475.75	539.64	6,475.75
Total.....	5				52,588.30
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960).....					200.00
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid).....					3,418.24
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per \$1,000 coverage).....					178.20
Travel (inclusive of field investigations).....					500.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees).....					500.00
Witness fees, expenses.....					100.00
Stationery, office supplies.....					400.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph).....					300.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents.....					50.00
Contingent fund.....					1,765.26
Total.....					7,411.70
Grand total.....					60,000.00

Funds requested, Senate Resolution 68, \$60,000.

Funds approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration, \$55,400.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, am I correct in saying that this is a subcommittee which was supposed to conclude its work last year?

Mr. JOHNSTON. We hoped to conclude our work last year, but I will state what happened. A bill which was reported by the Committee on the Judiciary would give a right to adjudicate all claims. There was a challenge. They did not merely adjudicate, but put in facts of other claims which were at the time under consideration, such as selling General Aniline, which was estimated to be worth approximately \$200 million. That being so, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] asked that a staff member representing the minority be appointed

to the committee to help keep the committee behind it and to see that the investigation was carried out, and also to straighten out some of the laws that were passed last year concerning which some mistakes were made. For that reason a little extra appropriation was made in order to bring to the committee an employee representing the minority.

Mr. ELLENDER. Since this committee was to complete its work last year, and since it submitted to the Senate recommendations, are we to understand that until the Senate acts the committee will remain active?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I think we shall have to be certain somebody is watching this matter. The Senator will see in the newspapers and in some of the columns before long a great deal about this particular transaction.

Personally, I do not think the Senate wants to turn it absolutely loose at this time. I do not know whether work will be completed this year or next year. I cannot say exactly. The Senator could ask the Department of Justice about that. That Department probably could tell us more.

I hope we can complete the work this year. We hoped to get it done last year. We would have finished, so far as we were concerned, if they had left out General Aniline & Film and also adjudicated the claim and brought it back for approval.

I think both the Democrats and Republicans on the committee will support me unanimously in that statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 68), as amended, was agreed to.

FUNDS FOR ADDITIONAL STAFF FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 41.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 95) to provide funds for additional staff for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report—No. 42—explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This resolution would authorize the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, "to employ one additional assistant chief clerk, seven additional professional staff members, and nine additional clerical assistants, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202(e), as amended, of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and the provisions of Public Law 4, 80th Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 95) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is authorized from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to employ one additional assistant chief clerk, seven additional professional staff members, and nine additional clerical assistants to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202(e), as amended, by the Legislative Reorganiza-

tion Act of 1946, and the provisions of Public Law 4, Eightieth Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE TO STUDY MATTERS PERTAINING TO MIGRATORY LABOR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 42.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 22) authorizing the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to examine, investigate, and study matters pertaining to migratory labor which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with amendments, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration without additional amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 22).

The amendments of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare are as follows:

On page 2, line 9, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 3, line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$75,000" and insert "\$68,750"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to migratory labor including, but not limited to, such problems as (a) the wages of migratory workers, their working conditions, transportation facilities, housing, health, and educational opportunities for migrants and their children, (b) the nature of and the relationships between the programs of the Federal Government and the programs of State and local governments and the activities of private organizations dealing with the problems of migratory workers and (c) the degree of additional Federal action necessary in this area.

"Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

"Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

"Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed

\$68,750, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report—No. 43—explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 22 as amended would authorize the expenditure of not to exceed \$68,750 by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to migratory labor including, but not limited to, such problems as (a) the wages of migratory workers, their working conditions, transportation facilities, housing, health, and educational opportunities for migrants and their children; (b) the nature of and the relationships between the programs of the Federal Government and the programs of State and local governments and the activities of private organizations dealing with the problems of migratory workers; and (c) the degree of additional Federal action necessary in this area.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 22), as amended, was agreed to.

CLERICAL ASSISTANCE FOR COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 43.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 20) authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to employ additional clerical assistance which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service without amendment, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 20) which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment.

The amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration is as follows:

In line 2, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is authorized, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to employ one additional clerical assistant to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 4, Eightieth Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report—No. 44—explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 20, as amended, would authorize the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to continue through January 31, 1964, the employment of one additional clerical assistant. Such clerical assistant would be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at a rate of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 4, 80th Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

The amendment by the Committee on Rules and Administration would reduce to an 11-month period commencing March 1, 1963, the authority of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to employ an additional clerical assistant.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 20), as amended, was agreed to.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE TO INVESTIGATE POSTAL SERVICE AND CIVIL SERVICE SYSTEM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 44.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 18) authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to investigate the postal service and civil service system which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service without amendment and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 18) which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments.

The amendments of the Committee on Rules and Administration are as follows:

On page 2, line 17, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 3, line 11, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$75,000" and insert "\$69,500"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and conduct such studies as may be deemed necessary with respect to any and all aspects of—

(1) the administration of the postal service, particularly with respect to (a) the quality and frequency of mail service rendered the public, (b) the operation of the postal establishment with maximum efficiency and economy, (c) modernization of facilities, and (d) parcel post;

(2) the civil service system, including but not limited to (a) steps necessary to improve the merit system, (b) the administration of the Postal Service and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1962, (c) dual compensation within the Federal service, (d) executive pay, (e) administration of the health and life insurance programs, and (f) operation of the retirement program.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$69,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 45), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 18 as amended would authorize the expenditure of not to exceed \$69,500 by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) the administration of the postal service, particularly with respect to (a) the quality and frequency of mail service rendered the public, (b) the operation of the Postal Establishment with maximum efficiency and economy, (c) modernization of facilities, and (d) parcel post; and

(2) the civil service system, including but not limited to (a) steps necessary to improve the merit system, (b) the administration of the postal service and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1962, (c) dual compensation within the Federal service, (d) executive pay, (e) administration of the health and life insurance programs, and (f) operation of the retirement program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 18), as amended, was agreed to.

AUTHORITY TO INVESTIGATE CERTAIN MATTERS BY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 45.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 12) authorizing the Committee on Public Works to investigate certain matters which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works without amendment, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 12), which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments.

The amendments of the Committee on Rules and Administration are as follows:

On page 2, line 5, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 3, line 2, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$125,000" and insert "\$118,100"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Works, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to flood control, navigation, rivers and harbors, roads and highways, water pollution, public buildings, and all features of water resource development.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$118,100, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report—No. 46—explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 12 as amended would authorize the expenditure of not to exceed \$118,100 by the Committee on Public Works, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to employ on a temporary basis such additional personnel as the committee deems advisable to carry out its functions during the 1st session of the 88th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 12), as amended, was agreed to.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION TO MAKE EXPENDITURES AND TO EMPLOY TEMPORARY PERSONNEL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 46.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 73) authorizing the Committee on Rules and Administration to make expenditures and to employ temporary personnel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 73), which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, on page 2, line 5, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 3, line 2, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$65,000" and insert "\$59,800"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

- (1) the election of the President, Vice President, or Members of Congress;
- (2) corrupt practices;
- (3) contested elections;
- (4) credentials and qualifications;
- (5) Federal elections generally; and
- (6) Presidential succession.

Sec. 2. For the purpose of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to

utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$59,800, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 47), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 73, as amended, would authorize the expenditure of not to exceed \$59,800 by the Committee on Rules and Administration, or by its standing Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters within its jurisdiction as specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, including—

- (1) The election of the President, Vice President, or Members of Congress;
- (2) Corrupt practices;
- (3) Contested elections;
- (4) Credentials and qualifications;
- (5) Federal elections generally; and
- (6) Presidential succession.

The jurisdiction of the subcommittee is very broad and includes all measures which propose amendments or modifications to the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, as amended; the Hatch Act, 1939; and the Soldier's Vote Act. Also within the subcommittee's jurisdiction are the seating of newly elected U.S. Senators, the comprehensive problem of campaign financing, and all other matters relating to Federal candidates and Federal elections.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 73), as amended, was agreed to.

AUTHORITY FOR SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS TO MAKE STUDY OF AMERICAN SMALL AND INDEPENDENT BUSINESS PROBLEMS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 47.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 49) authorizing the Select Committee on Small Business to make a study of American small and independent business problems.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 49) which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments on page 1, line 11, after the word "from",

to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 2, line 14, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$135,000" and insert "\$116,090"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Select Committee on Small Business, in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by S. Res. 58, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to February 20, 1950, and S. Res. 272, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to May 26, 1950, is authorized to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of the problems of American small and independent business and to make recommendations concerning those problems to the appropriate legislative committees of the Senate.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$116,090, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 48), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 49 as amended would authorize the expenditure of \$116,090 by the Select Committee on Small Business from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, "to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of the problems of American small and independent business and to make recommendations concerning those problems to the appropriate legislative committees of the Senate."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I understand the situation, there has been a cutback of nearly 10 percent on this item.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. I discussed this with the Senator earlier today, when the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] was present. There has been a reduction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 49), as amended, was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF DURATION OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING THROUGH JANUARY 31, 1964

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 48.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 23) extending the Special Committee on Aging through January 31, 1964.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 23) which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments on page 2, line 17, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March"; on page 3, line 5, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$213,000" and insert "\$200,400", and in the same line, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Special Committee on Aging established by S. Res. 33, Eighty-seventh Congress, agreed to on February 13, 1961, as amended and supplemented, is hereby extended through January 31, 1964.

Sec. 2. It shall be the duty of such committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of any and all matters pertaining to problems of older people, including but not limited to, problems of maintaining health, of assuring adequate income, of finding employment, of engaging in productive and rewarding activity, of securing proper housing, and, when necessary, care or assistance. No proposed legislation shall be referred to such committee, and such committee shall not have power to report by bill or otherwise have legislative jurisdiction.

Sec. 3. The said committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable.

Sec. 4. A majority of the members of the committee or any subcommittee thereof shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony.

Sec. 5. For purposes of this resolution, the committee is authorized to employ on a temporary basis from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, such technical, clerical, or other assistants, experts, and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee and with the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, employ on a reimbursable basis such executive branch personnel, as it deems advisable.

Sec. 6. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$200,400 from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Sec. 7. The committee shall report the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964. The committee shall cease to exist at the close of business on January 31, 1964.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report—No. 49—explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Special Committee on Aging was established by Senate Resolution 33, 87th Congress, agreed to February 13, 1961. It was authorized to continue and expand the scope of the work in which the Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, had been engaged during the previous 2 years. Senate Resolution 111, 87th Congress, agreed to March 22, 1961, increased the membership of the special committee from 9 to 21.

Under Senate Resolution 33 the special committee was authorized to expend not to exceed \$150,000 through January 31, 1962. Senate Resolution 204, agreed to September 15, 1961, authorized it to make additional expenditures not to exceed \$35,000 through the same date. Senate Resolution 238 of the 87th Congress, agreed to February 7, 1962, continued the authority of the special committee until January 31, 1963, and provided an additional \$185,000.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the pending resolution provides for the extension of the life of the Special Committee on Aging through January 31, 1964, with a reasonable and economical budget of \$200,400.

I am very pleased to note that the Rules and Administration Committee favorably reported the sum requested, and I sincerely trust that the Senate will also act promptly and favorably on this resolution.

The Special Committee on Aging, as we know, is comprised of 21 members; 14 Democrats and 7 Republicans, and is the second largest committee in the Senate.

The committee staff is composed of 11 members, of which 4 are in the category of professional staff members, and 5 in the category of secretaries and clerical help serving the majority, while one professional staff member and 1 clerk serve the minority. The resolution contained a request for an additional two members to be provided for the minority. The committee itself has no objection because of the wide scope of the work of the committee in dealing with the problems of elderly citizens.

The committee, though not a legislative one, serves a useful purpose as a forum in which the various problems of our elderly citizens can be heard and from which recommendations can be made to appropriate legislative committees.

Today in America, there are some 17½ million people 65 years of age and over. As each day passes, 1,000 are added to these ranks.

In the category of those 60 and over, there is the sum total of 25 million. If we move this age bracket down just a little lower to 56, there is a total of 38 million.

The problems of senior citizens are not related solely to those 65 and over. Difficulties begin occurring after an individual has attained the age of 40, and subsequently finds that he is without employment. Today such a person experi-

ences considerable difficulty in obtaining gainful employment to provide income necessary to take care of his family.

Without doubt this committee has done, and is doing a most important job in alerting the country to the complexity of the problems of senior citizens, and in exploring ways in which they might be either resolved or ameliorated.

These problems are many, and are often interrelated. They include:

Problems of employment for those 40 and over.

Low incomes that characterize far too many of our elderly, particularly women who have outlived their husbands.

Lack of suitable housing or rentals for which the elderly can afford to pay.

Difficulties which confront those involuntarily forced to move by virtue of the construction of necessary public works projects.

Problems involving health and nursing home care.

The problem of assessing the extent of responsibility in this field insofar as the Federal, State, and local units of government are concerned.

High cost of living on fixed incomes.

Maximum utilization of skills and experience of elderly citizens in making their contribution to this great country, as well as making their lives in retirement years worth while.

Many Senators will recall that many hearings were held in the various parts of the country over the last 2 years. Some of these were held in Florida; others in Pennsylvania, California, Missouri, Idaho, Washington, and other places. A great deal of invaluable factual information was obtained, which can guide us in seeking sound, effective, and adequate solution to many of the more urgent problems of our senior citizens.

There is no question in my mind but that this committee is doing a job in the public interest. Its extension, with this modest budget, most certainly is warranted.

I sincerely trust that the Senate will not hesitate in continuing its activities for another year, and will favorably act on the pending resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 23), as amended, was agreed to.

PARTICIPATION OF UNITED STATES IN WEST VIRGINIA CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 49.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 4) to provide for the actual participation of the United States in the West Virginia Centennial Celebration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 4), which was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the joint resolution of June 11, 1960 (74 Stat. 204; Public Law 86-508) is hereby amended by adding the following sections immediately after section 3 thereof:

"Sec. 4. The Secretary of Commerce is further authorized to provide for actual participation of the United States in the celebration.

"Sec. 5. In connection with such participation, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to: (a) incur such expenses as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, including but not limited to expenditures involved in the selection, purchase, rental, construction, and other acquisition of exhibits and materials and equipment therefor and the actual display thereof, and including but not limited to related expenditures for costs of transportation, insurance, installation, safekeeping, maintenance, and operation, rental of space, and dismantling; all without regard to the provisions of Revised Statutes 3709 (41 U.S.C. 5); (b) accept any gifts, loans, or donations of money, property, or services for use in carrying out the provisions of this Act; (c) procure services as authorized by the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not to exceed \$75 per diem; and (d) appoint, without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, such persons as he deems to be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

"Sec. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$100,000 to carry out the provisions of this Act."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 50), explaining the purposes of the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed resolution is to provide for the actual participation of the United States in the West Virginia centennial celebration.

STATEMENT

In the 2d session of the 87th Congress, Senate Joint Resolution 213, an identical resolution, was reported by this committee to the Senate on September 25, 1962, and passed the Senate on September 26, 1962, and was referred to the House Judiciary Committee. However, due to the fact that it was late in the session, that committee was unable to take action on the resolution.

The act of June 11, 1960, by joint resolution, provided for participation by the United States in the West Virginia centennial celebration, to be held in 1963 at various locations in the State of West Virginia.

That enacting legislation also provided for the Secretary of Commerce to cooperate with the West Virginia Centennial Commission in the planning of the celebration, and was further authorized to conduct a study to determine the manner in which, and the extent to which, the United States shall be a participant in and exhibitor at the celebration.

This joint resolution would provide for the actual participation by the United States through the Secretary of Commerce in the celebration.

The Secretary of Commerce would be authorized to incur such expenses as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this resolution, including expenditures involved in the selection, purchase, rental, construction, and other acquisition of exhibits and materials and equipment, and the actual display thereof, to accept any gifts, loans, or donations of money, property, or services for use in carrying out the provisions of this act, and to appoint such persons as he may feel necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The resolution authorizes an appropriation not to exceed \$100,000 to carry out the provisions of this act.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, my colleague from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and I, as well as the members of our delegation in the House of Representatives from West Virginia, are appreciative of the action just taken in this body on Senate Joint Resolution 4. The citizens of our State are carrying forward many and varied informative and interesting programs in this year during our centennial celebration. It is appropriate that the United States as a whole join West Virginia in this significant effort.

INVESTIGATION OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] for being so patient. He has been with us all day, waiting for the resolution in which he is especially interested to be considered. I refer to Calendar No. 35, Senate Resolution 63.

Mr. DODD. I thank the distinguished acting majority leader.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 35.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 63) to investigate juvenile delinquency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 63), which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, or page 2, line 7, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 3, line 2, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$188,000" and insert "\$173,300"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to juvenile delinquency in the United States, including (a) the extent and character of juvenile delinquency in the United States and its causes and contributing factors; (b) the adequacy of existing provisions of law, including chapters 402 and 403 of title 18 of the United States Code, in dealing with youthful offenders of Federal laws; (c) sentences imposed on, or other correctional ac-

tion taken with respect to, youthful offenders by Federal courts; and (d) the extent to which juveniles are violating Federal laws relating to the sale or use of narcotics.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.*

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation, as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$173,300, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report—No. 36—explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 63 as amended would authorize the expenditure of \$173,300 by the Committee on the Judiciary, through its Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, "to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to juvenile delinquency in the United States, including (a) the extent and character of juvenile delinquency in the United States and its causes and contributing factors; (b) the adequacy of existing provisions of law, including chapters 402 and 403 of title 18 of the United States Code, in dealing with youthful offenders of Federal laws; (c) sentences imposed on, or other correctional action taken with respect to, youthful offenders by Federal courts; and (d) the extent to which juveniles are violating Federal laws relating to the sale or use of narcotics."

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I want to say a few words concerning the resolution before us—to continue the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency.

I want to emphasize that, for several years now, juvenile delinquency, or youthful criminality, has been perhaps the No. 1 social problem facing this Nation.

In small towns, and large cities alike, in rural areas, and in huge metropolitan agglomerations, every day a number of young people begin a course that may lead to the court, to the training school, to the reformatory, or ultimately to the penitentiary for adult felons.

Between the years 1948 and 1956, the number of juvenile cases appearing in courts doubled in number, while the court age population grew by only some 19 percent. We saw in 1956 more than 500,000 youth cases brought before juvenile courts throughout the land. By

1957, this number had grown to over 600,000, and by 1958 to 700,000. Another increase raised the national court case load close to 800,000 cases in 1959, and substantially above this figure in 1960.

Only the last year for which figures are available, the year 1961, showed a slight 1 percent drop in nationwide delinquency cases coming before the juvenile judges. But this decline, encouraging as it may be, is too small to indicate a trend. The total number of young people who are today contaminated and infected with delinquency still runs into hundreds of thousands. These are significant numbers with a significant meaning. To understand what these figures mean, you must never forget that we are talking here about human beings.

These are children and teenagers who, in a few years of their young lives, have already acquired a past, but who often do not have a future.

To understand what these figures mean, we must recognize that each of them represents a human tragedy.

We must understand that each of them symbolizes the failure of a young man or woman, the failure of a parent or a family, the failure of a teacher, of a clergyman, and, ultimately, the failure of society itself.

These figures do not account for every young person who breaks the law. These figures do not even account for all juveniles arrested by the police.

The statistics we receive from one source or another are crude indications of the growth and spread of this disease we call juvenile delinquency.

The statistics only indicate the symptoms of the disease.

The germs, the causes, and the reasons why young children and teenagers commit crimes are not found in statistical reports.

These reasons are found, rather, in the homes where parents are immoral, selfish, or uninterested; in homes where parents are ill informed and ignorant altogether; in homes where parents are poverty stricken and unfortunate.

The reasons for delinquency are found in the schools that are overcrowded and lack teachers, in school programs that cannot engage the interests of children, in educational systems that have lost respect in the eyes of children because they are not respected by adults.

The reasons for delinquency are found in our economic institutions, in the factories, the department stores, the shops and service establishments which are the most efficient, the richest, the most prosperous in the world, but which are unable to provide employment to a million boys and girls who walk the streets looking for a job, desperately trying to find a legitimate place in life.

And, finally, the reasons for delinquency are found in the minds and the acts of men; men who for profit have built a trade in narcotics and other dangerous drugs and who have found young children easy victims; men who for profit are willing to corrupt young minds with pornographic publications; men who indiscriminately sell guns through the mail to children of all ages; men who, without regard for the young

and weak, are dedicated to selfish goals through corruptive means at any price.

The Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee is the only legislative body in either House of Congress that has as its basic interest the elimination of the juvenile delinquency problem in America.

The subcommittee has attempted through its reports to tell the American people of the dangers facing the younger generation. The subcommittee has acted upon legislative measures to protect youth from these corruptions, and it has searched for the basic causes, for the contributory conditions, and for control measures to stop the growth of delinquency.

I believe that the subcommittee has carried out the investigations and the studies that enable us to see where we stand today in relation to delinquency.

During the 87th Congress, the subcommittee acted upon 10 legislative proposals. Three of these have become law, and two others were passed by the Senate.

I have proposed to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], that this subcommittee be continued so that we can follow through with some of the legislation which we could not get out last year.

I have proposed also that there are several fields in which new study is indicated.

Delinquency will not be overcome by any one law or by any one program. Nor will it be eradicated by fighting the symptoms of the disease only. It has become evident that in fighting delinquency, we must fight the basic causes, the "behind the scene" factors, the hidden viruses.

Because lawbreaking by young men and women represents a growing hazard to the entire country, I have proposed that the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee be continued. I have proposed also that in its scope as a legislative body the subcommittee deal with the following areas during the year 1963:

First, legislative proposals to facilitate the treatment and curing of narcotic addicts. The subcommittee's investigations and hearings have shown that, besides the necessity to stop narcotics and other dangerous drugs from circulating through the country and from being brought into the country, it is imperative to cut down the demand for the drugs by rehabilitating those presently dependent on them. Significant changes are needed in the existing drug laws. The Federal Narcotics Control Act of 1956 will have to be modified, since it is felt that this law hampers rehabilitation by requiring long mandatory sentences for drug users and by forbidding release of such offenders on probation or parole.

Additional new legislation is also necessary to stop the illegal commerce in barbiturate and amphetamine drugs. Earlier in this session I introduced two bills to help control this new menace to young people. The subcommittee staff is presently studying questionnaire returns from over 250 police and other State, Federal, and local officials regarding the extent of their local problems and the proposed solutions.

Second, we will study the conditions prevailing in juvenile correctional institutions. It has been brought to the attention of the subcommittee that detention centers, training schools and reformatories for young offenders are greatly overcrowded. Some institutions house twice the optimum number of inmates. These conditions hamper rehabilitation. They are conducive to rioting even in institutions for girls. They incite attempts to escape and they endanger both the institutional personnel and the inmates. On several occasions correctional officers have been killed or permanently injured by escaping inmates.

These things must not be allowed to continue. At their best, institutions are questionable rehabilitative tools. But when they are crowded, when they are understaffed, and when they cannot supply specialized treatment, then such institutions become vicious traps for young boys and girls. They become cages where inestimable damage is done to the morale, to the sense of self-worth, and to the sense of human dignity of young people imprisoned in them. We must seek ways to relieve these pressures. And we must make youth institutions serve the purpose for which they were created—correction and rehabilitation.

Thirdly, I have proposed that the subcommittee look at the policies, procedures, and products of the motion picture industry. In our last year's study of television, the findings showed that network competition for ratings and audiences creates shows often permeated with themes of excessive sex and violence. Subcommittee investigators have discovered that motion pictures may also capitalize on such excesses as exemplified by certain programs shown in drive-in movies, specifically for young audiences.

Fourth, there is need to probe into certain interstate practices of placing minor children for adoption or for permanent free care. It has been brought to our attention that black market baby brokers induce expectant mothers to travel across State lines to, in effect, sell their babies to the highest bidder. Such transactions can have tragic consequences for the baby, for the mother, and often for the prospective parents as well. The subcommittee will consider legislation requiring Federal, State, or local governmental agencies to maintain closer control over adoption procedures.

The fifth area we plan to study relates to inadequate educational facilities, school dropouts, and youth unemployment.

Repeatedly, public officials connected with courts, with schools, and with other youth-serving agencies have claimed that the inability to maintain young people in schools and the unemployment they face after leaving school make them highly susceptible to crime and delinquency.

As chairman of this subcommittee, I was happy to cosponsor with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] the Youth Employment Act. However, we feel that additional legislation is necessary to relieve the pressures on youth

created by inadequate educational programs and facilities on the one hand and by unemployment and idleness on the other hand.

Another problem of concern to us has been the continuous traffic in obscene, pornographic material. The Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee was instrumental in enacting Public Law 85-796, designed to close loopholes in the pornography laws and to facilitate prosecution of transgressors of these laws. Today we find that new loopholes have been created, that new kinds of publications have appeared designed to evade the laws. Such magazines as *Eros* and *Liaison* are offered through the mail to even 12-year-old children. I think it is proper that we devise means to protect children from such attempted corruption and exploitation.

Already in this session the subcommittee has begun to conduct hearings regarding a similar problem, the illegal and irresponsible sale and distribution of handguns to mental defectives, criminals, and juveniles.

Finally, the subcommittee plans to take a closer look at crime and delinquency in our Nation's Capital. All the problems I have discussed are found here in one degree or another. By solving some of them through legislation or other measures, we will have found ways to deal with these problems in other parts of the country as well. Congress is directly responsible for this city and Congress is responsible to the entire country for the conditions which prevail here.

Generally, the subcommittee will follow new findings relative to delinquency control produced in the universities and colleges throughout the Nation. It will follow the progress made by governmental and private programs set up

under the new law, 87-274, which gives \$30 million annually to States and non-profit organizations for carrying out delinquency control projects and for testing new methods. The next few years may decide whether the increased efforts on all levels of society are effective in solving youth crime or whether entirely new trails must be blazed to finally conquer this affliction of American youth.

Mr. President, I ask that the resolution to continue the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee be considered favorably and that it obtain speedy passage.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this subcommittee, as I have pointed out on many occasions, was created 10 or 12 years ago. The Senator who proposed the creation of the subcommittee indicated that the first amount provided, which aggregated \$75,000 would be sufficient to complete the hearings in regard to juvenile delinquency.

This subcommittee, like almost all others, has been renewed from year to year. Instead of a cost of \$75,000, which the original proposer of the resolution stated would be the amount required to hold the hearings, we have now spent well over \$1 million, and still are going strong.

It seems that the more hearings held, the more the Senate goes into the problem, the worse the problem seems to become.

I cannot see any good which arises from this. To me it is money absolutely wasted.

The place to fight juvenile delinquency is not in the committee room or in the hearing room. It is in the church and in the home. It is in the woodshed.

Hearings and committees will not solve the problem. The money we have provided for the juvenile delinquency sub-

committee has not solved the problem, or begun to solve it. The money we are making available today will not solve it. If anything, the publicity resulting from its hearings and investigations may make the problem worse.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I shall be very brief and shall add only a word. As a member of this subcommittee I cannot sit silent without commending the chairman of the subcommittee for the very diligent work he has done in this field.

I point out that there are few more serious domestic problems in this country than the terrible problem of juvenile delinquency in our large metropolitan areas.

The chairman has set forth an agenda of hearings and subjects to be investigated. It is imperative, if we are to give the kind of attention to this subject which it deserves, that we appropriate the funds the subcommittee needs for its work.

I sincerely hope that this relatively modest request by the chairman of the subcommittee will be confirmed and approved by this body.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to. The resolution (S. Res. 63), as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of these proceedings on the so-called money resolutions, a tabulation showing action thereon by the Committee on Rules and Administration and other pertinent data.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Action by the Committee on Rules and Administration on Senate resolutions authorizing inquiries and investigations during the 88th Congress, 1st session

Unless indicated by *italic type* (and explained by footnote), all reductions in requested amounts represent 1/2 of that portion of the annual budget for salaries and employee benefits² to compensate for amounts authorized for February 1963 by S. Res. 88, 88th Cong., agreed to Feb. 19, 1963

R Resolution No.	Committee and purpose	Amount requested		Amount authorized last session	Difference	Action by Senate Rules Committee			Resolution No.
		12-month basis	11-month basis			Reduction of—	Increase of—	Amount approved	
S. Res. 74	Aeronautical and Space Sciences.....		\$82,500	\$90,000	-\$7,500			\$82,500	S. Res. 74
	Armed Services:								
S. Res. 75	Preparedness.....		175,000	220,000	-45,000			175,000	S. Res. 75
S. Res. 79	Stockpiling.....		6,500	115,000	-108,500		\$23,500	10,000	S. Res. 79
	Banking and Currency:								
S. Res. 14	General.....		83,700	80,000 ^{4a}	+3,700			83,700	S. Res. 14
S. Res. 15	Housing.....		105,000	107,000	-1,000			105,000	S. Res. 15
S. Res. 29	Commerce.....		330,000	315,000	+15,000			330,000	S. Res. 29
	Foreign Relations:								
S. Res. 26	Nondiplomatic representatives of foreign principals.....	\$50,000		50,000		\$1,400		48,600	S. Res. 26
S. Res. 25	U. S. foreign policy.....	150,000		160,000	-10,000	7,000		143,000	S. Res. 25
	Government Operations:								
S. Res. 17	General.....	490,000		500,000 ^{4b}	-10,000	31,700		458,300	S. Res. 17
S. Res. 27	Intergovernmental coordination, etc.....	95,000		90,000 ^{4c}	+5,000	7,000		88,000	S. Res. 27
S. Res. 45	Intergovernmental relations.....	115,000		40,000	+75,000	17,710 ^{4d}		97,290	S. Res. 45
S. Res. 13	National security problems.....	110,000		70,000	+40,000	17,750 ^{4e}		92,250	S. Res. 13
S. Res. 16	Interior and Insular Affairs.....	100,000		100,000				100,000	S. Res. 16
	Judiciary:								
S. Res. 55	Administrative practice and procedure.....	120,000		115,000	+5,000	9,400		110,600	S. Res. 55
S. Res. 56	Antitrust and monopoly.....	535,000		450,000 ^{4d}	+85,000	91,750 ⁷		443,250	S. Res. 56
S. Res. 57	Constitutional amendments.....	51,500		48,500 ^{4e}	+3,000		\$2,923 ⁸	54,423	S. Res. 57
S. Res. 58	Constitutional rights.....	165,000		140,000 ^{4f}	+25,000	12,700		152,300	S. Res. 58
S. Res. 59	Federal charters, etc.....	7,500		7,500		500		7,000	S. Res. 59
S. Res. 61	Federal judicial system.....	100,000		90,000	+10,000	7,800		92,200	S. Res. 60
S. Res. 60	Immigration and naturalization.....	135,000		125,000 ^{4a}	+10,000	10,800		124,200	S. Res. 61

See footnotes at end of table.

Action by the Committee on Rules and Administration on Senate resolutions authorizing inquiries and investigations during the 88th Congress, 1st session—Continued

Unless indicated by *italic type* (and explained by footnote), all reductions in requested amounts represent $\frac{1}{2}$ of that portion of the annual budget for salaries and employee benefits ¹ to compensate for amounts authorized for February 1963 by S. Res. 88, 88th Cong., agreed to Feb. 19, 1963

Resolution No.	Committee and purpose	Amount requested		Amount authorized last session	Difference	Action by Senate Rules Committee			Resolution No.
		12-month basis	11-month basis			Reduction of—	Increase of—	Amount approved	
	Judiciary—Continued								
S. Res. 62	Internal security.....	\$360,000		^{4b} \$325,000	+\$35,000	⁹ \$49,120		\$310,880	S. Res. 62
S. Res. 63	Juvenile delinquency.....	188,000		⁴ⁱ 198,000	-10,000	14,700		173,300	S. Res. 63
S. Res. 64	National penitentiaries.....	5,000		5,000				5,000	S. Res. 64
S. Res. 65	Patents, trademarks, copyrights.....	125,000		120,000	+5,000	9,200		115,800	S. Res. 65
S. Res. 66	Refugees and escapees.....	87,500		87,500		6,500		81,000	S. Res. 66
S. Res. 67	Revision and codification.....	30,000		26,000	+4,000	2,300		27,700	S. Res. 67
S. Res. 68	Trading With the Enemy Act.....	60,000		45,000	+15,000	4,600		55,400	S. Res. 68
	Labor and Public Welfare:								
S. Res. 95	Additional staff members.....								S. Res. 95
S. Res. 22	Migratory labor.....		⁽¹⁰⁾ \$68,750	^{4j} 70,000	-1,250			68,750	S. Res. 22
	Post Office and Civil Service:								
S. Res. 20	Additional clerical assistant.....	⁽¹¹⁾							S. Res. 20
S. Res. 18	General.....	75,000		^{4k} 75,000		5,500		69,500	S. Res. 18
S. Res. 12	Public Works.....	125,000		125,000		6,900		118,100	S. Res. 12
S. Res. 73	Rules and Administration (Privileges and Elections).....	65,000		150,000	-85,000	5,200		59,800	S. Res. 73
S. Res. 49	Small Business (select).....	135,000		125,000	+10,000	¹² \$8,910		116,090	S. Res. 49
S. Res. 23	Aging (special).....	213,000		185,000	+28,000	12,600		200,400	S. Res. 23
	Total (as of Mar. 13, 1963).....	4,544,950		4,449,500	+95,450	351,040	\$6,423	4,200,333	

¹ To nearest multiple of \$100 (downward).

² Includes agency contributions to employee retirement, health benefits, and group life insurance.

³ Increased \$3,500 at request of chairman and ranking minority member of subcommittee to provide compensation for minority counsel.

⁴ Increase through Feb. 28, 1963, by S. Res. 88; ^a \$2,500; ^b \$15,000; ^c \$5,500; ^d \$23,000; ^e \$2,000; ^f \$10,000; ^g \$20,000; ^h \$15,000; ⁱ \$6,200; ^j \$2,000. Total, \$103,200.

⁵ Initial request of \$115,000 for 12 months reduced by \$11,500 (10 percent) to \$103,500 for 12 months. Latter amount adjusted to 11-month basis by further reduction of \$6,210 ($\frac{1}{2}$ of salaries and employee benefits of reduced gross), leaving \$97,290 approved by committee.

⁶ Initial request of \$110,000 for 12 months reduced by \$11,000 (10 percent) to \$99,000 for 12 months. Latter amount adjusted to 11-month basis by further reduction of \$6,750 ($\frac{1}{2}$ of salaries and employees benefits of reduced gross), leaving \$92,250 approved by committee.

⁷ Initial request of \$535,000 for 12 months reduced by \$53,500 (10 percent) to \$481,500 for 12 months. Latter amount adjusted to 11-month basis by further reduction of \$38,250 ($\frac{1}{2}$ of salaries and employee benefits of reduced gross), leaving \$443,250 approved by committee.

⁸ Initial request of \$51,500 reduced by \$3,700 to \$47,800 for 11 months by regular formula. At request of ranking minority member of subcommittee \$6,623 (\$7,225) less $\frac{1}{2}$ was added to provide for a minority clerk.

⁹ Initial request of \$360,000 for 12 months reduced by \$25,000 to \$335,000 for 12 months. Latter amount adjusted to 11-month basis by further reduction of \$24,120 ($\frac{1}{2}$ of salaries and employee benefits of reduced gross), leaving \$310,880 approved by committee.

¹⁰ S. Res. 95 would authorize the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare from Mar. 1, 1963, through Jan. 31, 1964, to employ 1 additional assistant chief clerk, 7 additional professional staff members, and 9 additional clerical assistants to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman.

¹¹ S. Res. 20 would authorize the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service from Mar. 1, 1963, through Jan. 31, 1964, to employ 1 additional clerical assistant to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at a rate of compensation to be fixed by the chairman.

¹² Initial request of \$135,000 for 12 months reduced by \$10,000 to \$125,000 for 12 months. Latter amount adjusted to 11-month basis by further reduction of \$8,910 ($\frac{1}{2}$ of salaries and employee benefits of reduced gross), leaving \$116,090 approved by committee.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I rise to inquire of the distinguished acting majority leader what information he can give us as to the expected program tomorrow.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the acting minority leader.

It is expected that the Senate will complete action on bills on the calendar tomorrow. The remaining bills are private bills, all cleared by the minority and majority. There are no such bills on the calendar to which there is objection.

Then the Senate will take up the draft bill.

Mr. CURTIS. The act for the extension of selective service?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The extension of selective service; yes. I am hopeful that bill may be passed without a yea-and-nay vote, because many of our colleagues are absent. I do not believe it involves any controversy. It is quite important that the bill be acted upon.

Then there are some speeches which several of our colleagues have said they wished to make.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Could those of us who will be necessarily absent tomorrow have an assurance that if a yea-and-nay vote should be ordered it would go over until Monday or Tuesday?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should say so. If there is to be a yea-and-nay vote on it, we should permit every Member of the Senate to be back. After tomorrow, it is our intention to adjourn over until Tuesday, so that the Senator may have that assurance also. I am hopeful the measure can be passed without rollcall, because there is no controversy over it.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. There are a number of printing resolutions. I wonder if they could be taken up tonight. It is very important to have them acted on early.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would like to have them taken up. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] has been waiting patiently. He must leave tonight. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] also has been waiting.

SENATE RESOLUTIONS AND SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REPORTED EARLIER TODAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, earlier today Senate Resolutions 72, 99, 105, 106, and Senate Concurrent Resolution 14 were reported favorably, without amendment, from the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT A COMPILATION OF MATERIALS ENTITLED "SUMMER EMPLOYMENT BY COLLEGE STUDENTS IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—1961"

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 105.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 105) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be printed as a Senate document a compilation of materials entitled "Summer Employment by College Students in the Federal Government—1961", prepared by the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress; and there shall be printed six thousand two hundred additional copies of such Senate document for the use of the Members of the Senate.

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT A COMPILATION OF MATERIALS RELATING TO THE HISTORY OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 99.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 99) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed, with illustrations, as a Senate document a compilation of materials relating to the history of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, in connection with its fiftieth anniversary (1913-1963); and that there be printed for the use of that committee one thousand additional copies of such document.

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT THE "SIXTH ANNUAL REPORT ON THE STATUS OF THE COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT AND PARTICIPATING PROJECTS," ETC.

MR. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 72.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 72) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be printed as a Senate document the "Sixth Annual Report on the Status of the Colorado River Storage Project and Participating Projects," and "General Principles to Govern, and Operating Criteria for, Glen Canyon Reservoir (Lake Powell) and Lake Mead During the Lake Powell Filling Period", prepared by the Department of the Interior, with an introductory statement.

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT PAMPHLET ENTITLED "OUR CAPITOL"

MR. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 14.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 14) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, the pamphlet entitled "Our Capitol"; and that three hundred and twenty-three thousand five hundred additional copies shall be printed, of which one hundred and three thousand copies shall be for the use of the Senate and two hundred and twenty thousand five hundred copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

ADDITIONAL PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT OF SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 117, "THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, WHAT IT IS, HOW IT WORKS—A HANDBOOK FOR AMERICANS"

MR. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 106.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 106) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed seven thousand additional copies of Senate Document Numbered 117, of the Eighty-fourth Congress, second session, entitled "The Communist Party of the United States of America, What It Is, How It Works—A Handbook for Ameri-

cans", compiled by the Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate.

COMMENDATION OF SENATOR JORDAN, OF NORTH CAROLINA, AND STAFF OF COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

MR. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, before the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] leaves the Chamber, I wish personally to express the gratitude of both the majority and the minority for the wonderful attention which he has given today to the resolutions which have been considered, as the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration. I know of the many hours of hearings that were held on these resolutions and the great amount of detail that was presented. We are all indebted to the distinguished Senator from North Carolina.

He has been diligent and on guard, so to speak, in answering any and all questions. I personally appreciate it and I thank him on behalf of the entire Senate.

MR. JORDAN of North Carolina. I am exceedingly grateful to the Senator from Minnesota. I appreciate his kind words. As the Senator well knows, the committee held hearings on every one of these resolutions, and we brought forth as good answers as I think could be produced. It has been a pleasure to work with the Senator in getting the resolutions agreed to.

MR. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in addition, I wish to commend the staff, particularly Gordon F. Harrison, staff director; Hugh Q. Alexander, chief counsel, and John P. Coder, editorial and printing assistant.

MR. JORDAN of North Carolina. The staff has rendered excellent service in working with us and getting the resolutions drafted.

MR. HUMPHREY. We are grateful to the staff.

MR. JORDAN of North Carolina. We are indeed grateful to the staff.

MR. HUMPHREY. I yield now to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER].

TAX PROPOSALS AND THE ECONOMY

MR. MILLER. Mr. President, the President has been warning that, if his tax program is not adopted, we might have a recession. There are many of us who feel that his tax program, calling for a net tax cut of \$2.7 billion for fiscal 1964, will have very little effect in heading off a recession, much less getting the economy moving again. It is likely that the \$2.7 billion additional purchasing power which his tax cut is intended to produce will be offset by an increase in State and local taxes being voted throughout the United States this year. In addition, there are many who believe that the \$12 billion deficit which he has proposed will produce inflation which will shrink the purchasing power of our money by \$2.7 billion or more, thus leaving us on a treadmill.

However, quite apart from the subject of taxes, I believe the President should be warned that we will indeed have a recession if our basic industry of agriculture does not improve its position. There cannot be a healthy industrial economy unless there is a healthy agriculture. And the fact is, Mr. President, that contrary to glowing reports of the Secretary of Agriculture, there has been no real improvement in agriculture. Farm prices declined 1 percent during the month ended February 15. The farm price level remained at 78 percent of parity, compared with 80 percent a year ago. There has been a serious decline in livestock prices. Hog prices at the end of February were at a 3-year low. Prices of fat cattle are below any period since August of 1961, and the February prices were the lowest of any February level in 6 years.

It will not do for the Department of Agriculture to explain that the reason for the severe break in cattle prices is that there is a larger cattle population this year. We have a larger human population to feed, too. Moreover, the feed grain price-depressing activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation—selling off abnormally large amounts of stored grain—naturally depress livestock prices. Such activities should stop.

The severe east coast maritime strike and the prolonged newspaper strike in New York City have had a highly detrimental impact on the demand for choice beef from the Midwest. And we view with apprehension the discussions now being conducted in the Common Market over tariff policy with respect to export shipments of beef, pork, rice, and soybean oil from the United States. Recent discriminatory action by the Common Market against our poultry exports will destroy a \$50 million annual poultry export business unless this administration takes prompt retaliatory action against Common Market imports into this country and forces the Common Market to remove its discriminatory duties. Failure of the administration to act will be an open invitation to the Common Market to take similar action against beef and other agricultural exports from this country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an article entitled "Farm Price Index Off 1 Percent" appearing in the March 1 issue of the Des Moines Register; and two articles appearing in the Stockman's Journal for Saturday, March 2, 1963, one entitled "Hog Prices End February at 3-Year Low," and the other entitled "Fed Cattle Sell at Lowest February Level in 6 Years."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Des Moines Register, Mar. 1, 1963]

FARM PRICE INDEX OFF 1 PERCENT

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Farm product prices declined 1 percent during the month ended February 15.

Reporting this Thursday, the Agriculture Department said lower prices for cattle and hogs were primarily responsible. Partially

offsetting this were increases for oranges, chickens, eggs, and corn.

BELOW 1962

The mid-February price level was about 0.25 percent below a year earlier.

Prices paid by farmers in mid-February for goods and services used in production and in family living did not change from a month earlier, holding at a record level set in mid-January.

The farm price level remained at 78 percent of the parity price goal of farm programs. This compared with 80 percent of parity a year ago and the record high of 123 percent set in October 1946.

The Department said meat animals, other than sheep, declined 5 percent between mid-January and mid-February. Poultry and egg prices advanced 3 percent, fruit 5 percent, and feed grains 3 percent. Dairy products declined 1 percent during the month.

The general level of prices received by farmers in mid-February was at 242 percent of the 1910-14 base average, compared with 244 percent in mid-January, 243 percent in mid-February last year, and the record high of 313 percent set in February 1951.

COST INDEX

The level of prices paid by farmers in mid-February was at 311 percent of the 1910-14 average, the same as a month earlier. A year ago these prices were at 305 percent of the base average.

Average prices received by farmers for important products in mid-February compared with mid-January and the mid-February parity prices, respectively, included:

	Mid-February	Mid-January	Parity
Wheat, bushel.....	\$2.04	\$2.01	\$2.40
Rye, bushel.....	.978	.969	1.42
Rice, rough, 100 pounds..	5.18	5.27	6.44
Corn, bushel.....	1.06	1.03	1.59
Oats, bushel.....	.654	.645	.849
Barley, bushel.....	.91	.896	1.25
Sorghum grain, 100 pounds.....	1.70	1.68	2.49
Hay, baled, ton.....	29.69	22.30	26.60
Cotton, upland, pound.....	.2969	.3007	.4031
Cottonseed, ton.....	48.50	48.20	62.50
Soybeans, bushel.....	2.50	2.41	3.01
Peanuts, pound.....	.112	.112	.14
Flaxseed, bushel.....	2.79	2.75	3.89
Potatoes, 100 pounds.....	1.61	1.54	2.29
Apples, bushel.....	2.58	2.51	3.07
Grapefruit, box.....	.71	1.04	1.15
Oranges, box.....	2.21	1.72	2.86
Hogs, 100 pounds.....	14.80	15.40	22.40
Beef cattle, 100 pounds.....	20.40	21.60	24.00
Calves, 100 pounds.....	23.00	25.60	27.00
Sheep, 100 pounds.....	6.43	6.43	7.87
Lambs, 100 pounds.....	17.60	18.20	24.50
Butterfat, pound.....	.587	.589	.774
Milk, wholesale, 100 pounds.....	4.15	4.20	5.35
Chickens, live, pound.....	.153	.141	.238
Turkeys, live, pound.....	.222	.221	.336
Eggs, dozen.....	.373	.365	.482
Wool, pound.....	.47	.454	.778

HOG PRICES END FEBRUARY AT 3-YEAR LOW—BUTCHERS OFF 75 CENTS TO \$1, TOP DIPS TO \$15.25 LATE IN MONTH; SOWS 50 TO 75 CENTS LOWER

Despite decreased supplies from January and a fairly orderly marketing pattern during February, a bearish price trend dominated much of last month's trade on hogs at Omaha and losses amounted to 75 cents to \$1 on butchers while sow prices wound up 50 to 75 cents under January's closing figures. The break dropped late prices to the lowest level here in 3 years.

Reports from around the wholesale dressed meat circuit indicated that pork loin prices finished a month of up-and-down trading at \$1.50 lower levels on a sharp late break while other cuts were mostly \$1 off for the period.

Receipts of hogs at Omaha during February totaled 256,372 as against 314,871 for January and fell considerably short of every

month since September. In February of last year 240,664 head arrived.

Supplies last month included a wide range of weight and overall quality was usually pretty good. During the latter half of the period heavy butcher arrivals dwindled slightly while light and medium weights were offered more freely.

Sows made up about 9 percent of February's run. That figure was right in line with the preceding month's sow percent and was otherwise the shortest for any month since last March.

WEIGHTS AVERAGE LIGHTER

The average weight of all hogs marketed at Omaha during February was around 255 pounds. This figure was 5 to 8 pounds under the all-hog average weights for the preceding 3 months but was more or less in line with average hog weights here for the past few years.

Early in February prices on most 200-300-pound butchers ranged from \$14.25 to \$16.50. On the first market day of the month a couple hundred strictly choice around 225-pounders reached \$16.75 to set the months' peak. Before mid-February most butchers that scaled around 250 pounds cleared at \$15.50 to \$16.

During the last half of the period 200-300-pound butchers found outlet largely at \$13.75 to \$15.75 levels. While the top occasionally reached \$16 the best light butchers turned at \$15.25 to \$15.35 on the final rounds. The inside price was the lowest daily top here since March 1, 1960. Popular late-month prices on butchers that averaged around 250 pounds were \$14.50 to \$15.

Most sows offered at Omaha in February ranged in weight from 300 to 600 pounds and they cashed from \$12.50 to \$14.75. However, no sows were quoted above \$14 toward the close.

FED CATTLE SELL AT LOWEST FEBRUARY LEVEL IN 6 YEARS—PRICES ARE BELOW ANY PERIOD SINCE AUGUST OF 1961 ON BREAK OF MAINLY \$1 TO \$1.50, SOME BIG STEERS OFF \$2; MOST COWS STEADY; FEEDERS DIP

The break in prices which settled on the fed cattle trade late in 1962 and prevailed all through January continued last month to drop prices to the lowest February level since 1957.

A continuing lower trade on dressed beef carcasses at wholesale outlets was a major factor in keeping prices on the decline. The month's setback of \$1 to \$1.50 on most steers and heifers with some weightier steers off as much as \$2 left closing prices at the lowest level for any period since August of 1961.

A late rally erased an earlier decline on cows and they finished February on a mostly steady basis although some better beef offerings were as much as 50 cents over the close of January.

The declining cornfed market had a bearish effect on stocker and feeder trading but even so, the market held up fairly well on desirable quality lighterweight replacement stock but most fleshier offerings shared in the setback on grainfeds.

RECEIPTS MODERATE

The break on cornfeds continued even though receipts were moderate but they were frequently rather poorly distributed during a week's period. Arrivals last month, at 142,513, were the smallest in 4 years and the second lightest in 10 years for comparable periods. The run for the same month a year ago totaled 147,787 head.

Good to Choice offerings usually made up the big end of the grainfed supply. Average weights on steers ran above the comparable time a year ago and offerings averaging upwards from 1,150 pounds were generally the hardest to move with weight in late trading often having more of an influence on final prices than quality.

While the volume of fed steers and yearlings selling at \$24 and above in late trading was rather small, early in the period a fair showing ranged upward to the month's peak of \$26. It took a pretty good load of fat heifers to beat \$23.50 on closing rounds but earlier in the month a modest showing reached \$25 and above with a part load of 963-pounders and a load of 1,070-pounders at the \$26 mark.

At midmonth it was hard to pass \$15 on beef cows and most low grades sold down from \$12.50 to \$13. At the close, Choice beef cows sold to \$16 with odd head to \$16.50 and cutters cashed up to \$14.

STEER CALVES \$34

Trade on stockers and feeders was often on a catch-as-catch-can basis. Most Good to Choice yearling stockers and lightweight feeder steers moved at \$24 to \$27.50 with a load of Choice 537-pounders at \$28.50. Good to Choice fleshy feeders scaling around 800 pounds and up moved mainly at \$22.50 to \$24 but a load of Choice 1,000-pound grainfeds moved the feeder route at \$24.65.

Choice yearling stock heifers brought \$25 to \$26.25 with the latter price on 543-pounders and other sales ranging down from \$23 to \$23.25.

Good to Choice stock steer calves brought \$28 to \$33 with a part load of Choice 391-pounders at \$34, highest since January. It was also the highest on steer calves since 1959 for February.

Good to Choice stock heifers went out mainly at \$26 to \$29 and a shipment of Choice 143-pounders brought \$30 which was also the highest since early January and was a 4-year February high.

Odd bunches of Medium to Good stock cows brought \$13 to \$15.25 and early in the period a shipment of young cows on the heiferette order moved at \$19.

SHOULD THE GOVERNMENT LIE?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 109, part 1, pages 899 through 903, appear excerpts from remarks by Mr. Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, delivered at the Sigma Delta Chi dinner in New York City on December 6, 1962, as taped by the American Broadcasting Co. and transcribed by the American Newspaper Publishers Association. These were inserted in the RECORD by unanimous consent of the Senate at the request of the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

Mr. Sylvester is quoted as saying:

It's inherent in [a] government's right, if necessary, to lie to save itself when it's going up into a nuclear war. This seems to me basic—basic.

Here we have a statement by one of the administration's top spokesmen that really means this: If Mr. Sylvester or someone else in authority in the administration reaches a conclusion, in his own mind, that such action is "necessary," then he, as a representative of the Government, should lie.

Needless to say, this is a very dangerous statement of policy, and it has, no doubt, contributed greatly to the concern of the American people over whether or not the spokesmen for this administration in general, and Mr. Sylvester in particular, are giving out the facts on Cuba and other problems of vital concern to our Nation.

What prompts me to refer to these remarks by Mr. Sylvester is the testi-

mony by Mr. Sylvester Tuesday before the Government Operations Committee of the Senate. In response to a question from the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], Mr. Sylvester said:

The Government does not have a right to lie to the people, but it does have a right in facing an enemy, if information is not accurate and is intended to mislead the enemy, I think that any people will support their government in not putting out information that is going to help the enemy. And, if necessary, misleading them.

Apparently last December 6, Mr. Sylvester believed that a government has an inherent right to lie. Tuesday he said it only has a right to put out misleading information, but not to lie. Now all of us wonder how Mr. Sylvester draws a line between lying and being misleading. And we are concerned over having someone like Mr. Sylvester make a judgment over the circumstances under which lying or being misleading is to be undertaken. Apparently, from his remarks last December, he was of opinion that the confrontation in Cuba last fall constituted "going up into a nuclear war." This is some more of that "eyeball to eyeball" talk which unnecessarily and unjustifiably frightened the American people. Let me say, Mr. President, that I believe spokesmen for this administration have done a grave disservice to the American people in unduly frightening them over the Cuban confrontation. We were prepared, all right. But we were not anywhere near close to a nuclear war. And the reason we were not is because Mr. Khrushchev was not anywhere near to committing suicide.

The Cuban confrontation was simply another example of how, if we stand firm against Communist aggression and make it clear that further aggression will not be to the advantage of the Communists because of our power and our resolve, there will be no war—least of all a nuclear war.

The statements Mr. Sylvester has been making reveal an attitude of extreme pragmatism—following the philosophy that the end justifies the means. This is the philosophy expounded by Premier Khrushchev. It is not the philosophy which characterizes the American way of life. I think that the sooner the President finds another Assistant Secretary of Defense to replace Mr. Sylvester, the better it will be for all of us, including the administration.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE CLYDE DOYLE, OF CALIFORNIA

The Chair laid before the Senate a resolution from the House of Representatives, which was read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable CLYDE DOYLE, a Representative from the State of California.

Resolved, That a committee of twenty-eight Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying

out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague [Mr. KUCHEL] I send a resolution to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 112) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. CLYDE DOYLE, late a Representative from the State of California.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, adjourn until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the second resolving clause of the resolution, the Chair appoints the two Senators from California [Mr. KUCHEL and Mr. ENGLE] as the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the late Representative DOYLE.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar to which there is no objection, in order, beginning with Calendar No. 50.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

HOM WAH YOOK

The bill (S. 92) for the relief of Hom Wah Yook (also known as Hom Bok Heung), was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Hom Wah Yook (also known as Hom Bok Heung) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

PURIFICACION SIAT

The bill (S. 97) for the relief of Purificacion Siat was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Purificacion Siat shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

YOUNG WAI

The bill (S. 208) for the relief of Young Wai, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Young Wai shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

HAROLD AND SYLVIA FREDA KARRO AND CHILDREN

The bill (S. 234) for the relief of Harold and Sylvia Freda Karro and their three children, Allan Karro, Jennifer Karro, and Michelle Karro, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Harold and Sylvia Freda Karro and their three minor children, Allan Karro, Jennifer Karro, and Michelle Karro, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

STANISLAW BIALOGLOWSKI

The bill (S. 436) for the relief of Stanislaw Bialoglowski, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled. That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Stanislaw Bialogowski shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

PANAGIOTA MAKRIS

The bill (S. 506) for the relief of Panagiota Makris, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Panagiota Makris may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the said Act and a petition may be filed by Mrs. Yianoula Makris, a citizen of the United States, in behalf of the said Panagiota Makris pursuant to section 205(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans.

ANTONIO GUTIERREZ FERNANDEZ

The bill (S. 574) for the relief of Antonio Gutierrez Fernandez, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Antonio Gutierrez Fernandez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ROSWITHA SEIB

The bill (S. 596) for the relief of Roswitha Seib, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Roswitha Seib may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That unless the said Roswitha Seib is eligible for medical care under the Dependents' Medical Care Act (70 Stat. 250), a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act: *Provided further,* That the exemption granted herein shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

RONALD WHITING

The bill (S. 688) for the relief of Ronald Whiting, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ronald Whiting may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act: *And provided further,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

MICHELINA LANNI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 193) for the relief of Michelina Lanni which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, after line 11, after the word "Act", to insert a colon and "And provided further, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Michelina Lanni may be issued an immigrant visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act: *Provided,* That this Act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this Act: *And provided further,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendment was agreed to.
The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ISABEL LORETTA ALLEN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 195) for the relief of Isabel Loretta Allen which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments on page 1, at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "Isabel" and insert "Isabel", and in line 11, after the word "Act", to insert a colon and "And provided further, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and

Nationality Act, Izabel Loretta Allen may be issued an immigrant visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act: *Provided,* That this Act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this Act: *And provided further,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Izabel Loretta Allen."

HO KOON CHEW

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 421) for the relief of Ho Koon Chew which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the word "Act", to strike out "Ho Koon Chew" and insert "Koon Chew Ho", and in line 11, after the word "said", to strike out "Ho Koon Chew" and insert "Koon Chew Ho"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Ho Yee, a deceased United States citizen, shall be deemed to have resided in the United States prior to July 9, 1913, within the meaning of section 1993 of the Act of February 10, 1855 (Rev. Stat. 1878).

Sec. 2. For the purposes of the said Act, Koon Chew Ho shall be held and considered to be the natural-born son of the said Ho Yee, and shall be further held and considered to have been a United States citizen at all times since July 9, 1913: *Provided,* That the said Koon Chew Ho enters the United States for permanent residence within one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Koon Chew Ho."

KRYSTYNA RATAJ

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 635) for the relief of Krystyna Rataj which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, in line 5, after the name "Krystyna", to strike out "Rataj" and insert "Ratay"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (28) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Krystyna Ratay may be issued an immigrant visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act. This Act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Krystyna Ratay."

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT A PAMPHLET ENTITLED "OUR AMERICAN GOVERNMENT—WHAT IS IT? HOW DOES IT FUNCTION?"

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 26, which was reported this morning and is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 26) to authorize the printing as a House document of the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government—What Is It? How Does It Function?"

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution which had been reported from the Committee on Government Operations, with amendments, on page 1, line 2, after the word "That", to strike out "(a)"; in line 6, after the word "a", to strike out "House" and insert "Senate"; in line 8, after the word "Function", to strike out "In addition to the usual number there shall be printed two thousand copies for use and distribution by each Member of Congress"; and after line 10, to strike out:

"(b) As used in this concurrent resolution the term 'Member of Congress' includes a Member of the Senate, a Member of the House of Representatives, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico." and insert a semicolon and "and that there shall be printed one million eighty-four thousand additional copies of such document, of which two hundred and six thousand copies shall be for the use of the Senate, and eight hundred and seventy-eight thousand copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 26) was agreed to.

TO PRINT, WITH ILLUSTRATIONS, "A REPORT ON U.S. FOREIGN OPERATIONS IN AFRICA," BY SENATOR ALLEN J. ELLENDER

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 29, which was reported this morning and is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 29) to print, with illustrations, the report of U.S. Foreign Operations in Africa, by Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER.

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

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 29) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed, with illustrations, as a Senate document, a report entitled "A Report on United States Foreign Operations in Africa," submitted by Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, to the Senate Committee on Appropriations and that four thousand additional copies be printed for the use of that committee.

FIFTEENTH ANNUAL ARTHUR S. FLEMMING AWARDS PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the downtown chapter of the District of Columbia Junior Chamber of Commerce has completed its 15th annual Arthur S. Flemming Awards program. This program is conducted in cooperation with the Potomac Electric Power Co., the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., and the Washington Gas Light Co.

The Arthur S. Flemming Awards program was established to honor outstanding young men in the Federal Government and to recognize exceptionally meritorious work, to attract top-caliber young men to Government service; to encourage high standards of performance and to enhance appreciation of Government service and the opportunities and responsibilities that it presents. For the 15th annual program, over 90 Government agencies were invited to submit nominations for the awards. The Flemming Commission, under the chairmanship of Charles A. Dukes, Jr. narrowed the nominees to 21 men. The panel of judges, who chose the 10 finalists, was headed by the Honorable Tom C. Clark, Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, and included Oscar Berry, vice president and general counsel of the Washington Gas Light Co.; Louis Johnson, senior partner, Steptoe & Johnson, and former Secretary of Defense; Richard Norris, president of the Riggs National Bank; Charles E. Phillips, president of Equitable Life Insurance Co. and president of the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade; and C. R. Smith, president of American Airlines. The Senator from Minnesota also was privileged to serve on the panel of judges. The following winners were selected:

Lawrence Lewis Kavanau, Defense Research and Engineering.

Kevin T. Maroney, Department of Justice.

N. Thompson Powers, Department of Labor.

George Stevens, Jr., U.S. Information Agency.

John Robinson Wilkins, Agency for International Development.

Edgar Maurice Cortright, Jr., National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Norman Joseph Doctor, Department of the Army.

Charles M. Herzfeld, Department of Defense.

George Michael Low, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Joseph Francis Saunders, Department of the Navy.

Our country is indeed fortunate in possessing a Government career service which attracts these exceptionally talented young men and in having public-spirited organizations which have voluntarily established this program to recognize and honor them.

The Flemming Award winners, the downtown chapter of the junior chamber of commerce, and the cosponsors of this fine program are to be congratulated for their outstanding contribution to the Federal service.

I ask unanimous consent that the information relating to the outstanding service performed by the Flemming Award winners be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the information was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING 15TH ANNUAL AWARD WINNERS

ADMINISTRATIVE

Lawrence Lewis Kavanau, defense research and engineering; Dr. Kavanau's office is the focal point for the research and development aspects of the military space program and coordination with NASA and other agencies involved in the national space program. He served as Deputy Director and leader of the Department of Defense delegation on the Large Launch Vehicle Planning Group which provided the blueprint for the launch vehicles used in the National Manned Lunar Landing program.

Kevin T. Maroney, Department of Justice: Mr. Maroney has personally argued eight cases before the Supreme Court and five cases before various U.S. Courts of Appeal. The celebrated Rudolph Abel espionage case and the Supreme Court ruling requiring the Communist Party to register with the Attorney General are among his successes, "attributable almost entirely to the vigor, competence, experience, and mature judgment of Mr. Maroney."

N. Thompson Powers, Department of Labor: Mr. Powers had primary responsibility for organizing and coordinating the assistance program for workers adversely affected by the Trade Expansion Act. This program provides retraining, special unemployment compensation, and relocation allowances. "His outstanding performance contributed immeasurably to * * * this significant program for the protection of * * * workers * * * affected by trade and tariff concessions." He was also responsible for planning, coordinating and carrying out the White House Regional Conferences on Youth.

George Stevens, Jr., U.S. Information Agency: Mr. Stevens has the primary responsibility in the U.S. Government for worldwide projection of America's image through motion pictures. The USIA-produced movies of Mrs. Kennedy's visits to India and Pakistan have received international acclaim. He has established an intern program for developing new USIA motion picture production supervisors and was chairman of the U.S. delegation at the Cannes and Venice Film Festivals.

John Robinson Wilkins, Agency for International Development: Since May 1962, Mr. Wilkins has served as Acting General Counsel and is responsible for establishing, directing and coordinating all legal services for AID. He was personally responsible for providing

legal continuity in creating AID and terminating the International Cooperation Administration. Mr. Wilkins' role has been extraordinarily vital and influential in shaping in a legal way the course and conduct of the foreign-aid program.

SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL

Edgar Maurice Cortright, Jr., National Aeronautics and Space Administration: Mr. Cortright shares with the Director the responsibility for planning and directing NASA's unmanned scientific space exploration programs. He led the conception and establishment of the Mariner program, carrying it through to successful flight operation. In addition, he carries management responsibility for the lunar and planetary programs, the geophysics and astronomy scientific satellite programs, the space bio-science programs, and light and medium launch vehicle programs.

Norman Joseph Doctor, Department of the Army: As a research and development supervisor in the microminiaturization branch, Mr. Doctor has pioneered in electronic miniaturization, scoring breakthroughs of major importance to military, space and industrial programs. His revolutionary two-dimensional packaging techniques for hearing aids received nationwide recognition. Recent contributions have been electronic circuitry for short-wave receivers, a clock for man-portable range finders, and a presettable automatic timer.

Charles M. Herzfeld, Department of Defense: Dr. Herzfeld is responsible for directing, planning, and coordinating the entire ARPA ballistic missile defense effort (Project Defender). His analysis of the complex technical, political, economic, and strategic factors of the program has produced important modifications in related military research and development programs and major

changes in strategic weapons programs. Dr. Herzfeld's contributions have produced significantly more effective U.S. military posture.

George Michael Low, National Aeronautics and Space Administration: Mr. Low is responsible for development of manned spacecraft and management of manned space flight operations including Projects Mercury, Gemini, and Apollo. He was chairman of the select committee which performed the original studies leading to the manned lunar landing program. This program, now under his direction, is the next achievement of major significance to be attained in space.

Joseph Francis Saunders, Department of the Navy: As one of his programs in basic medical and dental research, Dr. Saunders established collaborative research programs with Britain and the Netherlands toward dealing with blood shortages during disasters. Under his direction, a process for indefinite stockpiling of human blood has been developed which will not only improve medical care and save millions of dollars annually, but has far-reaching implications for other medical research breakthroughs such as grafting of organs, preservation of tissues, and control of aging.

ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Representative DOYLE, of California, I move that the Senate adjourn until tomorrow, Friday, at 11 a.m.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 15, 1963, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 14, 1963:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

W. Averell Harriman, of New York, to be Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Having designated, in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5232, Maj. Gen. Charles H. Hayes, U.S. Marine Corps, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general while so serving.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Rear Adm. William A. Brockett, U.S. Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Ships in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years.

IN THE NAVY

Adm. Robert L. Dennison, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of admiral on the retired list pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Having designated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, Vice Adm. David L. McDonald, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of admiral while so serving.

Having designated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, Rear Adm. William E. Gentner, Jr., U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Assaults Against the Free Enterprise System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, it was my honor and pleasure to address the National Security Commission of the American Legion this morning at the Statler Hotel. I ask unanimous consent to have my remarks printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY U.S. SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER, REPUBLICAN, OF ARIZONA, BEFORE THE NATIONAL SECURITY COMMISSION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, MARCH 14, 1963, STATLER-HILTON HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Washington in his Farewell Address warned that our form of government could be attacked and destroyed through means other than a direct assault. I believe his words of warning could be appropriately directed to many of the activities which we find our society engaged in today. I am thinking of things like the direct and indirect assaults being made against the free enterprise system, like the downgrading of our military

system and its leaders, like the great unrealistic push for disarmament at any cost.

Today I should like to direct my remarks to what is taking place in the field of military development and disarmament. This is an area of great concern and importance to the America people because it directly affects the present and continued security of our Nation in a time of mortal conflict with an enemy which has sworn to destroy us. It also is an area which is growing so complex so fast that it must be studied constantly by all Americans interested in the defense and extension of freedom throughout the world.

And let me state at the very outset my fear that the course we are presently embarked upon is in the direction of unilateral disarmament.

On April 18, 1962, President Kennedy at a press conference said "the United States has today tabled at Geneva an outline of every basic provision of a treaty of general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world." This document should receive far more consideration and study than it has been given by the people of this country. Here is a sweeping, all-inclusive proposal for disarmament that had not been discussed with the interested Members of Congress, but which has the possibilities of reducing the U.S. ability to wage war at all levels to an impossibly weak position. At the time, no one took this document too seriously, and for a variety of reasons. To begin with, it was regarded more in the line of a propaganda gesture designed to show the world that we were more desirous of disarmament and lasting peace than were the Russians. It also was felt to be a document that the So-

viets would never agree to, and, therefore completely meaningless. Another factor was the assurance from administration spokesmen that any agreement reached at Geneva would have to be ratified by the U.S. Senate.

It never occurred to any of us, I am afraid, that the mere offering of this proposal at Geneva, containing as it did specific steps looking to the eventual disbandment of national armies and their replacement by a United Nations peace force, was in itself a moral commitment of a sort. And I don't believe anyone in his wildest dreams ever considered the possibility that the three-stage disarmament plan tabled at Geneva might provide the framework for unilateral moves by the United States to try and reverse the trend toward greater weapons systems.

Now I won't burden you with the entire wording of this document here today. But I must mention what to me is the salient point in the first stage of the American disarmament proposal, because it is in this area that we find the United States seemingly hellbent on accomplishment without benefit of Russian reciprocity. The point I have reference to calls for a reduction in the inventory of vehicles capable of delivering nuclear weapons. Either by accident or design, we seem to be proceeding with this objective through administrative orders from the Pentagon. Consider, for a minute, the decisions that have been announced since this program for disarmament was presented at Geneva. The RS-70 has been abandoned. Skybolt has been dropped, manned bombers are being phased out, Nike-Zeus is being delayed, the Dyna-Soar program is being reexamined for possible junking.