

to follow the traditions that have made this country great.

In conclusion, let it be said that whether the laws of Congress or the rules of the FCC are to be the dominant governmental influence in your affairs, the fact remains that you will be subject to Government regulation so long as you use the property belonging to the people. Perhaps this regulation will be more than you or I feel necessary, perhaps it will not be as much as many voices say is needed. In either event, it will continue to present challenges to you individually and as an industry—challenges that must be met by responsible action on your part.

You must remember that no regulated industry is more carefully spotlighted, none more in the public attention, than is the broadcasting industry. In most every home in this country reposes someone who is pre-

pared to offer a strong opinion about what he wants from the broadcasters who serve him. This vast audience can make itself heard with the Government; it can outshout you, and it can outvote you. Hence, you must continue to serve it wisely and well or it will cry out for stronger regulation of your affairs.

Before other regulated industry groups I have urged that a unified front be presented wherever possible in the industrywide relations with the Government. In no industry is this more important than in yours. It would be well for you to consider three questions which I leave with you:

"What of your own house?"

"Can you reach agreements as an industry on problems facing you—agreements strong enough so that you can address your Government with a unified voice?"

"Can you recognize that the challenge of regulation is not one to be met merely by loud protests, but that concerted, unified effort is required?"

Of responsibility I would say this: Your sense of service is made clear by the programs you transmit. Most of you do very well. Most of you are responsive to the needs and desires of people you serve. The public is your ultimate judge and as the public judges you, so will be decided your success as broadcasters.

Even within the confines of Government regulation, you are still free to pursue courses of responsibility and irresponsibility. Firmly convinced that most of you most of the time will make the correct choices, I will do my best to see that those decisions are always yours to make.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, DECEMBER 2, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Matthew 6: 35: *Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness.*

Most merciful and gracious God, may this new week be blessed with a deeper experience and a keener awareness of the guidance of Thy divine spirit.

We penitently acknowledge that we so frequently seek to order our character and conduct, on terms of our own selfish desires and wishes, our own personal aspirations and ambitions.

Inspire us with the joyous conviction that we are living and laboring for the kingdom of God and His righteousness, which the Master declared must always be our first concern.

Give us the certainty that there is a spiritual power in the universe which is working for righteousness and justice, however seemingly feeble and frail our own human efforts.

Hear us in His name, who is the King of kings and the Lord of lords. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, November 29, 1963, was read and approved.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE GUADALUPE MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, through the Guadalupe Mountains of Texas have passed the Apache of Geronimo, the conquistadores of Spain, the stages of the Butterfield Overland Mail, the pack-horses of gold miners, and the fearless feet of cliff-climbing boys. None of them has disturbed the peace. Ten months ago, I introduced a bill in this body to investigate the possibility of a park in

the Guadalupe. The Interior Department's subsequent report enumerates 12,000 years of history, a spectacular geological treasure, archeological delights, tales of lost gold mines, and the exultation of one of America's great natural surprises—an 8,751-foot mountain lifting the sky over Texas. Based on the recommendations made by the National Park Service and the National Parks Advisory Board, I am proud to introduce a bill today to authorize establishment of the Guadalupe Mountains National Park.

THE PRESIDENT JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY MEMORIAL COMMISSION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have today filed a bill calling upon President Johnson to establish a President John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Commission. This legislation is similar to the bill introduced in the Senate by Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota.

The duty of the Commission would be to make a full and complete study and evaluation with respect to any plan or plans which have been proposed with a view toward memorializing the late President Kennedy. During the course of the study and evaluation, it would be the duty of the Commission to consult with members of the immediate family of the late President, in order to determine their sentiments concerning all such plans.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this is the appropriate and sensible approach to the establishment or designation of a memorial to our late beloved President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. Many, many proposals have been made to memorialize President Kennedy since his untimely death at the hands of an assassin on November 22. I personally favor the renaming of the Cape Cod National Seashore to memorialize President Kennedy, and so provided in a bill, H.R. 9256, which I introduced last Wednesday, November 27. However, I think it does make sense to have a commission established to

make a complete study and evaluation of all such proposals to memorialize the late President, and that is why I introduced this bill today.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit during general debate on Tuesday, December 3.

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

There was no objection.

NO CAUSE FOR COTTON PANIC

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this House will be considering the Cooley cotton bill (H.R. 6196) Tuesday and Wednesday of this week. I believe most of us recognize that there is a need for some changes in the present cotton legislation, but as one who has spent his entire life in the Cotton Belt and therefore more familiar with some of the problems than the average person, I can truthfully say that the Cooley bill is not the answer or the solution to the problem.

As a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, I voted to report H.R. 6196 out of the committee, not with my endorsement, as I stated at the time that I felt this was not a sound bill, and the only reason I was willing to agree that the bill be brought to the floor was for it to act as the vehicle which could be used in securing some of the changes which are needed to strengthen the cotton economy, and to provide changes which in my opinion are necessary if we are to continue the cotton industry in this country.

It is my intention to offer amendments to this bill which I believe will accomplish the changes which are necessary if the cotton industry is to survive; amendments which will greatly reduce the cost of the program; which will tend to make cotton really competitive;

amendments which will provide for removing the inequity without going beyond to the point of providing a windfall to the domestic mills.

I also want to take this opportunity to call attention to an article which appeared in the November issue of the *Missouri Delta Farmer*, which I am today inserting in the daily *RECORD*. It will be entitled "No Cause for Cotton Panic."

STATUE OF FREEDOM—THE CAPITOL DOME

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, "Freedom" merits a minute of our time today. One century ago to this very hour she was the cynosure of all eyes including those of President Abraham Lincoln, and she was honored by a 35-gun salute. She is, of course, the bronze figure which surmounts the great cast iron dome of the Capitol.

The statue was modeled in Rome by the American sculptor, Thomas Crawford, and was cast by Clark Mills in his foundry near Bladensburg, Md. While this country was engaged in a Civil War which was extending the rights of freedom to all Americans, this statue was placed atop the lantern of the dome on December 2, 1863, as a symbol of the principle of universal freedom to which our society is dedicated.

Freedom has implications for 20th century America that were unknown during the Civil War or the Revolutionary era. The mechanics of living in freedom alter with the course of history, but the disciplines of freedom remain basically the same in every age. Freedom's habilitment may change, but we must always recognize her face. Unless we know freedom well, and observe her disciplines, as well as appreciate her gifts, we may pass her by and lose her light forever.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I was away from the Chamber for several days on official business as a member of the U.S. delegation to the recent NATO Parliamentarians' Conference. I necessarily missed several rollcall votes. Had I been present I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall No. 191, "aye."

Rollcall No. 192, "aye."

Rollcall No. 194, "nay."

Rollcall No. 195, "aye."

Rollcall No. 196, "nay."

I have also noted that the *RECORD* has me undeclared on two other rollcalls.

On rollcall No. 48, May 14, had I been present I would have noted "nay."

On rollcall No. 38, May 6, had I been present I would have voted "aye."

"ON THE SILVER STRAND"—BY TIBOR TOLLAS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to bring to the attention of my colleagues a poem about Africa by a Hungarian poet and refugee from the 1956 revolution, Tibor Tollas. He suffered many years in Communist prisons for no other crime than his belief in freedom. When Soviet tanks finally suppressed the heroic uprising of the Hungarian people, Tibor Tollas decided to dedicate his life to continuing the fight for freedom by pen and word of mouth. As a believer for freedom for all mankind he hoped that, by recounting his experiences of Soviet communism, he might help the African people preserve their newly won independence. His poem, "On the Silver Strand," follows:

ON THE SILVER STRAND

(By Tibor Tollas)

(Translated by Jascha Kessler)

After working hours a line of dusty heaps
Strings out and heads down to the shimmering shore

Away from the dinning, hot and narrow streets,
With their choked shops, of Dar es Salaam,

And escapes the burden of daily cares,
Then they emerge with grace from the steaming cars,

As solemn as princes of the East—
Eight or ten halfnaked brown pages to escort them—

Strangers in black Africa forever.
Moving with that pantherish sway,

The wife goes on ahead, her crown of ebony hair
Shawled with sevenscolored lucid silk,

And the man follows, stately slow,
Fullbearded black beneath his high white turban.

In the cool shadow of a palm
They lay their matting, seat themselves and gaze,

Motionlessly, at the moving waves, at the surf
That shouts against the sloping shore.

Somewhere, far beyond many horizons,
In the East, in the endlessness of waves,
Lies their native land, India.

A few wisps of trailing smoke announce
The ship arriving
With greetings from their parents.

It is good to wait for news to come,
To hear of the things they have longed for,
longed for.

And it is good to sit on the shore every day
In the tepid breeze beneath the palms
And listen to the familiar sound of these waves.

And it is good to dream, amid suffocating streets,
In the crowded dinning of the shops, among
the piled goods,

To dream that sometime
One of those silver-gray ships will take us home.

BROADCASTING INDUSTRY MAKES GREAT CONTRIBUTION TO THE NATION

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in the 9 days following the time of President Kennedy's assassination the people of the United States have been given the opportunity to see and to hear events of great historic importance.

It took the death of our young President to reveal to the Nation his strength of character, his vision, his dedication, and his courage. It focused public attention on the programs he sponsored and for which he worked in order to meet the needs of our people and our country and to promote the cause of world understanding and peace.

The Nation owes a debt of gratitude to the broadcasting industry, both radio and television, for the part members of that industry played in permitting the American people to witness the events of those tragic days and to learn about their Government, their President, and the Presidency as never before.

By its performance during those 9 historic days the radio and television industry has made a tremendous contribution to the Nation and its people.

The decision of the broadcasting companies to cancel commercial programs and advertising is to their everlasting credit and is deserving of the highest commendation of the American people.

There is much to be said for the broadcasting industry for more than any other media it provides the opportunity for the public not only to receive important information but also to hear various points of view on all important questions.

We all owe to the broadcasting industry our deep thanks for the preservation and protection of free speech and the people's right to know. It is an example which the publishing industry would do well to follow.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

PROVIDING FOR ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN PROPERTY IN SQUARE 758 IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AS AN ADDITION TO THE GROUNDS OF THE U.S. SUPREME COURT BUILDING

The Clerk called the bill (S. 254) to provide for the acquisition of certain property in square 758 in the District of Columbia, as an addition to the grounds of the U.S. Supreme Court Building.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING ESTABLISHMENT OF THE SAINT-GAUDENS NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE, N.H.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4018) to authorize establishment of the Saint-Gaudens National Historic Site, N.H., and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

LAKE ERIE SESQUICENTENNIAL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1828) to amend the joint resolution establishing the Battle of Lake Erie Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission so as to authorize an appropriation to carry out the provisions thereof.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

AMEND THE ORGANIC ACT OF THE NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5838) to amend the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449), as amended, to incorporate in the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards the authority to make certain improvements of fiscal and administrative practices for more effective conduct of its research and development activities.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

WATERS IMPOUNDED BY FLAMING GORGE DAM

The Clerk called the Senate joint resolution—Senate Joint Resolution 17—to designate the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by the Flaming Gorge Dam, Utah, in the States of Wyoming and Utah, as "Lake O'Mahoney."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding that this legislation had two dissenting opinions. I do not think it is proper to bring it up on the Consent Calendar as a result, and therefore I withdraw my reservation and ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

FUNDS OF THE KOOTENAI TRIBE, IDAHO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8527) to provide for the disposition of judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Kootenai Tribe or Band of Indians, Idaho.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the unexpended balance of funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Kootenai Tribe or Band of Indians of the State of Idaho that were appropriated by the Act of September 8, 1960 (74 Stat. 830), to pay a judgment by the Indian Claims Commission in docket 154, and the interest thereon, may be advanced or expended for any purpose that is authorized by the tribal governing body and approved by the Secretary of the Interior. Any part of such funds that may be distributed per capita to the members of the tribe shall not be subject to the Federal or State income tax.

With the following committee amendment: Page 1, line 10, strike out the word "approved."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time and passed.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of S. 2139, a similar bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the unexpended balance of funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Kootenai Tribe or Band of Indians of the State of Idaho that were appropriated by the Act of September 8, 1960 (74 Stat. 830), to pay a judgment by the Indian Claims Commission in docket 154, and the interest thereon, may be advanced or expended for any purpose that is authorized by the tribal governing body and approved by the Secretary of the Interior. Any part of such funds that may be distributed per capita to the members of the tribe shall not be subject to the Federal or State income tax.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASPINALL

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 2139 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 8527 as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 8527) was laid on the table.

GRAFF HOUSE SITE—INDEPENDENCE NATIONAL PARK

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 988) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire the Graff House site for inclusion in Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask a few questions concerning this bill. Do I understand that this would authorize \$200,000 in Federal funds for the acquisition of a site in Philadelphia of the dimensions of 50 by 124 feet; that it would also cost \$190,000 for clearing the site, landscaping, and so on and so forth, and that in perpetuity it would then cost anywhere from \$10,000 to \$20,000 a year for administration and maintenance? I might add that it appears there would also be an expenditure of Federal funds for furnishing house that is to be built.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. I would suggest to my friend from Iowa that his assumptions are correct. This is a particular spot on which was the building in which Thomas Jefferson wrote out the Articles of the Declaration of Independence. The original house has long since been torn down and there is another building on the property, a business building, with an appraised value of about the amount of money suggested in this bill. If this legislation is approved, most of the money will be spent to purchase this property. The citizens of Philadelphia would do some donating. The moneys necessary for the continued operation and maintenance would be somewhat in line with what the gentleman suggested.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand that we have only verbal assurance that the citizens of Philadelphia or whoever they may be are going to raise the money to put up the structure? I ask the gentleman what assurance other than a verbal assurance we have that they are going to do this? The Federal Government is going to move in now and push this project, but there is no assurance other than a verbal assurance, so far as I can see, that those in Philadelphia are going to carry out their part of the bargain.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, if my colleague will yield to me further—

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. I should like to ask him to yield to my friend from Pennsylvania, who is a Member here from the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and from whom my colleague can get the assurance that he is asking.

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

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SAYLOR. I might say that the gentleman is correct in his assumption that there is only a verbal assurance. But I would like to remind him of what has happened as a result of that verbal

assurance as far as Independence National Historical Park is concerned. It is the only park in the United States acquired, cleared, and rebuilt, and the United States has only had to pay one-half of the bill. The people of the city of Philadelphia and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania have assumed and paid half of all the costs, the acquisition of land, the clearing of the land, the cost of the improvements; and I am sure that if the people of Philadelphia and the people of Pennsylvania are the beneficiaries of Congress' action through this bill they will make good on their word and will see to it that they meet the obligations as set forth in the report.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, since this bill involves about half a million dollars, as nearly as I can figure it, and since the great city of Philadelphia, wealthy as it is, could, I am sure, well afford to undertake this rehabilitation or this reconstruction and pay the entire bill, I do not see why the taxpayers of the United States should be saddled with it, at least not until the money has been raised by those who say that they are going to raise part of the money therefor.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me further?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I think one of the finest examples of cooperation between a State, a city, and the Federal Government in this particular responsibility of preserving the sites of history is to be found in the Independence National Historical Park operation. This is a part of that program. This is not an original authorization except as it applies only to the Graff House mentioned in this proposed legislation. This is a going operation in Philadelphia at the present time. It is visited by millions every year. I do not believe that it is the sole obligation of the city of Philadelphia or the State of Pennsylvania to continue to preserve this area and to enlarge it in order to meet the demands of the American public.

Mr. GROSS. Nor do I think it is an obligation on the part of all the taxpayers of the country to spend half a million dollars on this kind of project in lieu of any real assurance that the people of Philadelphia are going to carry out their part of the bargain.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I would say that a good man's word is as good as his bond and the same can be said to be applicable to a city or a State.

In this instance, it is my opinion that the State's and the city's words are as good as their bond. They have already complied during the last several years in carrying out their particular part of the agreement in this area.

Mr. GROSS. I am speaking of this specific project.

Mr. ASPINALL. This is a part of the Independence National Historical Park area.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am not interested in what has gone before. I am interested in the expenditure of the taxpayers' money in view of the fact that we have a national debt of somewhere between \$310 and \$315 billion. In other

words, what we are doing is borrowing the money to spend in Philadelphia on this enterprise which could wait until we can see some financial daylight, let me say to the gentleman.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, my colleague is a very fine friend of mine but when my colleague begins to pinch pennies that are necessary in order to properly teach and to preserve the patriotism of the Nation and to continue this Nation as it should be continued, as far as I am concerned, I do not consider his reference to our national debt to be pertinent or of value to this discussion. Our national debt is a smaller debt per capita and, in comparison with our national income, than it has been throughout most of this century.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to my friend from Colorado that I do not think the patriotism of people of the United States rests upon this precise expenditure or any other single expenditure. I would very much dislike to think that that is the situation.

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

Mr. GROSS. Certainly.

Mr. FORD. I am curious to know whether or not this particular land acquisition is to be followed by others in the same adjacent area. In other words, are we establishing a precedent in this case that might be used in the future for other acquisitions in the same area?

Mr. ASPINALL. Will my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ASPINALL. I would say that this does not establish a precedent. We have already done this in a few instances since we established the Independence National Historical Park. This is just another step in this same area of historic significance in the tradition of the United States of America.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I would like to say to my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], that at the time the original bill for the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park was introduced, the Graff House site was one part of that bill. At that time the committee felt that the bill should be broken up into a number of pieces, and it was. This is the last part of the original bill.

Mr. GROSS. How many pieces were there originally?

Mr. SAYLOR. Four pieces, because three of them were not adjacent to Independence National Historical Park. Congress has acquired the other two and this is the third.

Mr. GROSS. Does that account for the fact that they did not want the whole bill of expense to hit Congress at the same time and so it was brought in piecemeal? Is that the reason?

Mr. SAYLOR. No, that was not the purpose. This is not the reason. In other words, as I said to the gentleman from Iowa before, the city of Philadel-

phia and the State of Pennsylvania have met half of the total obligation.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman this question: What is it going to cost to put up the replica of the Graff House?

Mr. SAYLOR. Those figures I do not know but, roughly, it is around \$190,000.

Mr. GROSS. It has been my understanding that the \$190,000 is an obligation on the part of all the taxpayers, and is not for the replica. How much money is going to be raised by the people of Philadelphia to put up the replica of the Graff House? That is their obligation. How much?

Mr. SAYLOR. If the gentleman will yield further, all of the costs whatever they are, are for the building and furnishing the replica as well as landscaping the same. The gentleman can rest assured that the city of Philadelphia and the State of Pennsylvania will meet those costs.

Mr. GROSS. I do not believe the gentleman has answered my question.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. According to the information available to me, the citizens of Philadelphia have joined themselves together in an organization and are undertaking a fundraising campaign to secure funds to defray development costs to the extent of \$190,000, which is the amount they estimate will be the cost of reproducing the replica of the original home.

Mr. GROSS. Am I correct in assuming this: The committee report says that demolition and development of the site and adjoining property includes landscaping and installation of statuary which are estimated to cost an additional \$190,000 to the Federal Government.

Mr. FORD. In my opinion, with the money that will be raised locally, they will be able to build the facility and landscape the grounds after the land has been obtained by Federal funds, to the extent of not to exceed \$200,000.

Mr. GROSS. Will someone on the committee tell the House that this \$190,000 for demolition and development of the site, landscaping, and so on and so forth will not become an obligation of the Federal Government, that the obligation to the Federal Government is the acquisition of the site, \$200,000, plus in perpetuity the maintenance of the property? Will someone on the Interior Committee tell us that the \$190,000 for development will be provided and any additional development, landscaping, erection of statuary, and so on and so forth, will be carried out by the people of Philadelphia through their contributions?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I have no hesitancy in assuring the gentleman from Iowa and the rest of my colleagues in the House that the people of the city of Philadelphia and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania will provide whatever funds are

necessary—\$180,000, \$190,000, or \$200,000—for the demolition and for the erection of the building, the furnishing thereof, and for the landscaping. The obligation of the Federal Government will be to acquire the site and to maintain it once it is completed.

Mr. ASPINALL. Once again the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has placed a limitation on the monetary authorization in this bill. Unless the moneys are raised by the people of Philadelphia, as presently contemplated, there will be no additional moneys for this project. I can assure my friend that as far as I am concerned I shall not come back to the House and ask for additional moneys.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order to include in Independence National Historical Park the site of the Graff House where Thomas Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire by purchase, donation, or with donated funds all or any interests in the land and improvements thereon located at the southwest corner of Market and South Seventh Streets, in the city of Philadelphia, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point located at the intersection of the southerly line of Market Street with the westerly line of South Seventh Street, thence southerly along the west side of South Seventh Street 124 feet, thence westerly 50 feet, thence northerly 124 feet, thence easterly 50 feet to the point of beginning.

SEC. 2. When acquired the land shall become a part of Independence National Historical Park and be administered by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to the laws and regulations applicable to the park.

SEC. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That, in order to include in Independence National Historical Park the site of the Graff House where Thomas Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire by purchase, donation, or with donated funds all or any interests in the land and improvements thereon located at the southwest corner of Market and South Seventh Streets, in the city of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, and more particularly described as follows:

"Beginning at a point located at the intersection of the southerly line of Market Street with the westerly line of South Seventh Street, thence southerly along the west side of South Seventh Street 124 feet, thence westerly 50 feet, thence northerly 124 feet, thence easterly 50 feet to the point of beginning.

"SEC. 2. The Secretary is further authorized to erect on the site aforesaid, with donated funds, a replica of the Graff House and to furnish and maintain the same.

"SEC. 3. The lands hereinbefore described and the building to be erected thereon shall become a part of the Independence National Historical Park and shall be administered in accordance with the laws and regulations applicable thereto.

"SEC. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums, but not more than \$200,000, as may be necessary for acquisition of the land described in the first section of this Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHANGING THE NAME OF THE ANDREW JOHNSON NATIONAL MONUMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5345) to change the name of the Andrew Johnson National Monument, to add certain historic property thereto, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Andrew Johnson National Monument established by Proclamation Numbered 2554 of April 27, 1942 (56 Stat. 1955), pursuant to the Act of August 29, 1935 (49 Stat. 958), is hereby redesignated the Andrew Johnson National Historic Site.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior may procure with donated or appropriated funds, by donation, or by exchange the following described lands, or interests therein, located in Greeneville, Tennessee, and when so acquired such lands shall become a part of the Andrew Johnson National Historic Site:

Beginning at a point which is the intersection of the east right-of-way line of College Street and the north right-of-way line of Depot Street;

thence continuing along the north right-of-way line of Depot Street south 62¼ degrees east 165 feet to its intersection with the west side of Academy Street;

thence leaving the north right-of-way line of Depot Street and continuing along the west right-of-way of Academy Street north 38 degrees east 93.4 feet to a point;

thence leaving the west right-of-way of Academy Street north 64¼ degrees west 184 feet to a point on the east right-of-way line of College Street;

thence with the east right-of-way line of College Street south 25¼ degrees west 83.7 feet to a point of beginning, containing 0.35 acre, more or less.

SEC. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 13, strike out "94.3" and insert "93.4"

Page 2, strike out lines 21 and 22 and insert:

"SEC. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums, but not more than \$66,000 for acquisition, restoration, and development costs, as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1243) which is similar to the bill the House just passed.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Andrew Johnson National Monument established by Proclamation Numbered 2554 of April 27, 1942 (56 Stat. 1955), pursuant to the Act of August 29, 1935 (49 Stat. 958), is hereby redesignated the Andrew Johnson National Historic Site.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior may procure with donated or appropriated funds, by donation, or by exchange the following described lands, or interests therein, located in Greeneville, Tennessee, and when so acquired such lands shall become a part of the Andrew Johnson National Historic Site:

Beginning at a point which is the intersection of the east right-of-way line of College Street and the north right-of-way line of Depot Street;

thence continuing along the north right-of-way line of Depot Street south 62¼ degrees east 165 feet to its intersection with the west side of Academy Street;

thence leaving the north right-of-way line of Depot Street and continuing along the west right-of-way of Academy Street north 38 degrees east 93.4 feet to a point;

thence leaving the west right-of-way of Academy Street north 64¼ degrees west 184 feet to a point on the east right-of-way of College Street;

thence with the east right-of-way line of College Street south 25¼ degrees west 83.7 feet to the point of beginning, containing 0.35 acre, more or less.

SEC. 3. There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$50,000 for acquisition of property under this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASPINALL

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 1243 and insert the provisions of H.R. 5345 as just passed by the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 1243 and insert the provisions of H.R. 5345 as passed by the House.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 5345) was laid on the table.

REVISING BOUNDARIES OF THE CARLSBAD CAVERNS NATIONAL PARK, STATE OF NEW MEXICO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7458) to revise the boundaries of the Carlsbad Caverns National Park in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have no objection to this legislation, but I am curious about one provision or one action taken by the committee. It is my understanding this proposed legislation repeals a provision of a 1930 law which allows park boundaries to be enlarged by Presidential proclamation. Is this a provision that is applicable to all park boundaries or only to this particular park boundary?

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

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. May I say that as far as national monuments are concerned, except those very few that have been established by statute, and there are only a very few, two or three, the President of the United States can do anything he wishes with reference to a national monument. He can cancel it out, he can destroy it, he can enlarge or decrease its boundaries at will.

Mr. FORD. Was this particular national park established by congressional action?

Mr. ASPINALL. This particular national monument was established first as a national monument by Executive order. Some years later it was reestablished by congressional action. With statutory authorization the President was given the authority, in this instance only, to firm up the boundaries if found necessary.

Mr. FORD. The provision in this proposed bill precludes a President now and in the future to extend the park boundaries. Is that the intent of the committee action?

Mr. ASPINALL. I am not so sure, now that my friend, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MORRIS], has called to my attention that this is a national park. It was my understanding that it was established in the first instance by Executive order. I would have to refer back to the report or to the hearings to find the definite answer to my friend's first question. In any event the boundaries would be subject after this legislation is passed only to action by the Congress.

Mr. FORD. It would also apply only to this particular park or monument, or whatever it is? It is not a provision that is applicable to all parks or monuments?

Mr. ASPINALL. That is my understanding. The gentleman from Michigan is correct in his presumption.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF RETIREMENT INSURANCE PROGRAMS TO CERTAIN LEGISLATIVE EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5128) to extend the benefits of the civil service retirement and group life and health insurance programs to certain legislative employees, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 2(d) of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2252(d)), is amended by inserting "(other than temporary employees engaged in the folding of

speeches and pamphlets for the House of Representatives)" immediately following "temporary congressional employee."

(b) The provisions under the heading "CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND" in title I of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1959 (72 Stat. 1064; Public Law 85-844), shall not apply with respect to benefits resulting from the enactment of subsection (a) of this section.

SEC. 2. Section 2(a) of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2091 (a)), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this subsection, temporary employees engaged in the folding of speeches and pamphlets for the House of Representatives shall be entitled to the benefits of this Act."

SEC. 3. Section 3(a) of the Federal Employees' Health Benefits Act of 1959, as amended (5 U.S.C. 3002(a)), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this subsection, temporary employees engaged in the folding of speeches and pamphlets for the House of Representatives shall be entitled to the benefits of this Act."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPENSATION IN CONNECTION WITH RECLAMATION PROJECTS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 130) to provide for the payment of compensation, including severance damages, for rights-of-way acquired by the United States in connection with reclamation projects the construction of which commenced after January 1, 1961.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That notwithstanding the existence of any reservation of right-of-way for canals under the Act of August 30, 1890 (26 Stat. 371, 391; 43 U.S.C. 945), the Secretary of the Interior shall pay just compensation, including severance damages, to the owners of private land utilized for ditches or canals in connection with any reclamation project, or any unit or any division of a reclamation project, the construction of which commenced after January 1, 1961, and such compensation shall be paid notwithstanding the execution of any agreements or any judgments entered in any condemnation proceeding, prior to the effective date of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, and page 2, line 1, strike out "the construction of which" and insert "provided the construction of said ditches or canals".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 130 provides for payment by the United States for rights-of-way acquired for canals constructed in connection with Federal reclamation projects without regard to any reservation under the act

of August 30, 1890. The legislation, as amended, is applicable to canals the construction of which starts hereafter or which began after January 1, 1961.

The legislation does not require the authorization of additional appropriations. If enacted, however, it will result in a nominal increase in the cost of future projects. Department of the Interior officials have estimated this increase at no more than an average of 1 percent. It should be pointed out that this additional cost will be fully repaid under reclamation law.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is needed because of numerous and serious inequities which have been created in recent years by the 1890 act. The 1890 act reserves the right-of-way for canals and ditches constructed under the authority of the United States in all patents thereafter issued for lands west of the 100th meridian. In other words, owners of land west of the 100th meridian whose title derives from a patent issued subsequent to August 30, 1890, are compensated only for improvements or crops that are damaged or destroyed when a reclamation canal crosses their property, while owners of land east of the 100th meridian or of land west of the 100th meridian patented prior to August 30, 1890, must be compensated fully for their land in a similar land taking.

Although the legislative history of the section of the 1890 act affected by H.R. 130 is very sketchy, it is clear that the Congress did not contemplate the construction of canals of the magnitude of those being built today or the long distances over which water is now being conveyed. Sixty years ago, when the reclamation program was getting underway, a right-of-way of 75 or 100 feet in width was normally the maximum that was required. Today, however, on the San Luis project in California, for instance, the main canal right-of-way is about 650 feet in width, and on at least one section of the main canal on the proposed Garrison diversion project in North Dakota about 1,400 feet of right-of-way width will be required. Also, canals today frequently pass through and cause severance damage to lands that are not benefited in any way by the canals or by the project of which they are a part. For instance, the main canal of the Ainsworth project in Nebraska runs 53 miles through lands which will receive no benefit from the Ainsworth project.

The reservation of the 1890 act is a floating type easement, never located precisely until a canal is actually placed upon the land. Hence, a landowner never can be sure that the spot he selects for the location of his improvements is not on the route of a future canal. Also, the first exercise of the Government's reserved right-of-way across a specific property does not terminate the operation of the statute. It is possible, though this happens very infrequently, for two, three, or even more canals to be located across the same piece of land.

The committee was informed that land covered by the 1890 reservation is ordinarily bought and sold at prices that do

not take into consideration the existence of a reserved right-of-way. The reservation, however, is a cloud on the title to a tract of land even though there may be no plans for a canal across it, because such plans could develop sometime in the future. Since the act of 1890 does not affect all property through which reclamation canals pass, the act has the effect of producing substantial differences in the amounts paid landowners when rights-of-way are taken and creates serious inequities, not only between landowners on different sides of the 100th meridian but also among landowners west of the 100th meridian. Among the reasons for these inequities are these:

First. The landowners with whom the Bureau of Reclamation deals today are rarely the original patentees and seldom are they aware that their lands are subject to the reservation until they receive a notice advising that the United States intends to exercise its right. In many instances, the present owner may hold lands some of which are subject to the reservation and some of which are not. In these cases the owner often refuses to sell to the United States the necessary right-of-way across the nonreservation land, thereby making condemnation action necessary. This results in additional costs and additional burdens on the courts. In some instances, an owner will attempt to negotiate a purchase contract for the nonreserved right-of-way at a figure sufficiently in excess of the appraised valuation to compensate him for the reserved right-of-way which the United States is taking without compensation. Again, in these instances the acquisition usually results in a court proceeding which is expensive and time consuming.

Second. In the West, many of the roads are built along section lines which are also property lines. Many reclamation project canals, especially the minor or smaller canals, are also built along the roads. In many instances, the canal could be built on either side of the road. The decision will necessarily result in an inequity, for not only is the land of the owner on one side of the road taken while the other's is not, but the first owner is told that he cannot be compensated for his land that is used.

Third. As already pointed out herein, modern techniques of water resource development embrace river-sized canals for which very wide rights-of-way must be taken—up to 1,400 feet in some projects now in the planning stage. In many cases the canals run for miles through lands that receive no direct project benefits. The San Luis project has already been referred to as an example where the main canal requires the acquisition of right-of-way up to 650 feet in width. That canal is approximately 102 miles in length and involves about 110 owner-ships, about 80 of which are subject to the reserved right-of-way. The canal crosses land much of which has extremely high productive potential for a wide variety of specialized agricultural crops. Current fair market value runs as high as \$2,000 per acre for nonreservation lands. It has been estimated that when

the reserved right-of-way is effective and payment is limited to improvements payments may be as low as \$100 to \$200 per acre. The Ainsworth project has also been given as an example of a canal which runs for miles across lands that receive no project benefits. In this instance, the storage reservoir and the main canal are located to the west of the 100th meridian, while the areas which will receive the irrigation water are on the east side of the 100th meridian. The lands crossed by the main canal will receive no benefit from the project, but there are the owners whose lands are subject to the 1890 act reservation and who are required to furnish free right-of-way for the benefit of the water users on the other side of the meridian.

Fourth. In the normal canal right-of-way acquisition it is the practice of the Bureau of Reclamation to install bridges across the canals for the use of the farmers and in order to reduce the severance damages. However, the Bureau is without authority to build these bridges across canals constructed on reserved rights-of-way, as the construction of the bridges would constitute a form of severance damage compensation. Therefore, in the Ainsworth project case and other similar instances, the landowners find their property cut in two without any means of getting from one part of their property to the other and without compensation for the damage.

Fifth. Even in those cases where the landowners are project beneficiaries, the effect of taking a reserved right-of-way without compensation often results in a burden upon the landowner out of all proportion to the benefits he receives. This results from the fact that irrigation costs, including the cost of acquisition of rights-of-way, for canals and ditches are reimbursable. When a reserved right-of-way is taken, the landowner bears the entire loss and the other irrigation beneficiaries pay less than full value for what they receive.

Mr. Speaker, in acting favorably on this legislation, the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee concluded that the right-of-way provision of the 1890 act has become a serious problem in recent years and that the problem will become more serious in the future unless congressional action is taken. While the committee recognized that enactment of the legislation would result in a nominal increase in construction cost of reclamation projects, it concluded that the burden of these additional costs, which must be fully repaid, should be uniformly distributed rather than placed upon a few landowners.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is meritorious legislation and I am pleased that the House has approved it.

WAIVER OF INSURANCE PREMIUMS UPON BECOMING DISABLED PRIOR TO AGE 65

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6777) to amend section 712 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide for waiver

of premiums for certain veterans holding national service life insurance policies who become or have become totally disabled before their 65th birthday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE]. On page 11 of the report, do the figures showing the cost to the Veterans' Administration represent money to be obtained by the Veterans' Administration from dividends or increased premiums on insurance? What is the source of the money for the expenditure indicated on page 11?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to extend, effective January 1, 1965, from age 60 to age 65 the delimiting age before which a person insured under a national service life insurance—NSLI—policy must become totally disabled to be eligible for waiver of premiums on such insurance. Under section 712 of title 38, United States Code, as now in effect, payment of premiums on NSLI may be waived during the continuous total disability of the insured, which continues or has continued for 6 or more consecutive months if such total disability began, first, after the date of application for insurance, second, while the insurance was in force under premium paying conditions; and third, before the insured's 60th birthday. The waiver is effective from the beginning of the total disability, if application is made within 1 year therefrom, and the waiver continues for the duration of such disability.

The age 60 limitation was placed in the law in 1940 when the National Service Life Insurance Act was enacted. Today the trend in the insurance industry is toward providing more health protection for our senior citizens. This trend is based upon experience which has established that persons age 60 and over who are alive today can expect to live longer, healthier, and more productive lives than could a similar person in 1940. The Veterans' Administration has, therefore, recently restudied the question of premium waiver for the older veterans. As the result of such restudy the VA advises that it favors the objective of H.R. 6777. The Actuarial Advisory Committee, composed of eminent authorities from the private insurance industry, concurs in this position.

Eighty-eight percent of all NSLI policies in force are participating. Accordingly, as to that group any additional benefit cost which will flow from this extended coverage will be borne solely by the policy-holders themselves in the form of very slightly reduced dividends. This cost will range from zero to a maximum of \$12 per year for each policyholder and is expected to average approximately 20 cents per year per policyholder.

The administrative costs are \$418,000 the first year.

I insert at this point certain tabular material pertinent to this subject.

Government life insurance programs for veterans and servicemen—Distribution of in-force as of the end of 1962 by ages attained in 1962

Attained age in 1962	World War I, USGLI (K)		World War II, NSLI (V)		Korean, VSLL (R.S. & W.)		Service disabled, SDVI (RH)	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
25 and under			66	\$467,228	6,769	\$58,222,358	5,253	\$48,115,651
26			40	288,859	13,271	119,125,818	2,792	25,550,701
27			115	1,000,365	33,528	303,858,056	3,555	32,281,687
28			3,981	35,163,601	59,360	534,968,654	4,317	39,139,166
29			28,322	232,493,921	112,654	1,004,756,924	5,333	48,166,789
30			83,983	675,325,031	115,383	1,024,544,505	5,536	49,153,958
31			133,344	1,035,587,841	103,367	913,057,236	5,098	44,692,068
32			166,297	1,265,127,407	80,514	710,638,779	4,484	38,433,294
33			184,282	1,388,169,773	54,790	484,504,080	3,228	27,857,782
34			193,481	1,387,148,311	29,569	259,978,159	2,180	18,580,804
35			237,077	1,616,927,345	10,403	88,615,035	1,217	10,346,548
36			226,246	1,490,398,103	6,258	52,831,268	888	7,537,987
37	1	\$338	235,826	1,520,749,798	3,486	28,808,481	705	5,981,730
38	4	6,000	252,881	1,616,963,803	2,394	19,738,482	540	4,489,778
39	121	295,967	252,500	1,594,950,736	2,060	17,072,104	495	4,145,000
40	2,429	4,650,375	255,676	1,591,642,484	1,795	14,457,500	546	4,331,500
41	6,478	12,326,345	282,872	1,760,607,937	1,501	12,141,000	533	4,340,500
42	7,116	14,233,302	281,081	1,732,893,715	1,294	10,610,500	490	3,816,196
43	6,591	15,881,115	250,949	1,524,953,674	1,053	8,509,000	435	3,428,711
44	6,516	19,867,411	244,935	1,502,719,323	1,097	8,818,027	409	3,152,000
45	5,768	20,539,301	215,308	1,327,793,583	1,000	7,832,500	393	2,984,000
46	5,281	20,128,103	194,210	1,208,861,685	915	6,880,000	303	2,329,500
47	4,609	19,035,759	172,947	1,077,449,170	751	5,617,500	290	2,204,500
48	3,610	15,239,150	150,505	934,942,148	706	5,473,000	249	1,748,990
49	2,901	12,856,627	131,631	818,755,932	604	4,572,000	219	1,550,941
50	2,251	9,754,847	120,101	753,485,963	523	3,976,383	181	1,353,000
51	1,843	8,294,433	106,990	672,900,056	451	3,539,000	168	1,215,500
52	1,695	7,814,541	97,264	618,687,067	400	2,786,500	137	905,500
53	1,541	7,760,118	87,805	561,979,183	327	2,156,500	126	869,000
54	1,512	7,661,246	81,933	525,821,501	306	2,115,000	123	796,500
55	1,379	7,001,127	72,933	468,537,756	275	1,869,000	99	652,500
56	1,158	5,740,708	58,461	371,855,618	216	1,421,000	80	478,000
57	1,150	5,301,550	39,752	248,691,373	171	1,076,000	65	423,000
58	1,224	5,456,663	24,876	160,493,167	159	1,067,500	52	343,000
59	1,352	5,773,756	21,117	135,616,633	122	763,000	44	303,500
60	1,875	8,335,148	18,116	115,230,929	115	699,500	35	223,000
61	2,800	13,319,975	14,941	93,875,480	99	620,500	36	249,000
62	9,727	49,699,673	12,993	77,662,801	68	461,500	22	139,000
63	14,006	68,704,354	10,266	59,071,084	54	385,000	34	197,500
64	15,448	76,305,323	8,811	49,952,320	39	240,000	30	171,000
65	19,705	91,350,134	6,487	36,544,338	31	177,500	28	180,500
66	25,007	111,546,342	3,779	22,629,319	28	185,000	15	107,000
67	24,651	110,848,660	2,987	17,947,223	30	225,000	20	157,500
68	21,952	99,482,700	2,375	13,927,578	32	196,500	15	126,000
69	18,548	84,748,298	1,954	11,321,328	12	84,000	17	112,500
70	15,674	72,772,883	1,479	8,517,962	14	71,000	4	24,000
71	12,062	57,922,820	1,005	5,766,665	9	43,500	6	39,000
72	10,026	47,719,984	749	4,403,755	4	37,000	1	10,000
73	7,878	38,416,673	631	3,391,372	3	13,000	1	4,000
74	6,264	29,981,802	480	2,507,799	5	15,000		
75	4,699	22,810,053	333	1,755,303			1	7,000
76	2,446	12,976,972	238	1,187,308				
77	1,147	6,773,638	154	746,812				
78	848	5,209,573	124	539,246				
79	636	3,855,089	65	317,070				
80	482	2,927,485	55	226,500				
81	442	2,650,069	32	162,000				
82	324	1,942,441	11	51,500				
83	266	1,624,593	15	57,500				
84	183	1,027,015	4	32,000				
85 and over	490	2,849,333	9	44,498				
Total...	284,087	1,251,740,212	4,977,880	32,387,319,370	648,045	5,729,864,849	50,828	443,451,281

Personnel in insurance offices

	Insurance personnel on rolls as of—		
	June 30, 1961	June 30, 1962	June 30, 1963
Central office	275	269	¹ 118
Philadelphia Insurance Center	2,223	1,853	1,600
Philadelphia Data Processing Center			² 29
Denver	544	506	³ 6
St. Paul	482	445	³ 579
Total	3,524	3,073	2,332

¹ Actual personnel on rolls, central office, department of insurance, as of Jan. 31, 1963, prior to reorganization, 257. The estimated insurance employment prior to reorganization as of June 30, 1963, 255.

Subsequent to reorganization (effective Feb. 1, 1963), actual insurance service employment as of June 30, 1963, was 118 (July 1, 1963, 113). The difference of 137 (255—118) resulted from transfers of personnel to other activities within the Department of Veterans' Benefits and transfers to the Department of Data Management.

² Data processing center established July 1962; personnel on rolls end of July 1962, 18.

³ Denver consolidated with St. Paul in June 1963. Staffing prior to consolidation as of—

	Apr. 30, 1963	May 31, 1963
Denver	425	395
St. Paul	460	464

Number of insurance policies in force, June 30, 1963:

	Philadelphia	St. Paul	Total
National service life insurance	3,624,159	2,034,363	5,658,522
U.S. Government life insurance	277,276		277,276

Expenditures for insurance operations, fiscal years 1961 through 1964

	Fiscal year 1961	Fiscal year 1962	Fiscal year 1963	Fiscal year 1964	Estimated average employment, fiscal year 1964
Philadelphia	\$15,263,615	\$13,552,124	\$13,791,604	\$5,904,000	928
Denver	3,725,587	3,436,386	3,709,621		
St. Paul	3,570,851	3,283,459	3,581,845	3,129,000	480
Central office	2,541,940	2,523,755	2,568,915	1,095,000	113
Field office cost paid by central office ¹	720,846	649,284	735,638		
Manila	16,300	13,165	7,908		
Total	25,939,139	23,458,173	² 24,395,532	³ 10,128,000	1,521

¹ Principally postage cost.

² The increase in operating cost for fiscal year 1963 was due to nonrecurring costs of about \$2,800,000 for the purchase of automatic data processing equipment.

³ Represents only personal service and travel costs. The recent reorganization resulted in transfer of all data processing functions from insurance to the Department of Data Management and the administrative, finance, and personnel functions from insurance to other elements of the Department of Veterans' Benefits. Costs other than personal services and travel are budgeted on the basis of total station and total central office requirements rather than by program.

Insurance employment declined from an average of 17,432 in fiscal year 1950 to an average of 3,001 for fiscal year 1963. Thus, in 1950, 1 employee was needed to service about 350 insurance accounts. Today, 1 employee services about 1,988 accounts—more than 5½ times the number serviced only 13 years ago. Major factors contributing to this accomplishment were reorganization combined with consolidation of field stations; many improvements and refinements to operating procedures, systems, and methods, including use of the latest mechanical and electronic equipment; and increased employee productivity attained through training and experience.

As to the question asked by the gentleman from Iowa, may I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], the author of the bill.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 6777, will amend the law providing for waiver of premiums on national service life insurance to permit veterans who become totally disabled prior to their 65th birthday to have premiums on their policies waived. At the present time payment of premiums on national service life insurance may be waived during continuous total disability of the insured which continues for 6 or more consecutive months. Total disability must have begun after the date of application of insurance and prior to the insured's 60th birthday. The waiver is effective from the beginning of total disability and continues for the duration of such condition.

H.R. 6777 will extend from age 60 to age 65 the age limitation for entitlement to waiver of premium. Enactment of this legislation is in keeping with the trend in insurance companies for providing more insurance protection for our older citizens. The age 60 limitation was included at the time the National Service Life Insurance Act was enacted in 1940. Because experience has established that persons aged 60 and over today live longer and are healthier than similar persons in 1940, it is reasonable to extend this coverage to veterans between the ages of 60 and 65 years.

I urge its passage.

In reply to the gentleman from Iowa, the expenses of this bill will be borne by the Veterans' Administration from the funds which come in from the national service life insurance. It will be an increased cost of administration. I will quote from the report on this measure: almost 88 percent of all NSLI policies in force are participating. Accordingly, as to that group any additional benefit cost which will flow from this extended coverage will be borne solely by the policyholders themselves in the form of a very slightly reduced dividend. This cost will range from zero to a maximum of \$12 per year for each policyholder and is expected to average approximately 20 cents per year per policyholder.

As to the relatively small group of non-participating policies—under 38 U.S.C. 723—there is now a substantial surplus in the revolving fund and future premiums are expected to continue to add to this surplus. The Veterans' Administration believes that the benefit cost of this bill as to such group will be met by earnings from premiums and interest and the

proposal to set aside \$1,350,000 as additional contingency reserves—out of amounts that would otherwise be transferred from this surplus to the Treasury—is simply for conservative fiscal management. When this type of non-participating insurance was originally authorized by the Congress there was no intent that the veterans' excess premiums should enrich the Federal Treasury.

As to administrative costs, all of the over 5.6 million policies now in force have the benefit of the existing statute—38 U.S.C. 782—which has provided since the inception of the program that the United States shall bear such administrative costs. The committee has no intention in this instance of departing from this longstanding policy as to existing contracts and the only cost involved in this proposal is as listed in the VA letter on page 11 of the report.

Mr. GROSS. Paid out of reductions in dividends and increased premiums?

Mr. SAYLOR. Partially.

Mr. GROSS. Both?

Mr. SAYLOR. Partially; out of dividends earned and the administrative expense of \$418,000 estimated by the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman thinks this is good legislation?

Mr. SAYLOR. It is good legislation. The USGL policy available only to World War I veterans has a waiver provision which is good at any age. This bill is an effort to make the World War II (NSLI) policy more comparable to the World War I policy which is probably the most generous policy ever issued to veterans by the Government.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 712(a) (3) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "sixtieth" and inserting in lieu thereof "sixty-fifth".

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: That effective January 1, 1965, subsection (a) of section 712 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Upon application by the insured and under such regulations as the Administrator may promulgate, payment of premiums on insurance may be waived during the continuous total disability of the insured, which continues or has continued for six or more consecutive months, if such disability began (1) after the date of his application for insurance, (2) while the insurance was in force under premium-paying conditions, and (3) before the insured's sixty-fifth birthday. Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, in any case in which the total disability of the insured commenced on or after his sixtieth birthday before his sixty-fifth birthday, the Administrator shall not grant waiver of any premium becoming due prior to January 1, 1965."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] for introducing this meritorious legislation. I agree with the gentleman and his colleagues on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs as to the desirability of passing H.R. 6777. Heretofore, a veteran carrying national service life insurance and paying the premiums thereon for many years, who became totally disabled between the ages of 60 and 65, had no alternative but to continue the payment of premiums after he became totally disabled. Despite the fact that total disability in many cases precluded the veteran so situated from pursuing gainful employment, he could ill afford to drop the insurance at this critical period in life. H.R. 6777 will correct this situation by extending the age limit within which insurance premiums may be waived for total disability from age 60 to age 65. I support the bill and urge that the House do pass it.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 3 legislative days to extend their remarks at this point in the Record on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks on the bill H.R. 130 immediately following the passage of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TRANSFERRING CONTROL OF PERSHING HALL, PARIS, FRANCE, TO THE ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9004) to transfer control of Pershing Hall to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs as a memorial to General of the Armies of the United States John J. Pershing while being utilized in the best interests of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not find very much information in the hearings concerning this transaction. I have one question: How is Pershing Hall in Paris to be financed from now on?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I will say to the gentleman that I do not know how there could be a fuller or more complete report on the bill than the report that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs made pertaining to this bill, and if the gentleman has a copy of the report, he could certainly see that.

I regret that the gentleman does not find the report informative. I invite his attention to the fact that hearings were held on this subject by a special subcommittee appointed for that purpose and held in Paris, France. They were rather voluminous hearings and were not

printed. A report of this special subcommittee was filed with the committee, and prior to the subcommittee's report, the General Accounting Office had made a report. All of this information was available to the committee when this question was considered in executive session.

Mr. GROSS. I find that much of the report is dedicated to testimony taken many, many years ago.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I would say to the gentleman that this started many, many years ago.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman give me the answer to the question: How is Pershing Hall to be financed in the future?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The sum of \$214,879.28 will be turned over to the Treasury. I am advised that this building is estimated to have a value of at least \$1 million.

The building itself is turned over to the Veterans' Administration. There are parts of this building in Paris that are very suitable for a memorial and other parts are suitable for nothing but possibly office space. I assumed that our Government would use this office space or would rent it out, and the income from this source would be used to support this building.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman does not think that this will in time become a burden on the taxpayers of this country?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. No more than it has been in the past.

Mr. GROSS. Has it been in the past?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Yes, the taxpayers of this country are paying a certain amount of money each year running up to as much as \$12,000 and down to approximately \$4,000 for the upkeep of this building.

Mr. GROSS. As a direct appropriation or revenue derived from certain uses of the building—which?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. No, the money has come from this memorial fund in the Treasury at this time which fund amounts to \$214,000.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I do not consider that to be direct congressional financing of the building. They have money invested in bonds and have a return from those bonds. The gentleman is not saying that this is what he considers to be direct Government financing; is he?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Part of this money has come from the taxpayers and part of it has come from many individuals and many different organizations throughout the country. I believe a rather full history is contained in the report on this bill.

This legislation would place Pershing Hall which is located in Paris, France, under the control of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs so that he may transfer control of that real property to any other department or agency of the United States which can use it and so notifies the Administrator before the 60th day after the enactment of the bill, or, failing that, so that the Administrator may use the property to carry out the functions of the Veterans' Administration. This is necessary because, although the United

States holds legal title to Pershing Hall, no officer, employee, department, or agency of the United States has exercised responsibility for administering this real property, and the American Legion which heretofore has maintained and operated Pershing Hall has, by a resolution of its national executive committee, indicated its intention of transferring control of Pershing Hall to the United States.

As a part of the transfer to the United States, provision would be made for various items of historical significance now in Pershing Hall, and the building would be designated in perpetuity as a memorial to General of the Armies of the United States, John J. Pershing.

The bill also provides for the transfer to the general fund of the Treasury of the Pershing Hall Memorial Fund—\$214,879.28—now in the Treasury, the income from which has been used for the maintenance of Pershing Hall.

The termination of the operating agreement will involve no cost to the United States, in fact, it will result in a saving through permitting the utilization of this real property for governmental functions of the United States and the return and use of the moneys cited above.

It is favored by the Veterans' Administration, the Bureau of the Budget, General Accounting Office, the State and Treasury Departments, and the American Legion.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, in November of 1963, I was selected by the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to serve on a special subcommittee for the purpose of going to Paris and reviewing the operation of Pershing Hall. This is a building located in Paris, France, which has been designated as a memorial to General of the Armies of the United States John J. Pershing.

Although the title of this building is vested in the U.S. Government by the provision of Public Law 171 of the 74th Congress, it has actually been operated and maintained by the American Legion. The responsibility for the day-to-day operation, maintenance, and perpetuation of Pershing Hall has been delegated to the American Legion, Department of France and Paris Post No. 1, based upon an agreement between those organizations and the American Legion national headquarters.

As a result of the review of the operation of Pershing Hall by the special subcommittee of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and on which I had the privilege to serve, it is my opinion that this building may better be preserved as a memorial to General of the Armies of the United States John J. Pershing by the transfer control of Pershing Hall to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 9004 will accomplish this purpose and it is for this reason that I rise in support of the bill.

The American Legion is to be commended for their desire to see that a

memorial such as Pershing Hall is maintained to honor the memory of one of this country's great soldiers, Gen. John J. Pershing. I was most pleased to note their endorsement of the purpose of this bill by the recent adoption of Resolution 20 by the American Legion national executive committee.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 9004. This bill will transfer the control of Pershing Hall to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to insure that the building be preserved as a memorial to Gen. John J. Pershing.

At the present time, title to the building known as Pershing Hall is vested in the U.S. Government with no U.S. Government agency responsible for its day-to-day maintenance and upkeep. The American Legion heretofore has been responsible for the day-to-day operation, maintenance, and perpetuation of Pershing Hall as a memorial to General Pershing. This responsibility has been delegated by the American Legion national headquarters to its Department of France and Paris Post No. 1 jointly. In a resolution adopted by the national executive committee of the American Legion in Indianapolis, Ind., on October 16, 17, and 18, 1963, the organization has asked to be relieved of its responsibility with respect to the operation of Pershing Hall. The resolution reads in part:

Whereas the American Legion believes that the high order of patriotic reverence due our great leader of World War I, Gen. John J. Pershing, can best be perpetuated through the acceptance by our National Government of the responsibility for maintaining and perpetuating Pershing Hall; and

The resolution further states:

Resolved, That the national commander be and he is hereby authorized and directed to contact the proper branch and agency of the Government of the United States for the purpose of negotiating and effectuating an appropriate and orderly transfer to, and the assumption by, the Government of the United States the responsibility to maintain and perpetuate Pershing Hall.

H.R. 9004 will carry out the wishes of the American Legion by transferring control of this property to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. The Administrator shall then transfer control of the property to any department or agency of the U.S. Government requiring this property to carry out its function. In the event no department or agency expresses a desire to use this property for its function, control shall remain with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and the property shall be used by the Veterans' Administration. The bill also provides that the building shall continue to be known as Pershing Hall and shall be maintained, perpetuated, and used as a memorial to General Pershing, whether the building is under the control of the Veterans' Administration or any other Government agency.

In short, Mr. Speaker, it is the committee's feeling that this building is ideally suited for providing sorely needed office space for one or more of our Government agencies in France and will at the same time provide a suitable memorial to the beloved commander in chief of the American Expeditionary Forces in World War I. I urge its passage.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) control over the real property in Paris, France, known as Pershing Hall, title to which was acquired by the United States pursuant to the Acts of June 28, 1935 (49 Stat. 426), and August 12, 1935 (49 Stat. 594), is transferred to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Administrator"). The Administrator shall transfer control over such real property to the head of any department or agency of the United States who before the sixtieth day after the date of enactment of this Act notifies the Administrator that the department or agency of which he is the head could use such real property to carry out its functions. If the head of more than one such department or agency so notifies the Administrator, the Administrator shall transfer control over such real property to the head of the department or agency of the United States designated for such purpose by the President, but the head of such department or agency shall provide for the use of portions of such real property in excess of the needs of the department or agency under his jurisdiction by other departments and agencies of the United States; subject, however, to proviso (b), referred to hereinbelow. If no other head of a department or agency of the United States notifies the Administrator as provided in the preceding sentence before the sixtieth day after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall retain control of such real property for use by the Veterans' Administration; subject, however, to proviso (b), referred to hereinbelow.

(b) Such real property shall continue to be known and referred to as Pershing Hall and shall be maintained, perpetuated, and used as a memorial to the memory of General of the Armies of the United States John J. Pershing and the officers and men of the American Expeditionary Forces in World War I. Any trophies, memorials and/or other memorabilia, legal titles to which are vested in the Government of the United States, remaining in Pershing Hall when control is assumed over it by the Administrator under the first sentence of subsection (a) shall be maintained, preserved, perpetuated, and appropriately displayed by the department or agency of the United States having control of such real property.

Any trophies, memorials, and/or other memorabilia and other personal property, legal title to which is not vested in the Government of the United States, remaining in Pershing Hall when control is assumed over it by the Administrator, under subsection (a) shall be the subject of negotiation between the Administrator and the true and lawful owners thereof.

Sec. 2. The Pershing Hall Memorial Fund created by section 2 of the Act of June 29, 1935, is abolished, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall cover any funds therein into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts and shall liquidate any nonliquid assets in such fund and cover the proceeds therefrom into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Sec. 3. The Act of June 28, 1935 (49 Stat. 126), is repealed.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 18, omit "29" and insert "28".
Page 3, line 28, omit "126" and insert "426".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the eligible bills on the Consent Calendar.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS AND OUTDOOR RECREATION, COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on National Parks and Outdoor Recreation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PRINTING CERTAIN PROCEEDINGS OF AMVETS AS A HOUSE DOCUMENT

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up the bill (H.R. 8751) to amend the act of March 2, 1931, to provide that certain proceedings of the AMVETS—American Veterans of World War II—shall be printed as a House document, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first section of the Act of March 2, 1931, as amended (44 U.S.C. 275b), is amended to read as follows:

"That hereafter the proceedings of the national encampments of the Grand Army of the Republic, the United Spanish War Veterans, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, the American Legion, the Military Order of the Purple Heart, the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America, Incorporated, the Disabled American Veterans, and the AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), respectively, shall be printed annually, with accompanying illustrations, as separate House documents of the session of the Congress, to which they may be submitted."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] is recognized.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I opposed this bill in the committee and did so not because of the organization involved, but because I can see no reason why public funds should be used for the printing of the proceedings of any private organization, and I might say this

bill will add one more to a long list which enjoys this Federal subsidy.

I have introduced a bill which would do away with this public printing or the public paying for the cost of printing the proceedings of any organization of any private, philanthropic, social, patriotic, or any other type of organization, and I intend to vote against this bill. I can see no reason for the taxpayer being called upon to pay the printing bill of organizations which are apparently financially sound; that maintain elaborate national headquarters buildings, with large and presumably well-paid staffs, and have the funds with which to meet all operating expenses, including the printing of the proceedings of their national conventions.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment. Page 2, line 2, strike out "of the World War".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF "TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS AND CHARITABLE TRUSTS: THEIR IMPACT ON OUR ECONOMY—SECOND INSTALLMENT"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 230 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives five thousand copies of the subcommittee chairman's report to Subcommittee Numbered 1 entitled "Tax-Exempt Foundations and Charitable Trusts: Their Impact on Our Economy—Second Installment", dated October 16, 1963.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF "TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS AND CHARITABLE TRUSTS: THEIR IMPACT ON OUR ECONOMY"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 231 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed for the use of the Select Committee

on Small Business five thousand copies of the chairman's report to the Select Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, Eighty-seventh Congress, dated December 31, 1962, entitled "Tax-Exempt Foundations and Charitable Trusts: Their Impact on Our Economy".

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR PRINTING OF CERTAIN OPINIONS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 237 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That (a) there shall be printed thirty-two thousand two hundred and fifty additional copies of the opinions of the Supreme Court of the United States (including concurring and dissenting opinions) in the cases of Engel against Vitale (370 U.S. 421) and Abington School District against Schempp (374 U.S. 203). Such opinions shall be printed together in one publication.

(b) Of the thirty-two thousand two hundred and fifty copies of such opinions printed pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, ten thousand three hundred copies shall be for the use of the Senate and twenty-one thousand nine hundred and fifty copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO PRINT AS A HOUSE DOCUMENT THE HANDBOOK ENTITLED "THE UNITED STATES COURTS"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 518 and ask for immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the handbook entitled "The United States Courts," by Joseph F. Spaniol, Junior, of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, as set out in House Document Numbered 233 of the Eighty-sixth Congress, brought up to date by the author, with a foreword by Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, be printed as a House document.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANKING PRIVILEGES FOR MRS. JACQUELINE KENNEDY, ETC.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 9291) to provide office space, supplies, equipment, and franking privileges for Mrs. Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy, to authorize appropriations for the payment of expenses incident to the death and burial of former President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all mail matter sent by post by Mrs. Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy, the widow of former President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, under her written autograph signature or facsimile thereof, shall be conveyed within the United States, its possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico free of postage during her natural life.

Sec. 2. For a period of six months following the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of General Services shall furnish to Mrs. Kennedy suitable office space appropriately furnished, supplied, and equipped as determined by the Administrator, at such place within the United States as Mrs. Kennedy shall specify. The supplies to be furnished shall include a sufficient quantity of envelopes marked "Postage and Fees Paid" to be used for international mail. For the same period the Administrator of General Services shall, without regard to the civil service and classification laws, provide for an office staff for Mrs. Kennedy. Persons employed under this section shall be selected by Mrs. Kennedy and shall be responsible only to her for the performance of their duties. Mrs. Kennedy shall fix basic rates of compensation for persons employed for her under this section which in the aggregate shall not exceed \$50,000 during such six-month period. The rate of compensation payable to any such person shall not exceed the maximum aggregate rate of compensation payable to any individual employed in the office of a Senator. Each individual appointed under this section to a position on the office staff of Mrs. Kennedy shall be held and considered to be an employee of the Government of the United States for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, and the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954.

SEC. 3. Subject to the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, the United States Secret Service of the Treasury Department is authorized to protect Mrs. Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy and her children for the one-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act. Not less than two agents shall be assigned at all times to provide the protection authorized by this section.

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act and to pay the expenses incident to the death and burial of former President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, including undertakers' charges and the expenses of transportation, to be expended under the direction of the President: Provided, That no payment of such expenses shall be made from any appropriation authorized by this Act to any officer or employee of the Government for personal or professional services.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, the first section of H.R. 9291 grants the franking privilege to Mrs. Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy, the widow of our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, as is customary for all widows of former Presidents. Similar provisions were made, for example, by the acts of January 25, 1924, June 16, 1934, and May 7, 1945, for the widows of Presidents Harding, Coolidge, and Roosevelt.

The second section of the bill makes appropriate and customary provisions for the prompt and orderly management and disposition of the very heavy burden of affairs which relate to the Presidency of the United States and remain unsettled after a President leaves office. The section requires the Administrator of the General Services Administration to furnish Mrs. Kennedy, for a 6-month period, suitable office space, furniture, supplies, and equipment, and an office staff, to be selected by and responsible to her, whose aggregate compensation shall not exceed \$50,000. The provisions of this section, except for the time and aggregate staff salary limitations, are substantially identical to those of subsection (b) of Public Law 85-745, which authorizes the furnishing of office space, staff, equipment, and supplies to living former Presidents during their lives.

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

Mr. MORRISON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. In the gentleman's statement he referred to the precedents for the franking privilege. Would he state to the House whether or not there are any precedents for the arrangement for a staff, for quarters and also for protection? By asking the question I am not undertaking to complain about it, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit me to finish my statement, I have the answer to his question therein.

Mr. HALLECK. Very well.

Mr. MORRISON. Section 2 of the bill is essential to assist President Kennedy's widow with the extremely heavy burden of responsibility imposed on her by reason of the tragic and untimely death of her husband while in office. The magnitude of this duty which has devolved on Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy is unprecedented because of the extraordinary scope and extent of worldwide and domestic interest and concern and the deep sense of shock and personal loss, not only of Americans but of world leaders and the people of every civilized nation. To Mrs. Kennedy remains the obligation of responding, in a manner consistent with the high dignity and prestige of the Office of the President and in the tradition of America, to foreign chiefs of state and dignitaries as well as to our own people. Within the first week after President Kennedy's death more than 200,000 letters and 90,000 telegrams were received, and messages still are arriving in heavy volume. This legislation will enable Mrs. Kennedy to care for these and other matters related to her husband's service which require her personal attention.

Section 3 of the bill authorizes the U.S. Secret Service to assign not less than two agents at all times to protect Mrs. Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy and her children for a 1-year period. It is the unanimous judgment of Federal law enforcement officials, based on experience and evaluation of the circumstances of President Kennedy's death, that there is and for some time will be an unusual

degree of danger to the life and health of the President's widow and her children.

Section 4 authorizes appropriations to carry out the provisions of the legislation and to pay expenses incident to the death and burial of President Kennedy. Similar provision for the expenses incident to the death and burial of former President Franklin Delano Roosevelt was made in the Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1945, 59 Stat. 412.

Mr. HALLECK. Now, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON. Yes, I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, the gentleman's statement, as I have listened to it, indicates that there are precedents for sections 1 and 4 of the bill but not for sections 2 and 3 of the bill. Is that not correct?

Mr. MORRISON. Well, there is a precedent for the staffing, furniture, and supplies and equipment, as well as secretarial help under the law that this Congress passed for the benefit of past Presidents of the United States who were no longer in office in order to carry on their work after they were out of the Office of the Presidency.

Mr. HALLECK. I understand that.

Mr. MORRISON. This is for Mrs. Kennedy to wind up the affairs of her husband.

Mr. HALLECK. Again, may I point out that by asking this question I am not undertaking to pass judgment on whether or not this should become law, but the Speaker discussed with me section 2 of the bill and other sections. I was out of town and I did not have a chance to discuss with the Speaker section 3 of the bill. But I understand that section was discussed with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDT]. However, I think it appears from the record that insofar as widows of Presidents are concerned, sections 2 and 3 have no precedent in the law. Of course, the situation now may be different and is probably different than some of the others that existed in the past.

Mr. MORRISON. There has never been this exact situation; therefore, there could be no exact precedent.

Mr. HALLECK. Let me conclude. I just want the RECORD to show that with the enactment of this legislation, if it is enacted and I assume it will be, it does go beyond actions heretofore taken with respect to widows of other Presidents.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MORRISON. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Technically, of course, the observation of the distinguished minority leader is correct. But with reference to the matter of taking care of expenses connected with or incidental to the death of a President in office, the Congress has always in recent years taken care of extraordinary expenses. This was true with reference to extraordinary expenses relating to the death of President Harding when the burial and transportation costs amounted to \$28,000. This, of course, is not a technical precedent with respect to the matter referred to, but it does show that the Congress has in the past taken care of extraordinary

expenses relating to the death of the President of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the Members that this bill, although it states that it was referred to the House Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service, was not referred to that committee nor have there been any hearings whatever on this measure. In the interest of orderly procedure, I regret that the bill did not come to the committee for hearings. The committee has no hearings scheduled for today or tomorrow and could easily have given consideration to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], that insofar as I can ascertain there is no precedent whatever for sections 2 and 3.

I should like to point out to those who may be interested that section 3 will not mean the assignment of only two Secret Service agents. I am sure we can agree that Secret Service agents should be detailed to the widow and her family for a limited time. But let us not think that this will be limited to two Secret Service agents, because the bill provides for the assignment of two "at all times." This means around the clock, and for a year, which automatically means several agents must be detailed for this purpose.

I would also call the attention of those who drafted the legislation to the language to be found on page 2, which reads as follows:

Each individual appointed under this section to a position on the office staff of Mrs. Kennedy shall be held and considered to be an employee of the Government of the United States for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act—

And so forth. Turning to page 3 of the bill you will find, beginning at line 14, the following proviso:

No payment shall be made from any appropriation authorized by this Act to any officer or employee of the Government for personal or professional services.

It seems to me that the language to be found on page 3 is in direct conflict with the language to be found on page 2 which I previously cited. I would suggest that an effort be made here today to correct this language. I do not see how the language to be found on page 3 of the bill, covering the entire act, can be with the employee provision in section 2. I do not see how you can deny payment of moneys by this act to any officer or employee of the Government and then provide for Government employees as is done in section 2.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I believe the amendment to the bill takes care of the matter in the proviso, if I understand the gentleman correctly.

Mr. GROSS. I may say to the gentleman I was not aware an amendment had been offered.

Mr. ALBERT. The amendment makes the language on line 14 read that "no

payment of such expenses shall be made from any appropriation authorized by this Act to any officer or employee of the Government for personal or professional services."

Mr. GROSS. Was the original language designed to prevent dual compensation, or what was the purpose of the proviso to be found on page 3?

Mr. ALBERT. The proviso, as I understand it, was taken from an appropriation act which did not contain the other sections, and by simply transposing it in this bill. The limitation on these expenses as regards Federal employees was not clear, therefore, in the language of the proviso as originally drawn. For that reason this amendment which makes the matter specifically clear, has been added in the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

There is another observation I should like to make with respect to this bill. I am beginning to get communications as to whether there would be included in the burial expenses paid by the Government the cost of the eternal light that has been installed in Arlington Cemetery. I do not know whether anyone here today is prepared to answer the question. If not, I suggest this and other information be developed in hearings before the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, I want the record clear that I believe proper provision should be made in all matters dealing with the tragic death of the late President Kennedy. But all that we do should be with restraint and in good taste. In the emotions of the present period let us retain perspective and not indulge in precedents and actions which could tarnish the memory of the man we seek to honor.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON], that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 9291.

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

DELAWARE RIVER JOINT TOLL BRIDGE COMMISSION

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6199) granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact of agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the supplemental compact or agreement set forth below, and to each and every term and provision thereof: *Provided*, That nothing therein contained shall be construed to affect, impair, or diminish any right, power, or jurisdiction of the United States or of any court, department, board, bureau, officer, or official of the United States, over or in regard to any navigable waters, or any commerce between the States or with foreign

countries, or any bridge, railroad, highway, pier, wharf, or other facility or improvement, or any other person, matter, or thing, forming the subject matter of the aforesaid compact or agreement or otherwise affected by the terms thereof: *Provided further*, That with respect to any port and terminal facilities, as defined in said supplemental compact or agreement, the power to exercise the right of eminent domain granted to the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission shall not be exercised to condemn property devoted to public use by any person or corporation, public or private, having the right of eminent domain or to condemn property of any person or corporation abutting on the Delaware River for the same use as that to which the property is being devoted or to condemn a dock or other facility abutting on the Delaware River when the dock or other facility is used as an integral part of a manufacturing plant or operation.

"SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA AND THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

"Amending and supplementing the compact or agreement entitled 'Agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey creating the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission as a body corporate and politic and defining its powers and duties,' as heretofore amended and supplemented, by extending the powers of the commission to include certain port and terminal facilities

"The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey do hereby solemnly covenant and agree, each with the other, as follows:

"(1) Article I of the compact or agreement entitled 'Agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey creating the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission as a body corporate and politic and defining its powers and duties,' executed on behalf of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania by its Governor on the nineteenth day of December, one thousand nine hundred and thirty-four, pursuant to an act of its General Assembly approved the twenty-fifth day of June, one thousand nine hundred and thirty-one (Pamphlet Laws 1352), as last amended by an act of said General Assembly approved the eighteenth day of May, one thousand nine hundred and thirty-three (Pamphlet Laws 827), and executed on behalf of the State of New Jersey by its Governor on the eighteenth day of December, one thousand nine hundred and thirty-four, pursuant to an act of its Senate and General Assembly approved June eleventh, one thousand nine hundred and thirty-four (chapter 215, laws of 1934; R. S. (1937) 32: 8-1), to which compact or agreement the consent of the Congress of the United States was given by section 9 of an Act of the Congress approved August 30, 1935 (Public No. 411, 74th Congress, 49 Stat. 1051, 1058), as heretofore amended and supplemented, be and the same is hereby amended and supplemented to read as follows:

"Article I

"There is hereby created a body corporate and politic, to be known as the "Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission" (hereinafter in this agreement called the "commission"), which shall consist of the commissioners, on behalf of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, provided for by the act, approved the eighth day of May, one thousand nine hundred and nineteen (Pamphlet Laws, one hundred forty-eight), and its supplements and amendments, for the acquisition of toll bridges over the Delaware River, and of commissioners, on behalf of the State of New Jersey, provided for by the act, approved the first day of April, one thousand nine hundred and twelve (Chapter, two hundred ninety-seven), and its supplements and

amendments, for the acquisition of toll bridges over the Delaware River, which said commissions have heretofore been acting as a joint commission by virtue of reciprocal legislation.

"No action of the commission shall be binding unless a majority of the members of the commission from Pennsylvania and a majority of the members of the commission from New Jersey shall vote in favor thereof.

"In the event that any ex-officio member of the commission from Pennsylvania shall for any reason be absent from a meeting of the commission, a deputy or other person in his department designated by him for such purpose shall be authorized to act at such meeting for and in behalf of such absent member and to vote in his place on all matters which may be presented for consideration at such meeting. Such designation shall be signed by such ex-officio member and filed with the secretary of the commission and shall continue in effect until the expiration of the term of office of such member or until another designation shall be made.

"The commission shall constitute the public corporate instrumentality of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey for the following public purposes, and shall be deemed to be exercising an essential governmental function in effectuating such purposes, to wit:

"(a) The administration, operation, and maintenance of the joint State-owned bridges across the Delaware River between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey, and located north of the present stone arch bridge of the Pennsylvania Railroad across the Delaware River from Morrisville to Trenton;

"(b) The investigation of the necessity for additional bridge communications over the Delaware River, and the making of such studies, surveys and estimates as may be necessary to determine the feasibility and cost of such additional bridge communications;

"(c) The preparation of plans and specifications for, and location, acquisition, construction, administration, operation and maintenance of, such additional bridge communications over the Delaware River at any location north of the boundary line between Bucks County and Philadelphia County in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania as extended across the Delaware River to the New Jersey shore of said river, as the commission deems necessary to advance the interests of the two States and to facilitate public travel; and the issuance of bonds and obligations to provide moneys sufficient for the acquisition or construction of such bridges; and the collection of tolls, rentals, and charges for the redemption of such bonds and obligations, and the payment of interest thereon;

"(d) The procurement from the Government of the United States of any consents which may be requisite to enable the commission to exercise any of its powers;

"(e) The investigation of the necessity for additional port and terminal facilities within the area (hereinafter referred to as the "district") comprising all of the territory within the counties of Bucks, Northampton, Monroe and Pike in Pennsylvania, all of the territory within the counties of Sussex, Warren, Hunterdon and Mercer in New Jersey, and that part of the territory within the county of Burlington in New Jersey north of the northerly bank of Rancocas Creek as said creek and its north branch extend in a general easterly direction from the Delaware River and through Mount Holly, Pemberton and Browns Mills and other communities to the Burlington-Ocean County boundary line in New Jersey;

"(f) The acquisition, construction, administration, operation and maintenance of such port and terminal facilities within the district as the commission may deem neces-

sary to advance the interests of the two States; the issuance of bonds or other obligations of the commission to provide moneys sufficient for the acquisition or construction of such facilities; and the collection of fees, rentals, tolls and other charges for the payment of such bonds or obligations and the interest thereon, and for the administration, operation and maintenance of such facilities."

"(2) Article II of said compact or agreement, as heretofore amended and supplemented, be and the same is hereby amended and supplemented to read as follows:

"Article II

"For the effectuation of its authorized purposes, the commission is hereby granted the following powers:

"(a) To have perpetual succession.
 "(b) To sue and be sued.
 "(c) To adopt and use an official seal.
 "(d) To elect a chairman, vice-chairman, secretary, and treasurer and appoint an engineer. The secretary, treasurer, and engineer need not be members of the commission.
 "(e) To adopt suitable by-laws for the management of its affairs.

"(f) To appoint such other officers, agents and employees as it may require for the performance of its duties.

"(g) To determine the qualifications and duties of its appointees, and to fix their compensation.

"(h) To enter into contracts.
 "(i) To acquire, own, hire, use, operate, and dispose of personal property.

"(j) To acquire, own, use, lease, operate, and dispose of real property and interest in real property, and to make improvements thereon.

"(k) To grant the use of, by franchise, lease, and otherwise, and to make and collect charges for the use of, any property or facility owned or controlled by it.

"(l) To borrow money upon its bond or other obligations, either with or without security.

"(m) To exercise the power of eminent domain.

"(n) To determine the exact location, system, and character of, and all other matters in connection with, any and all improvements or facilities which it may be authorized to own, construct, establish, effectuate, maintain, operate or control.

"(o) In addition to the foregoing powers, to exercise the powers, duties, authority and jurisdiction heretofore conferred and imposed upon the aforesaid commissions, hereby constituted a joint commission by reciprocal legislation of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey, with respect to the acquisition of toll bridges over the Delaware River, the management, operation and maintenance of such bridges, and the location, acquisition, construction, administration, operation and maintenance of additional bridge communications over the Delaware River at any location north of the boundary line between Bucks County and Philadelphia County in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania as extended across the Delaware River to the New Jersey shore of said river. The powers granted in this paragraph shall be in addition to those powers granted by paragraph (a) of article X of this agreement.

"(p) To exercise all other powers, not inconsistent with the Constitutions of the States of Pennsylvania and New Jersey or of the United States, which may be reasonably necessary or incidental to the effectuation of its authorized purposes or to the exercise of any of the powers granted to the commission by this agreement or any amendment thereof or supplement thereto, except the power to levy taxes or assessments for benefits; and generally to exercise, in connection with its property and affairs and in connection with property under its control, any and all powers which might be ex-

exercised by a natural person or a private corporation in connection with similar property and affairs.

"(q) To acquire, construct, rehabilitate, improve, maintain, lease as lessor or as lessee, repair and operate port and terminal facilities as hereinafter defined within the district, including the dredging of ship channels and turning basins and the filling and grading of land therefor.

"(r) To provide from time to time for the issuance of its bonds or other obligations for any one or more of its corporate purposes; all bonds and other obligations hereafter issued by the commission shall have all the qualities and incidents of negotiable instruments.

"(s) To fix, charge, and collect fees, rentals, tolls and other charges for the use of any of its port and terminal facilities so as to provide funds at least sufficient, with other funds available for such purposes (1) to pay the cost of maintaining, repairing and operating such port and terminal facilities, including the administrative expenses of the commission chargeable thereto, (2) to pay the bonds or other obligations issued on account of such facilities and the interest thereon as the same become due and payable, and (3) to provide reserves for such purposes, and to pledge such funds, over and above such costs of maintenance, repair and operation, to the payment of such bonds or other obligations and the interest thereon.

"(t) To petition the Interstate Commerce Commission, any public service or public utilities commission, or any other federal, state or local authority, whether administrative, judicial or legislative, for the adoption and execution of any physical improvement, change in method, rate of transportation, system of handling freight, warehousing, docking, lightering or transfer of freight, which, in the opinion of the commission, may be designed to improve or facilitate the movement or handling of commerce within the district or improve the terminal or transportation facilities therein."

"As used in this agreement the term 'port and terminal facilities' shall mean and shall include, without intending thereby to limit the definition of such term, any one or more of the following or any combination thereof:

"(1) Every kind of terminal or storage structure or facility now in use or hereafter designed for use in the handling, storage, loading or unloading of freight or passengers at steamship, railroad or motor terminals or airports, and every kind of transportation facility now in use or hereafter designed for use in connection therewith; and

"(2) All real and personal property and all works, buildings, structures, equipment, machinery, appliances and appurtenances necessary or convenient for the proper construction, equipment, maintenance and operation of such facility or facilities or any one or more of them.

"Notwithstanding any other provision of this agreement or any provision of law, state or federal, to the contrary, the commission may combine for financing purposes any port and terminal facility or facilities constructed or acquired by it under the provisions of this agreement with any bridge or bridges heretofore or hereafter constructed or acquired by the commission, subject to any limitations contained in any trust indenture securing bonds of the commission at the time outstanding.

"The powers herein granted to the commission with reference to port and terminal facilities shall supersede the right to exercise any such powers within the district, as defined in paragraph (e) of Article I of this agreement, by any other body which has been heretofore created by compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey.

"Nothing contained in any other of the provisions of this compact or agreement shall

be deemed or construed to amend, modify or repeal any of the powers, rights or duties conferred by, or limitations or restrictions expressed in, Article X of this compact or agreement, or any of the provisions of said Article X relating to a bridge to be constructed, operated and maintained by the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission or the New Jersey Turnpike Authority, acting alone or in conjunction with each other.

"In witness whereof, this 16th day of July, 1953, Alfred E. Driscoll has affixed his signature hereto as Governor of the State of New Jersey and caused the great seal of the State to be attached thereto.

"(GREAT SEAL)

"[S] ALFRED E. DRISCOLL,
Governor, State of New Jersey.

"Attest:

"[S] LLOYD B. MARSH,
Secretary of State.

"And, on this 13th day of July, 1953, John S. Fine has affixed his signature hereto as Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and caused the great seal of the Commonwealth to be attached thereto.

"(GREAT SEAL)

"[S] JOHN S. FINE,
Governor, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

"Attest:

"[S] GENE D. SMITH,
Secretary of the Commonwealth."

SEC. 2. The Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission is hereby authorized to combine for financing purposes any bridge or bridges heretofore or hereafter constructed or acquired by the Commission and any port and terminal facilities referred to in the supplemental compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey set forth above. Said Commission is hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for the use of such bridge or bridges so combined and to pledge such tolls in accordance with the provisions of said supplemental compact or agreement: *Provided*, That in fixing the rates of toll to be charged for the use of any bridge heretofore or hereafter constructed or acquired by said Commission or any bridge or bridges so combined, the same shall be so adjusted as to provide funds sufficient, with other funds available for such purposes, to pay the reasonable costs of maintaining, repairing and operating such bridge or bridges and their approach facilities and such port and terminal facilities under economical management, and to provide funds sufficient to amortize the costs of such bridge or bridges and their approach facilities and such port and terminal facilities, including reasonable interest and financing cost, as soon as possible, under reasonable charges, and said Commission may continue such tolls on all bridges heretofore or hereafter constructed or acquired by the Commission until all such costs shall have been amortized: *Provided, further*, That, the collection of tolls for the use of any bridge heretofore or hereafter constructed or acquired by the Commission, in excess of amounts reasonably required for the operation and maintenance thereof under economical management, shall cease at the expiration of fifty years from the date of the opening to traffic by the Commission of the bridge latest constructed or acquired by said Commission after the effective date of this Act, and the rate of such tolls shall be subject only to the provisions of section 503 of the General Bridge Act of 1946, as amended. The powers hereinabove granted shall be regarded as supplemental and additional to powers heretofore granted to said Commission.

SEC. 3. The right is hereby reserved to the Congress or any of its standing committees to require of the Commission the disclosure and furnishing of such information and data as is deemed appropriate by the Congress or any committee thereof having jurisdiction of the subject matter of this Act.

SEC. 4. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded? If not, the question is on the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6199.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, on August 30, 1935, Congress gave its consent to a compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey, creating the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission and authorizing the commission to administer State-owned bridges across the Delaware River in the vicinity of Trenton.

In 1947, Congress gave its consent to a supplemental compact authorizing the commission to acquire, construct, and operate bridges at any location north of the boundary line between Mercer County and Burlington County, to issue revenue bonds, to charge and collect tolls for the use of bridges constructed or acquired by the commission.

An act approved on March 31, 1932, gave the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact authorizing the commission to acquire, construct, and operate bridges across the Delaware River north of the boundary line between Bucks County and Philadelphia County and to combine for financing purposes any two or more bridges constructed or acquired by the commission.

At present the commission maintains and operates 5 toll bridges and 11 free bridges.

In 1953 the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey entered into a supplemental agreement which amends the compact of 1934 and is designed to broaden the power of the Delaware Joint Toll Bridge Commission to include the acquisition, construction, administration, and operation and maintenance of port and terminal facilities and the issuance of bonds for the financing thereof. H.R. 6199 gives the consent of Congress to that proposal. H.R. 6199 involves expenditures of no Federal funds.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, obviously I speak in favor of H.R. 6199, since it is a bill which I introduced. The purpose of this said legislation is to secure the consent of Congress to an amendment to the compact between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey creating the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission. The original compact of 1934 was approved by Congress on August 30, 1935. Amendments were approved by Congress in 1947 and 1951. H.R. 6199 would give consent to a supplemental agreement approved by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey in 1953.

The original compact of 1934 established the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, which took over responsibility for the acquisition, maintenance, and operation of bridges across the Delaware River above the city of Philadelphia and the opposite point on the New Jersey side. The subsequent amendments of 1947 and 1951 permitted grouping of the bridges into a single project for financing and pledging of tolls and extended the northerly limit of the district to the Pennsylvania-New York line.

The 1953 supplemental agreement, for which consent is sought in H.R. 6199, broadens the power of the commission to include the acquisition, construction, administration, operation, and maintenance of port and terminal facilities and the issuance of bonds for the financing thereof.

The Federal Government has expended approximately \$93 million in the deepening of the channel of the Delaware River from Philadelphia to a point just south of Morrisville, Pa., and Trenton, N.J. H.R. 6199, if enacted into law, will permit the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission to create ports along the said river between these points. The construction and operation of such ports on the New Jersey and Pennsylvania sides of the Delaware River at these points will make, to all intents and purposes, "ports on the sea," because it will permit deep sea cargo and passenger vessels to come up the Delaware River to the said ports. The Delaware Valley can confidently look forward to the growth of its industrial abilities as a result. This, of course, should add substantially to the economy of this area and this, in turn, will give a return to the Federal Government—in the form of additional Federal taxes—of some of the money originally invested in deepening the Delaware River channel. This bill is very necessary.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge passage of H.R. 6199. This bill would expand the existing compact between the States of New Jersey and Pennsylvania to authorize the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission to undertake development of deep water port and terminal facilities at Trenton, N.J., and Morrisville, Pa. The Legislatures of New Jersey and Pennsylvania have passed the requisite legislation to expand the bridge compact. Last December, the bridge commission formally requested the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CURTIN] and myself to introduce legislation to effect the necessary congressional approval of the compact changes. Pursuant to this request, I introduced on April 1, H.R. 5347. Subsequently, on the advice of bonding and engineering counsel, the commission indicated it wished the language of H.R. 5347 refined in certain respects. These refinements were made and incorporated in H.R. 6199 as introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CURTIN] on May 9. I accepted these changes and endorsed H.R. 6199 at the public hearing held before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on August 7. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to commend all

the public and private agencies and individuals on both sides of our Delaware River who have supported and endorsed this legislation. The entire effort has been carried out in an atmosphere remarkable for its spirit of cooperation and nonpartisanship. In passing this legislation, we will help open the upper Delaware River Basin to the commerce of the world. It is a good bill and I urge its passage.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD immediately prior to the passage of the bill just considered.

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

There was no objection.

GRAND PRAIRIE, TEX., AIRPORT

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 8462) to authorize the conveyance of certain real property of the United States heretofore granted to the city of Grand Prairie, Tex., for public airport purposes, contingent upon approval by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, and to provide for the conveyance to the United States of certain real property now used by such city for public airport purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subject to the provisions of section 2 of this Act, the city of Grand Prairie, Texas, shall be authorized to convey to the highest bidder all right, title, and interest of such city in and to certain real property transferred to such city for public airport purposes by the United States. Such real property consists of a tract of land containing 127.39 acres, more or less, comprising a portion of the 195.82-acre tract situated in the county of Dallas, State of Texas, described in the deed dated May 22, 1962, entered into between the United States as grantor, acting by and through the Secretary of the Army, and the city of Grand Prairie, Texas, as grantee, and more particularly described as follows:

Being a tract or parcel of land lying and situated in Grand Prairie, Dallas County, Texas, and a part of the McKinney and Williams survey, abstract Numbered 1045 and the Elizabeth Gray survey, abstract Numbered 517.

Beginning at a point on the east right-of-way line of Carrier Parkway (formerly Southwest Eighth Street) where it intersects the south boundary line of the McKinney and Williams survey, abstract Numbered 1045, said point being the northwest corner of lot 17, block 9, of the Indian Hills Park Addition to the city of Grand Prairie;

thence south 0 degrees 33 minutes 30 seconds west along the east right-of-way line of Carrier Parkway a distance of 2,683.0 feet to the southeast corner of Grand Prairie Airport;

thence north 89 degrees 34 minutes 30 seconds west a distance of 1,557.3 feet along the south boundary line to a point where property line bears due north;

thence north 0 degrees 02 minutes west a distance of 138.4 feet to a point where prop-

erty line turns west, said point being the northeast corner of the W. C. May survey, abstract numbered 890;

thence north 0 degrees 24 minutes west a distance of 3,578 feet to the southeast corner of the Texas Army National Guard 42.39-acre tract;

thence north 8 degrees 20 minutes 30 seconds west a distance of 691.70 feet to a point on the south right-of-way line of Jefferson Avenue;

thence north 81 degrees 39 minutes 30 seconds east along the south right-of-way line of Jefferson Avenue a distance of 249.06 feet to the northwest corner of land known as General Services Administration land acquisition;

thence south 8 degrees 20 minutes 30 seconds east a distance of 330 feet to a point for General Services Administration land's southwest corner;

thence south 44 degrees 41 minutes 30 seconds east following General Services Administration land's south boundary line a distance of 2,016.45 feet to the place of beginning and containing 127.39 acres of land, more or less.

(b) Subject to the provisions of subsection (c) of section 2 of this Act, the city of Grand Prairie, Texas, shall convey to the United States, acting by and through the Secretary of the Army, all right, title, and interest of such city in and to certain real property transferred to such city for public airport purposes by the United States. Such real property consists of a tract of land containing 65.99 acres, more or less, comprising a portion of the 195.82-acre tract situated in the county of Dallas, State of Texas, the exact legal description of which property is contained in the deed dated May 22, 1962, entered into between the United States as grantor, acting by and through the Secretary of the Army, and the city of Grand Prairie, Texas, as grantee, and more particularly described as follows:

Being a tract or parcel of land lying and situated in Grand Prairie, Dallas County, Texas, and a part of the McKinney and Williams survey, abstract numbered 1045 and the Elizabeth Gray survey, abstract numbered 517.

Beginning at a point said point being the northeast corner of the W. C. May survey, abstract numbered 890;

thence north 89 degrees 26 minutes west along the north boundary line of said May survey a distance of 1,091.0 feet to the southwest corner of said airport tract;

thence north 0 degrees 32 minutes 30 seconds east a distance approximately 1,162.45 feet to a point in a line with the northwest edge of the most westerly asphalt mat extended;

thence north 29 degrees 32 minutes 30 seconds east along the northwest edge of said mat a distance of 981.15 feet to a point perpendicular to and 400 feet west of the centerline of the north-south runway;

thence north 1 degree 19 minutes 30 seconds west along a line parallel to and 400 feet west of the said centerline a distance of 1,476.75 feet to a point on the south boundary line of most western ramp;

thence north 81 degrees 59 minutes 30 seconds east a distance of 614.10 feet to a point;

thence south 0 degrees 24 minutes east a distance of 3,578 feet to the place of beginning and containing 65.99 acres of land, more or less.

SEC. 2. (a) The sale referred to in subsection (a) of the first section of this Act shall be authorized in writing by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, only after—

1. A site for a new airport has been selected and the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, has determined that such site is capable of being developed and used as an airport adequate to meet the needs of Grand Prairie;

2. A plan for construction of airport facilities at the new site has been submitted to and approved by the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency;

3. The city of Grand Prairie has, through advertising and sealed bids, provided assurances that construction of airport facilities can be accomplished in accordance with the plan submitted to and approved by the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, and

4. The city of Grand Prairie has, after advertising, received sealed bids on the 127.39 acres to be sold and determines that the bid to be accepted is in an amount equal to or greater than the combined costs of acquiring land for a new airport site and constructing the airport facilities thereon in accordance with plans submitted to and approved by the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency.

(b) Any proceeds of the sale of the 127.39 acres in excess of the amount needed for acquisition and construction at the new site shall be held in a trust account and be available for expenditures only for operation, maintenance, and future development of the new airport.

(c) The real property acquired by the city of Grand Prairie, Texas, with the proceeds of the sale authorized pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall be subject to such terms, exceptions, reservations, conditions, and covenants as the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, after consultation with the Secretary of the Army, may deem appropriate to assure that such property will be held and used by such city for public airport purposes.

(d) Subject to the approval of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency with respect to the coordination of the sale authorized by him under the foregoing provisions of this section with the conveyance required by this subsection, the city of Grand Prairie, Texas, shall convey, without monetary consideration therefor, to the United States, acting by and through the Secretary of the Army, that tract of land containing 65.99 acres, more or less, situated in the county of Dallas, State of Texas, the exact legal description of which is set forth in subsection (b) of the first section of this Act.

Sec. 3. The provisions relating to the reversion to the United States of legal title to certain real property in the event it is not used for airport purposes contained in the deed dated May 22, 1962, entered into between the United States as grantor, acting by and through the Secretary of the Army, and the city of Grand Prairie, Texas, as grantee, are hereby declared to be null and void from and after the date of the disposal of said property in compliance with the provisions of this Act, to the extent such provisions apply to the 127.39 acres, more or less, described in subsection (a) of the first section of this Act.

Sec. 4. The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency shall issue and obtain such written instruments as may be necessary to carry out the foregoing provisions of this Act.

THE SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

MR. SPRINGER. I demand a second, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

MR. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the airport at the city of Grand Prairie, Tex., was originally constructed by the military for use during World War II. When it became surplus, it was deeded to the city with a reversionary clause, in the event it ceased to be used for airport purposes.

During the 20 years since the war ended the community of Grand Prairie has grown up around this airport to the extent that it is no longer a desirable location for a general airport. The city of Grand Prairie desires to dispose of this airport property and sell it for commercial use, and to use the funds derived from its sale for the purchase and construction of another airport at a more suitable location. The city cannot do this because of the reversionary clause in the deed requiring use of the property for airport purposes.

The Federal Aviation Administration has agreed that it will serve the public interest and that of aviation for this land to be sold by the city and for the proceeds to go into the building of a new airport in a more suitable location. It is understood and it is written into the bill that in the acquisition and construction of the new airport no Federal funds will be used and that it will not be eligible for participation under the Aid to Airports Act.

MR. SPEAKER, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT], who is the sponsor of this legislation, and who will explain the bill in more detail.

MR. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, this bill will make it possible for the city of Grand Prairie, Tex., to have a larger and safer airport with a longer runway and better approaches, farther removed from traffic congestion, at no cost whatever to the Federal Government.

The Federal Aviation Agency in its long-range study of airport needs has recommended that Grand Prairie needs a new and better airport for general municipal airport purposes.

Grand Prairie lies in the path of very rapid growth. It is between the cities of Dallas and Fort Worth. Its population has grown from approximately 14,000 in 1950 to approximately 42,000 today, and this growth has encroached directly upon the borders of the present airport. It is hemmed in from three sides. With the growth of the city, naturally enough, has come a growth in private air travel. Additionally, according to the Federal Aviation Agency, the approach patterns to this airport are not safe or conducive to continued safe travel by civilian planes in the foreseeable future.

The air is sometimes congested with traffic. Approximately 4 miles north of this present airport, which sits right in the path of this rapidly growing city, is the Greater Southwest International Airport, with long, 9,000 feet runways, used by intercontinental jet flights. Approximately 11 or 12 miles to the northeast lies Love Field, one of the most busily used airports in the entire Nation. Approximately 3 miles east lies the Grand Prairie Naval Air Station, sometimes known as Hensley Field, and used also by the Chance-Vought Aircraft Corp. Approximately 4 or 5 miles to the west of it lies the new Arlington Airport. Directly in one of the approach patterns is a city water tower. Therefore, the present city airport of Grand Prairie has been hemmed in from expansion and the air above it made somewhat hazardous

by a proliferation of other airport facilities.

This bill permits the sale of those downtown facilities and the use of the proceeds to buy much more adequate land at a site farther removed from the overlapping air traffic patterns, much more convenient for the purposes of takeoffs and landings and much safer for such use, without 1 penny of cost to the Federal Government.

It seems to me that this is a good bargain for the Government because under the terms of this bill the Federal Government gets back 65.99 acres that it had already given to Grand Prairie for its use. The Federal Government also gets the privilege of attaching to the new airport, which will be built from the proceeds of the sale of the old 127 acres, all rights, reservations, and restrictions that the Administrator of the FAA may desire to apply. Additionally, the Federal Government gets the benefits of a new, modern, safe, usable airport without the outlay of any matching funds as is usually the case. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, and because the legislation in its present form has been approved in principle by the Federal Aviation Agency and by the Department of the Army, and because it has been approved by the city of Grand Prairie and the Grand Prairie Chamber of Commerce and by the Private Pilots Association of that area, and because I know of no present objection to it, I believe this is the kind of bill that is in the interest of the Government of the United States as well as in the interest of Federal aviation and in the interest of the city of Grand Prairie.

MR. SPEAKER, I yield back the balance of my time.

MR. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER].

MR. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, this is a matter that has been of great interest to the people of Dallas County for many years. For the years that I have been in the Congress, we have been interested in seeing this move taken. I want to commend the gentleman of the subcommittee—the gentleman from Mississippi, and the gentleman from Texas, for their interest in this matter and for expediting it and bringing it to the floor of the House. I know of no controversy involved here insofar as the subcommittee and the citizens for years have tried to resolve the differences and all of the legal claims to this land.

There will be no Federal funds involved or requests for any Federal funds. As to the need for another airport location, I can testify from my own personal knowledge that there are many overlapping traffic patterns existing there, that constitute an extreme hazard to air traffic in addition to the details which the gentleman from Texas has pointed out.

Furthermore, I understand this property can be sold, with the proceeds going to the new airport. The land can be disposed of according to the disposition of the city of Grand Prairie which through its city planning will make the ultimate and highest use of the land.

Is that correct, may I ask my colleague, the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. WRIGHT. I will say to the gentleman from Texas that this is correct.

I should also like to say, if the gentleman will yield further, that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] has been very diligent over the years in attempting to work out the proper and most equitable solution of this problem. The present airport facility lies in his district. I have come in the picture only because of this rapid growth and expansion of the city of Grand Prairie, growing into and encroaching upon the borders of my district. The gentleman's district and mine lie adjacent, one to the other. He and I have worked together on this problem. I want to pay my respects and tribute to my colleague for the cooperative manner in which he has worked with me in the preparation of this legislation.

Mr. ALGER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I can also relay the information that to my knowledge the people of Grand Prairie and the mayor of Grand Prairie are pleased with this solution, recognizing the problems involved here.

Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman and the subcommittee for their efforts in this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a question or two concerning this bill. How did the Federal Government acquire the land in the first place? Did they buy the land or was it donated by the municipality, county, or State?

Mr. WRIGHT. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that the land popularly known as Grand Prairie Airport was acquired during World War II by the Federal Government as a part of the U.S. Navy program of outlying airfields and was used during the war for military purposes by the Government.

Some little time back the Government did deed to the city of Grand Prairie all of this property for the purpose of using it for a municipal airport, which is what it has been used for. Since it no longer is usable as a proper or safe municipal airport and the need exists for a better and more modern one, the property of the present site can be sold.

Mr. GROSS. Did the Federal Government purchase this land originally, or was it donated? I find nothing in the report to indicate how the Federal Government originally acquired it; that is, whether by purchase or donation.

Mr. WRIGHT. I would say to the gentleman from Iowa I do not know the answer to that question. It occurred during World War II. I would presume—and this is only a presumption on my part—that the Federal Government had purchased this land, although in much of that area much property was given to the Federal Government for its use during the war.

Mr. GROSS. What I am trying to do is arrive at the present fair market value of the 127 acres.

Mr. WRIGHT. Of course, we will not know the market value until it is sold, but I would say to the gentleman from Iowa that the value has been enhanced greatly since the time when the Federal Government was using it as a naval field.

Mr. GROSS. Is there a reverter clause in this bill?

Mr. WRIGHT. There is, I would say to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask this question? I am interested in this because the Federal Aviation Agency says the land is not surplus. In other words, according to the report, the Federal Aviation Agency says other agencies of the Government have not been asked whether they want this land.

Mr. WRIGHT. I would reply to the gentleman that one portion of this total property, an area consisting of some 66 acres, is to be given back to the Federal Government for use by the Department of the Army and the Texas National Guard.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. But under present law, I will say to the gentleman from Texas, the General Services Administration, when land is declared to be surplus to the needs of the Government, is supposed to contact other agencies and departments of the Government. That has not been done in this case as I understand it. Therefore, the land is not surplus and has not met this measurement or test of availability to other agencies.

Mr. WRIGHT. I would say to the gentleman that the Government determined that the highest and best public use for the land was for a public airport. Now, what we are doing in this bill is simply transferring the location of that public airport from a site where it is no longer suitable to a larger site where it will be more suitable, and the same governmental rights will then apply to this new site.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 8462.

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

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., November 26, 1963.
HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
House 206, U.S. Capitol,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In view of my recent election to the House Committee on Armed Services and the additional duties which I have assumed, I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the House Committee on Government Operations.

It has been a distinct pleasure to serve on this important committee, and I have appreciated the opportunity.

Sincerely,

RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 577) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

That ALBERT W. JOHNSON, of Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Government Operations.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO VITALIZE THE RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 9124) to amend title 10, United States Code, to vitalize the Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Reserve Officers' Training Corps Vitalization Act of 1963".

TITLE I—POLICY AND INTENT OF CONGRESS

SEC. 101. (a) The Congress hereby affirms its conviction that the primary source of commissioned officer personnel for the reserve components of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps shall continue to be the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program. Therefore, this Act is designed to continue in effect the four-year Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program with modifications that will make the program responsive to the requirements of our students, our civilian educational institutions, our Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and our national security.

(b) The Congress believes that all commissioned graduates of the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program should be required to perform a period of active duty or active duty for training in the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps and that each year a substantial number of these graduates should be offered commissions in the regular components of those armed forces.

(c) The Congress believes that each of the military departments should be authorized to provide substantial financial assistance to specially selected students in the four-year Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program so as to enable the armed forces under their jurisdiction to satisfy their requirements for highly qualified junior officers who agree to remain on active duty for four or more years.

(d) The Congress believes that the military and citizenship benefits which result from providing a program of military training to students at the secondary school level not only justify a continuation of the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program but require its ultimate expansion and availability to students at all qualified schools as provided in this Act.

TITLE II—JUNIOR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS PROGRAM

SEC. 201. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Subtitle A is amended by adding the following new chapter after chapter 101:

"CHAPTER 102.—JUNIOR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS

"Sec.

"2031. Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

“§ 2031. Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps

“(a) The Secretary of each military department shall establish and maintain a Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps, organized into units, at public and private secondary educational institutions which apply for a unit and qualify under regulations prescribed by him. However, the total number of institutions in which units may be maintained by all of the military departments may not be more than 2,000.

“(b) No unit may be established or maintained at an institution unless—

“(1) the unit contains at least 100 physically fit male students who are at least 14 years of age and are citizens of the United States; and

“(2) the institution provides a course of military instruction of three academic years' duration as prescribed by the Secretary of the military department concerned.

“(c) The Secretary of the military department concerned shall, to support the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program—

“(1) detail noncommissioned and commissioned officers of an armed force under his jurisdiction to institutions having units of the Corps as administrators and instructors;

“(2) provide necessary text materials, equipment, and uniforms;

“(3) establish minimum acceptable standards for performance and achievement for qualified units; and

“(4) request from Congress necessary annual appropriations.

“(d) Instead of, or in addition to, detailing noncommissioned and commissioned officers on active duty under subsection (c) (1), the Secretary of the military department concerned may—

“(1) authorize qualified institutions to employ, as administrators and instructors in the program, retired noncommissioned and commissioned officers, and members of the Fleet Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve, whose qualifications are approved by the Secretary and the institution concerned and who request such employment, subject to the following—

“(A) retired members so employed are entitled to receive their retired or retainer pay and an additional amount of not more than the difference between their retired pay and the active duty pay and allowances which they would receive if ordered to active duty, and one-half of that additional amount shall be paid to the institution concerned by the Secretary of the military department concerned from funds appropriated for that purpose; and

“(B) notwithstanding any other provision of law, such a retired member is not, while so employed, considered to be on active duty or inactive duty training for any purpose; or

“(2) recall retired members of an armed force under his jurisdiction to active duty for instructional and administrative duties at qualified institutions, but a member so recalled—

“(A) notwithstanding section 1402(a) of this title, is entitled, upon release from that active duty, to the same retired or retainer pay to which he would be entitled had he not been recalled to active duty;

“(B) is entitled to the benefits of section 1402 (b)-(d) of this title, if applicable to him; and

“(C) is not counted in computing strengths under any law.”

(2) The chapter analysis of subtitle A, and the chapter analysis of part III of subtitle A, are each amended by inserting the following new item:

“102. Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps..... 2031”.

“SEC. 202. Regulations implementing section 2031(a) of title 10, United States Code, shall be issued by the Secretary of each mil-

itary department not later than January 1, 1966.

TITLE III—SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS PROGRAM

SEC. 301. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Subtitle A is amended by adding the following new chapter after chapter 102:

“CHAPTER 103.—SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS

“Sec.

“2101. Definitions.

“2102. Establishment.

“2103. Eligibility for membership.

“2104. Advanced training; eligibility for.

“2105. Advanced training; retainer pay.

“2106. Advanced training; failure to complete or to accept commission.

“2107. Advanced training; commission on completion.

“2108. Financial assistance program for specially selected members.

“2109. Advanced standing; interruption of training; delay in starting obligated service; release from program.

“2110. Field training; practice cruises.

“2111. Logistical support.

“2112. Personnel: administrators and instructors.

“2113. Limitations on numbers in the programs.

“§ 2101. Definitions

“In this chapter—

“(1) ‘program’ means the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps of an armed force;

“(2) ‘member of the program’ means a student who is enrolled in the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps of an armed force; and

“(3) ‘advanced training’ means the training and instruction offered in the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps to students in the third and fourth years of a four-year Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps course, or the equivalent period of training in an approved two-year Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps course.

“§ 2102. Establishment

“(a) For the purpose of preparing selected students for commissioned service in the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps, the Secretary of each military department, under regulations prescribed by the President, may establish and maintain a Reserve Officers' Training Corps program, organized into one or more units, at any accredited civilian educational institution authorized to grant baccalaureate degrees, and at any school essentially military that does not confer baccalaureate degrees, upon the request of the authorities at that institution.

“(b) No unit may be established or maintained at an institution unless—

“(1) the senior commissioned officer of the armed force concerned who is assigned to the program at that institution is given the academic rank of professor;

“(2) the institution fulfills the terms of its agreement with the Secretary of the military department concerned; and

“(3) the institution adopts, as a part of its curriculum, a four-year course of military instruction or a two-year course of advanced training in military instruction, or both, which the Secretary of the military department concerned prescribes and conducts.

“(c) At those institutions where a unit of the program is established membership of students in the program shall be elective or compulsory as provided by State law or the authorities of the institution concerned.

“§ 2103. Eligibility for membership

“(a) To be eligible for membership in the program a person must be a student at an institution where a unit of the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps is established. However, a student at an institution that does not have a unit of the corps is eligible, if otherwise qualified, to be a member of a unit at another institution.

“(b) Persons from foreign countries may be enrolled as members of the program when their enrollment is approved by the Secretary of the military department concerned under criteria approved by the Secretary of State.

“(c) A medical, dental, pharmacy, or veterinary student may be admitted to a Medical, Dental, Medical Service, or Veterinary Corps unit of the program for a course of training consisting of ninety hours of instruction a year for four academic years.

“(d) Under such conditions as the Secretary of the military department concerned may prescribe, a medical, dental, pharmacy, or veterinary student who is a commissioned officer of a Reserve component of an armed force may be admitted to and trained in a Medical, Dental, Medical Service, or Veterinary Corps unit of the program.

“§ 2104. Advanced training; eligibility for

“(a) Advanced training shall be provided to eligible members of the program and, if the institution concerned so requests, to eligible applicants for membership in the program, who have two academic years remaining at such educational institution.

“(b) To be eligible for continuation, or initial enrollment, in the program for advanced training, a person must—

“(1) be a citizen of the United States;

“(2) be selected for advanced training under procedures prescribed by the Secretary of the military department concerned;

“(3) enlist in a Reserve component of an armed force under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the military department concerned for the period prescribed by the Secretary;

“(4) contract, with the consent of his parent or guardian if he is a minor, with the Secretary of the military department concerned, or his designated representative, to serve for the period required by the program;

“(5) agree in writing that he will accept an appointment, if offered, as a commissioned officer in the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps, as the case may be, and that he will serve in the armed forces for the period prescribed by the Secretary; and

“(6) complete successfully—

“(A) the first two years of a four-year Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps course; or

“(B) field training or a practice cruise of not less than six weeks' duration which is prescribed by the Secretary concerned as a preliminary requirement for admission to the advanced course.

“(c) A member of the program who is ineligible under subsection (b) for advanced training shall be released from the program.

“(d) This section does not apply to cadets and midshipmen appointed under section 2108, or foreign students enrolled under section 2103(b), of this title.

“§ 2105. Advanced training; retainer pay

“Except when on active duty, a member of the program selected for advanced training under section 2104 of this title is entitled to retainer pay at the rate of \$50 a month beginning on the day he starts advanced training and ending upon the completion of his instruction under the program, but not for more than two years. Retainer pay under this section may not be considered financial assistance requiring additional service within the meaning of the third sentence of section 456(d)(1) of title 50, appendix.

“§ 2106. Advanced training; failure to complete or to accept commission

“A member of the program who is selected for advanced training under section 2104 of this title, and who does not complete the course of instruction, or who completes the course but declines to accept a commission when offered, may be ordered to active duty by the Secretary of the military department concerned to serve in his enlisted grade or

rating for such period of time as the Secretary prescribes but not for more than two years.

"§ 2107. Advanced training; commission on completion

"(a) Upon satisfactorily completing the academic and military requirements of the program of advanced training, a member of the program who was selected for advanced training under section 2104 of this title may be appointed as a Regular or Reserve officer in the appropriate armed force in the grade of second lieutenant or ensign, even though he is under 21 years of age.

"(b) The date of rank of officers appointed under this section in May or June of any year is the date of graduation of cadets or midshipmen from the Military Academy, the Naval Academy, or the Air Force Academy, as the case may be, in that year. The Secretary of the military department concerned shall establish the date of rank of all other officers appointed under this section.

"(c) In computing length of service for any purpose, an officer appointed under this section may not be credited with enlisted service for the period covered by his advanced training.

"§ 2108. Financial assistance program for specially selected members

"(a) The Secretary of the military department concerned may appoint as a cadet or midshipman, as appropriate, in the Reserve of an armed force under his jurisdiction any eligible member of the program who will be under 25 years of age on June 30 of the calendar year in which he is eligible under this section for appointment as an ensign in the Navy or as a second lieutenant in the Army, Air Force, or Marine Corps, as the case may be. However, a member whose enrollment in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps program contemplates less than four years of participation in the program may not be appointed a cadet or midshipman under this section, or receive any financial assistance authorized by this title.

"(b) To be eligible for appointment as a cadet or midshipman under this section a member must—

"(1) be a citizen of the United States;

"(2) be specially selected for the financial assistance program under procedures prescribed by the Secretary of the military department concerned;

"(3) enlist in the Reserve component of the armed force in which he is appointed as a cadet or midshipman for the period prescribed by the Secretary of the military department concerned;

"(4) contract, with the consent of his parent or guardian if he is a minor, with the Secretary of the military department concerned, or his designated representative, to serve for the period required by the program;

"(5) agree in writing that he will accept an appointment, if offered, as a commissioned officer in the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps, as the case may be, and that, if he is commissioned as a regular officer and his regular commission is terminated before the sixth anniversary of his date of rank, he will accept an appointment, if offered, in the Reserve component of that armed force and not resign before that anniversary; and

"(6) agree in writing to serve on active duty for four or more years.

"(c) Except when on active duty, a cadet or midshipman appointed under this section is entitled to retainer pay at the rate of \$50 a month beginning on the day he starts his first term of college work under this section and ending upon the completion of his instruction under this section, but not for more than four years.

"(d) A cadet or midshipman appointed under this section is entitled to the same allowances as are provided for cadets and midshipmen at the Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies for—

"(1) initial travel to the educational institution in which matriculated;

"(2) travel while under orders; and

"(3) travel on discharge.

However, no allowance for travel on discharge may be paid to a discharged cadet or midshipman who continues his scholastic instruction at the same educational institution.

"(e) The Secretary of the military department concerned may provide for the payment of all expenses in his department of administering the financial assistance program under this section, including tuition, fees, books, and laboratory expenses.

"(f) Upon satisfactorily completing the academic and military requirements of the four-year program, a cadet or midshipman may be appointed as a regular or reserve officer in the appropriate armed force in the grade of second lieutenant or ensign, even though he is under 21 years of age.

"(g) The date of rank of officers appointed under this section in May or June of any year is the date of graduation of cadets or midshipmen from the Military Academy, the Naval Academy, or the Air Force Academy, as the case may be, in that year. The Secretary of the military department concerned shall establish the date of rank of all other officers appointed under this section.

"(h) A cadet or midshipman who does not complete the four-year course of instruction, or who completes the course but declines to accept a commission when offered, may be ordered to active duty by the Secretary of the military department concerned to serve in his enlisted grade or rating for such period of time as the Secretary prescribes but not for more than four years.

"(i) In computing length of service for any purpose, an officer appointed under this section may not be credited with service either as a cadet or midshipman or concurrent enlisted service.

"§ 2109. Advanced standing; interruption of training; delay in starting obligated service; release from program

"(a) The Secretary of the military department concerned may give to any enlisted member of an armed force under his jurisdiction, or any person who has served on active duty in any armed force, such advanced standing in the program as may be justified by his education and training.

"(b) In determining a member's eligibility for advanced training, the Secretary of the military department concerned may credit him with any military training that is substantially equivalent in kind to that prescribed for admission to advanced training and was received while he was taking a course of instruction in a program under the jurisdiction of another armed force or while he was on active duty in the armed forces.

"(c) The Secretary of the military department concerned may excuse from a portion of the prescribed course of military instruction, including field training and practice cruises, any person found qualified on the basis of his previous education, military experience, or both. A person accepted for advanced training under section 2104 of this title may be allowed to delay the start of that training and to interrupt it if, under the rules of the institution, there will be time enough, after any delay or interruption and before graduation, for him to complete the advanced training.

"(d) A person may become or remain a member of the program after receiving a baccalaureate degree or completing pre-professional studies if he has not completed the course of military instruction or all field training or practice cruises prescribed by the Secretary of the military department concerned. If a member of the program has been accepted for resident graduate or professional study, the Secretary of the military department concerned may delay the com-

mencement of that member's obligated period of active duty until the member has completed that study.

"(e) The Secretary of the military department concerned may, when he considers that the interest of the Service so requires, release any person from the program and discharge him from his armed force.

"§ 2110. Field training; practice cruises

"(a) For the further practical instruction of members of the program, the Secretary of the military department concerned may prescribe and conduct field training and practice cruises (other than field training and practice cruises prescribed under section 2104(b)(6)) of this title which members must complete before they are commissioned.

"(b) The Secretary of the military department concerned may—

"(1) transport members of the program to and from the places designated for field training or practice cruises and furnish them subsistence while traveling to and from those places, or, instead of furnishing them transportation and subsistence, pay them a travel allowance at the rate prescribed for cadets and midshipmen at the Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies for travel by the shortest usually traveled route from the places from which they are authorized to proceed to the place designated for the training or cruise and return, and pay the allowance for the return trip in advance;

"(2) furnish medical attendance and supplies to members of the program while attending field training and practice cruises, and admit them to military hospitals;

"(3) furnish subsistence, uniform clothing, and equipment to members of the program while attending field training or practice cruises or, instead of furnishing uniform clothing, pay them allowances at such rates as he may prescribe;

"(4) use any member of an armed force, or any employee of the department, under his jurisdiction, and such property of the United States as he considers necessary, for the training and administration of members of the program at the places designated for training or practice cruises.

"(c) A member of the program is entitled, while he is attending field training or practice cruises, to pay at the rate prescribed for cadets and midshipmen at the Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies. An applicant for membership who is attending field training or practice cruises to satisfy the requirement in section 2104(b)(6) of this title for admission to advanced training is entitled, while so attending, to pay at the rate prescribed for enlisted members of the armed forces in pay grade E-1 (under 4 months' service).

"§ 2111. Logistical support

"(a) The Secretary of the military department concerned may issue to institutions having units of the program, or to the officers of the armed force concerned who are designated as accountable or responsible for such property—

"(1) supplies, means of transportation including aircraft, arms and ammunition, and military textbooks and educational materials; and

"(2) uniform clothing, except that he may pay monetary allowances for uniform clothing at such rate as he may prescribe.

"(b) The Secretary of the military department concerned may provide, or contract with civilian flying or aviation schools or educational institutions to provide, the personnel, aircraft, supplies, facilities, services, and instruction necessary for flight instruction and orientation for properly designated members of the program. The Secretary of each military department shall report to Congress in January of each year on the progress of the flight instruction program.

"(c) The Secretary of the military department concerned may transport members of,

and designated applicants for membership in, the program to and from installations when it is necessary for them to undergo medical or other examinations or for the purpose of making visits of observation. He may also furnish them subsistence, quarters, and necessary medical care, including hospitalization, while they are at, or traveling to or from, such an installation.

"(d) The Secretary of the military department concerned may authorize members of, and designated applicants for membership in, the program to participate in aerial flights in military aircraft and in indoctrination cruises in ships of the Navy.

"(e) The Secretary of the military department concerned may authorize such expenditures as he considers necessary for the efficient maintenance of the program.

"(f) The Secretary of the military department concerned shall require, from each institution to which property is issued under subsection (a), a bond or other indemnity in such amount as he considers adequate, but not less than \$5,000, for the care and safekeeping of all property so issued except uniforms, expendable articles, and supplies expended in operation, maintenance, and instruction. The Secretary may accept a bond without surety if the institution to which the property is issued furnishes to him satisfactory evidence of its financial responsibility.

"§ 2112. Personnel; administrators and instructors

"The Secretary of the military department concerned may detail regular or reserve members of an armed force under his jurisdiction (including retired members and members of the Fleet Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve recalled to active duty with their consent) for instructional and administrative duties at educational institutions where units of the program are maintained. Notwithstanding section 1402(a) of this title, a member recalled to active duty for duty under this section is entitled, upon release from that active duty, to the same retired or retainer pay to which he would be entitled had he not been recalled to active duty. However, such a member is entitled to the benefits of section 1402(b)-(d) of this title, if applicable to him. Retired members recalled to active duty in connection with the program will not be counted in computing strengths under any law.

"§ 2113. Limitations on numbers in the program

"Not more than the following numbers of cadets and midshipmen appointed under section 2108 of this title may be in the financial assistance programs at any one time:

"Army program: 8,000.

"Navy program: 8,000.

"Air Force program: 8,000."

(2) The chapter analysis of subtitle A, and the chapter analysis of part III of subtitle A, are each amended by inserting the following new item:

"103. Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps..... 2101".

TITLE IV—CONFORMING AMENDMENTS AND REPEALS

SEC. 401. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 1475(a) (4) is amended by adding at the end thereof the words "any applicant for membership in the reserve officers' training corps who dies while attending field training or practice cruises under section 2104(b) (6) of this title or while performing authorized travel to and from the place where the training or cruise is conducted; or".

(2) Section 1478(a) (4) is amended—

(A) by striking out "section 4385(c) or 9385(c)" and inserting in place thereof "the first sentence of section 2110(c)"; and

(B) by adding the following sentence at the end thereof: "A person covered by section 1475(a) (4) of this title who dies while attending field training or practice cruises under section 2104(b) (6) of this title or while traveling directly to or from the place where the training or cruise is conducted is considered to have been entitled, on the date of his death, to the pay prescribed by the second sentence of section 2110(c) of this title."

(3) Section 1481(a) (4) is amended by striking out the words "of the Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps, Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps" and inserting the words "or applicant for membership in, a reserve officers' training corps" in place thereof.

(4) Section 3201 is amended—

(A) by inserting the words "in a reserve officers' training corps or" after the word "members" in clause (5) of subsection (a); and

(B) by inserting the words "in a reserve officers' training corps or" after the word "members" in clause (4) of subsection (b).

(5) Section 3355 is repealed.

(6) The analysis of chapter 337 is amended by striking out the following item:

"3355. Commissioned officers; Army Reserve: appointment; R.O.T.C. graduates."

(7) Section 3540 is repealed.

(8) The analysis of chapter 343 is amended by striking out the following item:

"3540. Educational institutions: detail of members of regular or reserve components as professors and instructors in military science and tactics."

(9) Chapter 405 is repealed.

(10) The chapter analysis of subtitle B, and the chapter analysis of part III of subtitle B, are each amended by striking out the following item:

"405. Reserve Officers' Training Corps. 4381".

(11) Section 5404(b) is amended—

(A) by inserting "and" at the end of clause (3);

(B) by striking out "; and" at the end of clause (4) and inserting a period in place thereof; and

(C) by striking out clause (5).

(12) Section 5504(h) is amended by striking out "5573, 6904, 6906" and inserting "2107, 2108, 5573" in place thereof.

(13) Chapter 541 is amended—

(A) by striking out the following item in the analysis:

"5652b. Regular Navy: lieutenants (junior grade) originally appointed as ensigns under section 5573, 6904, 6906, or 6909 of this title."

and inserting the following item in place thereof:

"5652b. Regular Navy: lieutenants (junior grade) originally appointed as ensigns under section 2107, 2108, 5573, or 6909 of this title."; and"

(B) by striking out from the catchline and the text of section 5652b "5573, 6904, 6906" and inserting "2107, 2108, 5573" in place thereof.

(14) Section 6023(a) is amended by striking out clause (2) and renumbering clause (3) as clause "(2)".

(15) Section 6387(a) is amended by striking out "6904, 6906," and inserting "2107, 2108," in place thereof.

(16) Chapter 601 is amended by repealing sections 6901, 6902, 6903, 6904, 6905, 6906, 6908, and 6910.

(17) The analysis of chapter 601 is amended by striking out the following item:

"6901. Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps: administration."

"6902. Transfer of graduates of Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps to Regular Navy."

"6903. Officer candidate training program: administration; qualifications for enrollment."

"6904. Officer candidate training program: members enrolled from Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps; appointment as midshipmen; pay; allowances; commissioning."

"6905. Officer candidate training program: members enrolled as naval aviation officer candidates; instruction; pay; allowances."

"6906. Officer candidate training program: naval aviation candidates; appointment as midshipmen; flight training; appointment as ensigns."

"6908. Officer candidate training program: naval aviators; retention or transfer to Reserve."

"* * * * *

"6910. Payment of expenses."

(18) Section 8201 is amended—

(A) by inserting the words "in a reserve officers' training corps or" after the word "members" in clause (6) or subsection (a); and

(B) by inserting the words "in a reserve officers' training corps or" after the word "members" in clause (4) of subsection (b).

(19) Section 8355 is repealed.

(20) The analysis of chapter 837 is amended by striking out the following item:

"8355. Commissioned officers; Air Force Reserve: appointment; A.F. R.O.T.C. graduates."

(21) Section 8540 is repealed.

(22) The analysis of chapter 843 is amended by striking out the following item:

"8540. Educational institutions: detail of members of regular or reserve components as professors and instructors in air science and tactics."

(23) Chapter 905 is repealed.

(24) The chapter analysis of subtitle D, and the chapter analysis of part III of subtitle D, are each amended by striking out the following item:

"905. Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps..... 9381".

SEC. 402. Title 37, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 209 is repealed.

(2) Section 415 is amended by striking out the words "a reserve officer of armed force or an officer of the Army, or the Air Force, without specification of component," and inserting in place thereof the words "a reserve officer of an armed force, an officer of the Army or the Air Force without specification of component, or a regular officer of an armed force appointed under section 2107 or 2108 of title 10".

(3) Section 422 is amended by repealing subsections (c) and (d).

(4) The analysis of chapter 3 is amended by striking out the following item:

"209. Members of naval officer candidate programs."

SEC. 403. Section 4 of the Act of August 1, 1956, chapter 830 (5 U.S.C. 802), is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Federal Employees' Compensation Act (ch. 458, 39 Stat. 742), as amended (5 U.S.C. 751-793), applies in the case of the disability or death of the following members and applicants for membership in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps of the Army, Navy, and Air Force:

"(1) Any member or applicant for membership who suffers disability or death from an injury incurred in line of duty while engaged in a flight or in flight instruction under chapter 103 of title 10; or

"(2) Any member or applicant for membership who suffers disability or death from an injury incurred in line of duty while performing authorized travel to or from, or

while attending, field training or a practice cruise under chapter 103 of title 10.

For the purposes of this section, an injury shall be considered to have been incurred in line of duty only if it is the proximate result of the performance of military training by the member concerned, or of his travel to or from that military training, during the periods of time indicated in clause (2). Any member or applicant for membership who contracts a disease or illness which is the proximate result of the performance of training during the periods of time indicated in clause (2) shall be considered for the purposes of this section to have been injured in line of duty during that period."

(2) The last sentence of subsection (d) is amended to read as follows: "However, reimbursement may not be made for any hospitalization or medical or surgical care provided a person while attending field training or a practice cruise under chapter 103 of title 10."

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. All payments made and supplies issued under sections 9385-9387 of title 10, United States Code, in connection with the training of a person at an Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps unit while he was a student at a civil educational institution where a unit of the corps was not established, are hereby validated.

SEC. 502. If a part of this Act is invalid, all valid parts that are severable from the invalid part remain in effect. If a part of this Act is invalid in one or more of its applications, the part remains in effect in all valid applications that are severable from the invalid applications.

SEC. 503. This Act becomes effective on enactment.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana is not opposed to the bill. I am opposed to the bill and I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Indiana opposed to the bill?

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from New York opposed to the bill?

Mr. STRATTON. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, this legislation comes to the House as a result of an extensive study by a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 210]

Andrews,	Betts	Brock
N. Dak.	Bolling	Brown, Calif.
Ashbrook	Bolton	Brown, Ohio
Ashley	Oliver P.	Buckley
Bennett, Mich.	Bonner	Cahill

Casey	Jennings	Pucinski
Celler	Jensen	Rivers, Alaska
Chelf	Johansen	Roberts, Ala.
Colmer	Johnson, Pa.	Robison
Corbett	Keith	Rogers, Tex.
Daddario	Kelly	Roosevelt
Davis, Tenn.	Keogh	Rumsfeld
Devine	Kilburn	St. Onge
Dorn	Kluczynski	Schenck
Dowdy	Landrum	Schwengel
Dulski	Lennon	Shelley
Dwyer	Lesinski	Sheppard
Farbstein	Lindsay	Shipley
Fino	Long, La.	Sibal
Fogarty	McDowell	Sikes
Frelinghuysen	McLokey	Siler
Fulton, Tenn.	Mailliard	Smith, Calif.
Fuqua	Martin, Mass.	Smith, Iowa
Gary	Martin, Nebr.	Staebler
Gibbons	Matsunaga	Thompson, N.J.
Glenn	Matthews	Thompson, Tex.
Goodling	Miller, N.Y.	Thornberry
Grabowski	Milliken	Trimble
Gray	Mills	Tuten
Hall	Mosher	Van Pelt
Hanna	Moss	Watson
Harris	Murphy, N.Y.	Whitten
Harrison	Murray	Widnall
Harsha	O'Brien, Ill.	Wilson,
Harvey, Ind.	O'Brien, N.Y.	Charles H.
Hoeven	Ostertag	Winstead
Holland	Passman	
Ichord	Powell	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 322 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT].

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is perhaps one of the most important, if not the most important, piece of legislation that this body has been called on to pass judgment upon. This is the ROTC program of our country, the program which provides officers to our three branches of the military services. It supplements and augments the cadre of officers supplied by the three Academies—the Naval Academy, the Military Academy, and the Air Force Academy.

In approaching this problem, the committee started from scratch. By that I mean it just forgot everything that had been introduced, took a piece of paper and started first of all by repealing all the laws on the subject matter and then bringing into consonance and uniformity a unified and uniform ROTC program.

The program touches the home of everybody in the United States and affects in particular the young men in those homes. It provides a plan whereby the young man in high school can participate in a training program which will have him put in the position of being exposed to recognition of authority, recognition of discipline, and, most important of all, the recognition of his own country. It starts the youngster at an early age to appreciate America. It then moves him into the universities and colleges of the country and allows him two or three programs of his own selection and choice whereby the basic foundation is a 4-year officer training program. What the program does is this:

First, it provides for the continuation and expansion of the junior ROTC program;

Second, it provides for the continuation of the 4-year senior ROTC program along with the establishment of an optional 2-year senior program; and

Third, it authorizes each of the military departments to provide financial assistance to selected students in the 4-year senior ROTC program so as to enable the departments to satisfy their requirements for career personnel.

BACKGROUND

As Members of the House will recall, early this spring, the Department of Defense announced that it planned to withdraw its support of the junior ROTC program at the conclusion of fiscal year 1963.

This action would have, if left unchanged, sounded the death knell for the junior ROTC program at 255 schools throughout the country.

Many Members of Congress protested this action, and legislation was introduced to not only require the continuation of the junior ROTC program, but also to require its availability to other schools who desired to incorporate the program in their curriculum.

The bills designed to accomplish this objective were H.R. 4444 and H.R. 4427.

A subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services initiated hearings on these bills early this spring. However, after 2 days of hearings, further deliberations on these bills were postponed when representatives of the Department of Defense requested an opportunity to make a full-scale study of the need for this program. At the same time, representatives of the Department assured the subcommittee that support of the junior ROTC program would be continued through fiscal year 1964.

Subsequently, the Department transmitted to the Congress a legislative recommendation proposing substantial changes to the senior ROTC program.

The legislative recommendations of the Department of Defense relating to the senior program were incorporated with the proposed changes to the junior ROTC program embodied in H.R. 4444 and H.R. 4427, and introduced as H.R. 8130.

Testimony was received from representatives of all military departments, representatives from the field of education, representatives of various veterans' groups and service associations, Members of Congress, and other individuals interested in the ROTC program.

As a consequence of these extensive hearings, the subcommittee rewrote the departmental proposal and introduced it as H.R. 9124.

The bill was unanimously approved by the Committee on Armed Services.

PRINCIPAL FEATURES OF H.R. 9124

The principal features of the bill as reported by the subcommittee are as follows:

1. INTENT OF CONGRESS

Since the bill represents a completely new provision of law providing the basis for a revised and modernized junior and senior ROTC program, the committee

considered it appropriate to include in the bill as title I a general statement concerning the policy and intent of Congress in respect to the ROTC program. This statement, among other things, reiterates congressional support of the basic 4-year senior ROTC program. In addition, the statement reflects the intent of Congress that all commissioned graduates of the senior ROTC program be required to serve on active duty or active duty for training in the Armed Forces.

Finally, the statement reflects the desire of the Congress to not only continue the junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program but require its ultimate expansion and availability to students at all qualified schools throughout the country.

2. UNIFORM AUTHORITY FOR ALL DEPARTMENTS

The bill provides for the repeal of all existing authority relating to both the junior and senior ROTC programs for each of the military departments and substitutes a single new provision of law which consolidates this authority, as modified, into one section of the United States Code which will apply uniformly to all the service departments.

3. EXPANSION OF JUNIOR ROTC

The bill would provide new statutory authority for the operation and expansion of the junior ROTC program. In accordance with the request of the Department, the subcommittee proposal would permit the Department to conduct various pilot programs to develop a more economical means of providing support for the junior ROTC program. This support would include the possible use of retired personnel to operate the program. However, in any event, this experimentation must be completed not later than January 1, 1966, at which time the departments would be required to issue regulations which would permit qualified schools to become eligible for the establishment of junior ROTC units. The legislation provides an expansion of the program from the present 254 up to a maximum of possibly as many as 2,000.

Although it would be impossible to estimate with complete accuracy the ultimate cost of this program, the ad hoc committee established by the Department of Defense which reviewed the program as proposed in H.R. 4444 and proposed also in this legislation, estimated the total cost of this program when fully implemented at less than \$25 million per year. This figure was based upon an anticipated participation in the program by 1,200 schools throughout the country. The present program includes 254 schools at an estimated cost of approximately \$5 million.

4. OPTIONAL 2-YEAR SENIOR ROTC PROGRAM

The bill would reassert the conviction of the Congress that the senior ROTC program should continue to be a 4-year program. However, the program would be modernized by permitting those institutions who prefer a 2-year oncampus program to establish such a program providing that, as a condition precedent for entrance into such a program, students will be required to successfully

complete a 6- to 8-week summer period of military training. This training period to be performed in the simulated grade of private—E-1—at \$78 per month, will serve as a substitute for the first 2 years of ROTC training—basic course.

Unlike the departmental proposal, use of the 2-year optional ROTC program will not force an institution to abandon the 4-year program. Thus, for example, colleges with a traditional 4-year ROTC program will now be in a position to accept junior college transferees without prior ROTC training and permit their participation in advance ROTC training with an opportunity for a Reserve commission. This cannot be done today.

In short, the availability of the 2-year ROTC program will permit all college students an opportunity to enter ROTC training as late as the completion of their sophomore year of college. The 6-year ROTC course at military schools would also continue to be authorized under H.R. 9124.

5. FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO STUDENTS IN THE 4-YEAR ROTC PROGRAM

The bill would authorize all the military departments to provide scholarship assistance to students in the 4-year ROTC program in order to satisfy special long-term service requirements for career-type officers. This scholarship program could consist of a maximum of 4 years or a minimum of 1-year scholarship assistance, or any figure in between.

This authority, for practical purposes, would be identical to that presently provided to the Navy alone.

The use of this authority would be permissive but could in no event exceed stated statutory ceiling of 8,000 students for the Army, 8,000 for the Navy, and 8,000 for the Air Force.

This differs from the departmental proposal by providing a uniform scholarship assistance program for all the military departments.

The scholarship assistance contemplated by the bill would consist of two elements:

First, the payment of tuition, books, laboratory fees, and so forth, for each academic year at an estimated cost of between \$800 to \$850 per student, and

Second, the payment of monthly retainer pay in the amount of \$50 per month for 10 months of each academic year at an annual cost of \$500 per student.

Students receiving financial assistance of this kind will be required under the terms of the bill, to commit themselves to a minimum period of 4 years of active duty.

6. REQUIRED PARTICIPATION IN SENIOR ROTC, OPTIONAL

The bill would provide by statute that the senior ROTC program can be made compulsory or elective at the option of the institution or State concerned.

7. UNIFORM GRATUITY

The bill would provide that ROTC graduates whether commissioned as Regular officers or Reserve officers, would be authorized to draw the same uniform allowance as is presently provided for ROTC students who are awarded Reserve commissions upon graduation. At the

present time, graduates of the ROTC program who are awarded Regular commissions are denied entitlement to a uniform allowance provided their Reserve contemporaries. This uniform allowance amounts to \$300 per student. This change by the committee would increase the cost of the bill over the departmental proposal approximately \$900,000 per year.

8. INCREASE IN RETAINER PAY

The bill would increase the monthly payment to ROTC students in the advanced course from the present \$27 to \$50 per month. However, it would also provide a "Reserve liability" for all students entering the advanced course and becoming eligible for this \$50 monthly retainer payment. The purpose of this "Reserve liability" is to make the student liable for an involuntary call to active duty for a maximum period of 2 years in the event he fails to accept a commission or elects not to finish the course.

The increase in the monthly retainer pay of students in the advanced course will increase the cost of the departmental proposal by approximately \$10 million annually.

It is interesting to note that the departmental proposal included a request for authority to increase this payment to students in the advanced ROTC course. However, testimony received by the committee indicated that the Department had no present intention of increasing this retainer pay until "it could be justified." The committee is convinced that this increase in retainer pay for ROTC students is completely justified and is long overdue. Consequently, the committee bill provides for an automatic increase in this payment to the amount suggested by the Department.

The committee has been advised that enrollment figures in the various ROTC programs of the several military departments have declined drastically over that originally anticipated for the beginning of the current school year. For example, Army enrollment figures for military science I anticipated an enrollment of 91,000 students whereas actual enrollment is approximately 81,000 students. In the Army advanced course—(MS-3)—it was anticipated that 17,700 students would be enrolled whereas only 14,000 actually enrolled. The Navy has suffered a very serious decline in its enrollment in the Navy contract program. Under Navy projections, it was estimated that 3,500 students would enroll in the first-year course of the program when actually fewer than 1,600 students elected to enroll. The Air Force had a similar experience in respect to enrollments in its advanced course.

In the judgment of the committee, there are many factors which contribute to this apparent lessening of interest in the ROTC program, not the least of which is the recent selective service order which provides that married men will be draft exempt. In addition, the committee notes that there has been no increase in the payment to ROTC students in the advanced course since 1950 whereas in the period since 1950 earnings of male workers have increased approximately 87 percent, and there have

been corresponding pay increases provided active duty military personnel.

9. INCREASE IN OTHER ALLOWANCES

The committee proposal would in accordance with the departmental request, authorize an increase in travel allowance for ROTC students traveling to and from summer training, from 5 cents to 6 cents per mile and, also in accordance with the departmental request, the payment for students while at summer camp will be increased from the present \$78 per month to \$111.15 per month. The estimated total cost of these changes will be less than \$2 million annually.

10. RETIRED PERSONNEL USED IN ROTC PROGRAM

The bill would authorize the use of retired military personnel to conduct both the senior and junior ROTC program. The committee was of the opinion that the military departments should be permitted to utilize retired personnel in the operation of both the junior and senior ROTC program so as to minimize the drain of these programs on their active duty military personnel and also reduce the budgetary implications of these programs. Retired military personnel receive between 50 to 75 percent of their basic pay while on the retired rolls. The Government receives no particular benefit from this payment. Therefore, the committee believes that many retired officers would be desirous of volunteering for duty in connection with the ROTC program and, thus, permit the military departments to operate these programs with such retired personnel with consequent savings in both dollars and manpower.

11. ADJUST ROTC CURRICULUM

Finally, the bill would permit the respective military departments to realine and adjust their ROTC curriculum so as to best satisfy their military requirements and also eliminate possible conflict with the other academic pursuits of students in ROTC training. This change results from the repeal of the existing statutory requirement that provides that a minimum of at least 3 hours a week of ROTC training be required of each student.

The committee wishes to emphasize that repeal of this requirement in the law is in no way intended to result in a total decrease in the number of hours of military training provided ROTC students. Testimony received by the committee indicates that with the revisions in the curriculum, the total military exposures of ROTC students will, in fact, be increased. Thus, the change provided by the bill would simply remove the inflexible requirement in existing law which precludes the adjustments desired by the military departments.

SUMMARY OF THE NEW SENIOR ROTC PROGRAM

As a consequence of the changes proposed by H.R. 9124, the various senior ROTC programs conducted by the military departments will all have the same uniform statutory basis.

Thus, each department would:

(a) Establish a 4-year senior ROTC program consisting of a basic course of 2 years, and an advanced course of 2 years' duration.

(b) When requested by the institution concerned, authorize students the privilege of substituting an accelerated summer training course between the sophomore and junior years in lieu of the first 2 years of ROTC training—basic course.

(c) Provide scholarship assistance to selected students who are participating for 4 years in the ROTC program.

(d) Pay students in the advanced ROTC course—third and fourth years—\$50 in lieu of \$27 per month as a retainer payment.

(e) Provide summer training pay of \$111.15 per month for all ROTC students other than those students in the special summer camp—substitute for basic ROTC—who will receive \$78 per month.

FISCAL ASPECTS OF THE BILL

The changes recommended by the Department of Defense to the senior ROTC program would have resulted in an annual increased appropriation requirement of approximately \$4.1 million.

The bill as rewritten by the Committee on Armed Services will result in an annual increased appropriation requirement of approximately \$15 million. This represents an increase of approximately \$11 million over the Department's estimate.

Practically the entire increase reflected in the committee's proposal results from its decision to increase the amount of retainer pay provided students in the advanced ROTC course.

As I have previously indicated, this change is long overdue, and was heartily endorsed by practically every witness who appeared before the subcommittee, including representatives of each of the military departments.

CONCLUSION

This is good legislation. I am certain that your careful scrutiny of every aspect of this legislation will result in your concurrence in the judgment of the Committee on Armed Services.

I urge your unanimous approval of this bill.

Simply stated, that is what the legislation does. It is important legislation. It came before the committee after a year of study. In this connection I want to say that I should like to compliment my own subcommittee, and particularly the ranking Republican member, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY] as well as other members of the committee for the diligence they applied in coming up with this legislation. It was reported out of the full committee by a vote of 31 in favor and 1 present. It comes to the floor now under suspension of the rules in order that we may get along with the business of the House, expedite the business before us, and move this legislation to the other body so that we may get it out and onto the law books so that it may be in force by the next scholastic year.

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

Mr. HEBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to underscore what the gentleman has said about the importance of this legislation at this time. I think it is gen-

erally recognized in all defense circles and educational circles as well that this overhauling of the ROTC program is long overdue. Will the gentleman indicate whether the land-grant colleges through their authorized spokesmen approve this legislation as written?

Mr. HEBERT. The land-grant colleges in Chicago in convention several weeks ago unanimously passed a resolution commending the committee for its action and supporting the legislation. It has had the full support of the land-grant colleges of this country.

Mr. FISHER. Will the gentleman indicate further whether all the affected universities, colleges, and school systems all over America have indicated support for this legislation?

Mr. HEBERT. All have indicated support of the legislation. All are heartily in favor of it. It gives them the flexibility of selecting the course, the 2- or 4-year course which they desire. I may say further that the most heartening thing during this whole hearing has been the support that the committee received from the secondary schools of the country and particularly from the people of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY].

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my thanks to the gentleman from Louisiana, the chairman of the subcommittee. When this bill was first brought before the committee we realized that there was a very great need for some legislation on this subject. The committee struck out practically everything but the enacting clause and rewrote the bill. Every member of the committee is for this bill, except as to one section, where they desired the so-called Powell amendment be added to the junior ROTC part of the program. I have usually supported the Powell amendment but frankly I did not see that this was the place where it should be added. It is already in the statute today. Title IV of the civil rights bill will soon be before us and it does cover that in a great deal more detail and receives much better consideration there than it would in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I think that every educator who testified before the committee was for this bill. What they wanted was to have a 2-year program along with the 4-year program. The reason for that was that there is an increasing need for ROTC officers; that is, reserve officers and Regular officers, who graduate from the ROTC program. It was felt that we must have an additional source of officer supply. The reason for that is that the junior ROTC participants—that is the young men who go to a junior college and then who came into the college ROTC program—had no opportunity in which to enter the program. So, now, we do have a 2-year program under this legislation. But in order for a person to take advantage of the 2-year program they must take 6 to 8 weeks of intensive summer training at a military camp so they will not start in cold, so to speak.

Mr. Speaker, there is also a scholarship program connected with this bill. The

scholarship program will be limited to the 4-year ROTC participants which I think is entirely proper. Those who take the scholarship route must sign up to take 4 years of commissioned service after they get their commission.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Defense was rather reluctant on the junior ROTC program because there is no direct connection between the junior ROTC program and officers for the regular service. But the feeling was unanimous on the part of the committee that we must continue the junior ROTC program. Every school with which we had any contact was overwhelmingly in favor of continuing the junior ROTC program.

There are now 254 junior ROTC high schools now participating in this program throughout the country. However, many who would like to participate have been unable or at least they have not been able to install any such program since 1947.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation gives to them the right to increase that number of participating schools to 1,000.

Mr. Speaker, as I stated earlier, there was no opposition as I recall—and I think I attended every session of the subcommittee—to this legislation except as I mentioned earlier the tying of the so-called Powell amendment into the junior ROTC program.

Mr. Speaker, there has been some objection that the bill was not brought up under suspension. Frankly, I did not know that it was not going to be brought up under a rule until just before I returned to my district at Thanksgiving.

I, frankly, was against the bill as it was originally brought out by the Department of Defense because I felt it would destroy the 4-year ROTC program which unquestionably is better than the 2-year ROTC program but with the changes made by the committee it is a good bill. The cost of this program cannot be estimated at this point. It depends upon how many scholarships are given. We will cut down the expense between the 2-year ROTC program as compared with the 4-year ROTC program, cut it down materially. But, then there will be the scholarship expense.

Mr. Speaker, we will also increase the per diem amount from \$27 to \$50 per month.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] has just indicated that this legislation is, in his own words, the most important piece of legislation that this body has been called upon to pass judgment on this year. He mentioned that it touches the home of every person in the United States. To me it is incredible that a piece of legislation of any such importance should be brought up here under a suspension of the rules, where there is little real opportunity to discuss its merits, and where there is absolutely no opportunity to offer amendments to it.

Last Wednesday the President of the United States in a very eloquent address

in this Chamber called upon us all to make certain that we get back a dollar of value for every dollar we spend. I suggest there is serious question, if this bill is enacted without amendment, that we would be getting a dollar value for every dollar spent.

As has already been indicated, one crucial amendment to this bill offered in committee lost by the narrow margin of 17 to 14. Yet in spite of all these considerations we are being asked to vote on this bill under suspension of the rules.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this bill does two specific things. First of all, it takes the so-called junior ROTC program which goes on in high schools in certain parts of the country at the present time, in some 254 high schools, and expands that to cover 2,000 high schools. This expansion involves an increase of some 500 percent in the total cost of the program, from \$5 million a year to \$25 million a year. More than that, the Assistant Secretary of Defense says on page 28 of the committee report in referring to any junior ROTC program:

There is no direct military requirement for this program.

That is the first point, and the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. PIKE] will develop this junior ROTC program in greater detail in a moment.

Now the other thing the bill does is to provide, as the gentleman from Louisiana has already said, an extension of the so-called Holloway plan whereby individuals receive regular commissions in the Navy by going to civilian colleges rather than to the service academies, with their college education paid for them through 4 years by the Government. This bill would extend this Holloway plan which now applies to the Navy alone, to the other two services, and that action could involve, as the committee report indicates, an increase of from \$10 to \$24 million annually in Defense Department spending.

Now the Holloway plan is a very interesting plan. It is popular with the Navy, and I think there is a good deal to be said for it.

It was designed to provide career officers in the Regular Navy. And it provides the same kind of free education obtained from the three service academies without some of the restrictions and limitations that are involved in attending the Naval Academy itself.

For this reason it has been very much in demand. But I think there is one serious question that has developed with regard to the Holloway plan which would only be aggravated by extending it to the Air Force and the Army, unless we do something to make more certain that the money we put into the program will really be used efficiently in recruiting career officers for our three armed services.

Now let's see how the Holloway plan has actually worked in this regard for the Navy. Actually, the Navy has been concerned about the program because it seems that a very substantial number of individuals, once they take the educational program and serve their time, re-

quired time in uniform, have been getting out of the Regular Navy. The Navy has tried hard to increase the percentage of those who stay. Today it stands at 38 percent. In other words, only 38 percent of those whose college education is paid for by the Government under this Navy program have elected to remain in the Navy as Regular officers. And some 62 percent or nearly two-thirds of those for whom the Government has paid their college education do not remain in the Regular Navy after the initial 4-year service requirement is met, do not, in other words, become career officers.

By contrast, in the Naval Academy the retention rate is 80 percent, or in other words, only one-fifth of those who have gotten an education at Government expense in a service academy fail to become career officers.

At the very least we ought to wonder whether this is sound economy, to shift our military officer procurement program from the present OCS arrangement, from the air officer candidate programs, and others, to a program in which we must spend roughly \$3 in order to get \$1 of return.

At the very least it would seem to me that if we are going to extend this Holloway program then we ought to try to do something to tighten up the bill to make sure that more of these individuals who get the Government scholarships end up as career officers in the regular service.

Some months ago the House passed and sent to the other body H.R. 7356, designed to increase the number of appointees in our three service academies, and in that bill we placed a provision extending from 4 years to 5 years the obligatory time of service in the regular components for those who graduate from our service academies.

Surely this ROTC bill ought at least to have that same 5-year requirement added to it for those whose college education is paid for at Government expense. Yet if we adopt this bill today and pass it under suspension of the rules we have no opportunity to bring this bill into conformity with H.R. 7356, and make at least as severe a service obligation for regular ROTC officers as we require for our service academy graduates.

But we find this important bill before us today under a procedure that prevents any consideration of its fiscal effect, prevents any improvement in the bill to ease the burden on the taxpayers, and prevents any consideration of the very grave doubts expressed by the Department of Defense on the military soundness of the junior ROTC program which this bill would expand rather than terminate.

For all these reasons, I believe the bill should be voted down in its present form.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIKE].

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I have never been able to hear the capable and genial gentleman from Louisiana without conjuring up enjoyable visions of that most delightful of cities, New Orleans. In my mind's eye, regardless of who holds the transitory title of king of the carnival, the perpetual hereditary baron of

Bourbon Street is the chairman of the subcommittee handling this bill.

Today, I must confess, I have a different vision. I see New Orleans, beautiful as ever. I see the Mississippi, rolling irresistibly to the gulf. Perhaps it is a sign of my own misspent youth, or maybe I have just seen too many bad movies, but on the Mississippi I see a majestic white sternwheeler and on the sternwheeler, in the men's cardroom, I see a traveling man who in my fancy looks remarkably like the gentleman from Louisiana.

His laugh is infectious and warming; his wit is delightful; and his eloquence is devastating. He wears a well-cut jacket—and aces drip from its sleeves. In his right coat pocket he carries an absolutely new deck of cards which he can read just as well from the back as from the front. In his left coat pocket he carries an absolutely new pair of dice from which, nevertheless, certain edges and corners have somehow been worn away.

While I love his infectious laugh, admire his delightful wit, and am impressed with his devastating eloquence, I am unhappy because I know I am being bilked, trimmed, jobbed, lumbered, clipped, and swindled. This, of course, is all fancy. This bill today is a fact.

I had an amendment to this bill, and the gentleman from Louisiana knew it. I offered it in the gentleman's subcommittee and it lost 7 to 2. I offered it in the full committee and it lost again, but by a vote of 17 to 14—9 out of 19 Democrats voted for it; 5 out of 12 Republicans voted for it. It was, in essence, a civil rights amendment, and any time you can come as close as 17 to 14 with a civil rights amendment in the Armed Services Committee you have a pretty good chance on the floor.

Today, on the suspension calendar, I cannot offer the amendment, and because I think it is important I ask you to vote against suspending the rules. I do not say this is a terrible bill; in fact, if we were given a fair chance to amend it I would vote for it whether the amendment passed or not, but I do not like a stacked deck or a crooked deal. When 14 out of 31 members of a committee vote for a major amendment to a bill, that bill does not belong on the suspension calendar.

I ask you to look at the additional views on page 31 in the report to see what the issue is. We are, by this bill, increasing the junior ROTC program from its present 255 high schools to a maximum of 2,000 high schools. The Department of Defense estimates that this increase would cost between \$25 and \$40 million as opposed to the present cost of approximately \$5 million. Furthermore, it is the position of the Department of Defense, and I quote:

There is no direct military requirement for this program.

The committee, however, has determined that this high school level ROTC program is valuable in teaching good citizenship to the youth of America. The gentleman from Louisiana spelled out what this teaching by the military would

contribute to America. He referred to the military as teaching our high school students: First, a respect for authority; second, recognition of discipline; and, third, a full appreciation of what this country means. Surely all of these are worthy things for our youth to study. I believe, however, and almost half of the committee believed, that it does not make sense for our military to be teaching good citizenship in schools which deny admission to some students because they are the wrong color. If this constitutes "a full appreciation of what this country means," then perhaps a student who has been denied admission to such a school does not fully appreciate his country. I submit further that it does not make sense for the military to be attempting to teach in segregated schools the benefits of making a career in an integrated military.

On the next to last page of the hearings on this bill the chairman of the full committee said to the chairman of the subcommittee:

Mr. HÉBERT, will you proceed to obtain a rule of consideration of this bill?

Such a rule was not obtained, and I do not know whether it was sought or not. The bill is here on the suspension calendar, and my civil rights amendment is not in order. The gentleman from Louisiana has said that such an amendment would kill the bill, and how many times we have heard that before. I have said to the gentleman from Louisiana, and I say again, that I will vote for this bill on the floor whether such an amendment passes or not. But I would not vote for it without an opportunity to offer such an amendment. I hope that the Members of this body would not, either. Give us an opportunity to try.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN].

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to say I concur in the conclusions made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIKE]. This bill should be voted down today because it is brought before the House under suspension of the rules which precludes necessary debate and the offering of important amendments.

I also want to take this opportunity to congratulate the chairman because I do think that in all other respects we have been able to produce a bill which makes much needed improvements, particularly in relation to the senior college program.

The difficulty here is over the junior ROTC program. As our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIKE], has indicated, there is every good reason for introducing this type of amendment on this type of program because at best, on the record made before the committee, there is a very marginal demand for the junior ROTC throughout the country. No matter how hard we tried, the testimony persisted in showing that the junior ROTC was expensive and was more related to good citizenship than to a military requirement for our national defense designed to produce a supply of officers for our Armed Forces.

I refer you to page 14 of the committee report where the ad hoc committee's

statement on the junior ROTC program is presented.

Quoting from the report:

This report responds to the request of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower) to study, analyze and submit recommendations on the future operation of the junior ROTC.

Then it goes on to say:

any future consideration to eliminate the program would bring renewed, vigorous and locally justified protests from students, school authorities, parents, community and national leaders.

This indeed has been true. This has been true in my own State of California where we have an enthusiastic junior ROTC program. I have already declared my interest and support of the program. However, in spite of my support I was startled to learn that in my own State—and you can find this data on page 6863 of the hearings—we have only a 1.1-percent rate of participation in the program. If you look at the hearings, you will find in appendix B the enrollment data of the various States in the program and you will find it is remarkably small.

Again I call your attention to page 14 of the report of the ad hoc committee where they go on to say:

No military requirements could be established and justified to continue the two programs as essential to national security and thereby become justifiable items in the defense budget.

I must move on in the interest of time, but it goes on to say:

From the military point of view, the benefits are largely informational and motivational which have undeniable yet unmeasurable impact on impressionable high school youths by creating favorable attitudes, and impressions toward military service and careers in the Armed Forces. From the national interest viewpoint, the development of better citizenship attitudes and attributes in youth at the high school level through the disciplined atmosphere of military organization and training is a felt if not stated national requirement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from California 2 additional minutes.

Let me add that the costs of the program under the bill are estimated to be in the order of \$25 million per year and hearing testimony includes a figure of \$40 million.

Mr. COHELAN. What this all amounts to is that our committee has done a diligent job and has developed a program which I am willing to support. We Members who are protesting bringing this matter before the House under suspension of the rules are willing to vote for it, but we want the opportunity to amend it. If given this opportunity, I believe the House will work its will and perfect this legislation. In those circumstances I have no doubt in my own mind about the result.

As far as I am personally concerned, and I participated, as did my colleagues, in the work of this committee, I approve of the work that has been done. But in regard to the junior ROTC program,

considering its character and the many social facets of this problem, it seems to me exceedingly important that if we adopt it, we do it in a way which will insure that all young Americans throughout the United States who wish to participate in this program can do so wherever an active junior ROTC unit exists.

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

Mr. COHELAN. Yes. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRAY. Was there any objection voiced in the committee to any facet of this final version of the bill except that it did not include the so-called Powell amendment.

Mr. COHELAN. As far as I know, the gentleman is correct. However, as you know, one of our colleagues who has already spoken, the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON], raised some very interesting questions about the Holloway plan.

Mr. BRAY. I recall and I just want to bring attention to the fact that the minority views say:

This legislation is good legislation which should be made better legislation.

It then went ahead to another matter which was the only other matter brought out.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to spending an additional \$25 million for a widely expanded high school ROTC. In fact, at the cost, I have grave doubts about any high school ROTC. I favor college ROTC. I find from reading the committee report that the civilian heads of the Pentagon are opposed to this bill. Apparently the bill's support comes from the military. As a matter of simple priorities within the budget we should not consider this expenditure. It is enough that this bill beeps up to some extent the college ROTC program. I would support that. But no amendments are permitted to this bill. In addition, I should like to note, there are many aspects of high school education in this country that needs support; this does not include their military aspects. It is too bad that the Pentagon civilian chiefs, in their letter to the committee, did not say exactly what their opinion is of this bill. It is pretty clear, however, that they think very little of it.

This has been an interesting debate, Mr. Speaker, but all too brief. Let us have this bill under a rule where further debate can be had and amendments offered. I should also like to have a clearer statement from the Pentagon. As it stands, Mr. Speaker, I shall vote against H.R. 9124.

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. Speaker, in closing I do want to take a few moments to pay tribute to my devoted friend from New York, of whom I am very fond. If I had the gift of words that he has and the ability to paint a word picture that he has painted, I would be very happy. However, I presume he is talking about some things I have read about on the Mississippi River in the old days, not

only in New Orleans, La., but a little higher up. However, his knowledge of this amazed me. I know it takes one to catch one. There is hardly a day that passes by in the committee when my good friend does not come up to me and say, "Eddie, when are you taking me to New Orleans?" I will promise to take him down there to visit the place at any time the opportunity presents itself, but I am amazed at his statement today. I thought he was interested in our cathedrals, in our battlegrounds, in our historic monuments and, yes, even in the cemeteries which are showplaces in New Orleans. But then he talks about Bourbon Street. I must promise him, if he does come to New Orleans, I will talk to some of my friends who are familiar with Bourbon Street, and I am sure they will give me cards of introduction, although I must say that it is just before an election down there. I am told that we have some of the greatest artistry there that this country has ever shown. I am sure he is going to be interested in the art, but during these seasonal procedures, I am told they drape the statues down there more than at other times. I do not know whether that will delay his visit or not, but I shall call on him.

Mr. Speaker, nobody is dealing a crooked deck around here. I am sure my friend did not mean to say that, having in mind the rules under which we operate here in the House. I am afraid that he has been suffocated through the saturation of frustration. When I was his age in the House I suffered from that same disease and I got a very good lesson by no one less than the distinguished teacher of "Vinson College." I learned from him and if my friend is around here a little while, he too will learn from the history of the committee.

I do not think there is anything dishonest or devious about this procedure. I do not think that every Member who stood up today and moved to suspend the rules and pass a bill was devious. Remember, it takes two-thirds of the Members present and voting to pass this bill. And let me say this to the House, Mr. Speaker. If this bill does not pass here today under suspension of the rules it means that the ROTC program can be thrown out of the window next year. It can be destroyed, as was evidenced already when the Department of Defense did attempt to destroy the high school program. It was only through the introduction of this legislation by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY] and myself that we blocked it. An attempt has been made to destroy the 4-year senior program. We want to get along with our business. We want to get this legislation out. This admittedly is a good piece of legislation according to the consensus of the gentlemen who have spoken here today in opposition to this procedure. The procedure which I have attempted to follow in bringing this bill up under suspension of the rules was designed to expedite congressional action on this very important legislation and was not intended to preclude House discussion of the merits of this bill.

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

Mr. HEBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRAY. Was there any evidence before the committee that there is any high school in the United States that has a junior ROTC program where the colored members are refused entrance into that program?

Mr. HEBERT. Not only was it not brought before the committee, but it was not even discussed. If the gentlemen who have spoken against this bill will take the time to read it—and apparently they have either failed to read the bill or deliberately misread it—they will see that with respect to the junior ROTC program, the Secretary of each military department is authorized to establish the program "under regulations prescribed by him."

This language appears on page 3, line 16, of the bill.

So also with respect to the senior ROTC program, included on page 8, line 7, is language which specifically provides that the program will be administered "under regulations prescribed by the President."

Any objective reading of this bill, therefore, indicates that there is no necessity for injecting the question of civil rights into this legislation in the form of an amendment as discussed by the gentleman from New York. I am certain that every Member of this body will agree with me that no one in the executive branch, including the President of the United States, is about to issue regulations governing the administration of the ROTC program which will violate the law of the land.

In short, there is full protection in this legislation for safeguarding every individual's civil rights. But, more importantly, I do not think this issue should be raised in this legislation. I do not understand the purpose of the gentleman from New York's action. He knows as well as every other Member of this body that positive legislation respecting the issue of civil rights in public education is contained in title IV of the bill reported out by the House Judiciary Committee. We should handle that issue when that legislation is being considered by the House and not attempt to drag a red herring into the debate on the merits of this bill.

Mr. BRAY. Was there any objection voiced by any member of the subcommittee or was there any opposition to this bill except just before the vote when the Powell amendment was brought up?

Mr. HEBERT. I was put on notice that it would be offered. I thought the gentleman from New York was being facetious. I told him at the time it was a move to kill the bill. He said it was not, when he knew it was.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HEBERT] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 9124.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STRATTON) there were—ayes 82, noes 44.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 176, nays 154, not voting 104, as follows:

[Roll No. 211]

YEAS—176

Abbott	Garmatz	Pepper
Abernethy	Gary	Perkins
Adair	Gathings	Pilcher
Albert	Gonzalez	Pirnie
Anderson	Grant	Poage
Andrews, Ala.	Griffiths	Poff
Arends	Grover	Pool
Ashmore	Gubser	Purcell
Aspinall	Gurney	Quile
Avery	Hagan, Ga.	Quillen
Ayres	Haley	Rhodes, Ariz.
Baker	Halleck	Riehlman
Baring	Hardy	Rivers, S.C.
Bass	Harvey, Mich.	Roberts, Tex.
Bates	Hébert	Rogers, Colo.
Battin	Hemphill	Rogers, Fla.
Beckworth	Henderson	Roudebush
Belcher	Herlong	Ryan, Mich.
Bell	Horton	St. George
Bennett, Fla.	Hosmer	Saylor
Boggs	Huddleston	Schadeberg
Bolton	Hull	Schwengel
Frances P.	Jarman	Scott
Bow	Johnson, Calif.	Secrest
Bray	Johnson, Wis.	Selden
Brook	Jonas	Sickles
Bromwell	Jones, Ala.	Slack
Brotzman	Jones, Mo.	Smith, Va.
Broyhill, N.C.	Keith	Snyder
Broyhill, Va.	Kilgore	Springer
Bruce	Knox	Stafford
Burkhalter	Kornegay	Steed
Burleson	Landrum	Stephens
Burton	Langen	Stinson
Cannon	Lankford	Stubbfield
Casey	Lipscomb	Sullivan
Cederberg	Lloyd	Taylor
Chamberlain	McCulloch	Teague, Tex.
Chenoweth	McFall	Thomas
Clausen	McIntire	Thomson, Wis.
Don H.	McMillan	Tollefson
Cleveland	MacGregor	Tuck
Cooley	Mahon	Tupper
Corman	Marsh	Vinson
Cramer	Martin, Calif.	Waggoner
Davis, Ga.	May	Watts
Dawson	Miller, N.Y.	Weltner
Downing	Montoya	Wharton
Edmondson	Moore	White
Elliott	Morris	Whitener
Everett	Morrison	Wickersham
Evins	Murphy, Ill.	Williams
Fallon	Natcher	Willis
Fisher	Nelsen	Wilson, Bob
Flynt	Norblad	Wilson, Ind.
Ford	O'Konski	Wright
Foreman	Osmer	Wyman
Forrester	Ostertag	Young
Fountain	Patman	Zablocki
Friedel	Pelly	

NAYS—154

Abele	Cunningham	Gialmo
Addabbo	Curtin	Gilbert
Alger	Curtis	Gill
Auchincloss	Dague	Goodell
Baldwin	Daniels	Gray
Barrett	Delaney	Green, Oreg.
Barry	Dent	Green, Pa.
Beermann	Denton	Griffin
Berry	Derounian	Gross
Blatnik	Derwinski	Hagen, Calif.
Boland	Dingell	Halpern
Brademas	Dole	Hanna
Broomfield	Donohue	Hansen
Brown, Calif.	Duncan	Harding
Burke	Edwards	Harsha
Byrne, Pa.	Ellsworth	Hawkins
Cameron	Feighan	Hays
Carey	Findley	Healey
Clancy	Finnegan	Hechler
Clark	Flood	Hoffman
Clawson, Del	Fogarty	Hollifield
Cohelan	Fraser	Holland
Collier	Fulton, Pa.	Hutchinson
Conte	Gallagher	Joelson

Karsten	Morgan	Ryan, N.Y.
Karth	Morse	Schneebell
Kastenmeier	Morton	Schweiker
Kee	Nedzi	Senner
King, Calif.	Nix	Short
King, N.Y.	O'Hara, Ill.	Shriver
Kirwan	O'Hara, Mich.	Sisk
Kunkel	Olsen, Mont.	Skubitz
Kyl	Olson, Minn.	Staggers
Laird	Patten	Stratton
Latta	Philbin	Taft
Leggett	Pike	Talcott
Libonati	Pillion	Teague, Calif.
Lindsay	Powell	Thompson, N.J.
Long, Md.	Price	Toll
McClary	Randall	Udall
McDade	Reid, Ill.	Ullman
Macdonald	Reid, N.Y.	Utt
Madden	Reifel	Van Deerlin
Martin, Mass.	Reuss	Vanik
Mathias	Rhodes, Pa.	Wallhauser
Meader	Rich	Weaver
Michel	Rodino	Westland
Miller, Calif.	Rooney, N.Y.	Whalley
Minish	Rostenkowski	Wyder
Minsall	Roush	Younger
Monagan	Roybal	
Moorhead	Rumsfeld	

NOT VOTING—104

Andrews	Goodling	Passman
N. Dak.	Grabowski	Pucinski
Ashbrook	Hall	Rains
Ashley	Harris	Rivers, Alaska
Becker	Harrison	Roberts, Ala.
Bennett, Mich.	Harvey, Ind.	Robison
Betts	Hoeven	Rogers, Tex.
Bolling	Horan	Rooney, Pa.
Bolton	Ichord	Roosevelt
Oliver P.	Jennings	Rosenthal
Bonner	Jensen	St. Germain
Brooks	Johansen	St. Onge
Brown, Ohio	Johnson, Pa.	Schenck
Buckley	Kelly	Shelley
Byrnes, Wis.	Keogh	Sheppard
Cahill	Kilburn	Shipley
Celler	Kluczynski	Sibal
Chelf	Lennon	Sikes
Colmer	Lesinski	Siler
Corbett	Long, La.	Smith, Calif.
Daddario	McDowell	Smith, Iowa
Davis, Tenn.	McLoskey	Staebler
Devine	Maillard	Thompson, La.
Diggs	Martin, Nebr.	Thompson, Tex.
Dorn	Matsunaga	Thornberry
Dowdy	Matthews	Trimble
Dulski	Milliken	Tuten
Dwyer	Mills	Van Pelt
Farbstein	Mosher	Watson
Fascell	Moss	Whitten
Fino	Multer	Widnall
Frelinghuysen	Murphy, N.Y.	Wilson
Fulton, Tenn.	Murray	Charles H.
Fuqua	O'Brien, Ill.	Winstead
Gibbons	O'Brien, N.Y.	
Glenn	O'Neill	

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Harris and Mr. Jennings for, with Mr. Grabowski against.

Mr. Passman and Mr. Rains for, with Mr. Rosenthal against.

Mr. Rogers of Texas and Mr. Sikes for, with Mr. Murphy of New York against.

Mr. Thompson of Texas and Mr. Chelf for, with Mr. Kluczynski against.

Mr. Mills and Mr. Brooks for, with Mrs. Kelly against.

Mr. Rivers of Alaska and Mr. Lennon for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Gibbons and Mr. Long of Louisiana for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. McLoskey and Mr. Hall for, with Mrs. Dwyer against.

Mr. Dorn and Mr. Thompson of Louisiana for, with Mr. St. Onge against.

Mr. Winstead and Mr. Colmer for, with Mr. Multer against.

Mr. Van Pelt and Mr. Hoeven for, with Mr. Widnall against.

Mr. Whitten and Mr. Davis of Tennessee for, with Mr. Roosevelt against.

Mr. Fulton of Tennessee and Mr. Fuqua for, with Mr. O'Neill against.

Mr. Bonner and Mr. Dowdy for, with Mr. Staebler against.

Mr. Matthews and Mr. Murray for, with Mr. Daddario against.

Mr. Roberts of Alabama and Mr. Thornberry for, with Mr. Farbstein against.

Mr. Trimble and Mr. Watson for, with Mr. Shipley against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Ashley with Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. O'Brien of New York with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton.

Mr. Shelley with Mr. Maillard.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Brown.

Mr. Dulski with Mr. Robison.

Mr. Digs with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Becker.

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Johansen.

Mr. Ichord with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.

Mr. McDowell with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Horan.

Mr. Moss with Mr. Siball.

Mr. Pucinski with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. St. Germain with Mr. Siler.

Mr. Tuten with Mr. Cahill.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Smith of Colorado.

Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Betts.

Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Glenn.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Messrs. FLOOD, BARRY, and BEER-MANN changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill H.R. 9124.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF CIVIL SERVICE APPOINTMENT REQUIREMENT

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 10) to extend the apportionment requirement in the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, to temporary summer employment, and for other purposes, with a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the sixth paragraph of section 2 of the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, as amended (5 U.S.C. 633), providing for the apportionment of appointments in the competitive civil service, is amended by inserting "(including appointments to temporary employment of more than thirty days in the period from May 1 through September 30 of each year, except appointments to the postal field service and appointments of an emergency nature)" immediately following "appointments to the public service aforesaid".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH].

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include data, tables, and other extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I do not know that it is important to take a lot of time on this legislation. It came before the House on October 1, 1962. There was a record vote on it. It passed by more than 300 votes to 19, and it is not materially changed.

H.R. 10, my bill, is rather similar to H.R. 3741 by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SLACK], to H.R. 2863 by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON], H.R. 3115 by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS], and H.R. 3501 by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI].

Mr. Speaker, in 1883 there was an apportionment act passed by Congress that pertains to Federal employment. It, however, does not refer to and it is not applicable to summer employment.

Mr. Speaker, summer employment has become quite an important budget item as Members of the House have probably observed. For example, in 1963 the Department of the Army spent about \$6 million on summer jobs. The Space Agency spent about \$1 million on summer jobs.

It must be borne in mind that this bill applies only to the Nation's Capital. We have never been privileged to make a thorough study of any area other than the Nation's Capital. I would like to have such study made and I have suggested that the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service do so. But we have not had much interest in expanding this study and I regret this so very much.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] made a very timely statement when he appeared before the committee in behalf of H.R. 2863. The gentleman said this:

It is indeed a great inspiration and a wonderful experience for a young person to be able to come to Washington during the summer and have the opportunity to work in the Federal service. This experience should not be limited in large part, as it is now, to young people living close to Washington. It should be made available to every deserving young person throughout the country.

That is true, particularly if we believe in the merit system. An amendment has been mentioned. The amendment I have offered to the bill that was passed recently, and was not in the legislation last year, requires the Civil Service Commission to conduct a competitive examination which means that boys and girls throughout the Nation can take this competitive examination and have an opportunity to come here to work. I might say even before I introduced the amendment, the chairman of the Civil Service Commission, Mr. John Macy,

announced that he expects to hold such an examination. But it must be borne in mind, and I want to emphasize this, until the House of Representatives passed legislation last October no such announcement had been forthcoming. There seemed to be in fact no interest whatsoever in doing so.

I say again, this is a simple bill that extends the apportionment act we have had since 1883 to summer employment. Some people try to pretend the present system has worked well. I have placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some tables I was able to work up through figures secured from the Departments. Out of 2,300 summer jobs in 1959 here in Washington, Virginia had 546, Maryland 628, and to use my own State of Texas, we had 14, even though we are considerably larger than either of the States mentioned insofar as our population is concerned.

I do not know whether competition did that or not. If it did, it certainly came out in a one-sided way.

I want to say that I do not blame the Members who live close by for being interested in trying to keep these jobs for the boys and girls of this area. At the same time, I feel as though the rest of us from other sections of the United States who have boys and girls just as capable should have a fighting chance at least to do summer work for the Government in the Washington area.

I want to concur in what the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] had to say. By the way, I wish each of you would get a copy of the report which accompanies this bill today, because it is a fair and representative one in my opinion.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] is the only one who signed the minority report. The vote in the committee was 14 to 3. He said:

I do not ask preference for these young people—

About the Washington area he is talking—

I ask only that they be given an equal opportunity with the other citizens and that they be not penalized because they happen to live here. I only wish to see them have the opportunity to compete on the basis of merit for summer employment.

The bill I have offered, H.R. 10, would do only that, plus having in it the apportionment provision and I think we can all concur in that objective.

I quote a paragraph from a column written by Mr. John Cramer which appeared October 24, 1963, in the Washington Daily News:

No one can defend past handling of summer jobs here. Too many have been handed out as plums for the sons of and daughters of agency big wheels and other favorites.

There are some fairly sizable sums of money spent by some departments for summer employment.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
November 6, 1963.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letter which has been referred to my

office concerning the amount of funds set aside and spent for summer jobs during the past summer.

The budgeting and funding procedures utilized by the Department of the Army do not permit the separation of funds for summer hire personnel. Also, the accounting system utilized by this service does not permit identification of costs of summer hire personnel. Therefore, the actual amount of funds utilized for summer hire in calendar year 1963 is not available.

A review of actions taken by Headquarters, Department of the Army, in authorizing temporary employment in calendar year 1963 shows that total employment was authorized as follows: 591 for April; 2,271 for May; 5,407 for June; 5,334 for July; 4,577 for August; 2,529 for September; and 178 for October. Assuming strengths in the same numbers, the total man-years would approximate 1,740 which when multiplied by an estimated cost per man-year of \$4,000 would aggregate a total cost of \$6,960,000.

Sincerely,

H. T. LaCROSSE,
Deputy Director of Army Budget, OCA.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND
SPACE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., November 20, 1963.
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: The following information supplements our previous correspondence to you relative to your question as to the amount of money NASA had set aside to spend for summer jobs during the summer of 1963 and the actual amount NASA spent for this purpose.

NASA did not specifically set aside funds for the summer student program during the summer of 1963. However, during the planning of the program, it was estimated that the cost would be \$1,027,500. Analysis of the actual expenditures revealed that the total cost amount for the program came to \$976,125.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD L. CALLAGHAN,
Assistant Administrator for Legislative
Affairs.

At least one agency used no summer employees in 1963.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Washington, D.C.
The Honorable LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This report is in response to your letter of May 4, 1963, concerning summer employment and to which I gave you an interim reply on May 8, 1963. This agency hired no summer employees in 1963.

If I may be of further assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
Director.

I quote the pertinent part of an article which appeared in the Washington Post on April 9, 1963. It was written by Mr. Jerry Klutetz.

Chairman John W. Macy also announced that CSC is developing plans for a nationwide competitive exam that would be used to fill summer jobs in 1964. This would be the first time for such a test and it would discourage both nepotism and partisan political considerations.

I include the two tables I have referred to.

Temporary employees, summer 1962—A tabulation of States of residence of temporary summer employees of the Federal agencies in the Washington, D.C., area, based upon replies to Representative Beckworth's inquiry

	Summary	Air Force	Navy ¹	Office of the Secretary	Area Redevelopment Administration	Business and Defense Services Administration	Bureau of the Census	Coast and Geodetic Survey	Bureau of International Programs	Maritime Administration	Patent Office	Bureau of Public Roads	Bureau of Standards	Weather Bureau	Comptroller General	Bureau of Engraving and Printing	Federal Communications Commission	Federal Power Commission	Federal Trade Commission	Government Printing Office	Post Office Department	State Department
Alabama	2																					2
Alaska																						
Arizona	4		1																			3
Arkansas	22	1		2	1		2						2		2		1		1		1	5
California	8	2		1		2							1								1	2
Colorado	6												1						1			2
Connecticut	2	1																				
Delaware	8	1				1	1				1		2	2								
Florida	4	1									1		1									
Georgia																						
Hawaii	1																					1
Idaho	12	1	2	2	1		1								1				1			4
Illinois	7	2																	1		1	3
Indiana	5	1				1	1															2
Iowa	6																					3
Kansas	4		2										3									
Kentucky	5	1	1			1					1		1						1			1
Louisiana	3							1														
Maine	812	75	325	32	10	21	30	16	9	8	19	28	43	20	9	1	36	23	3	24	36	44
Maryland	17	1	4	1	1	1	1		1			1					1				1	2
Massachusetts	13		5								2	1							2			
Michigan	2																					
Minnesota	1																					
Mississippi	6	2				1					1											2
Missouri	4																					
Montana																						
Nebraska	4		1		1								2									
Nevada	1																					
New Hampshire	19		1	1	1				1		1		4				1		4		1	4
New Jersey	2												1									1
New Mexico	42	3	4	2		1	4				5	2	8				2		3		1	7
New York	17		3	3	1		7				3	1										2
North Carolina	3																					
North Dakota	25	2	2	1		2	2	1					7						2			6
Ohio	1																					
Oklahoma	2																					
Oregon	34	2	5	1		1	2	1	1		6	1	6	1								7
Pennsylvania	3	2																				1
Rhode Island	4		2																	1		1
South Carolina	2																					
South Dakota	6		3																			
Tennessee	14	1		3							3		2									6
Texas	5			2							2	1							1			
Utah	655	106	152	27	9	18	3	23	7	8	25	34	27	31	5	5	39	23	3	6	41	63
Vermont	1																					1
Virginia	3	1		1															1			
Washington	6					1					1											3
West Virginia																						
Wisconsin	536	36	164	22	9	8	19	6	3	3	32	13	32	16	6		29	26	4	12	25	71
Wyoming	2,335	242	679	103	37	61	75	49	23	19	105	84	145	71	22	6	109	72	29	42	108	254
District of Columbia	611																					
Summary	2,946																					
Agriculture ²																						
Total																						

¹ Navy Department specifically notes that permanent home addresses are listed only if local address is not available. Navy list includes 64 employees with no address, local or permanent. They are not in the table.

² Department of Agriculture lists 611 employees as summer temporaries. It does not, however, list any local address or State of residence. These employees are not incorporated in the table.

NOTE.—In some instances the replies did not specify whether the employee's address was his temporary summer address or his permanent residence.

Replies were received but no data were supplied by Office, Secretary of Defense; Department of the Army; Atomic Energy Commission; Central Intelligence Agency; Department of Commerce; Department of Interior; and National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Source: Frederick L. Scott, History and Government Division, Legislative Reference Service, Sept. 4, 1962.

Summary of temporary employment in selected Government agencies, summer, 1959

States	Summary	General Accounting Office ¹	The Library of Congress	Department of Agriculture ²	Department of Commerce ³	Department of Defense ⁴	Department of the Air Force ⁵	Department of the Army ⁶	Department of the Navy ⁷	Department of Health, Education, and Welfare ⁸	Department of the Interior ⁹	Department of Labor ¹⁰	Department of State ¹¹	Department of the Treasury ¹²	Atomic Energy Commission ¹³	Civil Service Commission ¹⁴	Federal Communications Commission ¹⁵	Federal Power Commission ¹⁶	Federal Trade Commission ¹⁷	Interstate Commerce Commission ¹⁸	National Aeronautics and Space Administration ¹⁹	National Science Foundation ²⁰	Securities and Exchange Commission ²¹	Veterans' Administration ²²
Alabama	3				2				1															
Arizona	6				4					1														
Arkansas	37		3	1		1																		
California	37	2		2																				
Colorado	9				34					1	1			21										1
Connecticut	3		1		5					1	1				1									
Delaware	490				53																			
Dist. of Columbia	13	1	30	48	9	5	3	82	23	164	43	1	19	19								5		1
Florida	4																							
Georgia	13																							
Idaho	13				1					2	1	1			11									

See footnotes at end of table.

Summary of temporary employment in selected Government agencies, summer, 1959—Continued

States	Summary	General Accounting Office ¹	The Library of Congress ²	Department of Agriculture ³	Department of Commerce ⁴	Department of Defense ⁵	Department of the Air Force ⁶	Department of the Army ⁷	Department of the Navy ⁸	Department of Health, Education, and Welfare ⁹	Department of the Interior ¹⁰	Department of Labor ¹¹	Department of State ¹²	Department of the Treasury ¹³	Atomic Energy Commission ¹⁴	Civil Service Commission ¹⁵	Federal Communications Commission ¹⁶	Federal Power Commission ¹⁷	Federal Trade Commission ¹⁸	Interstate Commerce Commission ¹⁹	National Aeronautics and Space Administration ²⁰	National Science Foundation ²¹	Securities and Exchange Commission ²²	Veterans' Administration ²³
Illinois	33			2	13			2	6	2	3			4								1		
Indiana	14				5			2	4	1		1												2
Iowa	10		1		5		1		2	1														
Kansas	10		1		7				1	1														
Kentucky	9				2				2	3				1		1								
Louisiana	5								1					2										
Maine	2				2																			
Maryland	628	6	16	88	80	1	4	80	33	208	34	2	17	23		5	15	1	2			2	4	5
Massachusetts	54	1	1	1	21			10	10	8	1	2		1						1			2	2
Michigan	25		2		3			2	8	3	1	2	1					1						1
Minnesota	4			1	2					1														
Mississippi	5		1		2			2																
Missouri	13		1		5			2	1	2		1											1	
Montana	2							1																
Nebraska	9			2	6						1													
Nevada	1				1																			
New Hampshire	6				2					1		2											1	
New Jersey	24		1		6			2	3	1	1			2	8									
New Mexico																								
New York	110		4	7	28		1	11	9	11	4	1	2	2	28						1	2		24
North Carolina	26		2	1	9			5	4	2				3										
North Dakota	1			1																				
Ohio	16	1	2		6			2			3		1											1
Oklahoma	4			1	3																			
Oregon	6				6																			
Pennsylvania	57	1	2		22	1		9	4	4	1	1		4	4							1		3
Rhode Island	3				3																			
South Carolina	4		1		1				2															
South Dakota	4		1	1	2																			
Tennessee	12		1		8			1	1	1				1										
Texas	14	2			10	1		1																1
Utah	12		1		7										2		1							
Vermont																								
Virginia	546	2	13	88	77	17	7	137	30	61	57	1	16	15			12	2		4		1	1	5
Washington	9	1			4					2					1									
West Virginia	5		2		1					1														
Wisconsin	10		1	1	7							1												
Wyoming	2				1																			1
Alaska					2																			
Hawaii																								
Puerto Rico	1									1														
Virgin Islands																								
Foreign	3		3																					
Total number of employees	2,321	17	93	245	481	28	15	312	146	485	152	16	56	100	50	8	40	5	2	10	4	14	6	36

¹ General Accounting Office, letter of June 1, 1959. The figures given represent applicants who had been chosen or tentatively chosen to fill summer jobs in 1959.

² The Library of Congress, letter of Mar. 1, 1961. The figures given represent temporary employees hired for varying lengths of time up to a year, from May 15 to Aug. 15, 1959. The Library has no special program of summer employment.

³ Department of Agriculture, letter of June 16, 1959. The figures stated represent temporary jobs in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area which were to be filled by students during the summer, 1959.

⁴ Department of Commerce, letter of June 18, 1959. The figures given represent student assistants and student trainees hired for the summer, 1959.

⁵ Department of Defense, letter of June 10, 1959. The figures given represent students selected for summer employment in 1959 by the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

⁶ Department of the Air Force, letter of June 23, 1959. The figures given represent student trainees hired by the Department of the Air Force Headquarters for the summer, 1959.

⁷ Department of the Army, letter of June 15, 1959. The figures stated here represent students who had been selected or tentatively selected for temporary appointments for the summer, 1959, with the Department of the Army.

⁸ Department of the Navy, letter of May 19, 1959. The figures given represent students majoring in engineering or the physical sciences who were prospective employees of the Navy Department for the summer, 1959.

⁹ Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, letter of Aug. 19, 1959. The figures given represent students employed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the summer, 1959.

¹⁰ Department of the Interior, letter of July 21, 1959. The figures stated represent students who were appointed to temporary jobs in the Department of the Interior in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area for the summer, 1959.

¹¹ Department of Labor, letter of June 1, 1959. The figures stated include temporary student assistants who were selected for positions with the Department of Labor for summer, 1959.

¹² Department of State, letter of June 4, 1959. The figures given represent temporary employees and students whom the Department of State had hired or planned to hire for typing, stenographic, and student assistant positions for summer, 1959.

¹³ Department of the Treasury, letter of June 23, 1959. The figures given include all summer appointments of students, regardless of the temporary or nontemporary nature of the jobs, themselves, for 1959.

¹⁴ Atomic Energy Commission, letter of June 15, 1959. The figures given include all temporary summer appointments to the entire Atomic Energy Commission for summer, 1959.

¹⁵ Civil Service Commission, letter of June 9, 1959. The figures given indicate students occupying temporary positions with the Civil Service Commission for summer, 1959.

¹⁶ Federal Communications Commission, letter of June 5, 1959. The figures given represent students temporarily employed by the Federal Communications Commission for summer, 1959.

¹⁷ Federal Power Commission, letter of June 1, 1959. The figures given include individuals who were employed on a temporary basis as student assistants, for summer, 1959.

¹⁸ Federal Trade Commission, letter of May 28, 1959. The figures given indicate students holding temporary summer jobs as of May 28, 1959.

¹⁹ Interstate Commerce Commission, letter of June 1, 1959. The figures listed include tentative selections of individuals made to fill temporary typing and stenographic positions with the Interstate Commerce Commission for summer, 1959.

²⁰ National Aeronautics and Space Administration, letter of June 10, 1959. The figures given include summer appointments for 1959 with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

²¹ National Science Foundation, letter of June 3, 1959. The figures given include temporary stenographic, typing, and student trainee positions that were to be filled primarily by students during the summer, 1959.

²² Securities and Exchange Commission, letter of June 3, 1959. The figures given include students who were selected for participation in the student assistant program of the Securities and Exchange Commission for summer, 1959.

²³ Veterans' Administration, letter of June 17, 1959. The figures given include temporary summer jobs filled by students in the Central Office Headquarters and the Medical Division of the Veterans' Benefits Office for summer, 1959.

Compiled by Sandra D. Worthen, History and Government Division, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, Mar. 17, 1961.

Senator SALTONSTALL has done considerable work in connection with obtaining information about summer employment. I include a letter he wrote me May 10, 1963.

Senate Document No. 9, 88th Congress, 1st session, has considerable information that was made possible through the efforts of Senator SALTONSTALL.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
May 10, 1963.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Room 1307, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: The material from which the report was printed at my request was collected for me by the Library of Congress by direction of Miss Helen

Miller. It is now on file at the Government Printing Office.

The information requested from the various agencies did not include the hometown of the summer employee. Where applicable, it did include the college which he attended. The Senate Document No. 9 indicates jobs by agency rather than by State where located, but the location could be consolidated by going through it on a State-by-State basis.

Senate Document No. 9 is jobs that were actually filled in the summer of 1961 for anywhere from a few weeks to the entire summer.

I hope that this is helpful to you and if you want to send someone to study the basic document at the Government Printing Office, I am sure that they would cooperate.

Sincerely,

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
U.S. Senator.

P.S.—I understand the Government Printing Office has now returned the material to the Library of Congress.

I enclose a table from the Library of Congress:

Number of accredited institutions of higher education, by State (as listed in U.S. Office of Education, Education Directory, pt. 3)

	Accredited	Number of institutions of higher education in State
Alabama.....	23	26
Alaska.....	1	3
Arizona.....	4	7
Arkansas.....	15	19
California.....	154	169
Colorado.....	18	22
Connecticut.....	25	32
Delaware.....	4	4
Florida.....	23	45
Georgia.....	43	46
Hawaii.....	4	4
Idaho.....	7	8
Illinois.....	83	112
Indiana.....	32	41
Iowa.....	36	51
Kansas.....	29	45
Kentucky.....	36	35
Louisiana.....	19	21
Maine.....	10	22
Maryland.....	30	44
Massachusetts.....	72	96
Michigan.....	48	67
Minnesota.....	34	43
Mississippi.....	30	45
Missouri.....	50	63
Montana.....	9	11
Nebraska.....	17	23
Nevada.....	1	1
New Hampshire.....	8	12
New Jersey.....	20	38
New Mexico.....	8	9
New York.....	133	183
North Carolina.....	55	60
North Dakota.....	8	14
Ohio.....	63	70
Oklahoma.....	22	34
Oregon.....	22	27
Pennsylvania.....	109	129
Rhode Island.....	8	12
South Carolina.....	27	30
South Dakota.....	13	16
Tennessee.....	42	46
Texas.....	81	96
Utah.....	8	8
Vermont.....	12	16
Virginia.....	40	46
Washington.....	27	29
West Virginia.....	18	20
Wisconsin.....	32	62
Wyoming.....	2	6
Total.....	1,615	2,069

I enclose some figures that apparently came about by the studies of some employees of the Library of Congress:

Institutions of higher education attended by students hired in summer 1961 by the Federal Government for nonclerical jobs

ALABAMA, 213		
Alabama College.....	3	
Alabama Polytechnic Institute.....	5	
University of Alabama.....	72	
Auburn University.....	100	
Birmingham-Southern College.....	2	
Florence State College.....	10	
Howard College.....	1	
Huntingdon College.....	1	
Judson College.....	1	
St. Bernard College.....	1	
Snead Junior College.....	3	
Spring Hill College.....	2	

Institutions of higher education attended by students hired in summer 1961 by the Federal Government for nonclerical jobs—Continued

Talladega College.....	1
Troy State College.....	5
Tuskegee Institute.....	6

ALASKA, 23

University of Alaska.....	23
---------------------------	----

ARIZONA, 213

Arizona State College.....	56
Arizona State University.....	58
University of Arizona.....	91
East Arizona Junior College.....	1
Grand Canyon College.....	1
Phoenix College.....	5
Sante Fe College.....	1

ARKANSAS, 96

Arkansas Agricultural and Mechanical College.....	35
Arkansas Polytechnic College.....	2
Arkansas State College.....	5
Arkansas State Teachers College.....	1
University of Arkansas.....	41
Fort Smith Junior College.....	1
Harding College.....	2
Hendrix College.....	2
Little Rock University.....	2
Southern State College.....	5

CALIFORNIA, 1,388

Allan Hancock Junior College.....	1
American River Junior College.....	4
Antelope Valley Junior College.....	2
Bakersfield College.....	3
Cabrillo College.....	2
California Institute of Technology.....	27
California State Polytechnic College.....	77
University of California.....	376
Chaffey College.....	10
Chico State College.....	51
Citrus Junior College.....	2
Claremont Men's College.....	4
Compton District Junior College.....	4
Contra Costa Junior College.....	7
Diablo Valley College.....	6
East Los Angeles College.....	1
East Los Angeles Junior College.....	3
El Camino College.....	7
Foothill College.....	2
Fresno City College.....	6
Fresno State College.....	40
Fullerton Junior College.....	3
Glendale College.....	3
Hartnell College.....	3
Harvey Mudd College.....	7
Head Engineering College.....	1
Humboldt State College.....	101
Immaculate Heart College.....	1
La Sierra College.....	1
La Verne College.....	5
Lassen Junior College.....	4
Long Beach City College.....	2
Long Beach State College.....	10
Los Angeles City College.....	3
Los Angeles State College of Applied Arts and Sciences.....	13
Los Angeles Trade-Technical Junior College.....	1
Los Angeles Valley Junior College.....	6
Loyola University of Los Angeles.....	1
College of Marin.....	5
College of Medical Evangelists.....	1
Menlo College.....	1
Modesto Junior College.....	15
Monterey Peninsula College.....	2
Mount St. Mary's College.....	5
Mount San Antonio College.....	1
Napa College.....	2
Northrop Institute of Technology.....	2
Occidental College.....	2
Oceanside-Carlsbad College.....	1
Orange Coast College.....	7
College of the Pacific.....	4
Palomar College.....	3
Pasadena City College.....	13
Pasadena College.....	5
George Pepperdine College.....	1

Institutions of higher education attended by students hired in summer 1961 by the Federal Government for nonclerical jobs—Continued

College of Physicians and Surgeons.....	1
Pomona College.....	11
Porterville College.....	2
University of Redlands.....	5
Reedley College.....	11
Riverside City College.....	5
Sacramento City College.....	8
Sacramento State College.....	25
St. Mary's College of California.....	6
Salinas Junior College.....	1
San Bernardino Valley College.....	15
San Diego City College.....	2
San Diego State College.....	43
San Fernando Valley State College.....	2
City College of San Francisco.....	16
San Francisco College for Women.....	1
San Francisco State College.....	17
University of San Francisco.....	8
San Jose City College.....	2
San Jose State College.....	66
San Mateo, College of.....	20
Santa Barbara City College.....	7
University of Santa Clara.....	16
Santa Monica City College.....	1
Santa Rosa Junior College.....	10
Sequoias, College of the.....	3
Shasta College.....	31
Sierra College.....	22
Simpson Bible College.....	2
Siskiyou, College of the.....	11
University of Southern California.....	31
Stanford University.....	98
Stockton College.....	1
Taft College.....	7
Vallejo Junior College.....	2
Ventura College.....	7
Whittier College.....	2

COLORADO, 351

Adams State College.....	3
Colorado College.....	1
Colorado School of Mines.....	15
Colorado State College.....	7
Colorado State University.....	182
University of Colorado.....	102
University of Denver.....	11
Fort Lewis Agricultural and Mechanical College.....	9
Mesa County Junior College.....	5
Northeastern Junior College.....	2
Pueblo Junior College.....	10
Regis College.....	1
Western State College of Colorado.....	3

CONNECTICUT, 117

University of Bridgeport.....	2
University of Connecticut.....	26
Fairfield University.....	3
University of Hartford.....	1
New Haven College.....	1
Quinnipiac College.....	1
Trinity College.....	11
Wesleyan University.....	13
Yale University.....	59

DELAWARE, 22

University of Delaware.....	21
Wesley College.....	1

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, 318

American University.....	30
Catholic University of America.....	60
District of Columbia Teachers College.....	2
Dunbarton College of Holy Cross.....	1
Georgetown University.....	62
George Washington University.....	90
Howard University.....	71
Prince George's Community College.....	1
Washington Missionary College.....	1

FLORIDA, 168

Broward Junior College.....	3
Central Florida Junior College.....	1
Chipola Junior College.....	1
Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University.....	1
Florida Christian College.....	1
Florida Southern College.....	1

*Institutions of higher education attended
by students hired in summer 1961 by the
Federal Government for nonclerical jobs—
Continued*

Florida State University.....	47
University of Florida.....	80
Jacksonville University.....	1
University of Miami.....	12
Orlando Junior College.....	2
Palm Beach Junior College.....	1
Pensacola Junior College.....	6
Rollins College.....	3
St. John's River Junior College.....	1
Stetson University.....	5
University of Tampa.....	1
Washington Junior College.....	1

GEORGIA, 178

Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College.....	10
Agnes Scott College.....	5
Athens College.....	3
Berry College.....	1
Columbus College.....	1
Emory University.....	12
Georgia Institute of Technology.....	43
University of Georgia.....	79
Medical College of Georgia.....	20
Middle Georgia College.....	1
North Georgia College.....	1
Tift College.....	1
Wesleyan College.....	1

HAWAII, 24

University of Hawaii.....	24
---------------------------	----

IDAHO, 306

Boise Junior College.....	20
College of Idaho.....	5
Idaho State College.....	37
University of Idaho.....	225
North Idaho Junior College.....	9
Southern Idaho College.....	1
Northwest Nazarene College.....	1
Ricks College.....	8

ILLINOIS, 267

Augustana College.....	4
Blackburn College.....	2
Bradley University.....	15
Chicago Medical School.....	1
University of Chicago.....	25
Danville Junior College.....	1
Depaul University.....	4
Eastern Illinois State College.....	1
Eastern Illinois University.....	1
Greenville College.....	2
Illinois College.....	1
Illinois Institute of Technology.....	1
University of Illinois.....	102
Knox College.....	4
Macmurray College.....	3
Millikin University.....	1
Monticello College.....	1
Mundelein College.....	2
Northern Illinois University.....	6
Northwestern University.....	31
Principia College.....	1
Quincy College.....	1
Rockford College.....	1
Roosevelt University.....	2
Rosary College.....	1
St. Procopius College.....	1
Shimer College.....	1
Southern Illinois University.....	51

INDIANA, 264

Ball State Teachers College.....	1
Butler University.....	1
Depauw University.....	2
Earlham College.....	5
Hanover College.....	2
Indiana Central College.....	1
Indiana State Teachers College.....	2
Indiana Technical College.....	1
Indiana University.....	31
Manhattan College.....	6
Notre Dame University.....	45
Oakland City College.....	6
Purdue University.....	140
Rose Polytechnic Institute.....	5
St. Mary-in-the-Woods College.....	1

*Institutions of higher education attended
by students hired in summer 1961 by the
Federal Government for nonclerical jobs—
Continued*

Tri-State College.....	3
Valparaiso Technical Institute.....	2
Vincennes University.....	1
Wabash College.....	2
Valparaiso University.....	7

IOWA, 219

Clarinda Junior College.....	1
Cornell College.....	2
Drake University.....	6
Dubuque, University of.....	3
Fort Dodge Junior College.....	1
Graceland College.....	3
Grand View College.....	1
Grinnell College.....	5
Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts.....	3
Iowa State University of Science and Technology.....	122
State University of Iowa.....	61
Iowa Wesleyan College.....	1
Loras College.....	1
Luther College.....	1
Mary Crest College.....	1
Morningside College.....	1
Parsons College.....	1
St. Ambrose College.....	2
Simpson College.....	2
Wartburg Theological Seminary.....	1

KANSAS, 111

Baker University.....	1
Kansas State Teachers College.....	3
Kansas State College of Pittsburg.....	1
Kansas State University of Agriculture and Applied Science.....	41
University of Kansas.....	47
Pratt Junior College.....	2
Ottawa University.....	5
St. Benedict's College.....	2
Sterling College.....	1
Washburn University of Topeka.....	3
Wichita, University of.....	5

KENTUCKY, 83

Bellarmino College.....	2
Berea College.....	5
Centre College of Kentucky.....	1
Eastern Kentucky State College.....	2
Georgetown College.....	1
University of Kentucky.....	36
University of Louisville.....	22
Morehead State College.....	2
Murray State College.....	3
Pikeville College.....	1
Union College.....	4
Villa Madonna College.....	3
Western Kentucky State College.....	1

LOUISIANA, 107

Louisiana Polytechnic Institute.....	25
Louisiana State University and Agri- cultural and Mechanical College.....	55
Northeast Louisiana State College.....	2
University of Southwestern Louisiana.....	3
Tulane University of Louisiana.....	22

MAINE, 46

Bates College.....	2
Bowdoin College.....	2
Colby College.....	2
Gorham State Teachers College.....	1
University of Maine.....	39

MARYLAND, 587

Baltimore, University of.....	1
Baltimore Junior College.....	1
Charles County Junior College.....	5
Frederick Community College.....	1
Goucher College.....	6
Hartford Junior College.....	5
Hood College.....	4
Johns Hopkins University.....	73
Loyola College.....	2
Maryland State Teachers College.....	7
University of Maryland.....	433
Montgomery Junior College.....	20

*Institutions of higher education attended
by students hired in summer 1961 by the
Federal Government for nonclerical jobs—
Continued*

Morgan State College.....	5
Notre Dame of Maryland, Inc., College of.....	1
St. Mary's Seminary and University.....	2
Washington College.....	7
Western Maryland College.....	13
Hagerstown Junior College.....	1

MASSACHUSETTS, 387

American International College.....	2
Amherst College.....	10
Boston College.....	18
Boston University.....	11
Brandeis University.....	5
Durfee College of Technology.....	6
Harvard University.....	106
College of the Holy Cross.....	3
Lowell Technological Institute.....	1
Massachusetts Institute of Technology.....	95
Massachusetts State Teachers College.....	1
University of Massachusetts.....	52
Merrimack College.....	3
Mount Holyoke College.....	4
New Bedford Institute of Technology.....	1
New England Conservatory of Music.....	1
Nichols College of Business Administra- tion.....	1
Northeastern University.....	5
Radcliffe College.....	8
Smith College.....	3
Stockbridge School of Agriculture.....	1
Stonehill College.....	2
Tufts University.....	21
Western New England College.....	8
Wellesley College.....	6
Williams College.....	7
Worcester Polytechnic Institute.....	6

MICHIGAN, 283

Alma College.....	1
Andrews University.....	1
Calvin College.....	1
Central Michigan University.....	5
Detroit Institute of Technology.....	1
University of Detroit.....	9
Eastern Michigan College.....	5
Emmanuel Missionary College.....	1
Grand Rapids Junior College.....	1
Henry Ford Community College.....	1
Hope College.....	1
Kalamazoo College.....	1
Lawrence Institute of Technology.....	1
Mercy College.....	1
Michigan College of Mining and Tech- nology.....	31
Michigan State University of Agricul- ture and Applied Science.....	95
University of Michigan.....	96
Northern Michigan College.....	2
Suomi College.....	2
Wayne State University.....	15
Western Michigan University.....	12

MINNESOTA, 141

Augsburg College.....	1
Austin Junior College.....	2
Carleton College.....	5
Mankato State College.....	2
University of Minnesota.....	120
St. Cloud State College.....	1
St. Scholastica, College of.....	1
St. Olaf College.....	8
Gustavus Adolphus College.....	1

MISSISSIPPI, 160

Delaware State College.....	2
Delta State College.....	3
East Central Junior College.....	1
Hinds Junior College.....	10
Holmes Junior College.....	1
Itawamba Junior College.....	1
Mississippi Delta Junior College.....	1
Mississippi School of Mines.....	1
Mississippi Southern College.....	9
Mississippi State College.....	10
Mississippi State College for Women.....	2

*Institutions of higher education attended
by students hired in summer 1961 by the
Federal Government for nonclerical jobs—
Continued*

Mississippi State University.....	72
University of Mississippi.....	40
Perkinson Junior College.....	1
Sunflower Junior College.....	1
Southwest Mississippi Junior College.....	1

MISSOURI, 172

Central Missouri State College.....	2
Culver-Stockton College.....	2
Drury College.....	5
Joplin Junior College.....	5
Junior College of Kansas City.....	2
University of Kansas City.....	3
Kemper Military Academy.....	1
Missouri School of Mines and Metallurgy.....	42
University of Missouri.....	55
Missouri Valley College.....	2
Northeast Missouri State Teachers College.....	7
Northwest Missouri State College.....	1
Park College.....	1
St. Louis University.....	18
Southeast Missouri State College.....	1
Southwest Missouri State College.....	2
Washington University.....	21
William Jewell College.....	2

MONTANA, 353

Custer County Junior College.....	2
Eastern Montana College.....	2
College of Great Falls.....	3
Montana School of Mines.....	9
Montana State College.....	40
Montana State University.....	292
Northern Montana College.....	1
Western Montana College of Education.....	4

NEBRASKA, 76

Creighton University.....	6
Hastings College.....	5
College of St. Mary.....	1
Scottsbluff College.....	1
University of Nebraska.....	62
Nebraska Wesleyan University.....	1

NEVADA, 43

University of Nevada.....	43
---------------------------	----

NEW HAMPSHIRE, 44

Dartmouth College.....	15
University of New Hampshire.....	26
Rivier College.....	1
St. Anselm's College.....	2

NEW JERSEY, 127

Douglass College.....	2
Fairleigh Dickinson University.....	2
Jersey City State College.....	1
Monmouth College.....	11
Newark College of Engineering.....	17
Princeton University.....	36
Rider College.....	1
Rutgers, The State University.....	33
Seton Hall University.....	6
Stevens Institute of Technology.....	17
Trenton State College.....	1

NEW MEXICO, 144

Eastern New Mexico University.....	3
New Mexico College of Agriculture and Mechanical Arts.....	5
New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology.....	1
New Mexico Military Institute.....	1
New Mexico State University of Agriculture, Engineering and Science.....	68
University of New Mexico.....	58
New Mexico Western College.....	5
St. Michael's College.....	3

NEW YORK, 401

Adelphi College.....	2
Alfred University.....	1
Barnard College.....	1
College of Education at Brockport.....	1
Brooklyn College.....	5

*Institutions of higher education attended
by students hired in summer 1961 by the
Federal Government for nonclerical jobs—
Continued*

Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute.....	2
Broome Technical Community College.....	1
Buffalo University.....	10
Canisius College.....	1
Clarkson College of Technology.....	15
Colgate University.....	5
Columbia University.....	35
Cooper Union.....	11
Cornell University.....	95
Corning Community College.....	1
Downstate Medical Center.....	5
Elmira College.....	2
Fordham University.....	7
Geneseo Teachers College.....	1
Hamilton College.....	2
Hartwick College.....	1
Hobart and William Smith Colleges.....	1
Hofstra College.....	2
Hunter College.....	2
Ithaca College.....	1
Keuka College.....	1
Long Island Agriculture and Technical Institute.....	8
Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart.....	1
New York City Community College of Applied Arts and Sciences.....	21
New York Medical College.....	1
New York State College of Education.....	8
New York State College of Forestry.....	3
New York State Ranger School.....	3
State University of New York.....	22
New York University.....	22
Paul Smith's College of Arts and Sciences.....	3
College of Education at Plattsburgh.....	2
Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn.....	1
Post College.....	1
Pratt Institute.....	5
Queens College.....	2
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute.....	41
Rochester Institute of Technology.....	2
University of Rochester.....	12
St. Lawrence University.....	1
Stern College for Women.....	1
Syracuse University.....	28
Union College and University.....	6
Utica College.....	2
Vassar College.....	1
Wagner Lutheran College.....	1
Webb Institute of Naval Architecture.....	1
Yeshiva University.....	1

NORTH CAROLINA, 206

Agricultural and Technical College of North Carolina.....	1
Atlantic Christian College.....	1
Belmont Abbey College.....	1
Brevard College.....	3
Catawba College.....	3
Chowan College.....	1
Davidson College.....	1
Duke University.....	56
East Carolina College.....	3
Guilford College.....	3
Louisburg College.....	2
Lenoir-Rhyne College.....	1
Mars Hill College.....	1
Meredith College.....	1
North Carolina College at Durham.....	3
North Carolina State University.....	66
University of North Carolina.....	41
Sacred Heart Junior College and Academy.....	1
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary.....	1
Wake Forest College.....	8
Western Carolina College.....	4
Wilmington College.....	1
Wingate College.....	1

NORTH DAKOTA, 75

North Dakota School of Forestry.....	4
North Dakota State University.....	38
University of North Dakota.....	33

*Institutions of higher education attended
by students hired in summer 1961 by the
Federal Government for nonclerical jobs—
Continued*

OHIO, 323	
University of Akron.....	1
Antioch College.....	32
Ashland College.....	1
Bowling Green State University.....	5
Capital University.....	2
Case Institute of Technology.....	22
University of Cincinnati.....	16
Cleveland College.....	1
University of Dayton.....	16
Denison University.....	3
Fenn College.....	4
Hiram College.....	1
John Carroll University.....	7
Kent State University.....	6
Kenyon College.....	1
Lake Erie College.....	1
Marietta College.....	4
Miami University.....	11
College of Mount St. Joseph-on-the-Ohio.....	1
Muskingum College.....	3
Ohio State University.....	105
Ohio University.....	18
Oberlin College.....	16
Ohio Wesleyan University.....	10
Otterbein College.....	5
College of St. Mary-of-the-Springs.....	1
College of Steubenville.....	1
University of Toledo.....	5
Western College for Women.....	1
Western Reserve University.....	9
Wittenberg University.....	7
Wooster, College of.....	5
Youngstown University.....	2
OKLAHOMA, 221	
Cameron State Agricultural College.....	1
East Central State College.....	1
Eastern Oklahoma Agriculture and Mechanical College.....	3
Northeastern Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College.....	5
Northeastern State College.....	3
Northwestern State College.....	1
Oklahoma Baptist University.....	3
Oklahoma State University.....	134
University of Oklahoma.....	58
Panhandle Agricultural and Mechanical College.....	1
Poteau Community College.....	1
Southwestern State College.....	5
University of Tulsa.....	5
OREGON, 547	
Cascade College.....	1
Central Oregon College.....	2
Eastern Oregon College.....	5
Linfield College.....	5
Lewis and Clark College.....	5
Multnomah College.....	3
Oregon College of Education.....	1
Oregon State University.....	321
Oregon Technical Institute.....	36
University of Oregon.....	58
Pacific University.....	8
Portland School of Technology.....	1
Portland State College.....	58
University of Portland.....	20
Reed College.....	10
Southern Oregon College.....	3
Willamette University.....	10
PENNSYLVANIA, 641	
Albright College.....	1
Allegheny College.....	3
Bucknell University.....	12
Bryn Mawr College.....	4
Carnegie Institute of Technology.....	42
Chatham College.....	3
Chestnut Hill College.....	6
Delaware Valley College of Science and Agriculture.....	5
Dickinson College.....	9
Drexel Institute of Technology.....	23

Institutions of higher education attended by students hired in summer 1961 by the Federal Government for nonclerical jobs—Continued

Duquesne University.....	3
Franklin and Marshall College.....	5
Geneva College.....	2
Gettysburg College.....	8
Grove City College.....	5
Hahnemann Medical College and Hospital.....	4
Haverford College.....	4
Immaculata College.....	2
Juniata College.....	2
Jefferson Medical College of Philadelphia.....	5
Lafayette College.....	12
LaSalle College.....	5
Lebanon Valley College.....	1
Lehigh University.....	30
Lincoln University.....	1
Lycoming College.....	2
Mercyhurst College.....	1
Moravian College.....	1
Mount Aloysius Junior College.....	1
Muhlenberg College.....	2
Pennsylvania Military College.....	2
Pennsylvania State Teachers College.....	2
Pennsylvania State University.....	178
University of Pennsylvania.....	76
Philadelphia College of Pharmacy and Science.....	5
Philadelphia Textile Institute.....	1
University of Pittsburgh.....	47
Rosemont College.....	5
St. Francis College.....	1
St. Joseph's College.....	3
St. Vincent College.....	2
Scranton University.....	8
(East Stroudsburg) State Teachers College.....	2
(Slippery Rock) State Teachers College.....	1
(Shippensburg) State Teachers College.....	2
Susquehanna University.....	2
Swarthmore College.....	22
Temple University.....	22
Thiel College.....	2
Ursinus College.....	1
Villanova University.....	40
Washington and Jefferson College.....	1
Waynesburg College.....	2
Westminster College.....	8
Wilkes College.....	1
Wilson College.....	1

PUERTO RICO, 5

University of Puerto Rico.....	5
--------------------------------	---

RHODE ISLAND, 70

Pembroke College.....	6
Brown University.....	26
Providence College.....	1
Rhode Island School of Design.....	1
University of Rhode Island.....	35
Salve Regina College.....	1

SOUTH CAROLINA, 46

Anderson College.....	1
Benedict College.....	1
Charleston, College of.....	1
Citadel, The, Military College.....	6
Clemson Agricultural College.....	24
Furman University.....	1
Limestone College.....	1
Presbyterian College.....	1
University of South Carolina.....	8
Winthrop College.....	1
Wofford College.....	1

SOUTH DAKOTA, 72

Black Hills Teachers College.....	2
Dakota Wesleyan University.....	2
Huron College.....	1
Northern State Teachers College.....	1
South Dakota School of Mines and Technology.....	16
South Dakota State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts.....	40
State University of South Dakota.....	3

Institutions of higher education attended by students hired in summer 1961 by the Federal Government for nonclerical jobs—Continued

University of South Dakota.....	6
Southern State Teachers College.....	1
TENNESSEE, 178	
Carson-Newman College.....	8
Chattanooga, University of.....	1
Christian Brothers College.....	1
David Lipscomb College.....	3
East Tennessee State College.....	4
King College.....	3
Meharry Medical College.....	9
Memphis State University.....	5
Middle Tennessee State College.....	2
Milligan College.....	1
Peabody College for Teachers.....	1
University of the South.....	10
Southern Missionary College.....	2
Southwestern at Memphis.....	2
Tennessee Agricultural and Industrial State University.....	3
Tennessee Polytechnic Institute.....	15
University of Tennessee.....	82
Vanderbilt University.....	26

TEXAS, 343

Abilene Christian College.....	2
Allen Academy.....	1
Arlington State College.....	20
Baylor University.....	11
University of Dallas.....	2
East Texas State College.....	2
University of Houston.....	5
Lamar State College of Technology.....	2
Mary Hardin-Baylor College.....	2
McMurry College.....	1
Midwestern University.....	1
Misericordia College.....	1
North Texas State College.....	4
Pan American University.....	1
Rice University.....	22
St. Mary's University of San Antonio.....	22
Sam Houston State Teachers College.....	6
Southern Methodist University.....	15
Southwest Texas State College.....	1
Southwestern Junior College.....	1
Southwestern University.....	3
Stephen F. Austin State College.....	10
Sul Ross State College.....	2
Temple Junior College.....	2
Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College.....	1
Texas Christian University.....	99
Texas College of Arts and Industries.....	6
Texas Technological College.....	5
University of Texas.....	32
Texas Western College.....	67
Texas Woman's University.....	5
Texarkana College.....	2
Trinity University.....	7

UTAH, 411

Brigham Young University.....	63
Dixie Junior College.....	1
Snow College.....	1
College of Southern Utah.....	3
Utah State University of Agriculture and Applied Science.....	13
University of Utah.....	235
Weber College.....	79

VERMONT, 19

Middlebury College.....	2
Norwich University.....	4
University of Vermont and State Agricultural College.....	13

VIRGINIA, 316

Bridgewater College.....	4
Ferrum Junior College.....	1
Hampton Institute.....	1
Hollins College.....	1
Lynchburg College.....	3
Marion College.....	1
Mary Washington College.....	10
Medical College of Virginia.....	10

Institutions of higher education attended by students hired in summer 1961 by the Federal Government for nonclerical jobs—Continued

Radford College.....	3
Randolph-Macon College.....	10
Randolph-Macon Women's College.....	5
Richmond Professional Institute.....	6
University of Richmond.....	8
Roanoke College.....	5
Sweet Briar College.....	2
Virginia Military Institute.....	7
Virginia Polytechnic Institute.....	117
Virginia State College.....	1
University of Virginia.....	63
Washington and Lee University.....	10
Westhampton College.....	3
William and Mary, College of.....	45

WASHINGTON, 513

Central Washington State College.....	23
Centralia Junior College.....	10
Clark College.....	15
Columbia Basin College.....	3
Eastern Washington State College.....	3
Everett Junior College.....	6
Gonzaga University.....	14
Grays Harbor College.....	3
Northwest Bible College, Inc.....	2
Olympic College.....	15
Pacific Lutheran University.....	5
University of Puget Sound.....	4
St. Martin's College.....	3
Seattle Pacific College.....	1
Seattle University.....	11
Skagit Valley Junior College.....	1
Walla Walla College.....	10
State College of Washington.....	2
Washington State University.....	144
University of Washington.....	191
Wenatchee Valley College.....	17
Western Washington State College.....	10
Whitman College.....	15
Whitworth College.....	2
Yakima Valley Junior College.....	3

WEST VIRGINIA, 114

Concord College.....	2
Davis and Elkins College.....	4
Fairmont State College.....	1
Marshall University.....	17
Morris Harvey College.....	1
Potomac State College of West Virginia University.....	12
Shepherd State College.....	3
West Virginia Institute for Technology.....	7
West Virginia State College.....	1
West Virginia University.....	62
West Virginia Wesleyan College.....	3
Wheeling College.....	1

WISCONSIN, 115

Alverno College.....	1
Beloit College.....	2
The Cardinal Stritch College.....	1
Edgewood College of the Sacred Heart.....	1
Lawrence College.....	1
Marquette University.....	9
St. Norbert College.....	1
(Eau Claire) Wisconsin State College.....	1
Wisconsin State College and Institute of Technology.....	6
(Stevens Point) Wisconsin State College.....	1
Wisconsin State College.....	3
(River Falls) Wisconsin State College.....	1
University of Wisconsin.....	88

WYOMING, 65

Casper Junior College.....	2
Sheridan College.....	5
Wyoming Junior College.....	1
University of Wyoming.....	57

Total..... 11,865

(Some agencies were unable to indicate the student's college training and we were unable to identify institutions of higher education for 128 students.)

Education and Public Welfare Division
May 7, 1962.

I include a study in connection with
the preceding figures:

Institutions of higher education whose students were reported employed by the Federal Government in nonclerical jobs, summer 1961¹

	Total number of institutions of higher education ²	Number of institutions represented and number of their students in Federal nonclerical summer jobs ³		Institutions in the State which combined had at least 50 percent of stu- dents employed in Fed- eral nonclerical summer jobs	
		Institutions (II)	Students (III)	Institutions (IV)	Students (V)
Alabama.....	26	15	213	2	172
Alaska.....	3	1	23	1	23
Arizona.....	7	7	213	2	109
Arkansas.....	19	10	96	2	76
California.....	109	92	1,388	5	718
Colorado.....	22	13	351	1	182
Connecticut.....	32	9	117	1	59
Delaware.....	4	2	22	1	21
District of Columbia.....	24	9	318	2	161
Florida.....	45	18	168	2	127
Georgia.....	46	13	178	2	122
Hawaii.....	4	1	24	1	24
Idaho.....	8	8	306	1	225
Illinois.....	112	28	267	2	153
Indiana.....	41	20	264	1	140
Iowa.....	51	20	219	1	122
Kansas.....	46	11	111	2	88
Kentucky.....	36	13	83	2	58
Louisiana.....	21	5	107	1	55
Maine.....	22	5	46	1	39
Maryland.....	44	18	587	1	493
Massachusetts.....	36	27	357	2	201
Michigan.....	67	21	283	2	191
Minnesota.....	43	9	141	1	120
Mississippi.....	45	17	100	2	112
Missouri.....	63	18	172	2	97
Montana.....	11	8	353	1	202
Nebraska.....	23	6	76	1	62
Nevada.....	1	1	43	1	43
New Hampshire.....	12	4	44	1	26
New Jersey.....	38	11	127	2	69
New Mexico.....	9	8	144	2	126
New York.....	183	53	410	6	243
North Carolina.....	60	23	206	2	122
North Dakota.....	14	3	75	1	38
Ohio.....	70	33	323	6	207
Oklahoma.....	34	13	221	1	134
Oregon.....	27	17	547	1	321
Pennsylvania.....	129	56	641	4	343
Rhode Island.....	12	6	70	1	35
South Carolina.....	30	11	46	1	24
South Dakota.....	16	9	72	1	40
Tennessee.....	46	18	178	2	108
Texas.....	96	33	343	3	188
Utah.....	8	7	411	1	235
Vermont.....	16	3	19	1	13
Virginia.....	46	22	316	2	180
Washington.....	29	24	513	2	332
West Virginia.....	20	12	114	1	62
Wisconsin.....	62	13	115	1	88
Wyoming.....	6	4	65	1	57
Puerto Rico.....	5	1	5	1	5
Total.....	2,098	809	11,721	90	7,221

¹ Not all agencies were able to report students' college of attendance.

² U.S. Office of Education, Education Directory, pt. 3, p. 11.

³ Reported by Federal agencies to Legislative Reference Service in response to a survey conducted in behalf of the Honorable LEVERETT SALTONSTALL. Results of the survey are contained in 88th Cong., 1st sess., S. Doc. No. 9: "Summer Employment of College Students in the Federal Government."

NOTE.—Selected percentages: 38.6 percent of total number of institutions of higher education had students employed in Federal nonclerical summer jobs (based on totals, cols. I and II); 4.3 percent of total number of institutions of higher education had over 50 percent of the total number of students employed (based on totals, cols. I and IV); 11.1 percent of the total number of institutions of higher education which had students employed had over 50 percent of the total number of students employed (based on totals, cols. II and IV).

Source: Education and Public Welfare Division, Legislative Reference Service.

There have been those who contend they do not know how the apportionment act works. I include two letters.

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., October 15, 1963.
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This refers to your letter of October 9, 1963, enclosing a copy of an amendment to be offered by Mr. BROYHILL to H.R. 10.

H.R. 10 would require that summer temporary appointments which are made from civil service registers to positions in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area be apportioned among applicants from the several

States on the basis of population. The bill would affect only those appointments made through open competitive examinations. Most summer temporary appointments have not been made from civil service registers which are established as the result of open competitive examinations.

Mr. BROYHILL's amendment to H.R. 10 would eliminate the requirement for apportionment of summer temporary appointments from civil service registers. In lieu thereof, it would require that initial appointments to positions in the competitive service in grades GS-7 and below shall be made as the result of open competitive examinations prescribed by the Civil Service Commission. If the amendment to H.R. 10

is enacted Federal agencies would no longer be permitted to make temporary summer appointments to competitive positions in grades GS-7 and below without regard to civil service registers established as the result of open competitive examinations, either in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area or in the various States. The amendment would not affect current authorities to make temporary appointments to positions which are in the excepted service, i.e., appointments which agencies can make without competitive examinations.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN J. MCCARTHY,
Assistant General Counsel.

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., October 15, 1963.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This refers to your letter of October 9, 1963, asking how the apportionment provision of the Civil Service Act of 1883 works in connection with those jobs to which it applies.

Apportionment applies generally to career-conditional and career (permanent) appointments to competitive positions in the headquarters offices of agencies in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area. The Commission maintains a list of the apportionment standing of the States and territories showing the number of positions occupied by their residents in relation to the number of positions to which each is entitled on the basis of population. Those States and territories with fewer residents occupying apportioned jobs than they are entitled to are "in arrears" of their apportionment quotas. Those having more residents in apportioned jobs than they are entitled to are considered "in excess."

Apportionment does not apply to veterans. When nonveteran applicants seek appointment to apportioned positions, they submit proof of residence. Eligible applicants are certified in the following order:

1. All veterans, and those nonveterans from States and territories in arrears, in order of their examination rating; and

2. Nonveterans from States and territories in excess, in order of (a) the rank of their State or territory on the apportionment list and (b) their examination rating. For example, all eligibles from the State least in excess are certified before those from the State next on the list.

At the present time the apportionment provision applies to about 2.5 percent of all competitive appointments and the Commission can waive its application in the interests of good administration. Even though many appointments are excepted from apportionment, once they are made the person is counted in determining how his State stands with respect to its quota.

Even for those positions to which apportionment applies it has not resulted in comparable representation of all States. In the present labor market the Federal Government cannot attract enough applicants from States in arrears, many of which are at a distance from Washington, to meet their apportionment quotas.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN J. MCCARTHY,
Assistant General Counsel.

OCTOBER 15, 1963.

Memo to Mr. BECKWORTH:

Regarding the application and operation of the apportionment provisions of the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883.

This is in reply to your request of October 14, 1963, requesting a statement covering the manner in which the apportionment laws work and the job areas in which apportionment applies.

From what I am able to determine, the apportionment provisions of the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, do not apply to—

(1) persons subject to the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944;

(2) jobs which, as the law provides, are not "in the departments at Washington"—that is, jobs in the several States and outside the seat of government; and

(3) jobs which are excepted by the Civil Service Commission from the apportionment provisions applicable to Washington, D.C. The Commission is authorized by law to make such exemptions in the interest of good administration. Among these exceptions are scientific and professional jobs, artisan jobs, and other positions such as stenographers, firemen, gardeners, and jobs in the excepted service such as attorneys jobs and jobs in the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Central Intelligence Agency.

In addition, by order of the Commission under the above-mentioned authority of the Commission to make apportionment exemptions in the interest of good administration, the apportionment requirement applies only to those departmental headquarters jobs below the level of grade 13 of the Classification Act of 1949.

The exercise of this authority of the Commission to make exemptions from the apportionment provisions has been accelerated in many instances by reason of the fact that there cannot be obtained enough qualified eligibles to fill a particular State's apportionment, who are willing to come to Washington to work.

In general, some 46 States usually are in arrears with respect to their apportionment quotas.

The above information is based upon information which I have been able to obtain from the Civil Service Commission.

In addition, there are attached several photostatic copies of material prepared by the Commission on the application and operation of the apportionment law.

Respectfully,

DAVID B. CARPER,
Assistant Counsel.

I include some information which has been furnished me by the Civil Service Commission and the Housing and Home Finance Agency, plus an article from the Washington Post of September 24, 1963:

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., October 16, 1963.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your request of September 24, 1963, for our comments on the enclosed newspaper clippings regarding the filling of vacancies in the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

We do not have information regarding the results of the study reportedly made in the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Under the regulations, agencies may fill vacancies by original appointment from the competitive register or noncompetitively; i.e., by reassignment, transfer, or promotion. It is within the administrative discretion of the agency as to which method will be used. Usually the possibilities of noncompetitive action are explored before a request is made for eligibles from the competitive register.

If the vacancy is to be filled by the transfer of an individual currently employed in the Federal service or by the reinstatement of a former employee, the agency is free to select any qualified person from its files of applicants for noncompetitive appointment. There is no requirement that the vacancy be publicized.

Your enclosures are returned, as requested.
Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MACY, JR.,
Chairman.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY,
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR,
Washington, D.C., October 10, 1963.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Thank you for your inquiry regarding the article which appeared on September 24 in the Jerry Klutts column of the Washington Post. I welcome the opportunity to correct some of the impressions which have been drawn from the article.

In the spring of the year, our personnel division conducted an informal survey of new employees to determine just how effective the recruiting activities of the division had been in recent months. The director of personnel sent a brief questionnaire to the last 100 or so employees who had come to work for the Office of the Administrator, Community Facilities Administration, and Urban Renewal Administration. The key questions were simply these: (1) Briefly, how did you happen to come with the agency? (2) who referred you to your supervisor?

The results showed that approximately half of the people who were queried came to the agency as a result of recruiting activities of the personnel division. The other half were referred to the agency by employees or ex-employees. All of our employees involved in the survey were employed in competitive positions and were hired under civil service authority except for two attorneys who were appointed to positions outside the competitive civil service.

Although fewer than 5 percent of the employees who responded first learned of the agency by being referred here on civil service certificates, all of them were qualified through processes of the Civil Service Commission. All but seven passed civil service examinations or gained civil service status in another Government agency. These seven were appointed to temporary positions for which the Civil Service Commission had no appropriate examination.

Included in the survey group were many employees who at the time of their appointment had obtained civil service eligibility—as an example on the Federal administrative and management examination or the Federal service entrance examination—and, who as a result of their eligibility, applied to several agencies including HHFA for employment. Also included were several members of our college trainee group who were interested in the agency as the result of our recruiting activity at colleges across the country. The largest group in the survey, however, was made up of persons who, having full civil service competitive appointments in other agencies, transferred to the HHFA.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. WEAVER,
Administrator.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 24, 1963]
HHFA'S JOB QUERY SHOWS MANY FILLED
THROUGH FRIENDS

(Mike Causey writes the Federal Diary today. Jerry Klutts is touring the Pacific area to report on the activities of Federal employees in outlying stations. His reports will appear as they are received.)

Housing and Home Finance Agency's Community Facilities Office made what it admits is a highly unscientific study to find out how its recently hired employees found out about job openings.

Less than 5 percent of them were referred to HHFA by Civil Service Commission. About half said they heard about jobs directly through the personnel office or recruiting and the remainder said friends in the Agency and former employees alerted them to vacancies.

HHFA officials concluded that the practice of employees bringing their friends is one reason why some offices have hired so few Negroes and other minority group members in the past.

MR. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to considering H.R. 10 under suspension of the rules. Let me state at the outset I realize the difficulty which I am confronted with this afternoon in trying to convince my colleagues to vote against this legislation. I recognize that the odds are overwhelming against me being successful in this endeavor. I do not say that from any attitude of pessimism or any attempt to express humility on my part, even though I realize I am limited in being convincing. It is not because I lack merit insofar as my cause is concerned because, Mr. Speaker, I believe that my cause is just in opposing this legislation. I am speaking in the interest of fair play, good administration, and in the best interests of our Government.

Obviously, the reason the odds are overwhelmingly in favor of the legislation today is because it is loaded with political dynamite. On the surface it appears there are a lot of fat, juicy summertime jobs here in the Washington area that we can latch onto and spread out among our constituents or among the young people, the students, in our particular areas.

If that is the way this legislation appears to my colleagues, I do not blame them for supporting the bill. It would be politically foolish to oppose it.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that my colleagues would not knowingly want to be unfair. I do not think my colleagues would want to inflict injury on the people of this area for what may be a negligible gain to the people of their own particular sections. But regardless of the alleged personal losses or gains that may result from this legislation, I submit it is bad legislation. I think it should be defeated because it is bad legislation.

In the first place, H.R. 10 seeks to amend an outmoded, archaic law which was passed back in 1883. That was the so-called Apportionment Act. Most if not all Federal jobs at that time were located here in Washington. It seemed to be desirable at that time to apportion these Federal jobs in Washington throughout the States and territories on the basis of population. But such is not the situation today, Mr. Speaker. Less than 10 percent of the Federal jobs are located here in Washington. Over 90 percent of them are located in the States and territories. Interestingly enough, there are more Federal jobs in the State of California than there are here in the Washington metropolitan area.

There are, of course, several diminishing factors in this Apportionment Act. It does not apply to veterans, and incidentally 50 percent of the Federal employees are veterans, so they are exempted from the Apportionment Act. Then, the Civil Service Commission can waive the apportionment provisions insofar as certain categories of jobs under

the Classification Act are concerned. In fact, apportionment today actually only applies to about 2½ percent of all positions in the competitive Civil Service system. It has also not resulted in equal representation throughout the States and territories. Forty-six of the States and territories are underrepresented so far as their apportionment quotas are concerned. So it is proven that the Federal Government just cannot fill these jobs properly under this 1883 apportionment provision of law.

This legislation now before us is an attempt to apply this old archaic law to temporary summertime jobs, when the Civil Service Commission has been trying for years to get the act itself repealed.

H.R. 10 is unsuited to the type of positions to be filled. There are only 6,000 people involved in summer type jobs in the Washington, D.C., area. Half of those are clerical, clerk-typist jobs. Ten percent of them are under the so-called student trainee program, which are already being filled by examinations given throughout the country. The remainder are various types of jobs, technicians, laborers, and gardeners. There would be no common denominator whereby you could reapportion these jobs or have a nationwide competitive examination for them. It would be impossible to develop a workable system under this apportionment program.

Incidentally, students alone are not involved, or young people. There are many high school or college teachers on summer vacation who are undergoing certain training or studies. Will we deprive the Government of the benefit of their knowledge and experience in their specialized fields?

Then, of course, there are many full time people in the labor market who are waiting for permanent jobs.

It certainly is unfair to penalize these people to impose this type of restriction upon them just for the benefit of a very, very few young people throughout the rest of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, there seem to be two procedures under H.R. 10 which are somewhat contradictory. As pointed out by the gentleman from Texas, it does provide that these jobs be assigned on the basis of a nationwide competitive examination. I wholeheartedly support that portion of the bill.

None of us here in this area are asking for any special preference so far as qualification for jobs here in Washington or anywhere else is concerned. But the bill does contradict itself. It provides for this old outmoded system. How can these jobs be awarded on the basis of merit under a competitive examination and then provide that they have to be awarded on such an accidental basis as where the applicant happens to reside.

I also submit, Mr. Speaker, that this bill, H.R. 10 will not accomplish the objective that it seeks to accomplish.

As I said a moment ago, we are only talking about approximately 6,000 summertime jobs or temporary summer jobs out of a total of over 2½ million Federal jobs. There actually are in excess of 40,000 temporary summer jobs spread out throughout the Nation. Why not

cover all of these 40,000 or in excess of 40,000 jobs and not just these 6,000 jobs. Why only talk about the 6,000 jobs and say that only 6,000 jobs would be affected? The Civil Service Commission would continue to waive certain jobs because of shortages and we would probably wind up with only 600 jobs that are under the student trainee program. We will not get anywhere near the bonanza that the sponsors of the bill are claiming and seeking to make the membership believe would be available under this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this is a weak bill. It is incomplete and it is confused. Mr. Speaker, I think there is a better way to approach this problem. I think in opposing legislation, we should not oppose legislation unless we have a worthwhile alternative. I object to this measure coming up under suspension of the rules because I want to offer an amendment which would make a major step forward in our competitive civil service system. My amendment would make merit apply nationwide to these 40,000 jobs and not just to the jobs here in Washington. It would provide for a strict merit system and competitive examinations and not depend on the accident as to where a student or young person might happen to reside at any particular time. Let us put language in the legislation to eliminate all political considerations whatsoever such as favoritism as well as nepotism.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of California. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 212]

Alger	Grabowski	Passman
Andrews,	Hall	Pillion
N. Dak.	Harris	Powell
Ashbrook	Harrison	Pucinski
Ashley	Harsha	Rhodes, Ariz.
Becker	Harvey, Ind.	Rivers, Alaska
Bennett, Mich.	Hoeven	Roberts, Ala.
Betts	Horan	Robison
Bolton,	Horton	Rogers, Tex.
Oliver P.	Ichord	Rooney, Pa.
Bonner	Jennings	Roosevelt
Brooks	Johansen	Rosenthal
Brown, Ohio	Johnson, Pa.	St. Germain
Buckley	Kelly	St. Onge
Byrnes, Wis.	Keogh	Schenck
Cahill	Kilburn	Sheppard
Celler	Kluczyński	Shipley
Chelf	Laird	Sikes
Colmer	Landrum	Siler
Corbett	Lesinski	Smith, Calif.
Daddario	Long, La.	Smith, Iowa
Davis, Tenn.	McDowell	Smith, Va.
Devine	McLokey	Staeble
Diggs	Mailliard	Thompson, N.J.
Dorn	Martin, Nebr.	Thompson, Tex.
Dowdy	Matsunaga	Thornberry
Dulski	Matthews	Trimble
Dwyer	Milliken	Tuten
Farbstein	Mills	Van Pelt
Fino	Mosher	Vinson
Ford	Moss	Watson
Frelinghuysen	Multer	Whitten
Fulton, Tenn.	Murphy, N.Y.	Widnall
Fuqua	Murray	Wilson
Gibbons	O'Brien, Ill.	Charles, H.
Glenn	O'Brien, N.Y.	Winstead
Goodling	O'Neill	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 326 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

EXTENSION OF CIVIL SERVICE AP- PORTIONMENT REQUIREMENT

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] is recognized.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, before the quorum call I had just stated that H.R. 10, the bill which we have before us under suspension, would not accomplish the objective which it seeks, because there were only 6,000 summertime jobs or temporary jobs here in the Washington area of various types, and by the time various restrictions of the Civil Service Commission were placed upon them there would probably be only 600 to 700 jobs that would be available under the so-called apportionment system.

I was suggesting a better way of approaching this matter, feeling that in opposing any legislation an attempt should be made to suggest a worthwhile alternative, although under this particular procedure we would have to defeat this bill to get at a better approach to the problem.

There are 40,000 summertime temporary jobs throughout the Nation. I am suggesting that we apply the merit approach to all of the jobs, not just the 6,000 jobs here in the Washington area, and then fill these 40,000 jobs on the merit system basis, entirely and strictly on a competitive basis, and not on the basis of the State where the individual may happen to live at the time.

Then I would suggest that we provide for the elimination of all political influence or any favoritism at all, and eliminate any chance of nepotism by providing that having any relative working in a particular department would prohibit the employment of a temporary employee therein.

I was going to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this would be a giant step forward. Incidentally, the Civil Service Commission stated it would cost \$300,000 a year if this bill were enacted into law just for these very few jobs which may be made available in the Washington area. If we are going to spend that amount of money, why should we not make all 40,000 jobs throughout the Nation available for persons who are seeking summertime jobs.

As I say, an amendment would accomplish that but under suspension of the rules we are unable to offer an amendment. It is disappointing that the author or the sponsor of the bill asked for this measure to be brought up under suspension of the rules which would prohibit an amendment because he stated rather emphatically during the hearings that he would prefer these jobs to be filled on the basis of merit competitive examinations and not on the basis of where people happen to be living at the time.

Mr. Speaker, assuming that H.R. 10 would accomplish the objectives which it is alleged it would accomplish and as-

suming that it would be preferable to a truly merit system, I still say it would be unfair legislation. It would cut off the employment opportunities of local people. Government is a principal if not the only industry in this area. Most people work for the Federal Government or they do not work at all. I am not asking for any special concession for the people here in this area, but I am merely asking my colleagues not to penalize them but to give them an opportunity to compete for these jobs and other jobs throughout the Nation along with everyone else.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me point out that this legislation is vigorously opposed by the administration. It was opposed by the Kennedy administration, the Civil Service Commission, and the Bureau of the Budget. I am certain it is opposed by the Johnson administration, in line with what the President said here in his address to the joint session of the Congress on last Wednesday. It seems rather strange here when we have the first opportunity to take up legislation that we have a bill here that the administration strongly opposes with an effort to pass it regardless of the opposition to it. This will be the first opportunity we will have to carry out the policies of the new administration.

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield briefly to my colleague.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill—H.R. 10—and in doing so would like to associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL], as well as those others who have spoken or will speak against the proposal.

I oppose this bill because it does not make sense. It seeks to extend an antiquated, obsolete, and unworkable provision in extending law pertaining to permanent jobs in the Federal Government to those temporary jobs which are generally taken by college students and others with long vacations during the summer months.

Those who support this legislation think it will make it easier for their summer-free constituents to get jobs in Washington during vacation periods, but the fact of the matter is that those people, if they really want these jobs, have a very good chance of getting them under the existing setup.

The only thing that this bill would actually do if enacted would be to saddle the Civil Service Commission and other Federal agencies with an additional drawn out and involved procedure for hiring temporary summer help. And in doing so, I think it is clear, some of the agencies would have to go without some of the help needed to replace those who are on vacation.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, is designed to keep those people living in the Washington metropolitan area, many of whom live in Maryland, from getting temporary summer jobs with the Federal Government and see that the jobs instead go to people from other areas of the

country. But the measure will not do that. It will only make additional red-tape and prolong the application procedure. Many of the States will not be able to fill their quotas and then the agencies will be free to hire any qualified person.

Mr. Speaker, I do not argue against attempts to improve the hiring practices of the Federal Government. In fact, I welcome them. If the Members of this House want to improve the hiring procedures for temporary summer jobs, let us do it right. Let us put the whole thing on a merit basis and forget about States quotas. Then, only the most qualified people would be hired by the Federal Government.

Or, if we must retain the quota provision, then let us put the filling of all jobs on a quota basis. Let us take into consideration all the summer jobs that become available in the defense installations and sundry other Federal activities throughout the Nation, not just those in the Washington, D.C., area.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES].

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the suspension of the rules and the passage of the bill H.R. 10. In doing so, I would like to state first that in visiting with the many constituents I have in suburban Maryland I am impressed by the fact that they usually have one thing in common, and that is that they come from somewhere else. It is at the point now where it is a little difficult to find a native out there any more. This problem is going to become more acute and it is going to become more difficult as time goes on if the population projections come true, which estimate that there is going to be a doubling of the population in this metropolitan area in the next 15 or 20 years.

Another thing these folks usually have in common is that they first came here to seek Federal employment. This is a sort of subconscious poll that I have been taking. I am trying to get this information together, but I find that I really am unable to find out how they were first employed. I do not know whether they got the benefit of some sort of apportionment formula or whether they were veterans and the formula was not applied or whether the Civil Service Commission actually waived it in their particular case. But I do know they are here now and they have the right to expect that they will be treated fairly and their families will be treated fairly.

We must remember that the dominant industry in this metropolitan Washington area is the U.S. Federal Government. The effect of the bill H.R. 10 would be to cut short a major source of summer employment for the children of these same Federal employees who are now living in the metropolitan Washington area.

I think first we should recognize the very natural instinct that the children of Federal employees would naturally want to work in the Federal Establishment as their mothers and fathers do. I should think we would want to encourage these

children to be employed in the Federal Government. An obvious result of H.R. 10 would be to deny to some of these children employment.

As a matter of fact, it would encourage the bringing of youngsters, without parental control, into this area. I think those of us who are concerned with juvenile delinquency—and I know all of us are—should bear this in mind.

I noted in the report on H.R. 10, the figures show that there is a large number of temporary employees who reside in the metropolitan Washington, D.C., area. I think this is quite normal. I would have been surprised if the figures did not show this, but I am sure that the comparable situation exists if we look in the other centers of Federal employment in other parts of the Nation. But, of course, no one suggested that we apply some sort of an apportionment formula in those areas, and I would be the last to do so.

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

Mr. SICKLES. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I asked the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] to yield to me a moment ago. I know he was busy, and I appreciate the gentleman from Maryland yielding. I shall be delighted to work with the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES], now addressing the House, and to work with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] in helping to bring about an apportionment and a competitive examination with reference to the 40,000 that you have spoken about and pledge to you that if you will introduce a bill tomorrow or the next day and if the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] will introduce a bill tomorrow or the next day bringing about an apportionment and a competitive examination with reference to these 40,000, you will have our help. Just draw the bill and let us go over it and agree on one, and we will work on it.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SICKLES. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I will be very happy to do that, and in the light of the gentleman's support, it is needless to waste our time today to vote on this bill.

Mr. BECKWORTH. That is where the gentleman is wrong. He worked to stop this bill a whole year, and he knows it.

Mr. SICKLES. If it is back to me now, I would like to say I appreciate the offer of the gentleman from Texas. As I do not think an apportionment formula should be applicable in the Washington metropolitan area, I do not think it should be applicable anywhere else in the country.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say that the only effect of the passage of H.R. 10 would be to deny to the youngsters in this metropolitan area, most of whom are the children of Federal employees, the temporary employment which is offered by the dominant industry in this area. Therefore, I am opposed to the bill.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS].

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, there are several reasons why H.R. 10 should not be enacted. In the first place, civil service apportionment in summer employment has become an anachronism. At a time when almost all the jobs that come within the scope of this legislation were located in Washington, D.C., the idea of apportionment was attractive. With the growth in volume and the geographical dispersal of Federal employment opportunities, the concept is, however, now obsolete. To allow an archaic provision to remain on the books is bad enough, but to advocate its extension is simply unreasonable. An important factor in the consideration of this bill is the type of jobs involved in temporary summer employment. They are of such a nature that apportionment such as described in H.R. 10 would not be beneficial to the Government service. Individuals who have summer jobs with the Federal Government earn the benefits of experience and financial compensation, but the Federal Government receives benefits. We all gain from the fact that young, ambitious students become interested in Federal employment as a career.

The Government also benefits from the highly skilled and highly trained men and women from the professional ranks of educators who are available to the Government during the summertime. These persons make very important contributions to the Federal Government which might not otherwise be realized. An apportionment requirement such as proposed in H.R. 10 will cause many of these persons to find the door of summer employment closed to them and many others will assume the attitude that they would not qualify under the requirement and will seek employment elsewhere. In my opinion this will be a loss to the Federal Government as well as to the persons involved. It would work an effect which is completely contradictory to the merit system of employment it propounds. A highly skilled individual who may wish summertime Federal employment and whose services are desired by an agency of the Government may not be hired simply because his State quota had been filled. As the gentleman from Virginia has noted, to so impose a quota system on top of the competitive examination system would only lead to administrative chaos. Veterans, who make up a large percent of Federal employees, are exempt from the bill. In addition, the Civil Service Commission, "in the interest of good administration" can waive the requirement. There is, therefore, a question raised as to the value of legislation with such wide loopholes. There is an easier and much more effective method of insuring fairness and the highest level of competency in persons selected for summertime employment, and that is to employ summer temporary employees on the basis of nationwide competitive examinations. On this basis only the skilled will qualify and the fair standard of the merit system may at long last begin to become a workable reality.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the author of the bill, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH].

Is it not a fact that the reason we bring this bill out is so that the young people in his district and mine and in all districts throughout the country will have a chance at one of these very fine well-paying summer jobs here in Washington?

Mr. BECKWORTH. That is exactly the objective, to give them the opportunity to compete. And the last language we adopted in the committee had this kind of wording: "through an assembled examination, written, where possible."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] has expired.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH].

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the Apportionment Act being archaic. I will admit there are many people in these agencies and some in the Civil Service Commission who would like to see the Apportionment Act done away with because then they would have the right to hire for various government jobs many more people from the Washington area. People who hire individuals do not care for restrictions. Many would prefer that there be no Apportionment Act. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] introduced an amendment in our committee a little over a year ago to do away with the Apportionment Act. Do you know how many votes it got in the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service—and I think we try to do the right thing? It got one vote, and that was his vote. I leave it to you to determine who is archaic and what is archaic when it comes to the Apportionment Act.

The same thing has been attempted, I am sure, because the gentleman is correct—the Civil Service Commission has tried to get rid of the Apportionment Act, but it does not seem to get anywhere so far as results are concerned in the House of Representatives and in the other body. So apparently it is not as archaic as some might lead you to think.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that I must respond to the remarks which have been made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH].

Mr. Speaker, I stated at the outset of my remarks that I recognized the difficulty involved in getting many Members of Congress to vote against an apportionment system, because it would appear that they would get a greater number of jobs for their people than by some other method. But, I should like to quote the sentiments of the gentleman from Texas in this regard which appeared on page 3 of the hearings on this legislation, if I may, and here is what the gentleman from Texas said—

Mr. BECKWORTH. If the gentleman will yield, I did not hear the gentleman. I am sorry.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I am quoting the statement that the gentleman from Texas made during the hearings concerning apportionment versus the merit system or the competitive examination system. Here is what the gentleman stated:

I would be delighted to see all the patronage factors eliminated totally so far as these jobs are concerned. I am a strong believer in civil service. I have great faith in civil service.

As far as these summer jobs are concerned, I would like to see a written competitive examination given to just as many students as possible and if all of them can qualify from two or three States by that method, it would be all right with me.

Mr. Speaker, that is the type of amendment which I offered in the committee and which failed by a vote of 10 to 7. That is the type of proposal which I have made here on the floor of the House today but which type of amendment is prohibited under the method by which this bill has been brought up. It is the type bill which I would be glad to introduce since the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] has pledged me his support.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this procedure which is being attempted here today will be voted down.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH].

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas has never indicated that he opposes the apportionment aspect of the permanent law, the 1883 law, and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] knows I have never indicated that I oppose apportionment of summer employment jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I have worked several years to try to bring this legislation about and, certainly, I would not be opposing something on which I have worked as hard as I have on this.

I might say this: The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] knows that he has not been introducing bills along the line which the gentleman has been talking today.

I say, again, I shall be glad to work with the gentleman in an effort to bring about an apportionment act, an extension of the 1883 act on a competitive basis for all summer employees throughout the Nation and I here and now so state.

Now on October 15, 1963, John W. McCarthy, Assistant General Counsel of the Civil Service Commission, wrote to me as follows:

Most summer temporary appointments have not been made from civil service registers which are established as the result of open competitive examinations.

Does the gentleman from Virginia believe that?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Will the gentleman repeat his statement?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I shall be glad to.

Most summer temporary appointments have not been made from civil service registers which are established as the result of open competitive examinations.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. If the gentleman will yield, I would agree to that because they are not under the competitive civil service system. One portion of this bill places them under it. I am not opposing that.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I want to see them placed on a competitive basis.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division.

The question was taken and there were—ayes 121, noes 7.

The SPEAKER. Two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules are suspended and the bill is passed.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present. I was on my feet, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman insist upon his point of order?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I do. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present. Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet and asking for recognition.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state at this point that all time had expired and we were in the process of a vote taking place. Of course, the Chair, under the parliamentary rules, cannot recognize the gentleman at this point.

One hundred and twenty-one Members having voted in the affirmative and 7 in the negative—two-thirds having voted in the affirmative—the rules are suspended and the bill is passed.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman making the point of order that a quorum is not present and is he objecting to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman insist on his point of order?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that a quorum is not present and objects to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present.

Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 301, nays 18, not voting 115, as follows:

[Roll No. 213]

YEAS—301

Abele	Barry	Bow
Abernethy	Bass	Brademas
Adair	Bates	Bray
Addabbo	Battin	Brook
Albert	Beckworth	Brownwell
Anderson	Beermann	Broomfield
Andrews, Ala.	Belcher	Brozman
Arends	Bell	Broyhill, N.C.
Ashmore	Bennett, Fla.	Bruce
Aspinall	Berry	Burke
Avery	Betts	Burkhalter
Ayres	Blatnik	Burleson
Baker	Boggs	Burton
Baldwin	Boland	Byrne, Pa.
Baring	Bolton	Cameron
Barrett	Frances P.	Cannon

Carey	Huddleston	Quillen
Casey	Hull	Rains
Cederberg	Hutchinson	Randall
Chamberlain	Jarman	Reid, Ill.
Chenoweth	Jensen	Reid, N.Y.
Clancy	Joelson	Reifel
Clark	Johnson, Calif.	Reuss
Clausen,	Johnson, Wis.	Rhodes, Pa.
Don H.	Jonas	Rich
Clawson, Del.	Jones, Ala.	Riehlman
Cleveland	Jones, Mo.	Rivers, S.C.
Cohelan	Karsten	Roberts, Tex.
Collier	Karth	Rodino
Conte	Kastenmeier	Rogers, Colo.
Cooley	Keith	Rogers, Fla.
Corman	Kilgore	Rooney, N.Y.
Cramer	King, Calif.	Rostenkowski
Cunningham	King, N.Y.	Roudebush
Curtin	Knox	Roush
Dague	Kornegay	Roybal
Daniels	Kunkel	Rumsfeld
Davis, Ga.	Kyl	Ryan, Mich.
Dawson	Landrum	Ryan, N.Y.
Delaney	Langen	St. George
Dent	Latta	Saylor
Denton	Leggett	Schadeberg
Derounian	Libonati	Schneebell
Derwinski	Lindsay	Schweiker
Dingell	Lipscomb	Schwengel
Dole	Lloyd	Scott
Donohue	McClary	Secrest
Edmondson	McCulloch	Selden
Edwards	McDade	Senner
Elliott	McFall	Short
Ellsworth	McIntire	Shriver
Everett	McMillan	Sibal
Feighan	Macdonald	Sisk
Findley	MacGregor	Skubitz
Finnegan	Madden	Slack
Fisher	Mahon	Snyder
Flood	Martin, Calif.	Springer
Flynt	Martin, Mass.	Stafford
Fogarty	May	Staggers
Foreman	Meador	Steed
Fountain	Michel	Stephens
Fulton, Pa.	Miller, Calif.	Stinson
Gallagher	Miller, N.Y.	Stratton
Gary	Minish	Stubblefield
Gathings	Minshall	Sullivan
Glaimo	Monagan	Talcott
Gilbert	Montoya	Taylor
Gill	Moore	Teague, Calif.
Gonzalez	Moorehead	Teague, Tex.
Goodell	Morgan	Thomas
Grant	Morris	Thompson, N.J.
Gray	Morse	Thomson, Wis.
Green, Oreg.	Murphy, Ill.	Toll
Green, Pa.	Natcher	Tollefson
Griffiths	Nedzi	Tupper
Gross	Nelsen	Udall
Grover	Nix	Ullman
Gubser	Norblad	Utt
Gurney	O'Hara, Ill.	Van Deerlin
Hagan, Ga.	O'Hara, Mich.	Vanik
Hagen, Calif.	O'Konski	Vinson
Haley	Olsen, Mont.	Waggoner
Halleck	Olson, Minn.	Wallhauser
Halpern	Osmers	Watts
Hanna	Ostertag	Weaver
Hansen	Patman	Weltner
Harding	Pelly	Westland
Harsha	Pepper	Whalley
Harvey, Mich.	Perkins	Wharton
Hawkins	Philbin	White
Hays	Pike	Whitener
Healey	Pilcher	Wickersham
Hechler	Pillion	Williams
Hemphill	Pirnie	Willis
Henderson	Poage	Wilson, Bob
Herlong	Poff	Wilson, Ind.
Hoffman	Pool	Wylder
Hollifield	Powell	Wyman
Holland	Price	Young
Horton	Purcell	Younger
Hosmer	Quie	Zablocki

NAYS—18

Abbt	Friedel	Mathias
Broyhill, Va.	Garmatz	Morton
Curtis	Hardy	Patten
Downing	Lankford	Sickles
Duncan	Long, Md.	Smith, Va.
Fallon	Marsh	Tuck

NOT VOTING—115

Alger	Bonner	Daddario
Andrews,	Brooks	Davis, Tenn.
N. Dak.	Brown, Calif.	Devine
Ashbrook	Brown, Ohio	Diggs
Ashley	Buckley	Dorn
Auchincloss	Byrnes, Wis.	Dowdy
Becker	Cahill	Dulski
Bennett, Mich.	Celler	Dwyer
Bolling	Chelf	Evins
Bolton	Colmer	Farbstein
Oliver P.	Corbett	Fascell

Fino	Laird	Roosevelt
Ford	Lennon	Rosenthal
Forrester	Lesinski	St Germain
Fraser	Long, La.	St. Onge
Freilinghuysen	McDowell	Schenck
Fulton, Tenn.	McLoskey	Shelley
Fuqua	Mailliard	Sheppard
Gibbons	Martin, Nebr.	Shibley
Glenn	Matsunaga	Sikes
Goodling	Matthews	Siler
Grabowski	Milliken	Smith, Calif.
Griffin	Mills	Smith, Iowa
Hall	Morrison	Staebler
Harris	Mosher	Taft
Harrison	Moss	Thompson, La.
Harvey, Ind.	Multer	Thompson, Tex.
Hebert	Murphy, N.Y.	Thornberry
Hoeven	Murray	Trimble
Horan	O'Brien, Ill.	Tuten
Ichord	O'Brien, N.Y.	Van Pelt
Jennings	O'Neil	Watson
Johansen	Passman	Whitten
Johnson, Pa.	Pucinski	Widnall
Kee	Rhodes, Ariz.	Wilson,
Kelly	Rivers, Alaska	Charles H.
Keogh	Roberts, Ala.	Winstead
Kilburn	Robison	Wright
Kirwan	Rogers, Tex.	
Kluczynski	Rooney, Pa.	

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Johansen and Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Corbett against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Robison.
 Mr. St. Onge with Mr. McLoskey.
 Mr. Buckley with Mr. Alger.
 Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Smith of California.
 Mr. Celler with Mr. Mosher.
 Mr. Daddario with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.
 Mr. Multer with Mr. Freilinghuysen.
 Mr. Shipley with Mr. Taft.
 Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.
 Mr. Pascell with Mr. Cahill.
 Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Mailliard.
 Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Hoeven.
 Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Van Pelt.
 Mr. St Germain with Mr. Widnall.
 Mr. Grabowski with Mr. Goodling.
 Mr. Moss of California with Mr. Siler.
 Mr. O'Brien of New York with Mrs. Dwyer.
 Mr. Staebler with Mr. Becker.
 Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Fino.
 Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Ford.
 Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
 Mr. Dulski with Mr. Hall.
 Mr. McDowell with Mr. Laird.
 Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Kilburn.
 Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.
 Mr. Mills with Mr. Horan.
 Mr. Harris with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton.
 Mr. Brooks with Mr. Harrison.
 Mr. Ashley with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. Charles L. Wilson with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
 Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Griffin.
 Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Glenn.
 Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
 Mr. Diggs with Mr. Schenck.
 Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
 Mr. Shelley with Mr. Devine.
 Mr. Lennon with Mr. Ashbrook.
 Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Thornberry.
 Mr. Hebert with Mr. Whitten.
 Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Watson.
 Mr. Jennings with Mr. Trimble.
 Mr. Morrison with Mr. Colmer.
 Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Winstead.
 Mr. Bonner with Mrs. Kee.

Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Thompson of Texas.
Mr. Chelf with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Tuten.
Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Forrester.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Dowdy.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Roberts of Alabama.

Mr. Wright with Mr. Fraser.
Mr. Matthews with Mr. Matsunaga.
Mr. Ichord with Mr. Brown of California.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded. The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE INVESTIGATION AND STUDIES AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 179

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Resolution 547, as amended, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the investigations and studies authorized by H. Res. 179, Eighty-eighth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Banking and Currency, acting as a whole or by subcommittee appointed by the chairman of the committee, not to exceed \$200,000, in addition to the unexpended balance of any sum heretofore made available for conducting such investigations and studies, including expenditures for employment, travel, and subsistence of accountants, experts, investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditures in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

With the following committee amendment:

On line 6 strike out "\$290,000" and insert "\$200,000".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FUNDS FOR THE FURTHER EXPENSES OF THE STUDIES, INVESTIGATIONS, AND INQUIRIES AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 56

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Administration Committee I call up House Resolution 566 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the House resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of the studies and investigations to be conducted pursuant to H. Res. 56 by the Committee on Public Works, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$495,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, as the chairman deems necessary, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The chairman, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, is authorized and empowered to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any other departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Public Works shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "\$495,000" and insert "\$450,000".

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

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Over what period of time are these authorizations being made in this resolution as well as in the previous resolution?

Mr. FRIEDEL. This authorization is for next year.

Mr. GROSS. The calendar year?

Mr. FRIEDEL. For the next session, the second session of the 88th Congress.

Mr. GROSS. For the fiscal year ending June 30?

Mr. FRIEDEL. December 31, 1964.

Mr. GROSS. For the next calendar year?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER] may have permission to add their names to the additional views filed today by minority members of the Committee on the Judiciary pursuant to unanimous consent agreed to on Tuesday, November 26, 1963, by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY].

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

There was no objection.

FILING OF REPORT

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the report referred to directly above may be filed at any time up until midnight tonight.

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

There was no objection.

CITY OF BIRMINGHAM MOURNS DEATH OF JOHN F. KENNEDY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, the tragic assassination of President John F. Kennedy has brought unparalleled grief and sorrow to our Nation and, indeed, the world. Gone from our midst is an outstanding citizen and a leader who was the personification of the youth, vigor, and vitality of the country which selected him as its President.

My hometown of Birmingham, Ala., joins the Nation and world in an expression of sorrow to the family of the late President Kennedy and a voice of hope and unity for tomorrow to President Lyndon Johnson.

Through a letter dated November 26, 1963, Mayor Albert Boutwell sent to the Members of the Alabama delegation, first, statement of the mayor of the city of Birmingham, November 22, 1963; second, city of Birmingham proclamation dated November 23, 1963; third, statement of the mayor to the council, November 26, 1963; and fourth, resolution adopted by the Birmingham City Council on November 26, 1963.

I respectfully insert the above named documents into this issue of the RECORD on behalf of the city of Birmingham.

STATEMENT OF THE MAYOR OF THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM, NOVEMBER 22, 1963

I sincerely believe that almost every man, woman, and child in Birmingham, regardless of how deep their personal political feelings may run, are shocked and saddened as I am by this terrible tragedy.

I speak for the city government of Birmingham, for myself, as mayor, and for President M. E. Wiggins and his fellow council members, in expressing to the President's personal and official families the depth of the sorrow and sense of tragedy that we share with them and with the people of the United States. In the name of the city government and the people it represents, I have sent a telegram of condolence to the President's wife and children, to express to them our sympathy in this time of their personal loss and personal grief.

Whatever forces may lie behind this terrible event, whatever persons may have inspired the striking down of a President of

the United States, we can have no other feeling than one of sorrow and deep regret.

For the President's wife and children and the members of their families our hearts go out. We pray to Almighty God that He will, in His infinite compassion, comfort and strengthen them. And for the Nation we pray that divine providence will watch over and guide us in the troubled hours that will be the inevitable consequence of this sad day.

CITY OF BIRMINGHAM PROCLAMATION

Whereas the President of the United States of America has made the supreme sacrifice to which the courageous conduct of his office exposed him, as it has other great Americans and other Presidents; and

Whereas his death, in the very prime of life, at the hands of a traitorous assassin, strikes a blow not only to our Nation but to the whole free world; and

Whereas this city, its government and all its people, out of a deep and unalterable respect for the great office of the Presidency of the Nation, and out of sincere and human sympathy for the President's wife and his children and the members of their respective families, bows with them in sorrow; and

Whereas John Fitzgerald Kennedy's death in line of duty, has wiped out, for these hours of mourning and remembrance, all temporal differences or partisan feelings and united the whole free world in regretful sorrow;

Therefore, I, Albert Boutwell, as mayor of Birmingham and by the privilege vested in that office, do proclaim, with the concurrence of the president of the City Council of Birmingham and such members of the council as I have been able to consult, and do declare that the 30 days, beginning November 22, 1963, and ending at sundown December 21, 1963, shall be for the city of Birmingham a period of mourning and respect, during which the flags of the United States flown upon public buildings and other official flagstaffs of the city shall be flown at half-mast; and, that the city hall of Birmingham, and all other of its buildings, not essential to the services of public protection, shall be closed Monday, November 25, 1963, in observance of a day of prayer for the comfort of the President's family, and the blessing and guidance of Almighty God for the newly succeeding President in his administration of the affairs of our Nation;

I hereby request the effects of this proclamation to be observed by all the boards and agencies of the city, not essential to the maintaining of necessary services to the people of this city;

I further order that a copy of this proclamation be engrossed by the city clerk of the city of Birmingham, affixing upon it the great seal of the city of Birmingham and that the same shall be forwarded to Mrs. John F. Kennedy so that the bereaved family may know the sympathy and sorrow of our city in their hour of personal grief;

And, finally, I order that copies, similarly engrossed and sealed, shall be posted, together with appropriate floral wreaths upon the principal doors of the city hall of Birmingham, and there remain until sundown, November 25, 1963.

Given under my hand at Birmingham, Ala., this 23d day of November 1963.

ALBERT BOUTWELL,
Mayor.

Attest:

JUDSON P. HODGES,
City Clerk.

STATEMENT OF THE MAYOR TO THE COUNCIL, NOVEMBER 26, 1963

Mr. President and members of the council, I wish, at this time to offer for your consid-

eration a proposed joint resolution of the mayor and the council of the city of Birmingham.

There is no need to recall to anyone the tragic event of last Friday. Actions taken by your city government to express our deep and lasting sorrow and to condemn the senseless and inexpressibly evil act of violence that took the life of President John F. Kennedy have already been conveyed to the last President's wife and widow and to the Nation.

The time of mourning that loss to ourselves and the Nation is not ended. Indeed, it will cast its shadow over a long time to come. But, mourning, as we still are, the undeniable reality of this hour is that a nation, reunited by tragedy, must now proceed upon its destiny under the leadership of the man the Nation chose, along with the martyred President, as its Vice President.

I, therefore, as mayor, offer the following resolution to the council for its concurrence, so that it may be presented to President Lyndon B. Johnson as a unanimous expression of our support and confidence as he proceeds in the tasks which destiny has thrust upon him.

"Whereas on November 22, 1963, the cowardly act of an assassin fatally struck down John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America; and

"Whereas on that same day, by virtue of his earlier election by the people as Vice President of the United States, and by the provisions of the Constitution, Lyndon Baines Johnson, after illustrious service in both Houses of the Congress and in the Vice Presidency, has now assumed the highest office and honor of Chief Executive of the Nation, and leader of the free world; and

"Whereas in the performance of that office, he has earnestly and humbly evoked the support of this Nation, and the blessing and guidance of Almighty God for its successful accomplishment: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the government of the city of Birmingham, on behalf of all its citizens of all races and creeds, That we do hereby declare our unstinting support in all that he may seek to do to accomplish what is good for this Nation, and to lead it in the paths of peace and prosperity; and be it further

"Resolved, That we convey to the President of the United States our confidence in his leadership, and in the high ideals and principles that have characterized his public actions in the past, and predict his future direction; and, finally, be it

"Resolved, That we, as a government and a people, do join our prayers with his and with the Nation and with the prayers of free peoples everywhere, that Divine Providence may counsel him in wisdom, imbue him with unfaltering strength of mind and courage, and bless him with continuous good health against all the trials that lie before him, before us as a Nation. And finally do we pray that the God of peace and good will among men, will bless this Nation, under its new leadership, with lasting peace among the nations of the earth, and the material blessings of plenty to us and all mankind."

STATE OF ALABAMA,
Jefferson County:

I, Judson P. Hodges, city clerk of the city of Birmingham, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution duly adopted by the Council of the City of Birmingham at its meeting held November 26, 1963, and as same appears of record in minute book C-1 of said city.

Given under my hand and corporate seal of the city of Birmingham, this the 26th day of November 1963.

Albert Boutwell, Mayor; John E. Bryan, Councilman; Alan T. Drennen, Jr., Councilman; John Golden, Councilman; Don A. Hawkins, Councilman; Judson P. Hodges, City Clerk; M. E. Wiggins, President of the Council; Nina Miglionico, Councilman; Dr. Eleazer C. Overton, Councilman; George G. Seibels, Jr., Councilman; Tom W. Woods, Councilman.

RESOLUTION OF SUPPORT OF LYNDON B. JOHNSON BY CITY OF BIRMINGHAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the recent tragedy of the untimely death of President Kennedy has left a nation with a new leader who has had the full weight of leading the free world thrust upon his shoulders. In acknowledgment of the difficult position that President Johnson faces, the mayor of Birmingham, Ala., has issued a statement and the city council of that city has passed a resolution of comfort and support to the new President. I am inserting it in the RECORD as a further gesture of confidence in Mr. Johnson's ability to direct the high Office that he now holds.

STATEMENT OF THE MAYOR TO THE COUNCIL, NOVEMBER 26, 1963

Mr. President and members of the council, I wish, at this time, to offer for your consideration a proposed joint resolution of the mayor and the Council of the City of Birmingham.

There is no need to recall to anyone the tragic event of last Friday. Actions taken by your city government to express our deep and lasting sorrow and to condemn the senseless and inexpressibly evil act of violence that took the life of President John F. Kennedy have already been conveyed to the late President's wife and widow and to the Nation.

The time of mourning that loss to ourselves and the Nation is not ended. Indeed, it will cast its shadow over a long time to come. But, mourning, as we still are, the undeniable reality of this hour is that a nation, reunited by tragedy, must now proceed upon its destiny under the leadership of the man the Nation chose, along with the martyred President, as its Vice President.

I, therefore, as mayor, offer the following resolution to the council for its concurrence, so that it may be presented to President Lyndon B. Johnson as a unanimous expression of our support and confidence as he proceeds in the tasks which destiny has thrust upon him.

I sincerely believe that almost every man, woman, and child in Birmingham, regardless of how deep their personal political feelings may run, are shocked and saddened as I am by this terrible tragedy.

I speak for the city government of Birmingham, for myself, as mayor, and for President M. E. Wiggins and his fellow council members, in expressing to the President's personal and official families the depth of the sorrow and sense of tragedy that we share with them and with the people of the United

States. In the name of the city government and the people its represents, I have sent a telegram of condolence to the President's wife and children, to express to them our sympathy in this time of their personal loss and personal grief.

Whatever forces may lie behind this terrible event, whatever persons may have inspired the striking down of a President of the United States, we can have no other feeling than one of sorrow and deep regret.

For the President's wife and children and the members of their families our hearts go out. We pray to Almighty God that He will, in His infinite compassion, comfort and strengthen them. And for the Nation we pray that divine providence will watch over and guide us in the troubled hours that will be the inevitable consequence of this sad day.

"Whereas on November 22, 1963, the cowardly act of an assassin fatally struck down John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America; and

"Whereas on that same day, by virtue of his earlier election by the people as Vice President of the United States, and by the provisions of the Constitution, Lyndon Baines Johnson, after illustrious service in both Houses of the Congress and in the Vice Presidency, has now assumed the highest office and honor of Chief Executive of the Nation, and leader of the free world; and

"Whereas in the performance of that office, he has earnestly and humbly evoked the support of this Nation, and the blessing and guidance of Almighty God for its successful accomplishment: Therefore be it

"Resolved, by the government of the city of Birmingham, on behalf of all its citizens of all races and creeds, That we do hereby declare our unstinting support in all that he may seek to do to accomplish what is good for this Nation, and to lead it in the paths of peace and prosperity; and be it further

"Resolved, That we convey to the President of the United States our confidence in his leadership, and in the high ideals and principles that have characterized his public actions in the past, and predict his future direction; and finally be it

"Resolved, That we, as a government and a people, do join our prayers with his and with the Nation and with the prayers of free peoples everywhere, that divine providence may counsel him in wisdom, imbue him with unflinching strength of mind and courage, and bless him with continuous good health against all the trials that lie before him, before us as a nation. And finally do we pray that the God of peace and good will among men, will bless this Nation, under its new leadership, with lasting peace among the nations of the earth, and the material blessings of plenty to us and all mankind."

STATE OF ALABAMA,
Jefferson County:

I, Judson P. Hodges, city clerk of the city of Birmingham, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution duly adopted by the Council of the City of Birmingham at its meeting held November 26, 1963, and as same appears of record in minute book C-1 of said city.

Given under my hand and corporate seal of the city of Birmingham, this the 26th day of November 1963.

JUDSON P. HODGES,
City Clerk.

THE GIFT OF A MAN

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an address by

Bishop James A. Matthews, Methodist Bishop of New England.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address by Bishop James K. Matthews, Methodist Bishop of New England, at the interdenominational service at the Washington Cathedral, Washington, D.C., Sunday, November 24, at 4 p.m., in memory of the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy, President of the United States:

THE GIFT OF A MAN: A PROTESTANT INTERPRETATION OF THE LIFE AND DEATH OF JOHN F. KENNEDY

(By Bishop James K. Matthews)

Today, Americans can have but one thought; for we have been present at a new crucifixion. A people who could endure the villainous murder of Medgar Evers without undue remorse; who could observe the slaughter of the innocents by a bomb in a Birmingham church and not really cry out for justice, have called for a yet more costly sacrifice that of the President of their country. Truly, then, Americans are weeping not only for him but for themselves.

We react, indeed, in anger and sorrow; but do we react sufficiently in repentance? To fail to miss the message of God in this tragic hour would be to allow yet another martyr to have died in vain.

For martyr he was, as surely as those who have died for their vision in earlier ages: a martyr at the hands of extremists of every kind, as well as at the hands of the comfortable captives of the status quo which most of us have become; a martyr to those who enjoy prejudices a century out of date, and those who refuse to live in the day which God has given to us.

To take seriously the death of a martyr is to take the meaning of that death upon ourselves. For in his mortal wound is our own hurt and the hurt of all mankind.

We are a proud, and even arrogant, people who have told ourselves that this sort of thing could not happen here. In more primitive periods of our history, yes. Among more primitive peoples even today. But not here. What could not happen has happened and it has happened to us all.

More than this, all of us have had a part in the slaying of our President. It was good people who crucified our Lord, and not merely those who acted as His executioners. By our silence, by our inaction, by our willingness that heavy burdens be borne by one man alone, by our readiness to allow evil to be called good and good evil; by our continued toleration of ancient injustices, by our failure to address ourselves to this day—by these means we all have had a part in the assassination.

In particular measure, we of the church must bear a heavy share of responsibility. For we are those who speak for God. We are His people and the sheep of His pasture. We are the Body of Christ, which bears His wounds. We are the sentinels of civilization, but we have failed to sound the alarm. We have been conformed to the social order we were supposed to have informed. Alas, the garments of the slayer are at our feet. Therefore, "the time has come for judgment to begin with the household of God."

Our Lord says: "Every one to whom much is given, of him will much be required." This word of God is a summons to accountability, just as the events of these days are a summons to accountability. For all too long now we have not been called to account; either to one another; or to the world; or to God. We have been ready to receive abundantly

of God's grace, but it is when the demands of that grace are upon us that we fail to measure up.

We call this Thanksgiving Sunday, when we are supposed to acknowledge the mercy of God. It is not really a question of whether or not it is proper for us to celebrate Thanksgiving at such a tragic hour as this. The fact is that we as a people have allowed Thanksgiving, as a significant day, to be lost long ago. It has been reduced to feasting and football. It has become "a pleasant interlude between leaf raking and snow shoveling." This holiday, far from being a holy day, has become a hollow day. Having eaten our fill, and that in the midst of a hungry world, we are left with an empty feeling.

Fundamentally, we have been seized by a forgetfulness of nationwide proportions. Abraham Lincoln told a war-torn Nation in his Thanksgiving proclamation in November 1863: "We have forgotten the gracious Hand which has preserved us in peace and multiplied and enriched and strengthened us, and have vainly imagined in the deceitfulness of our hearts that all these blessings were produced by some superior wisdom and virtue of our own. Intoxicated with unbroken success, we have become too self-sufficient to feel the necessity of redeeming and preserving grace, too proud to pray to the God that made us."

If this was true then, how much more is it true today, exactly 100 years later. So it was that in President Kennedy's Thanksgiving proclamation of November 1963, he said: "As we express our gratitude, we must never forget that the highest appreciation is not to utter words but to live by them. Let us therefore proclaim our gratitude to providence for manifold blessings—let us be humbly thankful for inherited ideals—and let us resolve to share those blessings and those ideals with our fellow human beings throughout the world."

Yes, we have been seized by forgetfulness. No wonder we debate about our national purpose. No wonder we worry about what other nations shall think of us as a people? Is it not here that we have lost our way? We have forgotten who we are. We have forgotten whose we are. We have forgotten whence we have come. Therefore, we do not know where we are going.

"Much has been given to us," yet we have been a thoughtless and thankless people. I do not mean merely that we have been given abundant harvests and a proud heritage. These, we have come to take for granted. Rather, we have been given a man. And this man has been, in an astonishing way, a symbol of the changing world in which we live, a constant flowing river of change which has not left any part of earth untouched.

For, John Fitzgerald Kennedy represented and embodied a brandnew world. Indeed, he grasped for it by means of the image of the New Frontier, not merely as a political implement, but as a present reality. So radically has the whole climate of mankind changed that one could almost say that a person living at the beginning of this century would have been more at home in Julius Caesar's time than in our own. This cultural revolution in which we find ourselves was that for which our late President stood.

Again, he made valiant efforts to give a new sense of mission to us as a nation. This does not mean that he solved all our problems for us but that he was, by virtue of office and by deliberate intent, in the very middle of the dramatic struggles that characterize our age. This sense of mission, involving the welfare of all civilization, has scarcely ever been as well articulated as it was in his inaugural address. Nor has a more imaginative token of it been created than the Peace Corps. So it was that one Peace Corps volunteer said last Friday, "I

myself am a part of the legacy he left to the world." Young Americans, in particular, seemed to catch what this man symbolized.

Moreover, he invited and encouraged a new human dignity—a freedom for man now. If this was to have meaning, through Americans, throughout the world, it had to have substance now within our own borders. Therefore, the Negro citizens, patient for a hundred years, were encouraged by President Kennedy to become a new people. That is to say, they have decided to be the free people our Constitution and the Gospel of Jesus Christ say they are. When men determine to be free, there is an unanswerable quality about their determination.

From the Hebrew-Christian perspective, all of this is the work of God. For God is a God who acts in history; indeed, who makes history and gives meaning to human events. The President saw precisely this when he declared, "Here on earth God's work must truly be our own."

We have assuredly been given much in our day, but some factors in our national life have said "No" to it all. They have said "No" to a brandnew world; "No" to national involvement in the whole process of civilization; "No" to the fulfillment now of human dignity. For all this, the high price of martyrdom has been paid. A martyr is, literally, a witness, and this is the witness we have been given.

Great gifts demand great responsibility. "For every one to whom much is given, of him will much be required." What, in the light of this sacrifice, does the Lord require of us? All humankind will be watching what we do in response, for when a people takes its own history seriously, every man's history is involved.

First of all, we, who have been forgetful are called to recollection and return. We have come to take God for granted, have tried to encase Him in the past and to capture Him in our creeds. Meanwhile, He is at work, as always, in the present orders of society.

Let us recall that we are a people by heritage dedicated to law and order and to equality under law. This was by specific intent. For 343 years ago this very week the Pilgrims landed on Cape Cod. Their navigation had been faulty, and they had missed the territory for which they had been granted authority. Some of the colonists considered that they were, therefore, under no law. Then, by deliberate act, they made themselves equal under law, by creating the Mayflower Compact. In this they promised to "covenant and combine ourselves together into a civil body politic, for our better ordering and preservation and furtherance of the ends aforesaid; and by virtue hereof to enact, constitute, and frame such just and equal laws, ordinances, acts, constitutions, and offices, from time to time, as shall be thought most meet and convenient for the general good of the colony, unto which we promise all due submission and obedience."

They were, therefore, a covenanted community: in acknowledging God, they acknowledged one another. By self-conscious promises, each held himself before God as responsible to his neighbor in a common endeavor. We are summoned by the martyrdom of our President to renew such a covenant of equity, under law, which is basic to any true community.

Secondly, in the light of this sacrifice, we are called to receive the very realities which it symbolizes. Therefore, we must embrace this new world of radical change and possibility. For it is offered to us as the gift of God.

Moreover, if this is to be a meaningful sacrifice, we are called as a people deliberately to involve ourselves in the whole enterprise of humanity. For, in a degree unparalleled in earlier centuries, we owe ourselves to the world. Merely to preserve our-

selves as a nation is to lose our identity. But to give our lives in the service of total civilization is to find ourselves. For it is only in our mission together that we are a nation.

Again, in view of this martyrdom, we are called to a deepened fulfillment of the dignity of every person. There can no longer be any second-class people of any kind, anywhere. Only through acknowledging this dignity for all—without any exception—can any one of us possess dignity himself. So it is that integrity may return to us and we can be the nation we have pretended to be.

What I have said is that we have been present at a new crucifixion and that we all have, in fact, contributed to it. Our crucified Lord enables us to understand the cruciform nature of all human existence, and He endows even the most senseless event with cosmic meaning. But the Christian is not allowed to speak of crucifixion without speaking also of resurrection. This can only be realized by our embodying, as living sacrifices, that which was embodied by the one who was slain. That is to say, we are to confront life and the world with a new openness, a new awareness of our true identity and responsibility as a nation, and a new readiness to acknowledge the validity of every human being.

Finally, let us receive the torch that has been passed to a new generation of Americans. For this generation, as John Fitzgerald Kennedy himself so clearly expressed it, "would not exchange places with any other people or any other generation. The energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it—and the glow from that fire can truly light the world." That never-dying torch has now been lighted by a martyr for his people. For this man not only uttered words but lived by them. "Every one to whom much is given, of him will much be required." Amen.

KENNEDY AND THE WORLD'S FAIR

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill which will authorize the Secretary of Commerce, under the authority delegated to him by the President's Executive Order No. 11014, to provide an appropriate exhibit of the life and career of our late President at the New York World's Fair, which opens in April 1964.

Participation by the United States in the fair is authorized by the provisions of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961. Last year we appropriated—as part of the public welfare amendments of 1962—\$17 million to finance our participation. My bill provides that the Secretary, in carrying out these functions, include an appropriate memorial exhibit in honor of the late President Kennedy.

I hope that the Congress will enact this bill so that the many millions of visitors to the fair from other countries will come to know John F. Kennedy better and come to realize that he was, as President Johnson has characterized him, "a great and good man."

THE COTTON BILL: HOW IT AFFECTS CONSUMERS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, on November 13, the Honorable HAROLD D. COOLEY, of North Carolina, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and author of the Cooley cotton bill, H.R. 6196, extended his remarks in the RECORD, page 21784.

He responded to a statement I had made concerning the bill on November 8.

It was clear that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] contends the bill will benefit American consumers. In fact, his remarks were captioned, "The Cotton Bill: A \$500 Million-Plus Gain for American Consumers."

In his remarks he declared:

Mr. Speaker, the greatest benefactor under this legislation will be the American consumer. Americans will enjoy lower prices for American-made cotton goods, at savings amounting to more than \$500 million a year—it was shown to our committee that a rise or fall in the cost of cotton is almost invariably and completely accompanied by a rise or fall of the same degree in cotton cost prices. The Department of Commerce established this as a fact in the hearings of our committee.

Perhaps the gentleman was led to this conclusion by comparisons between the price of raw cotton and "gray cloth," a nonconsumer item which emerges only a short distance from raw cotton in the manufacturing process. Due to this proximity, it is not surprising that gray cloth prices follow raw cotton closely. A chart showing this comparison appears on page 10 of the committee report accompanying H.R. 6196.

A reader who mistakenly thinks of gray cloth as a typical cotton product for consumers might assume that consumer prices go up and down together with remarkable precision.

Perhaps this was the case with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

In any event, the chart does not tell the whole story. Indeed, its incompleteness is misleading.

The price history of retail cotton products is readily available from the Agricultural Marketing Service, USDA, the same office from which the gray cloth-raw cotton comparison came.

At my request, the AMS supplied me with average composite retail cost of 25 products—expressed in terms of 1 pound of cotton—for the period 1935–63. Most of this information appeared in the USDA's Marketing Research Report No. 277, published in 1958. The selection of the 25 typical products, of course, was made by the USDA, not by myself.

The period covered by this information does not reach back quite as far as the chart on page 10 of the committee report, but it goes far enough to refute the generalization repeated by the

gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]:

That a rise or fall in the cost of cotton is almost invariably and completely accompanied by a rise or fall of the same degree in cotton cost prices.

I present below this information, listing first the retail cost in dollars of the composite cotton products, and second the average farm value of raw cotton. Farm value is based on average prices of cotton in central markets less one-half cent per pound estimated to be the difference between central-market price and price received by farmers.

It is clear at a glance that retail prices do not rise and fall precisely with raw cotton. You will even observe periods in which raw cotton went down while retail prices rose, and vice versa.

Cotton products: Average composite retail cost of 25 products (expressed in terms of 1 pound of cotton), and average farm value

Year	Retail cost	Average farm value
1935	\$0.91	\$0.12
1936	.91	.12
1937	.95	.11
1938	.89	.08
1939	.88	.09
1940	.89	.10
1941	.98	.13
1942	1.22	.18
1943	1.29	.19
1944	1.37	.20
1945	1.50	.22
1946	1.84	.29
1947	2.17	.33
1948	2.20	.33
1949	1.98	.30
1950	2.03	.35
1951	2.24	.41
1952	2.14	.38
1953	2.13	.32
1954	2.08	.33
1955	2.07	.34
1956	2.10	.33
1957	2.12	.32
1958	2.11	.32
1959	2.12	.31
1960	2.17	.30
1961	2.19	.31
1962	2.15	.33
1963	2.17	.33

¹ 1st half of year.

This morning I distributed to each Member a duplicated sheet showing this data graphically. Unfortunately graphs cannot be published in these remarks, so I present the table instead.

In a brief search of legislative history, I find some expert testimony which denies that retail prices necessarily respond to changes in raw material costs.

For example, in the 84th Congress, consideration was given to H.R. 12, a proposal to restore 90 percent of parity price supports on basic farm commodities, including cotton. The committee report, emerging from the committee chaired then, as now, by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] called attention to the fact that "a \$4 dress shirt contains less than 30 cents worth of cotton."

On October 4, 1962, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] inserted a statement in the RECORD in which he said:

From 1950 to 1960 the price of a pound loaf of bread rose by nearly 7 cents—the price the farmer received for the wheat in that loaf of bread actually dropped.

In a speech printed in the RECORD on September 1, 1960, my chairman made this report:

As one illustration of how the farmer and the middleman have fared, I refer to an official Department of Agriculture report which shows that from 1948 to 1958 the cost of wheat and other ingredients in a loaf of bread declined 12 percent at the farm, while processing and marketing margins for the loaf increased 55 percent. Thus, in the 10-year period, the cost of the loaf of white bread increased from 13.9 to 19.3 cents, on a national average, while the price received by the farmer for a bushel of wheat declined from \$1.98 to \$1.72.

On March 24, 1958, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] inserted a statement in the RECORD, as follows:

Now let us look specifically at the relationship of farm price to consumer price in these two commodities.

In 1952 milk prices were supported at 90 percent of parity and the average price of a quart of fresh milk in grocery stores throughout the country was 22.8 cents. In 1957 the support had been reduced to 83 percent of parity (actually 76 percent of parity as computed in 1952), and the retail price of milk had risen to 24.3 cents a quart.

Now look at wheat. Department of Agriculture figures show that in January 1948, the farm price of wheat reached a peak of \$2.81 a bushel, and the average price of a one pound loaf of bread at that time was 13.8 cents. In 1955, the farm price of wheat had dropped to \$2.14 a bushel, and the average price of a loaf of bread had increased to 17½ cents. Thus while the price of wheat declined 24 percent, the price of bread advanced 27 percent. In 1952, wheat was supported at 90 percent of parity of \$2.20 a bushel and the average price of a loaf of bread was 16 cents. In 1957, with wheat at \$2 a bushel, the average price of a loaf of bread was 18.8 cents. For the wheat in an 18.8 cents loaf of bread, the farmer gets somewhere between 2.6 and 3.2 cents.

These figures substantiate completely that another cut in the farm prices of milk and wheat will mean simply that \$250 million will be taken away from dairymen in 1958, and more than \$200 million from wheat producers, and all these millions will be absorbed by middlemen between the farmers and the consumers. Consumers will derive no price benefit whatsoever.

It would be ridiculous to argue, on the basis of what the gentleman from North Carolina has presented, that lower raw material prices mean higher consumer prices. He does not make such a contention, and neither do I.

However, it is equally unrealistic to argue, as the gentleman has been arguing recently on the cotton bill that lower raw material costs will yield an equal drop in consumer prices.

It is fantastic to predict that an increased tax outlay of \$250 million for the cotton program will yield a \$500 million-plus gain for the consumer. That is picking up more than a \$2 gain for each \$1 outlay.

Such conclusions certainly fly in the face of the gentleman from North Carolina's statements in 1958, 1960, and 1962 on consumer-raw material prices. They also fly in the face of the official figures reported by the Department of Agriculture.

Another distinguished member of the Committee on Agriculture recently com-

mented on the relationship between raw commodity prices and consumer prices. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], during the 86th Congress, issued a statement on farm problems in the form of a committee print. In it he declared:

The tremendous loss which farmers have sustained in the way of low prices for their products in recent years has not been passed on to consumers.

Here is the gentleman from Texas' [Mr. POAGE] comment on this subject:

Let us see just what effect the price of wheat has had on the cost of bread. Just 12 years ago wheat sold as high as \$2.81 a bushel. At that time bread sold for a little less than 14 cents a pound. The price of wheat has continued to drop until today the average market price is about \$1.80—a drop of approximately one-third in what the farmer received for wheat. During that same period of time, the price of bread has not gone down at all but has gone up to 20 cents a pound—an increase of nearly 50 percent. Certainly, there is no justification for blaming the farmer with the high cost of bread.

The same sort of situation exists in regard to milk. Twelve years ago farmers were receiving 11.3 cents for a quart of milk, which was retailing for 21.1 cents. Today farmers get just 11.1 cents for that quart of milk, but consumers are paying 25.1 cents. Certainly, I don't mean to say that the lower farm prices go, the higher consumers' costs will be, but I do mean to say that the record shows rather clearly that the tremendous loss which farmers have sustained in the way of low prices for their products in recent years has not been passed on to consumers—and if low farm prices don't help consumers, why should Government try to lower them?

No one can accurately predict the effect on consumer prices of a bill like H.R. 6196.

THE STATUE OF FREEDOM ON THE CAPITOL DOME

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, today is the 100th anniversary of one of America's most important symbols—the symbol of man's highest aspiration—freedom. Down through the centuries, men have braved the unknown and uncharted seas; have faced the trials of the wilderness; have given up their earthly possessions; have set aside material security; have laid their own lives on the sacrificial block; that this precious right derived as a gift from the eternal Creator would not be corrupted by the self-seeking, power-mad opportunists whose passion it is to wield the scepter of power over the lives of individuals and nations.

Exactly 100 years ago today, December 2, 1863, at precisely the hour this House convened today—12 o'clock noon—the final segment of Freedom Statue which tops the dome of this great Capitol Building and dominates the entire area was lifted off the ground by means of the steam hoisting apparatus which had

been successfully used for construction of the entire dome. Twenty minutes later the head and crown was moved to its place and firmly attached to the body of the figure, 300 feet in the air. It was adjusted. The American flag was unfurled over its head and the national salute of 35 guns was fired from a field battery on Capitol Hill. The last gun from this salute was answered by a similar salute from the 12 forts which at that time of Civil War constituted a line of fortifications surrounding the city of Washington.

I invite my colleagues to take special note of this symbol that tops the Capitol dome as they leave the House today and as they come here for sessions of this body. I urge those who visit their Capital City to make a special effort to pause and view this important historic monument as a first on their list of musts to see.

Whether against a clear blue cloudless sky on a crisp autumn day, or a white and pink puffed sky in summer; whether it is seen in the haze of the early morning serving to catch the first ray of a rising sun in early spring, or reflects the light of a setting sun in a fading summer evening; whether the air be hot or chilled, in rain and in sunshine, Freedom Statue stands as a silent sentinel to help all who view it from near or afar to remember that America is richly blessed above all nations with that priceless possession—freedom. For those who may not be in possession of the official information regarding the statue, the following, I am sure, will be of great interest:

STATUE OF FREEDOM

The statue surmounting the dome of the U.S. Capitol, and facing to the east, is officially known as the Statue of Freedom. It is 19 feet 6 inches high, weighs 14,985 pounds and cost, exclusive of erecting in place, \$23,796.82.

The figure is that of a woman clad in flowing draperies with her right hand resting upon the hilt of a sheathed sword and her left holding a wreath and grasping a shield. At the waist, a brooch bearing the letters "U.S." holds the drapery in place. The head is covered by a helmet encircled with stars and surmounted by a crest composed of an eagle's head and a bold arrangement of feathers, suggested by the costume of our Indian tribes.

As a protection from lightning, 10 bronze points, tipped with platinum, are placed as follows: one on the head; six on the feathers in the headdress; one on each shoulder; and one on the shield.

The statue was designed by Thomas Crawford, father of F. Marion Crawford, the novelist, and the plaster model for which he received \$3,000 was executed in the Crawford studios in Rome. Mr. Crawford died in 1857 before the model was shipped from his studio. Shipment was subsequently made on April 19, 1858, on the bark *Emily Taylor*. The bark, having sprung a leak, put into Gibraltar for repairs after which the voyage was resumed. Encountering stormy weather, leaks again developed and part of the cargo, such as bales of rags and cases of citron, was thrown overboard, but on the 27th of July, the leak having increased to such an extent, it was determined for safety to put into Bermuda. Upon surveys held, the vessel was condemned and sold. The cargo, which had been landed and stored, was finally forwarded to its destination as indicated in the records, which show that in De-

cember 1858 Tappan and Starbuck of New York, acting as general agents for the United States in the receipt and forwarding of the statuaries, notified Captain Meigs, in charge of the work at the Capitol, that the bark *G. W. Horton*, from Bermuda, had arrived with some of the statuaries on board. It was not possible to bring all of the statuaries, and as late as March 30, 1859, the last of the statuaries, or portions of the model, were shipped from New York to Washington by the schooner *Statesman*.

The contract for casting the statue in bronze was awarded to Clark Mills, whose foundry was located near Bladensburg which lies just northeast of the District of Columbia. On May 17, 1861, on account of the existing conditions due to the Civil War, Captain Meigs, Superintendent of Construction of the U.S. Capitol, issued orders to stop work on the statue.

The annual report of Thomas U. Walter, Architect of the Capitol Extension, dated November 1, 1862, states that "the Statue of Freedom, which is intended as the crowning feature of the dome, is completed, and removed to the grounds east of the Capitol, where it has been placed on a temporary pedestal, in order that the public may have an opportunity to examine it before it is raised to its destined position."

The hour of 12 m. December 2, 1863, was selected for the completion of the erection of the statue in place on the dome. Four of the sections had been previously raised to their places and firmly secured to the structure, leaving the fifth section, embracing the head and shoulders, to constitute the crowning feature, the hoisting and adjusting of which was the occasion of a Special Order No. 248 of the War Department which provided that at the moment at which a flag was displayed from the statue, a national salute of 35 guns should be fired from a field battery on Capitol Hill, the last gun from this salute to be answered by a similar salute from the 12 forts which at that time constituted a line of fortifications surrounding the city of Washington.

Precisely at 12 m. on the aforesaid 2d day of December 1863, the crowning feature of the statue was started from the ground in front of the Capitol by means of the steam hoisting apparatus which had been successfully used for the construction of the entire dome and in 20 minutes it reached the height of 300 feet, when it was moved to its place and firmly attached to the remaining portion of the figure; as soon as it was adjusted, the American flag was unfurled over its head and the national salute was fired.

The original plaster model from which the bronze statue was cast is now on exhibition in the old building of the National Museum in Washington, D.C.

The freedom statue should remind us and the world of the multitudes who, with their lives—in peace and in war—have made freedom meaningful. These include not only Presidents and other high Government officials but men and women serving in office at every level of government; the schoolboy who writes his thesis on "What America Means to Me"; the young lady who marches with her Girl Scout troop, proudly carrying the flag of her country; the mother who rears her child with a love for freedom with responsibility; the dad who works to support his family, who looks ever beyond each day that he might grasp the opportunity to do greater things; the preacher, priest, and rabbi who serve their countrymen in the name of the Almighty, reminding them it is God who has endowed them with the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness;

the soldier standing guard on a lonely outpost; the sailor braving the perils of the sea—words cannot begin to name the multitude of citizens who swell the mighty chorus of those who have made freedom ours and who today, unsung yet willing, keep us free.

Let not this day pass without noting that those who had occupied this historic place of responsibility and authority not only were strongly aware of where they had been and from whence they came—but they faced without flinching the responsibilities that confronted them in their day and met them at whatever cost, because they placed their own conscience and sense of duty above life itself. This symbol of freedom which they placed atop the Capitol dome is evidence, too, that in the midst of struggle and pain and suffering they looked forward with hope and faith, confident that God, having a stake in the destiny of this free Nation, would preserve it and keep it.

Our Nation lives because God lives in the hearts and lives of its citizens. While life itself requires sacrifice, I am confident that the people of the United States will not be found wanting in the future as they have not been found wanting in the past when the right demanded their all.

PLEDGE OF SUPPORT FOR PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FOREMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express the heartsickness and sorrow of west Texans and Americans everywhere over the incredible and shocking tragedy that occurred on Friday, November 22. We all mourn this terrible tragedy that brought death to our President and painful injury to our Governor. Our warmest and most sincere sympathies are felt for Mrs. Kennedy, her children, and the family. Our prayers are with the Kennedy family and also, with our Texas Governor, John Connally and his family.

Mr. Speaker, our hopes, prayers, and support are with our new and able President, Lyndon Johnson, in the trying days ahead. We pledge our strength and support in joining with him in picking up the reins of Government and carrying on in the manner in which we know, he and we, are capable. May God's love, grace, and mercy be with President Johnson, the Members of Congress, and all Americans as we face the challenge before us.

JOHNSON ADMINISTRATION TO UNDERGO FIRST TEST ON CUBA IN VENEZUELA DEMAND FOR OAS MEETING TO CONSIDER SANCTIONS AGAINST CUBA

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

from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the first real test of the determination and decisiveness of the administration of President Johnson on the Cuba question comes tomorrow when Venezuela, with proof positive of Cuba's armed intervention in the recent elections there, asks for a meeting of the foreign ministers of the Western Hemisphere nations in the OAS to consider sanctions against Cuba under the Rio Treaty of 1947.

It is my earnest hope that the United States will take a leadership role in calling for the imposition of sanctions against Cuba's Communists who have been caught "Red handed," so to speak, with their weapons on the beach of Paragana, some 3 tons of it, inciting riots and violence in an effort to create an atmosphere of chaos that could have resulted in the invalidation of the election through the imposition of martial law, had it succeeded.

The arms were traced to a Belgian national arms factory that provided the list of the numbers of weapons provided for the Cuban Army which matched the serial numbers on the weapons found on the beach in Venezuela.

The Rio Treaty provides for sanctions against Cuba in such a case, including the breaking off of diplomatic relations, complete cutoff of all trade—including flow of subversives—all communications and even the use of armed force. Today five Latin countries continue to recognize Cuba: Mexico, Chile, Brazil, Bolivia, and Uruguay.

I have been calling for the demand, by the United States, that these nations withdraw recognition but no effort to accomplish this has been made by our State Department. Little has been done in preventing the flow of subversives to and from Cuba. Too little has been accomplished in cutting off trade—even between our allies and Cuba. Even these steps short of the use of armed force have not been taken.

It is my hope that the Johnson administration will back up this demand for a meeting of the foreign ministers as proposed by Venezuela and that we will at last give the OAS the needed leadership in imposing sanctions to cut off the threat of communism from Cuba.

This is the first major test of the ability of the new administration to meet the challenge of Communist growth in this hemisphere and in dealing with the Cuban challenge. The entire world will be watching to measure the determination of the United States under its new leadership. Now is the time to let the world know of our will to win against the Communist menace in this hemisphere.

Following are two articles on this subject which appeared in the December 2, 1963, issue of the Washington Daily News:

A NEW TEST FOR SOLVING CUBA POSER

(By Virginia Prewett)

Venezuela's request for Organization of American States action under the Rio Treaty

against Castro's Cuba for aggression and subversive attack is no more a parochial hemisphere crisis than was Castro's power seizure in Cuba.

This is the beginning of a test of Russian and United States positions. The test will determine whether Russia means to exact as the price of the tenuous existing detente a free hand on the Central and South American land mass. It will determine whether the United States believes Latin America is expendable.

Venezuela now gives the United States an opportunity to solve the Cuban problem at the insistence of a Latin American complainant invoking a treaty that binds all New World governments. This is an open and honorable path, in many ways far less dangerous than the inside plotting against Castro that has gone on in U.S. official circles for months past.

CLEANUP CHANCE

It gives the United States a chance to clean up the Caribbean in support of a Latin American nation that is an example of democratic reform. If there is to be any peace, then our Government must surely stand for the rule of law and of recognized international treaties established to maintain peace. This was the prime purpose of the Rio instrument.

If our helmsmen are timid and boggle this chance, the effects will be tremendously far reaching. For our treaty obligations under the Rio instrument are every bit as solemn and legal and binding as our NATO obligations. They are as binding as the Moscow test ban treaty.

President Romulo Betancourt of Venezuela has voiced a grim truth: So long as Castro's Cuba exists, Latin America will be under unbearable Communist subversive attack. He asks for the threat to be eradicated the only way it can be—with the elimination of Communist Cuba.

THE FINE PRINT

The U.S. State Department appears to support the Venezuelan position. But the fine print shows that our officials, while admitting that Venezuela has caught Cuban subversion red handed, speak of "increasing vigilance" around Cuba. This is quite different from eradicating the evil at its source.

Washington assures Latin America that we keep strict surveillance over Cuba. This rings hollow in face of the Castro-armed terror in Venezuela and in Colombia and elsewhere.

Many U.S. leaders, more familiar with Europe or Asia, regard Latin America as a sideshow. If Washington pushes this fatal weakness too far, we shall find ourselves isolated in a sea of broken alliances, broken treaties, and hostile neighbors controlled from Moscow.

ARMS ISSUE RAISED: OAS PLANS MEETING ON CASTRO

(By Richard H. Boyce)

For the fifth time since Fidel Castro came to power in Cuba, the rest of the hemisphere is considering a high-level conference on what to do about him.

None of the previous meetings has had much effect. Now Venezuela wants the council of the Organization of American States to call a meeting of foreign ministers of the hemisphere nations.

Venezuela, long a prime target of Communist Cuba's terrorism and subversion, wants the meeting because she discovered a cache of 3 tons of arms and ammunition on Paragana Beach, some 350 miles northwest of Caracas.

The cache included Belgian-made rifles.

PROOF

Venezuela says Cuba put the arms there, and calls this an act of aggression. The United States said modern electronic tech-

niques were used on the arms here to bring out markings, and proved Venezuela's claim.

The Belgian national arms factory clinched it by providing a list of serial numbers of weapons the factory made for the Cuban Army.

Finding the arms is the first real proof the Castro regime is shipping munitions to Castroites in other Latin American countries, though this has long been regarded as true.

Tomorrow the OAS meets to consider Venezuela's charge and decide whether to order a Foreign Ministers' Conference.

STEP BY STEP

It would take only a majority of the 20 OAS members to call such a conference. But the Ministers' Conference would need a two-thirds vote to take action against Castro.

What action could it take?

Venezuela wants the Conference to be held under the 1947 Rio Treaty.

This spells out steps the hemisphere can adopt—recall of ambassadors from Havana, breakoff of diplomatic and consular relations, complete cutoff of all trade and communications and the use of armed force.

The Foreign Ministers' Conference held in Punta del Este, Uruguay, in January 1962, kicked Castro's regime out of the inter-American family of nations, and suspended trade in arms.

But that action did not make any breakoff mandatory. Five Latin countries still have diplomatic ties with Cuba—Mexico, Chile, Brazil, Bolivia, and Uruguay.

Under the Rio Treaty, breaking ties would be mandatory.

Diplomatic observers here speculate finding of the arms cache is such serious proof of Castro's work that even these five countries might vote for some Rio Treaty sanctions.

But no one expects a ministers' conference to vote the use of armed force. Armed force is not obligatory on member nations under the Rio Treaty.

THE CENTAUR PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday afternoon, November 27, 1963, America's space program achieved another first. A new kind of launch vehicle, called Centaur, was successfully fired from Cape Canaveral, now known as Cape Kennedy. That launching was significant for a number of reasons.

To begin with, Centaur is the first booster in America's stable of launch vehicles that uses liquid hydrogen fuel. Hydrogen has long been recognized as a fuel with great promise for it offers significant performance advantages over conventional propellants for rocket use. Liquid hydrogen, however, is hard to handle, and harnessing it for space missions involves development of a whole new technology.

Virtually all upper stages of large space vehicles under development during the next decade, both chemical and nuclear, will be designed to take advantage of the unique properties of liquid hydrogen. Centaur, therefore, provides the Space Agency with an indispensable research and development tool, with which our scientists are learning liquid hydrogen technology.

In addition, NASA plans to use the Centaur launch vehicle for a variety of space missions, the most urgent of which

is the unmanned exploration of the moon with a spacecraft called Surveyor; this is a necessary preliminary to the Apollo manned lunar landing program.

Major elements of NASA's planetary science program also depend upon the Centaur launch vehicle, with its inherent ability to project larger payloads to the planets.

We members of the Committee on Science and Astronautics are particularly pleased at Centaur's first successful flight, following a long history of technical difficulties, delays, and reassignments of responsibility.

In order to throw a little light on some of the problems encountered in the program, I want to give a brief review of Centaur's unusual history.

The Centaur program dates back to the summer of 1958, when a proposal by General Dynamics/Astronautics to develop a liquid hydrogen-liquid oxygen upper stage for the Atlas rocket was accepted by the advanced research projects agency of the Department of Defense.

During its first year or so, Centaur was not a launch vehicle development program in any real sense. The initial contract did not even provide for development of a guidance system. No missions or payload capabilities were specified. The program was conceived as a feasibility study, simply to demonstrate the use of liquid hydrogen as a rocket fuel.

Funding during the early phases of the program was low, and ARPA directed that no interference with the Atlas ICBM program would be permitted. Moreover, off-the-shelf equipment and existing Atlas tooling and technology were required to be used as fully as possible in fabricating Centaur. This is an important point, for it was later discovered that some of the Atlas fabrication techniques were not effective in building tanks for the supercold and highly volatile liquid hydrogen. Taming liquid hydrogen has turned out to be much more difficult than anyone had supposed at the outset.

From this modest beginning, the Centaur program moved gradually toward the status of a full-fledged booster development program. Its first assignment was the synchronous orbit satellite mission and this gave Centaur a payload goal. Later, lunar and planetary exploration missions were assigned to Centaur.

In the meantime, management responsibility for the program went from ARPA to the Air Force. Then, following the passage of the Space Act of 1958, and the creation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Centaur program was officially transferred from the Defense Department to NASA in July 1959.

The Marshall Space Flight Center, already committed to the Saturn program, was given primary responsibility for the Centaur program. Because of Marshall's preoccupation with Saturn, the Air Force technical and contract management teams continued actual supervision of Centaur.

Last year, following the failure of the first flight test, the program was reassigned to NASA's Lewis Research Center in Cleveland.

In summary, Centaur began as a low-priority, financially austere feasibility study, in competition with high priority defense programs. As its importance to the national space effort became more apparent, its terms of reference were changed; and, as time passed, its inherent technical difficulties came to the surface; technical difficulties, I might add, that we have learned to expect in most new programs.

Certainly, the original flight schedule of Centaur was overly optimistic. hindsight also tells us that the complexity of the program was greatly underestimated.

These facts have combined to make for a history of delay, disappointment, and frustration in the Centaur program.

Shortly after the failure of the first flight test in May 1962, I directed the Subcommittee on Space Sciences, under the able chairmanship of Congressman JOSEPH E. KARTH, to hold hearings on Centaur. The report of the subcommittee was critical of NASA management, as well as the performance of the prime contractor. I am pleased to be able to tell the House today that officials of both organizations have stated to us that the committee's investigation was an important factor in getting the Centaur program on the right track.

The subcommittee recommended, among other things, that consideration be given to assigning the Nation's highest priority to Centaur. Soon thereafter, NASA assigned the DX priority to this essential program.

In addition, many changes have since been made in the management of the program, both by NASA and by the prime contractor. Centaur now has a supporting organization consistent with its importance to the Nation's space effort.

Under the expert supervision of Dr. Abe Silverstein, Director of NASA's Lewis Research Center, the Centaur vehicle has been subjected to the most rigorous and thorough ground testing procedures. Several innovations have been introduced into the program; many new fabrication techniques have been developed, and novel prelaunch procedures have been adopted.

I recently visited the Lewis Center, as several other members of our committee have. Only 2 weeks ago, the facilities of General Dynamics/Astronautics, the prime contractor for Centaur, were inspected by members of our committee. We have all been impressed with the magnitude of the difficulties which have been overcome in this highly complex undertaking. We have been equally impressed with the sound and orderly manner in which the Centaur program is now being pursued. I am sure I speak for all those members when I say we are confident that Centaur is on its way to becoming a great success.

Not too long ago, the press was filled with stories to the effect that \$100 million was wasted in the Centaur program. This figure was based on a report to the Science and Astronautics Committee by the Comptroller General which I had specifically requested.

That report was misinterpreted by the press, and a closer look at it will reveal

that no such conclusion was drawn by the Comptroller General. The alleged \$100 million waste included \$76 million reportedly lost in the Advent project, the military communications satellite project.

Interesting enough, the Advent project, like Centaur, came under the scrutiny of our committee during the 2d session of the 87th Congress. We had received reports that Advent was in trouble, and I directed the Karth subcommittee to look into it.

The report on Advent concluded that this program was a poor example of effective interservice cooperation, and that the failure of full cooperation accounted, at least in part, for the fact that over \$170 million had been spent on Project Advent, and the Nation had very little to show for it.

Dr. Harold Brown, Director of Defense Research and Engineering, testified that the Advent satellite, designed in 1958, was obsolete in 1962. Our investigation also revealed that the Advent satellite, originally designed to weigh about 1,000 pounds, ended up weighing almost 1,400 pounds—far in excess of Centaur's most optimistic predicted payload capability for the synchronous orbit.

While there can be no doubt that certain programs incurred losses because of the unavailability of Centaur on schedule, it is incorrect and unfair to attribute the entire unrecoverable loss associated with the Advent program to Centaur, as the press apparently did. Suffice it to say that the Advent project had its own severe management and technical difficulties which led to its cancellation in June 1962.

In conclusion, let me say that we have felt free to criticize NASA when criticism seemed to be indicated. More than that, we believe it was our duty. On the other hand, we are glad for an opportunity to praise, when praise has been earned.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the successful flight of Centaur represents a significant advance in the development of a new technology upon which much of America's future space effort depends. The importance of this first step toward the harnessing of hydrogen to do man's work in space can hardly be overestimated. Last week's achievement notably advances the state of the art in chemical rockets.

I believe we should all take this opportunity to extend our congratulations to Mr. James E. Webb, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and his entire organization.

I also want to recognize the competence of the prime contractors, General Dynamics/Astronautics and the Pratt & Whitney Engine Co. These companies, working as a team, have given America a new breakthrough in its exploration of outer space.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of my committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], for yielding to me.

CENTAUR—FAILURE FOLLOWED BY SUCCESS

I join with my chairman, the distinguished gentleman from California, in the congratulations upon the successful Centaur flight vehicle of November 27, 1963. Centaur is an integral part of our total space program and upon its success depends subsequent stages.

It might be well for us at this time to look back upon the unsuccessful Atlas-Centaur flight vehicle on May 8, 1962. The Comptroller General of the United States in a report—March 1963—upon request of the distinguished Chairman MILLER, of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, made the following summary of its findings:

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

A special NASA Board of Inquiry, established to investigate the cause of failure of the first Atlas-Centaur flight vehicle on May 8, 1962, found that, regardless of any other possible causes, the vehicle was doomed to failure because the Centaur weather shield was not designed to withstand the pressure loads which acted upon it. The Board noted that failure of the weather shield could have been predicted on the basis of pressure distribution data furnished in September 1960 to NASA and GD/A personnel responsible for Centaur. Whether NASA or GD/A should have anticipated the failure is a matter of technical opinion.

We were advised that the NASA Centaur project office in California did not have sufficient staff available to permit a detailed review of pressure distribution data. Although the Centaur project office was then under the authority of the Marshall Space Flight Center (MSFC), we found no evidence that the data were submitted to MSFC for review. It appears that, because of MSFC's extensive experience and reputation in rocket design and development, MSFC possessed a sufficient and competent staff to have reviewed the weather shield design and the data in adequate detail.

Although the responsibility for adequately designing the Centaur vehicle lies primarily with the contractor, we believe that the inadequate participation by NASA in the technical aspects of the Centaur structural development greatly enhanced the chances that the improper design in the weather shield region would be overlooked. (See p. 42.)

DAMAGE OF ABOUT \$1.2 MILLION AT P & WA TEST STANDS AND RESULTING DELAY PROBABLY WOULD HAVE BEEN PREVENTED IF STANDARD SAFETY DEVICES HAD BEEN INSTALLED

In November 1960 and January 1961, three explosions which cost the Government about \$1.2 million occurred at P & WA's Florida Research and Development Center. Although automatic abort equipment designed to prevent explosions had been in general use in rocket engine test facilities at other locations for several years, it was not installed at the P & WA test stands on which Centaur engines were tested until after the third explosion.

The information obtained by us indicates that both the Air Force and MSFC had sufficient previous experience in the practical use of automatic abort systems to have required the installation of such systems at the P & WA test stands. Also, it would seem that P & WA had a responsibility to develop and furnish suitable automatic abort equipment in accordance with prevailing safety

standards for rocket test stands. NASA and P & WA have stated that automatic abort systems would probably have prevented explosions such as those which occurred at P & WA. It appears that the risk of monetary losses and program delays involved in not providing automatic abort systems was unreasonably high.

OVERSTATEMENT OF PAYLOAD CAPACITY TO DOD CONTRIBUTED TO COSTLY DELAY IN CANCELING THE ADVENT SPACECRAFT

One of the principal reasons for canceling the Advent¹ in May 1962 was the ever-increasing, unfavorable disparity between the payload capacity of the Atlas-Centaur launch vehicle and the weight of the Advent spacecraft which was being developed by the Department of Defense (DOD). The payload capacity of the Atlas-Centaur decreased and the weight of the Advent increased. In our opinion, NASA, upon becoming increasingly aware that GD/A's payload computations for the Atlas-Centaur were in error, did not take adequate measures to provide the best available payload information to DOD. As a result, we believe that NASA contributed to unnecessarily prolonging development of the Advent for which funds were being expended at a rate of \$4 million a month.

NASA officials agree that neither GD/A nor NASA had fully adequate control over payload computations. They stated also that GD/A, since it changed its management in February 1962 to a project-type organization, has forwarded much better information on Atlas-Centaur payload capabilities. NASA informed us further that its employees have now been assigned to review the accuracy of payload quotations on a day-to-day basis.

THERE WAS A DELAY IN ASCERTAINING AND IMPLEMENTING REQUIREMENTS FOR A FLIGHT TERMINATION SYSTEM

Although the Air Force published requirements for an independent flight termination system in April 1960, NASA did not approve GD/A's proposal for a system or did not authorize its incorporation into the Atlas-Centaur until February 1962. The Centaur project office had requested GD/A to submit a proposal for the system in September 1961, following a delayed but unsuccessful attempt by GD/A to obtain a waiver of the requirements.

In February 1962, GD/A estimated that the delays in ascertaining and implementing range safety requirements would result in postponement of the second Atlas-Centaur flight for about 15 weeks. Also, the delay had the effect of NASA's assuming too high a payload capability for the Atlas-Centaur. Although the flight is now delayed for other reasons, we believe that the belated actions by NASA and GD/A are illustrations of deficiencies in the Centaur management practices.

USE OF CONTRACTOR PERSONNEL BY THE NASA PLANT REPRESENTATIVE WAS NOT PROPER

The NASA plant representative at GD/A had been utilizing contractor personnel as secretaries for various periods since August 1960 in contravention of the general rule that purely personal services for the Government are required to be performed by Federal personnel under Government supervision. The GD/A employees were utilized for confidential NASA work while under the supervision and administrative control of GD/A personnel. The NASA plant representative at GD/A stated that after January 1, 1963, he would make no further use of GD/A secretaries. The NASA representative at P & WA informed us that he also uses contractor personnel to augment his secretarial staff.

¹The Advent spacecraft under development until May 1962 was canceled as part of a reorientation of the Advent program within the Department of Defense.

In our opinion the use of the contractor's secretaries does not provide the safeguards necessary to prevent unauthorized disclosure of confidential NASA information to such contractor.

UNNECESSARY FEE WAS ALLOWED GD/A FOR SUPPORT OF ATLAS PROPULSION SYSTEM

Although the Air Force contracts directly with the Rocketdyne Division of North American Aviation, Inc. (Rocketdyne), to provide field service support to all users of the Atlas booster, NASA contracted with GD/A for estimated costs of \$110,000 and a fee of \$7,150 to provide such services for Atlas-Centaur vehicles through a subcontract with Rocketdyne. In our opinion the services should be provided under the existing Air Force contract thus eliminating the payment of a fee to GD/A.

The subcontract between GD/A and Rocketdyne expires on June 30, 1963. If an expanded Atlas-Centaur flight program should require additional field service support, the amount of the unnecessary fee to GD/A would probably be increased. While no decision has been made, NASA officials informed us that the GD/A subcontract with Rocketdyne could still be canceled.

AIR FORCE PROVIDED UNREALISTIC LAUNCH DATES UNDER FOLLOW-ON CENTAUR CONTRACT

Initial launch dates for Atlas-Centaur vehicles Nos. 7 through 10 were known to the Air Force and GD/A to be unrealistic when incorporated into the Air Force follow-on contract AF 04(647)-815 with GD/A. The contract provided for the same launch dates for vehicles 7 and 8 that had been established for vehicles 5 and 6 under contract AF 18(600)-1775. Only one launch pad was available for Atlas-Centaur launches and at least 2 months' preparation at the pad was required to launch a single vehicle. We believe that the practice of establishing an unrealistic launch schedule tends to de-emphasize to a contractor the importance and urgency of meeting time requirements under contractual agreements.

PROGRAM TO CLEAN UP AND STREAMLINE CONTRACTS DID NOT GENERALLY RESULT IN IMPROVEMENT OF CONTRACTING PROCEDURES

During the hearings before the Subcommittee on Space Sciences of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics in May 1962 on the Centaur program, NASA officials stated that on January 1, 1962, the Centaur project office had been transferred from Los Angeles to Huntsville and that the Air Force contracts had been converted to NASA contracts "in a program to clean up and streamline the administration of the project." We found no evidence that NASA had taken such action with respect to contracts with GD/A. Only one of the two contracts with P & WA for engines had been rewritten to consolidate into one document most of the prior contract changes.

Although it appeared as of January 1963 that NASA had taken steps to strengthen contract procedures, the procedures which existed through calendar year 1962 did not, in our opinion, assure prompt and adequate contractual coverage.

Mr. Speaker, although there has been slippage in the program it now appears that we have the first successful Atlas-Centaur flight vehicle. It is a pioneer in the field where hydrogen propellant will be utilized. This two-stage launch vehicle takes advantage of the high-energy characteristics of hydrogen as a fuel and is therefore ready to perform more complex deep space missions for the United States. Later on hydrogen will be the fuel for the upper stages of Saturn I, I-B, and V which will be five vehicles as well as NERVA—nuclear engine for rocket vehicle applications. Its

capability of lifting some 8,000 pounds of scientific equipment into near orbit has been well described by the gentleman from California.

Recently, I had the privilege of visiting with the chairman of the Subcommittee on Space Sciences, the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. JOSEPH KARTH, the General Dynamics plant in San Diego, Calif. I was impressed by the dedication of the men on this project and their work in correction of the intermediate bulkhead and weather shield problem. They predicted at that time the successful flight which occurred November 27. The slippage time and the millions of dollars lost in the early pioneering stages for the Centaur cannot be recovered. However, if NASA, DOD and contractors continue to cooperate, communicate, and learn from the mistakes of the past, future losses can be kept to a minimum.

The United States cannot afford the luxury of a wasteful, poorly integrated space program. Careful coordination of the entire space effort must be accomplished.

I join in congratulations to the people of NASA, the DOD, the Centaur project managers, and the people of General Dynamics/Astronautics.

COOPERATION WITH OUR NEW PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, like other Members of the House of Representatives, I listened to the address of President Lyndon B. Johnson to the joint session of the Congress on November 27, 1963.

Having assured the President of my desire to cooperate with him during this difficult period, I was especially anxious to hear his speech and to learn his program for the Nation. Especially, I wanted to listen to what he had to say with regard to keeping America strong economically, because I felt certain he would give assurance of maintaining military strength—which of course he did.

Many of us, Mr. Speaker, have been worried about huge planned Federal deficits and ever-mounting Government expenses to be added to the national debt and charged to future generations. Therefore, I am happy to say it was comforting to have President Johnson pledge that the expenditures of the Government will be administered, as he said, with the utmost thrift and frugality. The Government, he promised, would set an example of prudence and economy. He rededicated our Nation to the defense of the strength and stability of the dollar.

Mr. Speaker, this was good to hear. And equally, or even more so, it was gratifying to have President Johnson state his firm belief in the independence and integrity of the legislative branch of our Government, because I have long been disturbed at the ever-growing power of the executive branch at the expense of Congress.

The 32 years of President Johnson on Capitol Hill, as he said, have given him pride in the ability of the Congress to distill from our differences strong programs of national action and, furthermore, he expressed belief in the capacity of Congress, despite the divisions of opinion which characterize our Nation, to act wisely when the need arises.

Mr. Speaker, it is not for me or anyone other than the President to read between the lines of his speech, but I can comment and point out that the Constitution places responsibility over spending and taxes and the stability of the economy on the legislative branch. My assurance to the President of utmost cooperation is not a pledge to support all New Frontier programs for spending the taxpayers' money when and if the President requests them. He knows that. He knows I have my job to do. But when it comes to helping our President obtain Federal Government thrift and frugality, or setting an example of prudence and economy, I will be cooperating completely.

In this connection, right now, who will say there is an end in sight of deficit spending? Who will say the cost of Government will not continue on an upward spiral? Who will say our Nation is not on a spending spree and that taxes are too high?

Sixty years ago, Government cost 2 percent of the income of the people. Today it takes 23 percent of the national income. Yet we are forced to spend borrowed money. For each family, the Government has spent \$5,100 we do not have, and this per capita debt is \$129 more in 1963 than it was in 1962.

The biggest domestic problem of President Johnson is that there are not enough job opportunities in America today to take care of our expanding population.

When I pledged my cooperation to him, I meant in helping to solve just such problems as unemployment.

The Kennedy administration had sought to cure unemployment, but its original plan did not succeed—as many of us had predicted. That plan was for accelerated expenditures for public works.

When it was obvious that stepped-up Government spending of money we did not have, for things we did not need, was failing to cure the unemployment problem, a new proposal was suggested, of a tax cut to stimulate business and buying power and thereby create prosperity and more jobs. No one that I know of has successfully argued against this latter proposal. Everyone has agreed that an incentive to industry to expand and make more job opportunities is essential. But there was and still is divergence of opinion as to the issue of accelerating Government spending.

This controversy over the economic benefits of private versus public spending was pointed up by one of our colleagues not long ago, who opposed an administration project for construction in his own congressional district. This was the Department of the Interior's proposed Trotter Shoals Dam on the Savannah River in Georgia. The cost of this project was estimated to be \$78 million

and it would remove 22,000 acres of land from the tax rolls. Only a few permanent jobs would result.

On the other hand, it has been shown that if the Government does not build this dam, a private industry, the Mead Paper Co., will construct a \$40 million plant on the site. Some 1,400 workers would be needed to build this plant and permanent jobs for 650 persons would be provided at the mill, and 450,000 cords of pulpwood, worth \$9 million, would be used annually. This would employ an additional 2,500 persons.

Meanwhile, if the private paper company is permitted to go ahead, the Duke Power Co. will build a steamplant at this same site at a cost of \$210 million. On this project, more than 1,000 persons would be employed during construction and 135 permanent jobs would be created. Moreover this private power company would buy \$24 million worth of coal a year to produce 11 billion kilowatt-hours annually. The Federal dam would only produce 471 million kilowatt-hours.

In addition to all this, the Mead paper plant would pay \$3.8 million a year in local, State, and Federal taxes. The Duke Power Co. would pay \$13 million in annual taxes.

So those, who, like myself, favor private enterprise expansion over public spending wherever possible, have a real example to use in this case. But, in general, my point is that new bridges, post offices, and public projects of this nature, necessary and desirable though they may be, do not create permanent new jobs.

However, getting back to our new President, Lyndon Johnson, who so eloquently asked for our help, Mr. Speaker, I think history and experience clearly indicate wherein the Congress can provide economic cooperation. After all, it is the Congress that votes the new programs and provides the appropriations. The legislative branch, if it intends to cooperate and restore fiscal responsibility, must hold the line and control spending itself. This is the way to help the President. This could generate prosperity and public confidence.

Furthermore, the answer to congressional control over Federal finances, as has been clearly shown, is placing the responsibility for all appropriations in one committee of the House and one committee of the Senate.

Originally, when Congress was organized in 1789, all House appropriations and all taxes were under the jurisdiction of a single committee—the House Committee on Ways and Means. For 76 years, this worked well, because that committee could make the suit, as it were, to fit the cloth. It wrote the spending bills and then wrote a tax program to provide the necessary funds.

By 1865, however, the workload had become too burdensome for a single committee and a new Committee on Appropriations was established, making one committee to handle taxes and one to handle appropriations. This retained the advantage of one overall House committee on spending. But in the years 1880-85, unfortunately, certain House committees, including the Committee on

Agriculture, were given jurisdiction over their own appropriations, and, from then on, Government spending in relation to its revenue got out of hand. From then on until 1920, a net national deficit of almost \$22 billion resulted. A billion dollars in those years, relatively speaking, would have been at least 10 times what it is now. It became quite obvious that the Congress was unable to control its own spending, and both major political parties recognized this and the need to return jurisdiction over all appropriations to a single committee which could weigh the urgency and need of programs against the amount of Federal income and the condition of the Treasury. In 1916, both Democratic and Republican platforms called for the return to the former practice of initiating appropriations bills in a single committee, so that waste and duplication in the public service could be avoided as much as possible.

Thus it was that in 1920 an impartial arbiter in the form of a single Committee on Appropriations, was again established, to effect retrenchment when necessary.

Indeed, during the ensuing decade, the Government enjoyed an average surplus of \$1 billion a year.

Alas, however, with the creation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in 1932, a new device to obtain funds from the Treasury without an appropriation was initiated. This was done by authorizing Government agencies to borrow and make expenditures without the benefit of the normal annual appropriations procedure. So it has been that in the ensuing 30 years, Congress has used this latter method—now called backdoor spending—to finance many Government programs. More than \$150 billion of such borrowing from the Treasury has been authorized. Yet, the Constitution provides that no money shall be drawn from the Treasury except by an appropriation made by law.

Meanwhile, \$16 billion of such borrowings have already had to be canceled because the agencies had expended money in a way not subject to repayment. More losses will have to be forgiven in the future. Meanwhile, right now, under various backdoor spending authorizations, \$26 billion is available without any appropriation unless Congress rescinds existing authorizations.

Mr. Speaker, through backdoor spending, the control over Federal spending has been abdicated by Congress. The only proven method of acting in a fiscally sound and responsible way is to return all financing of Government programs to the annual appropriations procedure. That is the way to cooperate with our new Chief Executive. Under this method, and with a single committee to help retrench when retrenchment is needed, the President can hope to meet his pledge of utmost thrift and frugality.

President Johnson has assured us he believes in the independence and integrity of the legislative branch, so let us be independent and not delegate our responsibilities to the executive branch, which is done under backdoor spending authorization.

Let me emphasize that the guideline to national solvency and balanced budgets is in elimination of backdoor spending and return to a single Appropriations Committee system.

In this connection, I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that President Lyndon Johnson will follow the advice of former President Eisenhower, who, in his farewell address to Congress, urged that no new borrowing authorizations be enacted.

This past year, we have almost closed the back door of the Treasury. Let us lock it. Mr. Speaker, in this and other ways, let us help our new Chief Executive meet his promises of stability of the dollar and setting an example of prudence and economy.

I applaud President Johnson for his stated respect for the integrity of the legislative branch.

Are we worthy of that respect for our independence and integrity? Are we going to do our part and exercise our judgment as to practicing thrift and frugality with the taxpayers' money? Who would suggest that Lyndon Johnson, a onetime Member of this House, did not mean what he said? Surely both branches of Government can cooperate in this important matter by cutting non-essential expenditures and voting a substantial cut in taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I pledge my support for such a program.

ACTION BY OAS OR FORM A PAN AMERICAN NATO ORGANIZATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the Organization of American States will meet at the urgent request of the Government of Venezuela because of the attempted subversion of that Government by action of Communist Castro. We have had continuing reports of Communist actions against the Government of Venezuela which have culminated now in the discovery of tons of smuggled weapons and explosives to be used by the terrorists, which the Venezuelan Government says it has proof came from Communist Cuba. Venezuela will produce evidence that these arms came from Communist Cuba. On November 27, these pro-Castro terrorists kidnaped Col. James K. Chenault, deputy chief of the U.S. Army mission in Venezuela. An attempt was made to bomb the home of a naval officer of the mission.

Certainly the Government of the United States should strongly back the efforts of the Government of Venezuela to bring about complete economic isolation of Cuba and to take the necessary steps to prevent the export of Communist arms and munitions from the shores of Cuba. In fact, this Government in announced public statements is already committed to this policy.

It is obvious that the failure of the Organization of American States to take positive and effective action regarding Cuba has been because action by the Organization of American States is de-

pendent upon almost total cooperation within the Organization itself. As a result we have seen action deferred, stymied, and watered down by the refusal of a few countries to be willing to do anything about Communist Cuba and, of course, our own failure to exert necessary leadership must be acknowledged as one of the contributing factors of this inaction.

If the Organization of American States does not formulate and take effective action to live up to its obligations to prevent the spread of communism in this hemisphere as a result of this urgent call by Venezuela, then the U.S. Government should consider a NATO-type agreement with those nations of Central and South America who are willing to do something against the spread of communism in this hemisphere. We should move to form such a military alliance so that we may meet the situation of the spread of communism in this hemisphere with fast action. We should invite those nations who agree to participate in such an undertaking to an immediate conference to set up this NATO-type alliance.

Those who, for their own reasons, do not wish to take part, should not be pressured to join, since they would only be unwilling partners at best, and might in fact destroy the effectiveness of any military moves necessary. We have such an alliance in NATO and it has successfully met the threat of communism in Europe. Our Government tells us that we must be ready to fight communism alongside our NATO partners in Europe, or as we did in Korea, Lebanon, southeast Asia, and elsewhere all over the world. Surely the need to defend our own back door, Latin America, is of equal importance. In Europe and in southeast Asia our defense organizations are based on a willingness of a group of nations to join with us in a military alliance. We should take immediate steps to set up such an organization in Latin America.

To our sister nations in Latin America we should extend a warm invitation for mutual military protection. To those who do not accept, we should say that by your action you indicate you do not want U.S. military or economic aid and any such aid to these countries should be suspended.

While the defense of freedom is a world-wide problem, we must begin to treat our own hemisphere with more attention. The Organization of American States has not responded with the direct action that is needed in emergency situations. Only a mutually agreeable NATO-type organization can respond swiftly and decisively to military action, subversion, and Communist tactics. It has succeeded and proven its worth in Europe. Surely we can apply this experience to Latin America as a means to insure the continued freedom of this hemisphere.

THE ARNOLD ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT CENTER REPORT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIBONATI], is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, on November 21 a congressional group comprising the gentleman from Michigan, Harold M. Ryan; the gentleman from Illinois, Kenneth Gray; the gentleman from Missouri, Richard Ichord; the gentleman from Florida, Edward J. Gurney; the gentleman from Texas, Bob Casey; the gentleman from New York, Otis G. Pike; the gentleman from Vermont, Robert T. Stafford; the gentleman from Illinois, Roland V. Libonati; and Herbert Lineberger, administrative assistant to the gentleman from North Carolina, Basil Whitener, also included our genial and considerate escort officers Col. Bruce Arnold and Maj. Harry Funk, invitees of the Air Force, were airborne at 9:05 a.m., eastern time, at Andrews Field in two VC140B planes en route to near Smyrna, Tenn., Sewart Field, arriving at 10:45 a.m., eastern time. We were met by commander, Col. William G. Moore, Jr., 839th Air Division, distinguished flier of over 100 missions in World War II and Korea—and also Col. Charles F. Franklin, base commander, holder of the Flying Cross, the Air Medal and cluster in World War II, serving with the 21st Troop Carrier Squadron which he organized. After introduction and pleasantries, we departed by air for Tullahoma, Tenn., arriving at 11:05 a.m., eastern time. We proceeded by auto to the Arnold Engineering Development Center escorted by Maj. Gen. William L. Rogers, USAF, in command of the Center, for a series of briefings and visits to the operational and research laboratories comprising the institute and Center.

General Rogers, in his introductory remarks, covered the history and mission of the Center as follows:

The Arnold Engineering Development Center is named for the late general of the Air Force Henry H. (Hap) Arnold. In November 1944, General Arnold asked Dr. Theodore von Karman, chief scientific adviser to the Air Force, to form a group to investigate air research and development in this country and other countries. The group was to formulate a long-range plan which would establish and maintain the United States in the forefront of air power.

Dr. von Karman's report on that investigation to General Arnold said, in part, that the Air Force should:

Create new facilities * * * with the objective of developing supersonic and pilotless aircraft.

The Center for supersonic and pilotless aircraft development should be equipped with adequate wind tunnel facilities to attain speeds up to three times the velocity of sound, with large enough test sections to accommodate models of reasonable size, including jet propulsion units, and one ultrasonic wind tunnel for exploration of the upper frontier of the supersonic speed range. Ample characteristics of propulsion systems of very high altitudes should be provided.

Planning for an Air Engineering Development Center was continued from 1946 to 1949 with thorough coordination of Air Force plans with the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, the Research and Development Board, Army, Navy, and the Aircraft industry. In October 1949, Congress approved con-

struction of the Air Engineering Development Center and authorized \$100 million for an "interim" construction program.

The site selected was an area of approximately 34,000 acres in middle Tennessee, formerly known as Camp Forrest Reservation. This site was donated by the State of Tennessee. Headquarters, Air Engineering Development Center was activated as a limited major air command on January 1, 1950, and construction was underway by the end of 1950. On May 1, 1951, the Center became a part of the Air Research and Development Command, now the Air Force Systems Command.

Since 1953, the facilities have been used to test advanced aircraft, missiles, and space weapons. Data of major importance have been provided for many of the Nation's highest priority aerospace projects. Many changes and additions have gone into the design, construction, and operation of the tunnels and test cells in order to keep them not only abreast of current—1963—requirements, but also prepared for future needs.

MISSION OF THE ARNOLD ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT CENTER

The mission of the Arnold Engineering Development Center is to support the timely acquisition of superior aerospace systems by conducting research, development, test, and evaluation in aerospace environmental facilities for the Air Force, other Government agencies, and industry, and conduct foreign aerospace technology activities within the scope of the assigned mission.

Arnold Engineering Development Center is directly responsible to Headquarters Air Force Systems Command for mission accomplishment and will:

First. Keep headquarters AFSC informed on the progress of the AEDC mission and the Center's effectiveness.

Second. Support AFSC divisions, centers, other Air Force commands, DOD, or Government agencies as directed by headquarters AFSC.

Third. Provide technical assistance to other Government agencies regarding both present and future research and development—R. & D.—programs, basing assistance on Center test experience and analysis of contractor development tests.

Fourth. Prepare and submit to headquarters AFSC or the appropriate AFSC division, time-phased plans within the Center mission areas, based on approved R. & D. objectives. Plans will include projected requirements for technical and supporting facilities and other resources in accordance with approved AFSC procedures.

Fifth. Conduct or support basic research within the scope of Center capabilities and approved research planning objectives.

Sixth. Participate in applied research and technical support programs, as authorized by headquarters AFSC.

Seventh. Support and participate in system studies, development, and tests within the scope of approved AFSC system development directives and system requirements.

Eighth. Perform engineering analysis and evaluation of Air Force tests from data collected, as required.

Ninth. Acquire, evaluate, analyze, and report in a timely manner information on the current and projected status of foreign aerospace technology in technical areas appropriate to Center operations.

Tenth. Establish and maintain close continuing direct coordination and collaboration with the Foreign Technology Division—FTD—to provide an integral and technically enhanced foreign technology capability.

Eleventh. Assure the effective continuing application of pertinent foreign technological data to the planning, development, test, and evaluation activities inherent to the mission of the Center.

Twelfth. Enter into, execute, and administer contracts in support of assigned programs within the limits of procurement authority, as redelegated by headquarters AFSC.

Thirteenth. Conduct basic and applied research for aerospace environmental facility development and operation, and in other technical areas applicable to the unique facilities of AEDC.

Fourteenth. Conduct analysis and research into promising areas that will enhance the design of aerospace vehicles and their propulsion systems, based upon the background of experience gained from tests of weapon and space systems and their propulsion units.

Fifteenth. Conduct active liaison with AFSC divisions and centers, other Government agencies, and industry having management responsibilities for R. & D. in the fields of gas dynamics, propulsion, and aerospace sciences to insure effective use of the AEDC capabilities in these fields.

Sixteenth. Serve as command focal point for simulated high-altitude rocket testing.

General Rogers then proceeded to show slides and films covering the research program and discussed its accomplishments and failures in solving the technical and physical problems referred to the institute by all facilities throughout the Nation—maintained by the services in space operation. The detailed completeness of his dissertation on the highly technical experimentation with parachutes, motors and engines, and so forth, so difficult for laymen to understand is a high compliment to his talents and professional astuteness in this specialized field. His discussion of various phases of the tests in experimental work conducted at the institute were as follows:

INTRODUCTION

The successful flight of all of today's aerospace vehicles—aircraft, missiles, satellites and spacecraft—requires mastery of a whole new spectrum of extremely hostile flight environments.

Insuring reliable performance of these craft, and their propulsion and control systems, in the very low pressures of space; in the minus 320° temperatures which confront orbiting satellites; through the severe aerothermodynamic forces of reentry is of critical importance in developing aerospace systems of today.

Flight simulation laboratories which can simulate many of these difficult phases of flight are very important factors in the rapid

and economical development of these programs, and they will assume even greater proportions of importance in the future.

There are many different types of flight simulation laboratories ranging from the "as large as a breadbox" high-vacuum chamber owned and operated by a small company in the aerospace industry to the much larger and complex test units operated by the military services, the NASA or large universities.

Today I would like to describe to you the laboratories of the Air Force Systems Command's Arnold Engineering Development Center in southern Tennessee. In general, these facilities are unique in that they represent the largest and most powerful of their specific types currently available for use. A quick look at these various high-altitude rocket test cells, supersonic and hypersonic wind tunnels, and some examples of some of the tests that are performed in them, is the most effective way to convey to you the importance of the work being done in laboratories of this type.

I assumed command of the Arnold Center less than 2 years ago. My prior assignment was as vice commander of the Air Force Missile Test Center at Cape Canaveral, duty which sharpened my appreciation for the work done at Arnold. We are all familiar with some of the spectacular failures or "limited successes" that have occurred at the Cape. My job there gave me an opportunity to learn many of the background problems which caused the loss of these expensive missiles and spacecraft; and, what to me is more important, a realization of how many more failures we might have encountered if it had not been for the valuable development testing performed in flight simulation laboratories like those at the Arnold Center.

The Arnold Engineering Development Center was named in honor of Gen. "Hap" Arnold, a man who had the foresight and wisdom to foresee the need for development testing facilities. These facilities were for the exploration of the upper frontier of the supersonic speed range.

In November 1944 General Arnold instructed Dr. von Karman, chief scientific adviser to the Air Force, to form a group to investigate air research and development facilities in this and other countries. Dr. von Karman accepted this challenge and a thorough study was made.

Within a year the report was completed and presented to General Arnold on behalf of the AAF scientific advisory group. In part, it stated that the Air Force should "create new facilities with the objectives of developing supersonic and pilotless aircraft." It further states that "this Center should be equipped with adequate wind tunnel facilities to attain speeds up to three times the velocity of sound, with large enough test sections to accommodate models of reasonable size, including jet propulsion units, and one ultrasonic wind tunnel for exploration of the upper frontier of the supersonic speed range. Ample characteristics of propulsion systems of very high altitudes should be provided."

In 1946 the "unitary wind tunnel" plan was prepared. This plan provided for the construction of facilities as envisioned by the AAF scientific advisory board. This plan was reviewed by the President's Air Policy Board. It was approved and submitted to Congress in 1948. In October 1949 the plan was approved and signed. At the time when construction was about to begin General Arnold passed away in 1950.

On June 25, 1951, President Harry Truman dedicated the Center in the name of our deceased comrade while General Arnold's widow stood at his side.

Due to the continued foresight of subsequent leaders the mission at Arnold has expanded considerably—from supersonic air-

craft to aerospace vehicles; from pilotless aircraft to missiles; from testing of models of reasonable size to full scale vehicles.

The Wright brothers, were two of the early experimenters using a wind tunnel for testing purposes.

For those of you who have not been fortunate enough to see this gigantic complex, the study of an aerial view of our station would show in the background a manmade lake 12 miles long with a shoreline of 75 miles. If the magnitude of numbers means anything, we use in excess of 200,000 gallons of water per minute for cooling purposes.

This is equivalent to the water used by a city the size of Washington, D.C. Our electric bill runs around \$4 million per annum in the land of TVA. Electricity used is equivalent to a city the size of New Orleans or approximately 1½ million people.

In the foreground is located the propulsion wind tunnel facility, a far cry from the earlier model used by the Wright brothers.

The rocket test facility is located in the vicinity.

The von Karman gas dynamics facility and the 1,000-foot hypervelocity range which is now being prepared for initial operation.

The aerospace simulation test facility currently under construction is programed to test full and subscale vehicles and their components under simulated orbital conditions.

I call to your attention the J-4 vertical rocket test cell which is now under construction. The cell will test liquid rockets up to a thrust level of 500,000 pounds simulating conditions at altitudes of over 100,000 feet. For future use this cell can be modified to test vehicles of 1.5 million pounds thrust. Cooling water requirements would be 1.5 million gallons per minute.

Thus we have reviewed the past, present, and future. Just how do we do our job? Primarily our end product is a piece of paper giving the results of tests. We are supported in this area with a contractor in the test area and the Corps of Engineers in the construction area.

We have a normal military staff organizational structure—a Headquarters AEDC organization.

In order to show a trend using 1961 as a base line our operation has increased approximately from 23 to 56 percent. This is discounting inflation. During the past year we have supported other Government agencies such as the Mercury and Apollo programs for NASA; Pershing and Nike programs for Army; Polaris program for Navy.

In the last 5 years the real property value has tripled from \$88 million in 1957 to approximately \$346 million today. This will give you an idea of our dynamic growth.

The questions uppermost in everyone's mind are "Are we paying our own way?" and "What are we contributing to the overall defense effort?" Since our end product is a test document there is no way to maintain a profit-and-loss statement on our operation. Such laboratories are expensive, but in their proper perspective their cost is minor compared to any single development program involving numerous flight tests of expensive boosters and payloads required to insure an effective and reliable operating system. The findings in our tests conclusively show that testing in a controlled environment is far superior to testing by trial and error from Vandenberg or Canaveral. Controlled conditions can dictate whether the test should be continued or the system abandoned. I would now like to cite some of our major accomplishments.

An Atlas series E launched at Cape Canaveral resulted in failure; the failure occurring in the base of the Atlas. Telemetry data did not indicate the cause of these failures. However, analysis of the film taken and other data showed that the problem originated in the base of the vehicle.

A one-tenth scale model of the Atlas series E was fabricated and placed in one of the altitude test cells of the Arnold Center. It was subjected to the same conditions at which the failures occurred at Canaveral. The extensive amount of instrumentation used in this test showed that the three hot rocket exhaust jets were intersecting at two points. This caused a low pressure zone to occur between the three nozzles which resulted in hot exhaust gases recirculating in the base of the missile.

This shows an Atlas firing in an altitude chamber. When hot exhaust gases were expelled the low pressure areas caused the gases to flow in the base between the three nozzles. This problem was not evident in single nozzle configuration such as Thor and Jupiter.

However, it becomes more evident in nozzle configurations such as the solid propellant motor shown in this film clip and also other multinozzle boosters such as those used on the Titan, Minuteman, and Saturn. All of these systems have received tests at Arnold Center.

Tests on the Agena engine have been conducted for the past 4 years in the Arnold Center facilities. This is the Agena 8096 engine mounted in test cell T-4. This phase of our support deals with the development of an optimum area ratio nozzle. The green portion of the nozzle is an uncooled extension, to cool this much area would result in a weight penalty for the propulsion systems. Therefore, uncooled nozzle extensions of various designs and materials had to be developed.

This shows a proposed nozzle made of graphite being tested at an altitude of 110,000 feet theoretically, and during sea level tests this nozzle performed satisfactorily. However, as shown here after only a few seconds operation the nozzle separated from the engine. This we feel again was due to the fact that there was greater heat input to the nozzle at altitude conditions than the material could withstand. Here, a titanium alloy nozzle was subjected to the same test conditions. It proved sound and is presently being used in the Agena system.

Aerodynamic data must of necessity be obtained before actual flight testing can take place. Many tests are conducted on complete aircraft and missile configurations under highly realistic flight conditions. This is the X-15 installed in our mach 8 tunnel. Design changes necessary to assure safe reentry resulted from these tests. In this program more than 500 different reentry conditions were simulated and more than 2 million data points were obtained.

Various control surfaces are subjected to tests in several of our aerodynamic testing units and often assist in overcoming such problems as wing breakups.

Also of critical importance is heat transfer data on reentry. This is, we mount the Mercury capsule in our hot shot 2 tunnel. It is undergoing a reentry condition of mach 15 at 175,000 feet. Data must be obtained on heat transfer rates, pressure distribution, ionization effects, and other reentry phenomena. These are just a few of the critical problems we are able to investigate in the Arnold Center laboratories.

As to the parachute recovery system; the data capsule is mounted in our 16-foot transonic circuit, on a forward sting support system which allows us to release the parachute. A primary chute is bolted to the floor of the tunnel while air flow is being established. Once the condition in the tunnel matches that of actual reentry the explosive bolt releases the primary chute which pulls the main chute out of the data capsule. Therefore you see what could have happened to the first 12 Discoverer parachutes. The parachute was not designed to withstand the opening shock. As a result it was ripped to shreds. Our previous experience in the de-

sign and testing of ICBM recovery parachutes enabled us to recommend modifications which resulted in a parachute which performed quite satisfactorily.

The test programs described up to this point are indicative of our past accomplishments. Now, I would like to show some of our most recent tests concerning current and future systems. As an example of our current systems I would like to use the Minuteman ICBM.

As to the Mercury hot-shot firing—of critical importance is heat transfer data on reentry. The Mercury capsule is mounted in our hotshot 2 tunnel undergoing a reentry condition of mach 15 at 175,000 feet. Data must be obtained on heat transfer rates, pressure distribution, ionization effects and other reentry phenomena. These are just a few of the critical problems we are able to investigate in the Arnold Center laboratories.

In a parachute recovery system the data capsule is mounted in our 16-foot transonic circuit. The capsule is mounted on a forward sting support system which allows us to release the parachute for the tests.

Early in the development of the Minuteman we conducted a series of tests on proposed design configurations. These tests were conducted in various AEDC tunnels throughout the transonic, supersonic, hypersonic, and hypervelocity speed regimes. This slide shows the Minuteman model installed in our continuous flow mach 8 tunnel.

Tests of the solid propellant motors for Minuteman have been run continuously in one or more test units for the past 3 years. At first the programs consisted of testing small prototype motors and various components. It then progressed to the full-scale systems, such as this third stage motor mounted in J-2. The programs also became very complex. In this test the plumbing in the foreground is connected to the blowout ports of the third stage. After a specified burning time these blowout ports open in the ducting which is simulating altitude pressures. This is the critical point at which the nosecone separates and continues on a ballistic trajectory. Thus the thrust termination data obtained in this test was of critical importance.

The largest solid propellant motor we have tested to date was this full-scale, second-stage Minuteman mounted in J-2. This program consisted of measuring the total thrust within 0.5 percent accuracy with the nozzles at various gimbal angles. All of these propulsion tests have been conducted under simulated operating altitude conditions. These tests are expected to continue for several months, and even after the missile is operational, product improvement tests will be conducted. Better fuels will undoubtedly be developed and have to be tested. Improved components and controls will be incorporated even in the operational configurations.

As for systems to operate in the future; we are currently testing several. Among these is the X-20 Dynasoar glide vehicle. The booster for this system will be the Titan III.

Titan III model was tested with solid propellant strap-on rocket motors operating in the 16-foot supersonic wind tunnel. Purpose of the test was to obtain data on base heating of the basic Titan from the exhaust of the strap-on boosters. Test with the 5.5-percent scale model ranges from mach 0.6 to mach 3 at near-trajectory altitude conditions. Technician here makes final adjustments to one of the strap-on boosters prior to test run. Cylinder at bottom simulates container for solid rocket motor thrust vector control fluid. Future tests will be made to study base heating during simultaneous operation of strap-on boosters and main sustainer engines.

TITAN BOOSTER SEPARATION

Titan III separation tests were run on an 11.5-percent scale model of the first and second stages of the launch vehicle in one of

the high-altitude simulation cells of RTF. Tests were to determine forces and pressures on the spent first stage boosters, simulated here by dummies on either side of the second stage, as the cases are jettisoned from the launch vehicle. Test results will be used to help determine a safe technique for first-stage booster separation. Technician in this picture is making final adjustment prior to test.

Other tests conducted in the Center's rocket test facility in support of Titan III included the firings of six small rocket motors that contained the propellant planned for use in the solid strap-on boosters to determine the amount of radiant heat produced by the exhaust gases at various trajectory altitudes.

ATLAS STAGING

To introduce another phase of our support—I would like to discuss an Atlas at altitude. We experimented with a 1½-stage vehicle and studied the booster engines being separated at altitude.

TITAN "FIRE IN THE HOLE" STAGING

To jettison the first stage fuel tanks of the Titan sustainer we will use the "fire in the hole" technique as the test setup in T-4 on the rocket test facility.

TITAN FIRING

The second stage rocket fires while the first stage fuel tanks are attached. This was accomplished to determine pressures and temperatures at the interstage compartment during second-stage ignition.

TRANSTAGE IN J-2A

The full-scale transtage engine for the X-20, Titan III. Transtage in this case simply means final stage. It provides the impulse to put the X-20 into final orbit and to make adjustments in the orbital path. These tests were run to learn how the engine would perform at extreme altitudes and to verify the structural durability of the entire system and its individual components.

TITAN-DYNASOAR MODEL IN PWT

Combined aerodynamic and propulsion tests are conducted in our larger facilities. The Titan-Dyna-Soar configuration is installed in our 16-foot transonic tunnel. Air flow disturbances generated by the model and the booster fins are investigated to assure that the exhaust gases will flow correctly. These tests are necessary as we have found in many instances that disturbances caused by external surfaces and pods interfere with the exhaust gas flow.

DYNA-SOAR-TITAN IN A

The suborbital configuration is tested in tunnel A of VKF.

The test was conducted to obtain pressure, temperature, force, and flow visualization data on the X-20 vehicle mated to the Titan booster. This tunnel is capable of simulating velocities from 1.5 to 6 times the speed of sound.

DYNA-SOAR-TITAN SEPARATION TEST

This is the same model being tested to obtain stability and control data during and after staging.

DYNA-SOAR FLUTTER IN 16T

An early configuration of Dyna-Soar is subjected to flutter tests in the transonic speed range. It experienced considerable difficulties.

DYNA-SOAR FLUTTER MODEL IN 16S

The later model was tested in the 16-foot supersonic tunnel. It proved to be structurally sound through the supersonic and transonic range reentry.

SCHLIEREN FILM—DYNA-SOAR HEAT TRANSFER TEST

Unique photographic technique allows us to study the airflow over the model during maneuvering. Also study of shock waves

created by airflow over model. These tests were conducted at supersonic reentry conditions.

DYNA-SOAR GLOWING UNDER MACH 10 REENTRY CONDITIONS

This model held longer than a normal period of time shows essentially the results should a pilot be subjected to these mach 10 reentry conditions for more than a few minutes.

IMPACT TARGET

Hypervelocity impact tests are being conducted to determine the effects of impact of projectiles upon various types of target material. Crater volume as much as 32 times the projectile mass has been measured. These studies will aid in properly shielding personnel and instrumentation inside future spacecraft—protection against potential damage that collision between spacecraft and debris presents. Even minute particles of meteorite dust can cause serious damage.

IMPACT OF LUCITE TARGET BY TINY METAL PROJECTILE

Slow motion made up from frames from ultra-high-speed camera which photographs approach and impact upon target at rate of up to 1,400,000 frames a second. We noted shock wave formation and back spalling of target material.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing gives you a look at some of the typical tests and test units at the Arnold Center.

In closing I would like to emphasize one very important point—the basic economics of an operation such as this. The total capital investment in the Arnold Center now is approximately \$345 million—a large investment, but one that has paid for itself many times over.

To use just one example: Several years ago three missiles had been launched from Canaveral for the purpose of recovering their nose cones by a parachute to determine the effects of reentry. All three of the attempts were failures, and it was suspected that the parachute system was not working. At Arnold they suspended the full-scale nose cone in the test section of the large 16-foot transonic wind tunnel; brought it to the exact conditions that existed as the parachute was deployed. The recovery package was released and it was observed that the canopy oscillated wildly in a "squidding" motion.

In 3 nights a total of 17 simulated recoveries were run in the tunnel and a fix determined that was proved on the next flight. This test cost less than a hundred thousand dollars, but I hesitate to say how much the first three attempts to recover the nose cone had cost—many millions of dollars each. I am sure, when you consider the expense of down range tracking and recovery and all of the other preparations that are required for actual flight.

Furthermore, in 3 nights time—for relatively little expense—we obtained better information than could have been gained in 17 additional flight attempts. Better, because we had a close look at the parachute at the exact moment it was released.

This same pattern of saving is found in almost every test performed at Arnold. Without these facilities, I am sure, we would not have progressed to the point we have reached today, and the combined military and space programs of this Nation would have cost us many hundreds of millions more than they have. I'm not alone in this conviction; Air Force Secretary Eugene Zuckert, former Chief of Staff Thomas White, and AFSC's commander, Gen. Bernard Schriever, have made similar comments concerning work at Arnold.

In short, facilities of this type substantially reduce the time and money required for systems development. In accelerating

aerospace progress they are, truly, springboards to space.

We are proud to present for the RECORD the biography of Maj. Gen. William L. Rogers, U.S. Air Force:

MAJ. GEN. WILLIAM L. ROGERS, U.S. AIR FORCE

William L. Rogers was born in Larchwood, Iowa, on December 29, 1911. He was graduated from Rock Rapids (Iowa) High School in 1929, and after attending the University of South Dakota for 1 year, entered the U.S. Military Academy. He was graduated in 1934 with a bachelor of science degree.

In 1939 he received a master of science degree from Cornell University in Ithaca, N.Y.

From 1944 to 1945 Lieutenant Colonel Rogers was commanding officer of the 1141st Engineer Combat Group in the European theater of operations, receiving the Legion of Merit and the Silver Star. From 1945 to 1947 he served as commanding officer of the 346th Engineer General Service Regiment in Germany, being awarded the Commendation Ribbon in March 1946 from 7th Army Headquarters.

Colonel Rogers transferred from the U.S. Army to the U.S. Air Force on September 26, 1947. Following 2 years of duty at Offutt AFB, Nebr., and Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind., he attended the Air War College at Maxwell AFB, Ala. He then was assigned to Headquarters, MATS, in Washington, D.C., where he served as Chief of Installations, Directorate of Materiel, from July 1950 to June 1951, and as Deputy Director, Materiel, from June 1951 to April 1952.

From 1952 to 1954 Colonel Rogers was assigned as Deputy Chief of Staff, Materiel, at Headquarters, Air Research and Development Command, in Baltimore, Md. In July 1954 he became assistant for development programming with the Deputy Chief of Staff, Development, at Headquarters, U.S. Air Force, in Washington, D.C. He held this position until March 1958. During this tour of duty he was promoted to the rank of brigadier general in October 1958.

In March 1958 General Rogers became vice commander of the Air Force Missile Test Center, Patrick AFB, Fla. In May 1958 he was awarded an oak leaf cluster to the Legion of Merit for his work at Air Force headquarters, the citation stating that "General Rogers designed streamlined administrative procedures for Air Force ballistic missile programs by revising the controls exercised by Headquarters, U.S. Air Force, over the field agencies to better manage the research and development program; and bringing the management of all research and development resources under the research and development agencies." In March 1961 General Rogers was promoted to the rank of major general.

On June 23, 1961, General Rogers assumed command of the Arnold Engineering Development Center, Arnold Air Force Station, Tenn.

General Rogers is the son of William Boynton and Olivia Beatrice Rogers. He married the former Dolores Stack on March 15, 1947, and has four children. He is a member of Beta Theta Pi fraternity, and a member of the New York Athletic Club.

We were then conducted on a tour of the facilities including space and environmental facilities. At each facility we received a briefing on operational and experimental effects. Major Calkins on dynamics, tunnels, and so forth. Colonel Clements, statistical and compressive operation and control.

Certainly the \$45 million per year spent in the operation of the institute is worth millions more in savings, and resulted in the success of the space pro-

gram. The University of Tennessee has entered the area setting. Its operational building program is being built for the establishment of a branch school of engineering and chemical research center in conjunction with the institute—that theorization, experimentation, and operation may facilitate the training and development of talented and skilled engineer specialists—to insure the future accomplishments and to secure solutions of problems so necessary to protect our domination and study of space in the scientific sense.

The physical plant primarily consists of:

First. Observation point on perimeter of hole during construction.

Second. Test capsule: The rocket engine or missile being tested will be mounted within the capsule. Initial construction will permit testing of engines having up to 500,000 pounds' thrust. Tests will be at a simulated altitude of 100,000 feet. Future expansions of capabilities will permit testing of engines having 1.5 million pounds of thrust. The capsule diameter is 48 feet at the base and reduces to 30 feet prior to reaching the cap. The initial height will be about 45 feet, but can be increased by adding spool pieces of either 48 or 30 feet diameter. The overhead crane has a capacity of 100 tons and a clear hook height of 128 feet above the ground.

Third. Oxidizer tank: The initial tank will be a dewar for lox and has a nominal 20,000-gallon capacity. Propellant combinations which may be used in the immediate future are lox-RP-1, nitrogen tetroxide-hydrazine and lox-LH₂. Other propellant combinations may be required and the propellant system will be modified as required by test requirements.

Fourth. Rocket fuel tank: This is of stainless steel and has a nominal 15,000 gallon capacity. It is pressurized by gaseous nitrogen and will use fuels as described in item 3.

Fifth and sixth. Steam accumulators and plant: Initially there will be three accumulators, each about 12 feet in diameter and 95 feet long. These will be manifolded and fed by the steam generator plant—item 6. The design pressure is 725 pounds per square inch.

Seventh. Fuel oil tank: This is for storage of fuel oil for the steamplant and has a capacity of 30,000 gallons.

Eighth. Calibration steam ejectors: These are used to help evacuate the test cell to the simulated altitude at which the test will be run. These will operate for about 2 hours prior to a test in order to calibrate the instrumentation and will be turned off prior to start of test.

Ninth. Atmospheric exhaust stack: This stack will be used when the exhaust products are routed directly to the atmosphere. Normally, the exhaust products will be routed through ducting to the exhaust machinery presently in existence at the rocket test facility. The duct runs underground from the test cell, passes under the exhaust stack, through a shutoff valve and a water separator, then continues underground to the point marked 13 on the photo where it rises above ground. The cen-

terline of the overhead portion is 49 feet above the roadway and the duct is 13 feet in diameter.

Tenth and eleventh. Watertanks: These provide storage for the water used for cooling the outside of the diffuser and the exhaust products. The water is delivered to the spray chamber—below the test capsule—at a rate of 500,000 gallons per minute. The water duct carrying the water from the tanks to the spray chamber is designed to carry 1.5 million gallons per minute in order to permit future expansion.

Twelfth. Control building: This houses the test controls and the major portion of \$2 million worth of instrumentation. Directly above item 12 is the VKF complex. Directly above item 13 is part of the RTF complex.

The tour of the facilities revealed the scientific perfection of all operations to meet the purposes of the installation. Short briefings by Major Calkins treating with the Aerospace Environmental Facility and Dynamics Facility were indicative of the revolutionary advances made in these respective scientific fields. Colonel Clements' subject, "Statistical and Compressive Operation and Control." In conformity with the general described mission heretofore presented, a more detailed description of the capabilities and accomplishments of the U.S. Air Force's Arnold Engineering Development Center at Arnold Air Force Station are herewith presented:

ARNOLD ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT CENTER, ARNOLD AIR FORCE STATION, TENN.

In the four major laboratories of the Center—which is one of six centers in the Air Force Systems Command—flight conditions can be simulated from sea level to altitudes around 350,000 feet and from subsonic velocities to those well over mach 20.¹ Equipment being tested ranges in size from small-scale models to full-scale vehicles with propulsion systems installed and operating. Testing is conducted in all aspects of flight—ballistics, aerodynamics, propulsion and aerospace environment.

Vital problems being investigated in the ballistic missile, satellite and space vehicle fields are connected with launch; stability and heating during transonic, supersonic, hypersonic and hypervelocity flight; propulsion efficiency at low to extreme altitudes, meteorite impact and reentry into the earth's atmosphere.

Problems being investigated in connection with winged vehicles and their engines, which make the most efficient use of the atmosphere's oxygen and density, include stability and propulsion efficiency between all flight extremes of the aircraft and its propulsion system.

The Arnold Center operates as a service to the aerospace industries, to educational institutions and to other military and civilian agencies of the Federal Government involved in aerospace research and development. The direction, scheduling, planning and budgeting of the Center is performed by a U.S. Air Force staff of military and civilian personnel. It is operated and maintained under contract to the Air Force by ARO, Inc., a subsidiary of Sverdrup & Parcel, Inc. Construction is under the supervision of the U.S. Army Engineer District, Mobile, Ala.

The work of the Arnold Center is helping to accelerate development of space, ballistic and atmospheric flight weapons of the future.

¹ Mach 1=speed of sound; 763 miles per hour at sea level.

HISTORY

As World War II was drawing to an end, the late Gen. H. H. (Hap) Arnold, wartime commander of the American air forces, became increasingly alarmed over advances the Germans had made in aeronautical research and development. Consequently, he asked the late Dr. Theodore von Kármán, one of the world's leading aeronautical scientists, to form a group to investigate the German facilities as soon as the war was over.

Dr. von Kármán's report on that investigation to General Arnold said, in part, that the Air Force should "create new facilities * * * with the objective of developing supersonic and pilotless aircraft. The center for supersonic and pilotless aircraft development should be equipped with adequate wind tunnel facilities to attain speeds up to three times the velocity of sound, with large enough test sections to accommodate models of reasonable size, including jet propulsion units, and one ultrasonic wind tunnel for exploration of the upper frontier of the supersonic speed range. Ample facilities for the study of combustion and other characteristics of propulsion systems of very high altitudes should be provided."

The job of designing, building, and operating such development test facilities was a large order. Nothing of such magnitude and scope in this field had ever been conceived before. Nevertheless, the task was undertaken and today we have the Arnold Engineering Development Center. Appropriately, the Center carries the name of the man directly responsible for its conception.

Construction on the Center began early in 1950. The first test laboratory went into operation in 1953. Since that time, testing equipment designed to speed the development of rocket engines; turbojet, ramjet, and turboprop engines, and aircraft, missiles and space weapons, has been continually phased through shakedown and calibration into operation. Many of these new testing units have been connected to existing plant equipment, such as compressor and exhaust systems, cooling water lines and control rooms, which eliminated the costly duplication that would have otherwise been required. In addition, new principles, new equipment, new materials and new techniques were incorporated into the Center while it was being designed and built. Moreover, hundreds of changes have since gone into the design, construction and operation of the tunnels and test cells in order to keep them not only abreast of current requirements but prepared for future needs.

ROCKET TEST FACILITY

The rocket test facility is designed for development and evaluation testing of propulsion systems for advanced aircraft, missiles, satellites, and space vehicles. These include rocket engines as well as ramjet, turbojet and turboprop engines.

Although this facility, originally called the engine test facility, continues to test advanced airbreathing engines, the Nation's ballistic missile, satellite, and space programs have brought about a shift in emphasis in this laboratory to more and more rocket testing. This is a significant change in the original role set for the facility, which was designed more than 10 years ago only for testing the airbreathers.

Modifications to the original plant and development of new testing equipment and techniques have made it possible to test both solid- and liquid-propellant rocket units at conditions simulating flight to altitudes above 300,000 feet. Rocket engines which can be tested range from small units of a few hundred pounds thrust to large full-scale engines in the tens of thousands of pounds of thrust class.

A new aerospace rocket test cell provides an altitude simulation capability of up to 350,000 feet with radiation panels for orbital

heat flux simulation and full-scale engine propulsion tests.

One vertical test cell now in operation accommodates testing of full-scale rocket engines generating up to 200,000 pounds of thrust at simulated altitudes above 100,000 feet with the engine installed in the cell in its natural upright position.

Another vertical rocket test cell now nearing completion will be capable of testing rocket engines with thrust ratings up to 500,000 pounds. Later, modifications can be made to accommodate engines generating 1,500,000 pounds of thrust. This test cell, most of which is underground, required excavation of a hole 250 feet deep and 100 feet in diameter.

Still another test cell now under construction will be capable of testing solid rocket motors generating up to 200,000 pounds of thrust at simulated altitude conditions of more than 120,000 feet.

The purpose of these rocket engine tests is to obtain such information as the burning characteristics of a propellant, the precise amount of thrust an engine generates, and the durability of a rocket engine nozzle case and associated controls. Thus, information of this nature can be obtained without the costly launch of a complete missile. At the same time, altitude tests in these cells can reduce considerably the time element, as well as the number of launches, required in the development of a weapon system.

By the same token, tests of airbreathing engines can help cut down development time and the number of flight tests required for manned aircraft and certain types of guided missiles. These tests may involve complete flight-type engines or they may involve heavier "boilerplate" versions of an engine in which inlets, compressors, combustors, nozzles or other sections can be installed for experimental investigations.

During test of an airbreathing engine, air that has been conditioned to simulate the desired altitude and temperature is forced onto the test cell at the velocity which permits running the engine at the power setting of the desired mach number.

Testing in this facility is not limited to new and untried propulsion systems. From the start, development tests have been run on a number of airbreathing engines and rocket engines which power operational aircraft and missiles and problems encountered in operation have been solved here.

VON KÁRMÁN GAS

The Von Kármán Gas Dynamics Facility is named in honor of the late Dr. Theodore von Kármán who was one of the world's foremost aerodynamicists and scientists.

Dr. von Kármán was born in Budapest in 1881. He was Chairman of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's (NATO) Advisory Group for Aeronautical Research and Development (AGARD), a position he held from the time the group was formed, on his recommendation, in 1952.

During World War II, he was Chairman of the Scientific Advisory Group of the U.S. Air Force. Later, he became Chairman Emeritus of the Advisory Group's successor, the Scientific Advisory Board. He also served as consultant to a number of industrial concerns and to the Department of Defense, the Army and the Navy, as well as the Air Force.

As Chairman of the Scientific Advisory Group, Dr. von Kármán wrote the recommendation that a center, which developed into the Arnold Center as it is today, be established. He died May 7, 1963.

DYNAMICS FACILITY

The Von Kármán Gas Dynamics Facility is designed for the aerodynamic testing—that is, testing of the effect of airflow on shapes—of aircraft, missiles, satellites, space vehicles and their components at highly realistic flight conditions ranging from Mach 1.5 to 20 and above. There are eight wind

tunnels of various sizes and capabilities in this facility.

Two are intermittent—or blowdown—tunnels. Air for these tunnels is stored in a pressure tank from which it flows through the test section into a vacuum sphere. The pressure tank is 720 feet long. It has an inside diameter of 3 feet. Its walls are 4 inches thick. The vacuum sphere is 80 feet in diameter.

To prepare for a test run, the pressure tank upstream of the tunnels is filled with compressed air. At the same time, air is pumped out of the vacuum sphere downstream of the tunnels. The air pressure in the tank is up to 4,000 pounds per square inch and the sphere can be evacuated to about one three-hundredths of an atmosphere.

When the test run is ready to be made, valves are opened at either end of the tunnel, thereby producing airflow through the 12-inch square test section in which the model is installed. Controls regulate the pressure and density of the air required for the specific test. Duration of the test, which may range from a few seconds to as long as 15 minutes, depends upon the conditions required. One of these tunnels operates in the mach number range from 1.5 to about 5, the other from 5 to 8.

Three of the tunnels in the Von Kármán Facility are continuous-flow tunnels. Air supply is from a nine-stage compressor system that is an eighth of a mile long and is driven by electric motors totaling 100,000 horsepower. These tunnels run for hours at a time. Thus the term "continuous flow."

One continuous-flow tunnel has a test section 40 inches square, the other two, 50 inches in diameter. They can therefore accommodate models much larger than those used in the blowdown tunnels. The mach number range in the first of these tunnels is 1.5 to 6, the other two operate at mach 8 and 10. The first has a flexible nozzle with which the Mach number of the airflow can be changed while the tunnel is operating. The other two have fixed axisymmetric nozzles.

Aerodynamics tests at mach numbers from 15 to 20 are made in the electric-arc-driven, hypervelocity tunnels of the hotshot type, so named by the engineers of ARO, Inc., who developed them originally. Hotshot 2 has a 50-inch-diameter test section whereas tunnel F has a 100-inch-diameter test section.

The components of a hotshot-type tunnel are a generator, an electric energy storage unit, an arc chamber, a nozzle, a test section, and a diffuser (vacuum tank). The operation of a hotshot tunnel is as follows:

First, the model is installed in the test section. Then a thin metal or plastic diaphragm is inserted between the arc chamber and the nozzle. Next, all of the tunnel, except the arc chamber, is evacuated down to near-vacuum conditions. Then the electric storage units are charged with energy. Hotshot 2 has a large induction coil with a capacity of 10 million joules, while the capacity of the tunnel F coil is 100 million joules.

When the desired level of the charge in the storage unit has been reached, an arc is initiated in the arc chamber. The resultant discharge raises the temperature and pressure of the gas (air or nitrogen) in the chamber to as much as 8000° F. and 20,000 pounds per square inch. The diaphragm bursts and the air flows through the nozzle into the test section, over the model and into the vacuum tank.

While the test runs in the hotshot tunnels are relatively short—one-twentieth of a second at most—special instrumentation developed by ARO, Inc., permits recording of the necessary data. In addition, the flow over the model is recorded with high-speed motion picture and still cameras. The film

is exposed at thousands of frames per second, as compared to a speed of 24 frames per second used in standard commercial movie cameras.

In another approach to model testing at hypervelocities, experimental work is being conducted in the hyperballistic range field. The model in this case can be equipped with telemetry equipment. It is fired in free flight down a closed range at velocities of thousands of feet per second, instead of having the airflow pass over a stationary model as in conventional wind tunnels. The telemetry equipment in the model transmits to receivers outside the range the temperatures and pressures acting on the model during its flight. Two prototype ranges are currently being used in this work and a 1,000-foot-long, large-scale range is going through shakedown and calibration. Simple models have been launched at satellite velocity (18,000 miles per hour) from VKF two-stage, light gas guns.

Another VKF test unit is a prototype, low-density, hypervelocity, continuous flow wind tunnel. Its purpose is to provide simulation of aerodynamic conditions encountered by spacecraft at altitudes on the order of 200,000 to 300,000 feet and to help decide the most critical features of advanced test facilities. Rarefied atmospheres of certain other planets also may be simulated.

The present tunnel uses a continuous plasma torch which heats any of a variety of gases to the order of 4,000 to 10,000° F. In a typical case, nitrogen gas is being heated to 8,000° F., then expanded through a cooled hypersonic nozzle, to a mach number near 10, where the model is mounted. Equivalent density altitude in the test section is almost 50 miles. Models glow cherry-red with heat despite conduction and radiation cooling.

Still another field of study in this facility is the damage that could be caused by collision of a space vehicle and minute particles of natural or man-made space debris.

Two hypervelocity impact ranges are already in use for this purpose and a third, larger and more versatile range is scheduled to go into operation soon.

Plates of metal such as aluminum or copper, which could be used for the outer skin of space vehicles, are used as targets. Launchers, specifically designed for the purpose, propel BB-sized pellets of various materials down the ranges at velocities of thousands of feet per second.

Special cameras and electronic timing equipment enable technicians to determine the exact speed of the pellet at impact. Another special camera, capable of taking pictures at 1,400,000 frames per second, provides a graphic record of significant crater formation as the tiny projectile slams into the target.

PROPULSION WIND TUNNEL

The propulsion wind tunnel is designed to test large-scale model and, in some cases, full-scale aircraft, missiles, satellites, and space vehicles; and the propulsion systems for them in the mach number range from 0.5 to about 4. In addition, a propulsion system can be mounted for testing in its nacelle, pod, wing section or body of the aircraft, missile, satellite, or space vehicle just as it would be mounted in actual flight.

Altitude conditions ranging from sea level to well above 100,000 feet can be simulated in the propulsion wind tunnel.

The propulsion wind tunnel, as a facility, has two 16-foot wind tunnels—the transonic circuit and the supersonic circuit—and 1-foot model tunnels of each. The transonic circuit operates in the mach number range from 0.5 to about 1.6 and the supersonic circuit operates from mach 1.5 to about 4. In overall design they are basically the same.

The two large wind tunnels have removable, interchangeable test sections, which are an integral part of the tunnel when in place. Each circuit has its own compressor.

Both are driven by the same system of motors.

With the interchangeable test sections, preparations for one test may be made at the same time another is being run in the tunnel. Thus, tunnel shutdown time between tests is shortened considerably. The common motor drive system permits operation of both tunnels simultaneously, under certain conditions. For peak operation of either tunnel, however, the entire motor drive system is connected to the compressor in the one tunnel.

Airflow, which reaches velocities between 100 and 200 miles an hour in the ducting both upstream and downstream of the test section, is guided smoothly around the corners of the tunnel by giant turning vanes that resemble oversize, vertical venetian blinds.

The air in the transonic circuit, which has been heated by friction and compression, also passes through a bank of water-cooled baffles before it goes into a stilling chamber and thence through a flexible nozzle, which regulates the velocity to the desired Mach number, into the test section.

The test section itself has perforated walls in the Transonic Circuit. That is, the walls, the floor and the ceiling have thousands of holes in them. And it is surrounded by a plenum chamber. This arrangement prevents shockwaves, inherent to sonic and supersonic flight, from reflecting off the walls back onto the model. Some of the air flows through the holes in the walls into the plenum chamber and is run back into the circuit downstream of the test section.

Since these two tunnels are closed circuits, a scavenging system was devised and installed to remove exhaust gases from the tunnel air when operating propulsion systems are tested. The scoop for this system is located directly behind the nozzle of the propulsion unit being tested. The scoop leads into ducting which, in turn, leads to the exhausters in the rocket test facility. The exhausters suck the exhaust gases out of the propulsion wind tunnel and through a cleaner before they are forced into the atmosphere. At the same time dry, uncontaminated air is fed back into the circuit through a large silica-gel drier in the same quantities removed by the scavenging system.

The flexible nozzles in these tunnels control only the velocity of the airflow through the test section. These tunnels have movable stings or supports on which the test objects are mounted. To simulate diving and climbing the sting is manipulated so that the test object itself is rolled or tilted up and down.

Just as tests are now run on models in these test sections, so were tests run on models of the test sections themselves before construction began on the actual tunnels. Moreover, these two model tunnels—the transonic model tunnel and the supersonic model tunnel—are being used today to run tests on small-scale models of aircraft, missiles, and space weapons. The smaller, prototype tunnels have test sections 1 foot square.

AEROSPACE ENVIRONMENTAL FACILITY

The Aerospace Environmental Facility was established in late 1962 in preparation for testing full-scale satellite and space vehicles under simulated conditions of their operational environment for continuous periods of as long as a year.

While the main test unit of this facility is still under construction, various systems, instrumentation, and techniques to be applied in the operation of this unit are being developed and tested in several smaller aerospace simulation chambers.

Designated the Mark I Aerospace Environmental Chamber, it will have a test area 35 feet in diameter and 65 feet high. It will provide the simulated conditions for ground testing satellite and space vehicles during

their trajectory from the launch pad to altitudes of 200 to 300 miles.

The chamber will be capable of simulating real time altitude trajectory conditions from sea level to 15 miles altitude, one of the critical phases of a launching, in 82 seconds.

To create these conditions, the chamber will be equipped with vacuum pumping and cryogenic systems to simulate the low pressures and temperatures of space. Another system will simulate the sun's radiance to which an orbiting vehicle is exposed and an energy source will be installed to simulate the earth radiance and albedo, or earth reflection, as seen by a vehicle orbiting the earth. In addition, the chamber will be equipped with shakers to simulate the vibrations to which the vehicle is subjected while its rocket motors are operating and special handling equipment will simulate the pitch and roll conditions of orbit and space flight.

The types of information that will be obtained in the Mark I chamber include:

Performance and reliability of entire vehicles and their components.

The effects that various space phenomena, such as evaporation of materials, have on vehicles and their components.

Temperature distribution over the entire vehicle and its components.

The function of electrical equipment in a complete vehicle.

The vibrational characteristics imparted to a vehicle in the absence of aerodynamic damping.

And the effects of aerospace environments on lubricants and other materials.

The information that will be obtained in test programs in the Mark I chamber will result in a considerable reduction in the time, expense, and risk required to place a satellite in orbit or a space vehicle on its flight path.

PROJECTS

These are some of the programs for the Army, the Navy, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, as well as the Air Force, which were supported by extensive simulated high altitude, high speed tests at the Arnold Center: Agena, Atlas, Polaris, XB-70, X-15, Surveyor, Bullpup, Syncom, Asset, Mercury, Nike-Zeus, TFX, X-20, Titan I, II, and III, Saturn, Pershing, Apollo, Gemini, Sergeant, Minuteman, Discoverer, Scout, Ranger, Thorad.

Certain aspects of wind tunnel and propulsion system test cell work are common to all four major laboratories at the Arnold Engineering Development Center. Among them are:

CONTROL AND OBSERVATION

Control of the test object and all simulated flight conditions that are not preset in each of the wind tunnels and test cells is from a control room remote from the test sections or cells. In some cases, safety is a factor in this remote control.

When engines are undergoing test, whether in the propulsion wind tunnel or the Rocket Test Facility, power setting is controlled from the control room by an engineer or technician with a throttle similar to an airplane throttle. This is also true in the case of throttleable rocket engines. Angle of attack, airflow velocity, temperature and pressure are also controlled from the control room when not preset. The plenum evacuation and scavenging systems of the propulsion wind tunnel are also controlled from this remote point.

Observation of the object undergoing test can be covered by standard or high-speed motion picture and automatic still cameras mounted in the test sections or cells. In addition, closed circuit television is used to monitor the tests.

INSTRUMENTATION

Hundreds of standard temperature and pressure-sensing devices are attached to the engines or models to obtain the data during

simulated flight tests in the wind tunnels and propulsion system test cells.

In the Hotshot tunnels, however, the nature of the tests and their relatively short duration demand special instrumentation. It must be small, yet it must respond instantaneously and it must be accurate. Such instrumentation was conceived and fabricated by ARO, Inc., technicians and has been acclaimed as a major engineering accomplishment.

Additional complications produced by the tremendous acceleration forces which act on hyperballistic range models and the telemetry equipment they carry are being overcome in work in the pilot ranges. Models and transmitters have withstood up to 200,000 G's—a force working against them that is equal to 200,000 times their own weight.

DATA RECORDING AND REDUCTION

Every instrument installed in a test object, whether it is a rocket engine or an aerodynamic shape, is connected or tuned to automatic data recording equipment outside the test unit. The data are then fed from this equipment to automatic data reduction equipment—or "electronic brains"—and the engineers and technicians on the test have precise data available to them only seconds after a test point has been run.

One advantage in this system is that the engineers and technicians running the test in many cases can make changes, if desired, while the test run continues. Another is the tremendous reduction in the lag between the end of the test run and the time finished data are available, which sometimes took weeks or months using the old manual and semi-automatic data reduction methods.

ONLY THE BEGINNING

But even after the data are reduced and the test reports written the job isn't finished. It is, in fact, only the beginning. Not until the information contained in the report is applied—to make the Nation's aerial and space weapons second to none—can the job be considered complete.

"I am keenly aware of the tremendous responsibility the Air Force currently has in using nearly 25 cents of each Federal tax dollar * * * The Air Force must spend this money so that the country receives the maximum amount of defense for it * * * After seeing some of the work at the Arnold Center, I know of no other installation in the Air Force where our money is being spent with greater effect."

EUGENE M. ZUCKERT,
Secretary of the Air Force.

"One of our Nation's most important aerospace research centers * * * with capabilities unmatched anywhere in the free world * * * Its environmental laboratories offers us priceless assistance in developing present and future aerospace systems."

GEN. THOMAS D. WHITE,
Former USAF Chief of Staff.

"Modern facilities such as these are one of the most valuable assets we have to national progress in aerospace technology."

GEN. B. A. SCHRIEVER,
Commander, AFSC.

TENNESSEE SPACE INSTITUTE

The Tennessee Space Institute, which will be operated by the University of Tennessee, is scheduled to open formally in September of 1964.

The institute will be built on a 400-acre site on the shores of Woods Reservoir only a few miles from Arnold Center. It will be fully accredited and will provide graduate study in engineering and science leading to the degrees of master of science and doctor of philosophy.

Establishment of the institute came about as the result of the joint efforts of ARO, Inc., contract operator of the center; the U.S. Air Force and the University of Tennessee. The Air Force donated the land and the State

appropriated \$1.25 million for construction of the initial buildings.

Students and faculty will have access to many of the laboratories, as well as the engineering and scientific staff, at the \$340 million center, which gives the institute promise of becoming one of the world's leading institutions for advanced study and research in aerospace technology.

The curriculum will provide course work in space vehicle design, propulsion, gas dynamics, and space environmental problems. The initial faculty will consist of about a dozen professors.

A recent article by Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, "The Flaw in the Military Space Program," is worthy of the attention of the Congress and the public. He discusses the technical fallacies for tomorrow's space power:

THE FLAW IN THE MILITARY SPACE PROGRAM
(By Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, commander, Air Force Systems Command)

(NOTE.—U.S. Air Force's Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, AFSC's 52-year-old commander, is a graduate of Texas A. & M. and entered on active duty in July 1932. After a brief break in service, he returned to uniform in 1938 and has been on the rise ever since. Considered one of the Air Force's most knowledgeable men, Schriever was named AFSC's first commanding officer when the command was created in 1961, and received his fourth star shortly thereafter.)

A change in attitude is urgently needed because long leadtimes, required for construction, must be clearly recognized when considering.

The United States is engaged in a technological race with the Soviet Union. The obvious intention of the Soviets is to achieve decisive superiority in military technology.

Their leaders have proclaimed this goal repeatedly and they appear to be channeling their national resources effectively toward this objective. A number of their achievements in space flight not only show considerable technical ability but also manifest a definite potential for future military applications.

In the face of this technological challenge, adequate long-range planning for national security must take into account the technical facilities that will be needed to develop tomorrow's spacepower. This is a matter of real urgency, because advanced laboratories, wind tunnels, environmental chambers, ranges, and associated equipment are items with extremely long leadtimes.

Today's weapon systems, it should be remembered, have been developed in facilities that were conceived in the 1940's and built in the 1950's. At that time, they were regarded as very advanced. They involved some technical risk and could not be justified on the basis of systems of that day. However, these same facilities have been indispensable to the development of weapon systems in our inventory today—systems which were neither approved nor funded at the time the facilities were designed.

For example, the engineering test cells at the Air Force Arnold Engineering Development Center (AEDC), Tenn., were designed in 1944-45 to test air-breathing propulsion systems. Today, three of the seven cells are used exclusively to test rocket motors—which were not even part of a U.S. weapon system at the time the cells were conceived.

It took over 4 years of review by a number of agencies before the test cells were finally approved, authorized, and funded. The first cell was partially operational in 1953, but the total complement did not become totally operational until 1957—12 years after initial steps had been taken for their acquisition.

Had it not been for the forward-looking efforts of Dr. Theodore von Kármán, and his scientific associates, as well as the foresight

of those who approved construction of these test cells, they would not have been available even then to support the Nation's space efforts.

Since 1958, these Air Force facilities have supported nearly every major missile and space program, including U.S. Air Force's Atlas, Titan, and Minuteman; Army's Pershing and Nike; Navy's Polaris; and NASA's Mercury and Apollo manned space flight programs.

TESTING INDISPENSABLE

They have been indispensable to instrumented tests, designed to investigate the causes of malfunctions, and have repeatedly revealed problems not predicted by theoretical studies or by sea-level testing. They have found design deficiencies which were not revealed by telemetry data.

In many cases, this testing obtained data which could not have been obtained in any other way. In every case, simulated tests proved to be significantly cheaper than flight tests.

Vast quantities of new data, as well as dramatic savings in time and money, have resulted from the use of flight simulation facilities. Testing in a controlled environment has repeatedly proved more effective and less costly than testing by trial and error from the launch pad. Controlled tests have been invaluable in accurately pinpointing the causes of malfunctions in flights.

For example, when an advanced ICBM failed at Cape Canaveral, films of the launch indicated the failure originated in the vehicle's base, but telemetry data failed to show the cause of the failure. A scale model of the missile was constructed and placed in an altitude test cell at AEDC.

When that model was subjected to the same conditions at which failure had occurred, it was determined, through extensive instrumentation, that the launch-pad failure had been caused by hot exhaust gases, recirculating in the base of the missile. This same problem was found to be common to several advanced missile and booster systems, all of which have since received tests in the Arnold facilities.

By enabling research personnel to reproduce the extremely hostile flight environment of the upper atmosphere, the altitude chambers at Arnold have helped solve a number of such puzzling problems.

In one typical instance, the Arnold facilities were used to find out why a rocket motor had failed in orbit, in spite of a perfect test record at sea-level conditions. When the motor was tested under simulated conditions of actual flight, the causes of failure were readily determined and the necessary changes were made.

Similarly, the altitude chambers have been used to test new materials for rocket nozzles and to investigate the causes of failure in recovery parachutes at extremely high altitudes.

One of the factors in the success of the X-15 program is the extensive preliminary testing under conditions simulating those of actual flight. Wind tunnel tests of the X-15 configuration involved the simulation of more than 500 different reentry conditions and resulted in the accumulation of more than 2 million data points. A number of design changes, necessary to assure safe reentry, resulted from these tests.

FACILITIES ARE BROAD

The test cells at Arnold are only a portion of the facilities used by the Air Force for the development, testing, and evaluation of new systems.

The Central Inertial Guidance Test Facility at Holloman Air Force Base, N. Mex., performs invaluable work in the testing of guidance systems. It was here that the Minuteman sled-test program was conducted. In the course of the project, three specific defects were discovered—any one

of which could have caused the loss of a missile. Necessary corrections were made and the guidance system worked perfectly when the first Minuteman was fired at the cape.

Development of the Central Inertial Guidance Test Facility points up one of the chief problems in constructing new research facilities—that of providing instrumentation of sufficient accuracy to gage the equipment being tested. This is a continuing problem as weapon systems increase in precision and reliability. The measuring and evaluating devices must always be more precise and more reliable.

It should be evident that modern, up-to-date research facilities are essential to the continuing progress of military technology. These are the items with the longest lead-times of any element in the system's acquisition cycle.

Acquisition of a comparatively simple facility must start about 4 years before the facility is required. A complicated, state-of-the-art facility, such as an advanced wind tunnel or environmental chamber, may require a leadtime of as long as 8 years. A new item in the military construction program often requires more than 2½ years between its initiation and the receipt of funding which permits negotiating for a construction contract.

The long leadtime for acquiring technical facilities becomes a major pacing factor in the timely acquisition of weapon systems. New technical facilities must be conceived on the basis of projecting the state-of-the-art to anticipate scientific requirements.

Therefore, they must precede the approval and funding of new systems. If facility development is delayed until the emergence of an approved and funded system that specifically requires it, the facility cannot be ready by the time the system requires its services. In order to assist in preventing repeated flight test failures and in developing design parameters, the facility must be ready when the system enters the development phase.

To meet its responsibilities for the rapid advancement of technology and the development of new aerospace systems, the Air Force urgently needs new technical facilities to support research, development, test, and evaluation missions. In order to insure the timely acquisition of these new facilities, more effective procedures must be followed.

U.S. Air Force has taken several specific steps to improve its procedures for facilities acquisition. Recently, the 850-A program area was established to perform resources planning studies and analyses.

Work in this area includes generalized studies to determine facilities requirements and requirements trends; analysis of alternate methods of expanding and modernizing technical facilities; and identification and validation of future facility requirements.

MORE ARE NEEDED

Many of today's research and development technical facilities are, themselves, actually products of research—and more of them will be so in the future.

In recognition of this fact and in order to alleviate the difficulties encountered in establishing design criteria, cost, feasibility, and other specifications as required, the Air Force has established program area 850-E, "Design criteria for R. & D. facilities." Work in this area is a natural follow-on to work in the 850-A program area and includes all research, present and future, that contributes directly to or supports the design criteria of a planned R. & D. technical facility.

Facility acquisition procedures have also been improved by the fact that, beginning with the fiscal year 1964 budget submission, technical facilities are treated separately from other construction items.

Purpose of these improvements is to insure that requests for new research and development facilities will be adequately sup-

ported by feasibility and cost data. But, in addition to these changes in procedures which have already been implemented, a change in attitude is urgently needed.

To begin with, the long leadtime required for technical facilities must be clearly recognized and approval procedures should take cognizance of this factor. Efforts must be made to achieve drastic reduction in leadtime—particularly in the long, drawn-out approval phase.

Secondly, the justification of facilities should be based on technical feasibility and design criteria rather than on detailed design drawings and specifications. The design and scope of the new facilities should be flexible enough to permit changes during the acquisition cycle to take advantage of new knowledge and to adapt to changing requirements and applications.

Finally, the importance of economy must be considered in justifying new test facilities. Where adequate environmental test facilities are not in existence, new systems have to be tested in actual flight.

This can be a very costly procedure, since every failure is likely to involve either the destruction of the system or very serious damage to it. Where potential failures can be identified by simulated flight tests, considerable savings are possible.

A recognized element of risk is involved in acquiring new facilities, as there is in any urgent military program. But, the need for technical facilities more than justifies the risk involved, in view of the alternatives. A decisive Soviet lead in space technology and military spacepower would be disastrous for the free world. The United States cannot afford to neglect the requirements of technological progress.

The need for improved research and development facilities has been stated at the highest Department of Defense levels. In his memorandum on in-house laboratories, dated October 14, 1961, Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara stated: "The Department of Defense must insure that these laboratories, which constitute one of our greatest assets, are properly supported and utilized."

Several days later, Dr. Harold Brown, Director of Defense Research and Engineering, noted four factors that affect the acquisition and retention of leading scientists and engineers—salary, organization, working environment, and physical environment.

Since the fall of 1961, a major effort has been made to upgrade in-house competence, and a number of improvements have resulted. Public Law 87-793, passed by the Congress on October 11, 1962, reformed the Federal salary structure and incorporated the principle that these salaries should be comparable with those in private enterprise for the same level of work.

Formation of the Research and Technology Division of the Air Force Systems Command, on July 26, 1962, was another of these improvements. This step was designed to improve management procedures for U.S. Air Force laboratories and create a more challenging and stimulating working environment.

But, the problem of improving the physical environment still remains to be solved. As Secretary Brown has pointed out: "The quality of the physical plant is very often viewed as a basic method for expression of the relative value which central management places upon the local laboratory's collective efforts. In many cases, the Defense laboratories are lagging behind Government-supported industrial or university standards."

In spite of this recognition of the problem, the Air Force has not yet been able to secure the modern laboratory facilities it requires to attract and stimulate the efforts of the highest caliber technical people.

It is not enough to give a scientist pay and recognition. He also needs the tools with

which to work—and this means research and development facilities, advanced enough to support investigations on the frontiers of knowledge. The upgrading of in-house competence, in the final analysis will be heavily dependent on the provision of adequate working facilities for in-house scientists and engineers.

It is clear that Air Force capabilities, during the next 5 to 10 years, are inextricably tied to decisions made on research, development and test facilities today. These decisions, in large measure, will determine the ability of the Air Force to continue to meet the responsibilities for national security in the space age.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. McLOSKEY (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), on account of death of member of his staff.

Mr. ROOSEVELT (at the request of Mr. MILLER of California), for today through the balance of the week, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PELLY, for 20 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida for, 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LIBONATI (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 60 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BRAY (at the request of Mr. MORSE), for 15 minutes, on Wednesday, December 4.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. PELLY to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter in his special order today.

Mr. ALGER.

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

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. BRAY.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on November 29, 1963, present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

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

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

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

H.J. Res. 809. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1964, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, December 3, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1403. A letter from the national adjutant, Disabled American Veterans, transmitting the reports and the proceedings of our national gathering, held in Miami Beach, Fla., August 18 through 24, 1963, for the year ending June 30, 1963, pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Congress (H. Doc. No. 282); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1404. A letter from the executive secretary, Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, transmitting the 50th Annual Report of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia for the calendar year 1962, pursuant to an act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, approved March 4, 1913; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. McCULLOCH: Committee on the Judiciary. Part 2, additional views on H.R. 7152, Civil Rights Act of 1963 (Rept. No. 914). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. H.R. 8751. A bill to amend the act of March 2, 1931, to provide that certain proceedings of the AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), shall be printed as a House document, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 931). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 230. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of 5,000 copies of the study, "Tax-Exempt Foundations and Charitable Trusts: Their Impact on Our Economy—Second Installment," for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business; without amendment (Rept. No. 932). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 231. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of 5,000 copies of the study, "Tax-Exempt Foundations and Charitable Trusts: Their Impact on Our Economy," for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business; without amendment (Rept. No. 933). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 237. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of certain opinions of the Supreme Court of the United States in cases involving the offering of prayers and reading from the Bible in public

schools; without amendment (Rept. No. 934). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 518. Resolution to print as a House document, the handbook entitled "The United States Courts"; without amendment (Rept. 935). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 9000. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; without amendment (Rept. 936). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 7170. A bill to amend the Alaska Public Works Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to collect, compromise, or release certain claims held by him under that act; without amendment (Rept. No. 937). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1713. A bill to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior canceling irrigation charges against non-Indian-owned lands under the Klamath Indian irrigation project, Oregon, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 938). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 547. Resolution to provide additional funds for the investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 179; with amendment (Rept. No. 939). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 566. Resolution to provide funds for the further expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 56; with Amendment (Rept. No. 940). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. AYRES:

H.R. 9305. A bill providing for the election of an acting Vice President by the House of Representatives in certain instances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 9306. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make loans to Indians for purchase of certain real property; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 9307. A bill to establish a commission to be known as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Commission; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 9308. A bill to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 9309. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide that the penalties for homicide prescribed in such title shall apply to any person who kills the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, or the head of any executive department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9310. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 9311. A bill to continue for 2 years the suspension of duty on certain alumina and to make permanent the suspension of

duty on certain bauxite; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POOL:

H.R. 9312. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Guadalupe Mountains National Park in the State of Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 9313. A bill to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act so as to extend to qualified schools of optometry and students of optometry those provisions thereof relating to student loan programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 9314. A bill to amend the U.S. Warehouse Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 9315. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act so as to require that certain firearms transported in interstate or foreign commerce must be consigned to the recipients through local law enforcement officers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AYRES:

H.J. Res. 818. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of the Vice President by the Senate in certain instances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H.J. Res. 819. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 820. Joint resolution designating the National Cultural Center as the John F. Kennedy Memorial National Cultural Center; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.J. Res. 821. Joint resolution to establish a commission to be known as the John F. Kennedy Memorial Commission; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 822. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.J. Res. 823. Joint resolution providing for the issuance of standard silver dollars bearing the likeness of John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TUPPER:

H.J. Res. 824. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve and protect references to reliance upon God in governmental matters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. Res. 578. Resolution to provide for the issuance of identification cards to the spouses of Members of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 9316. A bill for the relief of Evelyn Adora Flowers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9317. A bill for the relief of Enrico Cortina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 9318. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Francavilla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 9319. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Zora Secivanovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

467. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of the mayor and City Council of Omaha, Nebr., expressing deepest sympathy to the wife and family of President John F. Kennedy; resolving that we turn our eyes and hearts toward God in this darkest hour of history while the people of the world are still suffering from the initial shock of the loss of this greatest of leaders by assassination at a time when the strength of his mind and heart are sorely needed throughout the world; and resolving that we strive to bring peace and freedom to all people in all parts of the world, as would

be the will of President John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America; to the Committee on House Administration.

468. By the SPEAKER: Petition of John W. Potter, mayor, Toledo, Ohio, relative to memorializing President John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on House Administration.

469. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to legislate to require the President of the United States, when traveling, always to be protected, as far as is humanly possible, by bulletproof glass, or comparable substance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

470. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to amend the second amendment to the Constitution of the United States to

the effect that the Federal Government may have the power to cause all keepers and bearers of arms to be duly registered and licensed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

471. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to legislate to require the President when riding in an automobile, to ride in bulletproof cars, and when with the people in large numbers to wear bulletproof clothing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

472. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to initiate an amendment to the Constitution of the United States limiting the term of President to that of one 6-year term, with no eligibility or possibility for reelection, as well as no eligibility for election in his own right to the Vice Presidency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

We Should Proliferate Weapons Among NATO Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 2, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Sunday's Star published an editorial, "Nuclear Generosity," commenting on the proposal of the Republican project committee on NATO unity—of which I am a member—that the United States give tactical nuclear weapons to our NATO allies. Here is the text of the editorial:

NUCLEAR GENEROSITY

A group of House Republicans looking for ways to shore up the Atlantic Alliance is urging that the United States give small nuclear weapons to NATO countries. The idea is that these countries will no longer be irritated by the American monopoly, and the Alliance will tend to draw closer together.

This would be a generous gesture—but a dangerous one. The United States has kept control over its nuclear weapons during the past three administrations for sound reasons. Here are some of them:

Nuclear war is so incredibly dangerous to civilization that even the smallest nuclear weapons should be used only if there is no alternative and only in the most controlled and deliberate way possible. The more countries that can fire these weapons in time of stress, the more likely it is that they will be fired unnecessarily.

Once one is fired, there could be a tendency for both sides to use more and more, bigger and bigger warheads until the world slips unwittingly into what could be nuclear suicide. The more countries that are free to contribute to this slide, the more apt it is to happen.

Nuclear weapons of any size may never be used again, or if they are used, close control may prove to be possible. These uncertainties make it nonetheless important, however, to try to keep the weapons under control. Congress was wise to make transfer of nuclear weapons to other countries illegal. The law should not be changed out of hope for a change in the attitude of our allies.

Mr. Speaker, I disagree with the conclusions reached in the editorial, but believe the newspaper rendered a public service in calling attention to the proposal.

The main purpose of the proposal was to help shore up the NATO alliance. To me, the strengthening of NATO is the most urgent and vital task confronting the United States. The uncertainties which naturally accompany a change in U.S. executive leadership make the task all the more urgent.

At present we are treating our NATO allies like irresponsible children. We deny them weapons we know our common adversary possesses. If West Germany were invaded by the nuclear-armed Communists, for example, it would have no nuclear weapons of its own for defense. Tactical weapons with nuclear warheads exist in West Germany, of course, but they are locked up. The United States holds the keys. Whether they would actually be used to defend West Germany would depend on a U.S. decision at the moment of crisis. The decision might be either yes or no.

As our allies review recent U.S. policy they may be justified in wondering if we would actually defend Europe's cities with our nuclear weapons. Witness our weak followthrough in Cuba, withdrawal of missiles from Italy and Turkey, the test ban treaty, cancellation of Skybolt.

At any moment, Khrushchev may nibble aggressively at NATO frontiers, figuring the United States will not respond with nuclear weapons.

If we give our NATO allies nuclear tactical weapons, we would at the same time be giving each of them—and the NATO alliance—the strongest possible vote of confidence. It would be a U.S. commitment to defend Europe far stronger and more tangible than words. This assurance would not be overlooked in Moscow.

Khrushchev would know that if he attacked any part of NATO he would bring nuclear weapons into action. This knowledge would be a strong deterrent to Communist aggression.

Sharing nuclear weapons with our NATO allies would actually reduce the danger of war. The weakness of our present policy can be illustrated by drawing a parallel between the NATO alliance and the U.S. Federal Union.

Suppose each of our 50 States had its own military defenses, with the 50 tied together with a treaty alliance. Of the

50, only 1—Illinois, let us say—had nuclear weapons. Illinois dispersed nuclear vehicles among the other 49 States and promised to use these weapons to defend each of the other States in case of Communist aggression. Illinois kept the nuclear warheads under lock and key, however, and reserved to itself the final decision on when and if they would be used.

Under these circumstances, would it not be better—for the cause of peace as well as resistance to communism—for Illinois to supply the other 49 States with complete nuclear weapons, which each could use at will?

This would not be the ideal arrangement, of course. Central civilian control of all U.S. nuclear weapons is far better than proliferation among the 50 individual States of the Union. But proliferation certainly would be far better than an Illinois monopoly. Illinois might have the best of intentions, but in a showdown its promise to defend California—or any other State—might not be fulfilled.

Nor is the proliferation our project committee recommends the ideal arrangement for NATO's 15 nations. In my opinion, central civilian control of all NATO nuclear weapons would be far better.

Unhappily, no central civilian authority exists. NATO is not a government and holds no authority. Consequently, there is no central civilian authority to which control of all NATO nuclear weapons could be transferred.

NATO is but a treaty alliance, far weaker than the Articles of Confederation which proved to be grossly inadequate for the Thirteen Original States in early U.S. history.

Curiously, we have advanced to the nuclear age in military science, but we are still in the oxcart age in political science. We have not had the good sense to link the NATO peoples with the same type Federal structure that serves the people of the 50 U.S. States so well.

We should proceed at once to forge this linkage, and thus create a central civilian authority to which all NATO nuclear weapons could be transferred.

Meanwhile, we should strengthen NATO by giving its member nations the tactical nuclear weapons they need and

deserve. Proliferation of weapons among those who love liberty is an act of humanity and peace.

Communism Still Poses Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 2, 1963

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, it is noteworthy that of all the nations in the world the only one which gloated over our President's assassination was Red China. Their official remarks clearly demonstrated the viciousness and hatred which typify the leadership of that country.

It might be well to briefly study the ruthless and insane ambition which is demonstrated in the actions of the present ruler of the 700 million Red Chinese today. I will quote extracts from writings either by Mao Tse-tung or written under his direction. Mao Tse-tung, himself, is a brilliant, well-educated man.

The following verses are taken from a Chinese folksong:

The sun is rising red in the East.
China has brought forth a Mao Tse-tung.
He plans blessings for the people.
Aiyayo, he is the people's great saviour.
Mao Tse-tung is a son of the Chinese earth;
He will lead us to fight the enemy.
There will come a time when we will be masters.

Aiyayo, all our enemies shall be beaten.

Mao's supreme egotism is shown in this extract from an official publication of Red China:

Mao Tse-tung is China's greatest theoretician, thinker, and revolutionary * * * Mao can truly be regarded as a genius such as never before has appeared in Chinese history.

Perhaps the following extract from a poem written by Mao himself best displays his military ambitions to conquer. In this poem he places himself as a greater military genius than Genghis Khan, the great Mongol leader who was perhaps the greatest and most ruthless conqueror of all time.

These lands, these rivers, their bewitching charm
Inspired the conqueror of Chin and Han,
Tang and Sung in splendour striving to expand.
Alas! All short in stature! And Genghis Khan
Knew only how to shoot a hawk for play.
For the towering figure watch the scene today!

Perhaps the principal cause of America's failure to understand what to expect from our potential enemies is that we have forgotten that "he who will not learn the lessons of history is doomed to relive it."

The histories used in American schools have recorded little of the great and ruthless Chinese conquerors who have led a cruel and relentlessly expanding nation in the past. The strength of

China has ebbed and flowed several times in the last 20 centuries.

In the centuries of Chinese history, she also has been controlled by dynasties of the Mongols and Manchus, but in each instance these conquering peoples became Chinese themselves.

It is true that for three centuries Russia has been an aggressor against China, but today Mao appears to be bent on revenge toward the rest of the world.

His subjects are hungry. There is nothing Mao would like better than to take over Russian territory in central Asia and Siberia, much of which was once controlled by China. He has created several border incidents, but he knows that he cannot today cope with Russian strength.

He is creating incidents along the border between North and South Korea; he has invaded India in two different places, and India has been one of his friends; he is now taking over American influences in Cambodia and the American mission has been ordered to leave. He is pushing the war in Vietnam, and is gaining control of Laos. The tentacles of Red China are probing deep into the new and underdeveloped countries of Asia.

The fact that China is today vengeful toward Russia should not fill us with hope and confidence toward a better relationship with Russia, for world communism today, whether dominated by Russia, China, or Cuba, is our mortal enemy, and it is naive to believe otherwise.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 2, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of November 30, 1963:

AMERICA'S HOUR OF TRIAL

The violent act of a madman has brought sorrow to every American heart. There is no individual who does not grieve at the untimely death of John F. Kennedy. We offer our prayers that his widow and his children receive the God-given strength and wisdom which alone can make the burden bearable. Even in our grief, however, we recognize that life and death are intertwined—that death is not the end, but the continuation for the soul of man. No matter how tragic the death, how deep felt our sorrow, life and the Nation must go on. We pause to pay tribute and honor to our dead President. In that vein I issued the following statements over the last tragic weekend:

STATEMENT ON THE DEATH OF THE PRESIDENT

"No words can express our deep sorrow in this tragic hour. God alone can sustain us in our loss. Our hearts and prayers go out to Mrs. Kennedy, the children, and other members of the Kennedy family. We pray also for the speedy recovery of the Governor. We must call upon our inner strength to keep cool heads and preserve our country and our people."

TELEGRAM TO MRS. KENNEDY

"There are no words to express the deep sorrow felt by all the people of the Nation, but we did want you to know that our thoughts and prayers are with you and the children at this time. May God give us strength to protect and preserve our country to which your husband so valiantly dedicated himself."

TELEGRAM TO PRESIDENT JOHNSON

"The entire Nation is with you as you assume the tremendous responsibility now imposed upon you. May God give you the strength to preserve the Nation and the ideals for which it stands and to that end we pledge our support."

Now the last tributes have been paid and the President sleeps on the hillside in Arlington. It is up to all of us now to move forward in preserving the Nation and its liberties so that John F. Kennedy will not have lived nor died in vain. In preserving this Nation we must preserve the constitutional government with its three branches—we must preserve the freedom of debate, to oppose those things we believe wrong and support those we believe are right. Opposition, loyal opposition, is a tradition of our free society. Opposition to legislation is not based on hate, nor does the mere fact that a legislator opposes certain legislation or certain programs make of him a breeder of hate or an accessory to murder. To believe that to oppose is to destroy would put an end to representative government and there would be no meaning to the President's dedication to his principles or to his death.

In that spirit, then, let's continue to build in America. Let's not condemn the whole Nation, the city of Dallas, or those of opposite political parties. There is good sense in the editorial from the Wall Street Journal of November 26, 1963. I commend it to all the people of Dallas and reprint it here as a part of this newsletter:

"NO TIME FOR COLLECTIVE GUILT"

"In the shock of these past few days it is understandable that Americans should find their grief mingled with some shame that these events should happen in their country. We all stand a little less tall than we did last Friday morning.

"Yet, for our own part, we find past understanding the remarks of some otherwise thoughtful men who, in their moment of shock, would indict a whole nation with a collective guilt. It seems to us that they themselves have yielded to the hysteria they would charge to others, and in so doing show that their own country is past their understanding.

"Anyone who has been reading the newspapers, listening to the radio, or watching television has heard these men; they include public commentators, Members of our Congress, and men of God. And the substance of what they charge is that the whole of the American people—and by inclusion, the ways of the American society—are wrapped in a collective guilt for the murder of a President and the murder of a murderer.

"A Senator said that the responsibility lay on 'the people of Dallas' because this is where the events took place. A spokesman for one group of our people said the Nation was 'reaping the whirlwind of hatred.' One of our highest judges said the President's murder was stimulated by the 'hatred and malevolence' that are 'eating their way into the bloodstream of American life.' A newspaper of great renown passed judgment that 'none of us can escape a share of the fault for the spiral of violence.' And these were but a few among many.

"Such statements can only come from men who have not been abroad in the land, neither paused to reflect how the events came about nor observed in what manner the whole American people have responded to tragedy.

"A President lies dead because he moved freely among the people. He did so because he was beloved by many people, respected by all, and because everywhere people turned out in great numbers to pay him honor. In a society of tyranny the heads of state move in constant fear of murder, cordoned behind an army of policemen. It is the fundamental orderliness of the American society that leads Presidents to move exposed to all the people, making possible the act of a madman.

"In the tragedy there is blame, surely, for negligence. In retrospect, perhaps, it was negligent of a President himself not to be aware that there are ever madmen in the world; yet it is a negligence born of courage and confidence. It was negligent of the police authorities, perhaps, not to search and cover every corner, every window, which might shield a madman; yet it was a negligence born of years of proven trust in the crowds of Americans through which Presidents have safely moved.

"It was most certainly a terrible negligence on the part of the local police authorities which permitted one man to take vengeance into his own hands. It was an outrageous breach of responsibility for them to have moved a man accused of so heinous a crime in so careless a fashion. It was outrageous precisely because all the American people were themselves so outraged by the crime of assassination that anyone who knew these people ought to have known that one among them might be deranged enough to do exactly what was done.

"Yet the opportunity for negligence came because here the accused was being treated as any other accused, his detention in the hands of local police, the procedures those followed for the ordinary of murders. In another land he would have been efficiently buried by a secret police in a Lubyanka prison, never again to be seen or heard of until his execution.

"One might say, we suppose, that some of this negligence could be laid to all of us. It is, after all, the eager interest of the people in the persons of their leaders that brings them into open caravans, and it is the desire of the people to follow the normal ways even in murders of state that left the accused to bungling local police.

"In sum, there is in all of this—let there be no mistake—much to grieve, to regret, to blame. We can't escape remorse that there are madmen in our midst, that a President is dead, that we have been denied the right to show in open court the virtue of a free society. Now we pay the price of all sorts of negligence.

"But there is something different from the charge in the indictment. It is more than nonsense to say that the good people of Dallas, crowding the streets to honor a President, share a murderous guilt; or that the tragic acts of madmen cast a shadow on the whole of America. Such an indictment is vicious.

"Of reasons for shame we have enough this day without adding to them a shameful injustice to a mourning people."

TRIBUTE TO ANOTHER HERO

We remember, too, in this moment of sorrow Officer J. D. Tippit of the Dallas Police Department. I attempted to convey some of the feeling of the people of Dallas in the following telegram to his family:

"In this hour we would like you to know that you have our deepest sympathy. May God be with you and give you strength and courage. It may comfort you to know that an entire nation recognizes the bravery and dedication of your husband and that in his death he will become an inspiration to others that we may all meet our challenges with the same courage he did whenever duty calls."

STATEMENT ON PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S MESSAGE TO CONGRESS

President Johnson said what had to be said. He presented his plan, his beliefs as embodied in the legislation to which he has given his support. He will continue the program of the New Frontier. We admire his forthrightness and his decisive action in enunciating his program:

The tragic event of the past few days will not be forgotten by any who lived in this time, but as President Johnson stated so eloquently, the country must move forward. The legislative process must be pursued and those of us charged with the responsibility of representing the people in the Congress of the United States must make an effort to guard the fundamental principles of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

Some of us will continue to oppose the encroachments on the freedoms of the individual by big government. To abandon our convictions would be a mockery of our system and all that elected representatives of the people should be.

It is a basic part of our constitutional form of government that opposition to stated programs be expressed. Through the give and take of debate, then, we arrive at legislative conclusions in the interest of the whole Nation and all of its people.

Opposition is not hatred. Holding of views contrary to the leadership on given

legislation does not make those who hold such views disloyal or accessories to murder.

Should opposition on principle be subdued because of fear of criticism, then the American concept of government will be lost and our late President will then truly have lived and died in vain.

I have faith, however, in the goodness and the stability of the American people, in the honor and judgment of our elected representatives, and I am certain we will move forward, a united nation, each of us dedicated to preserving it and the principles for which we stand in a climate of freedom in which all of us believe.

In this spirit I shall continue to point out the dangers I see in some of the specific legislation now pending. I shall continue to do my best to preserve fiscal responsibility and the soundness of the dollar and will, as I have always done, apply to each piece of legislation the acid test of its constitutionality and whether or not it is within the framework of the amount of money the taxpayers can afford to spend.

I do regret President Johnson's emotional appeal, asking for support of legislation in memory of our late President. We who believe in government of law, not men, endorse or oppose legislation on merit alone, and should not be asked to evaluate legislation on taxation, civil rights, education, and other areas on any other basis.

Also, I share the view expressed by some who sensed the inconsistency of President Johnson's avowal of belief in independence and integrity of the legislative branch just after having appealed as President, in the name of our late President, that we pass all pending administration legislation.

NOW WE LOOK AHEAD

The week has now ended and the events have been recorded in the book of history. Our duty demands that we look to the future. Our national purpose, our national character have been sorely tried, but in the magnificent response of the American people our country withstood the test. We will continue to have our differences of opinion on what means should be used to achieve the common good, but we have proved to the world and, more importantly, to ourselves that we are one people, a united people, able to band together in time of crisis and to openly express our deepest feelings when any neighbor or any fellow human being needs comfort and strength.

Looking toward the future our national purpose is unchanged—to protect and preserve this free Nation and in the words of the Constitution, "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Psalms 84: 11: No good thing will the Lord withhold from them that walk uprightly.

O Thou who art the source of every needed blessing, we beseech Thee to clarify our minds and cleanse our hearts as we face the duties and responsibilities of this day.

Show us how we may strengthen and safeguard the freedom and integrity of our Republic and make her truly great.

May we be assured that Thy continued favor toward us is to be found in obeying Thy will and in following Thy leading.

Fill us with a longing to hasten the dawning of that glorious day when all nations shall be united in the bonds of brotherhood.

Grant that in times of peril and danger we may sustain one another and in times of suffering and sorrow may we minister to one another's needs.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

SENDING TO CONFERENCE INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 8747) mak-

ing appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, with amendments of the Senate thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. THOMAS, EVINS, CANNON, OSTERTAG, and JONAS.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.