

certain surplus property to the Aiken County Historical Commission for use at a historic monument; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mrs. NEUBERGER):

S. 1203. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain lands situated in the State of Oregon to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1204. A bill directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Kansas to the State of Kansas, Forestry, Fish and Game Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1205. A bill to amend the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act with respect to the contribution made by the Government toward health benefits protection for retired Federal employees and members of their families; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1206. A bill for the relief of Georgie Lou Rader; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1207. A bill for the relief of Noble Frank Smith and his wife, Viola Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. HILL:

S. 1208. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide a grant program for the prevention and control of dental diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. KUCHEL (for himself, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. BEALL, Mr. CASE, Mr. FONG, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 1209. A bill to establish a procedure for adoption and implementation of plans for the desegregation of public schools; to provide financial and technical assistance to facilitate desegregation of public schools; to restrict Federal financial aid for segregated public schools and institutions of higher education; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. CASE (for himself, Mr. BEALL, Mr. FONG, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 1210. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; and

S. 1211. A bill to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity to encourage and enforce a policy of equal employment opportunity in Federal employment, in employment under Government contracts, and in employment in programs supported or in facilities constructed by Federal grants-in-aid; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 1212. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment in the District of Columbia because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. BEALL, Mr. CASE, Mr. FONG, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 1213. A bill to assure decent, safe, and sanitary housing to families displaced by construction of highways forming a part of the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. BEALL, Mr. CASE, Mr. FONG, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 1214. A bill to further secure and protect the rights of citizens to vote in Federal and State elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. BEALL, Mr. CASE, Mr. FONG, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 1215. A bill to protect civil rights by providing criminal and civil remedies for unlawful official violence; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1216. A bill to provide Federal assistance to State and local police forces through projects to develop and demonstrate more effective techniques and practices of law enforcement; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 1217. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of race, color, religion, or national origin in the furnishing of accommodations and facilities to any person at hotels or motels, the business of which affects interstate commerce; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 1218. A bill to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act to prohibit discrimination in any respect whatsoever on account of race, creed, or color in hospital facilities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself, Mr. FONG, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. BEALL, Mr. CASE, Mr. COOPER, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. PEARSON):

S. 1219. A bill to make the Commission on Civil Rights a permanent agency in the executive branch of the Government, to broaden the scope of the duties of the Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 1220. A bill 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 acceptance and approval by the Director of Airports, Federal Aviation Agency, as protector of the interests of the United States of America; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 1221. A bill for the relief of Alfredo Menichelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

S. 1222. A bill to amend the Vocational Education Act of 1946 to expand and improve vocational education, with emphasis on the need for providing employment training for youth in a fast-changing economy; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. LONG of Missouri:

S. 1223. A bill for the relief of Mr. Miguel Antonio Acosta;

S. 1224. A bill for the relief of Dr. Luis E. Angles; and

S. 1225. A bill for the relief of Dr. Marshall Ku; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 1226. A bill to assure and prevent certain concerted activities by labor organizations which interfere with or obstruct or impede the free production of goods for commerce or the free flow thereof in commerce,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 1227. A bill authorizing the Association of Universalist Women (a nonprofit corporation in the District of Columbia) to consolidate with the Alliance of Unitarian Women (a nonprofit corporation in the State of Massachusetts); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

S. 1228. A bill to declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma; and

S. 1229. A bill to declare that certain land of the Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma is held by the United States in trust for the Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DODD (for himself, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. MECHEM, Mr. RBICOFF, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. KUCHEL):

S.J. Res. 65. Joint resolution to request the President to negotiate with the Mexican Government for the purpose of setting up a joint United States-Mexican Commission to investigate the flow of marijuana, narcotic drugs, and dangerous drugs between the United States and Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

By Mr. THURMOND:

S.J. Res. 66. Joint resolution expressing declaration of will of the American people and purpose of their Government to achieve complete victory over the forces of the world Communist movement; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

S.J. Res. 67. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1968 winter Olympic games in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

#### CONCURRENT RESOLUTION PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PART 1 OF HEARINGS OF JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE ON THE JANUARY 1963 ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 35) authorizing the printing of additional copies of part 1 of the hearings of the Joint Economic Committee on the January 1963 Economic Report of the President, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

#### RESOLUTIONS

#### TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT, WITH ADDITIONAL COPIES, A RE- PORT ENTITLED "STUDY MISSION TO SOUTHEAST ASIA"

Mr. MCGEE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 117), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved*, That there be printed, as a Senate document, a report entitled "Study Mission to Southeast Asia", submitted by Senator GALE W. MCGEE to the Senate Committee on Appropriations and that twenty thousand additional copies be printed for the use of that committee.

#### LOANS WITHOUT DISCRIMINATION ON REAL ESTATE BY FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Mr. SCOTT (for himself and Senators BEALL, FONG, JAVITS, KEATING, and KUCHEL) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 118) concerning loans without discriminatory provisions, on real estate by financial institutions, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

#### PUNISHMENT OF CERTAIN OFFENSES AGAINST POSTAL OFFICERS OR EMPLOYEES

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for punishment of certain offenses committed against postal officers or employees in the course of their employment. Currently, punishment is provided only in the case of certain offenses committed against post office inspectors. In my opinion, punishment should apply equally to such offenses committed against any officer or employee in the field service of the Post Office Department. The bill I have introduced will accomplish this objective.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1191) to provide for punishment of certain offenses committed against post officers or employees in the course of their employment, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### AMENDMENT OF UNIFORM ALLOWANCE FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Uniform Allowance Act of 1954. This measure authorized the departments and agencies to pay not to exceed \$100 annually toward the cost of uniforms required by law or administrative order to be worn by employees in the performance of their official duties.

In many instances this did not meet the actual cost of the uniforms even in 1954. During the 9 years since that date, the cost of uniforms has gone up until today the allowance is often totally inadequate. In such instances, employees have no choice except to use part of their meager salaries for the purchase of uniforms that cannot be worn except in the performance of their official duties. This is not a fair or equitable situation.

The bill I have introduced raises the amount the Government can pay from

\$100 to \$150 annually, except where overcoats or other outer garments are prescribed for protection against the elements, in which cases an additional \$50 annually would be allowed. Enactment of this measure is required in the interest of justice.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1192) to amend the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

#### AMENDMENT OF SECTION 309(e) OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, RELATING TO FILING OF PETITIONS FOR INTERVENTION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 309(e) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to require that petitions for intervention be filed not more than 30 days after publication of the hearing issues in the Federal Register. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the Record, together with an explanation of the proposed legislation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and explanation will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1193) to amend section 309(e) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to require that petitions for intervention be filed not more than 30 days after publication of the hearing issues in the Federal Register, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and explanation presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

#### FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,

Washington, D.C., March 14, 1963.

THE VICE PRESIDENT,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The Commission has adopted as a part of its legislative program a proposal to amend section 309(e) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to require that petitions for intervention be filed within 30 days after publication of the hearing issues, or any substantial amendment thereto, in the Federal Register.

The Commission's draft bill to accomplish the foregoing objective was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget for its consideration. We have now been advised by that Bureau that from the standpoint of the administration's program there would be no objection to the presentation of the draft bill to the Congress for its consideration. Accordingly, there are enclosed six copies of our draft bill and explanatory statement on this subject.

The consideration by the Senate of the proposed amendment to the Communications Act of 1934 would be greatly appreciated. The Commission would be most happy to furnish any additional information that may

be desired by the Senate or by the committee to which this proposal is referred.

Sincerely yours,

NEWTON N. MINOW,  
Chairman.

#### EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 309(e) OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, AS AMENDED, TO REQUIRE THAT PETITIONS FOR INTERVENTION BE FILED WITHIN 30 DAYS AFTER PUBLICATION OF THE HEARING ISSUES

Delays in the administrative process are of serious concern to the public, the bar, administrative agencies, and the Congress. In order to promote efficiency, the Commission has been seeking methods of expediting its administrative process while at the same time balancing the requirement of protecting the public interest with its duty to also safeguard the rights of private parties. One of the areas in which undue delay seems to be a special problem is in the hearing process. The Commission's legislative proposal herein is one which it believes will reduce undue delay.

When an application is filed with the Commission, it must be processed to determine what action thereon would be appropriate. Basically, this processing consists of examining an application to determine whether it is complete and whether the applicant is legally, technically, and financially qualified. Assuming that he meets these minimal qualifications and there is no reason for a hearing, the Commission can grant the application without a hearing. But if the applicant's qualifications can be determined only after a hearing, or if some other reason exists, then the Commission is required by section 309(e) of the Communications Act to designate the application for a full hearing, specifying with particularity the grounds and reasons for such hearing.

When an application has been designated for hearing under section 309(e), any party in interest who has not been notified of the designation for hearing can acquire the status of a party to the proceeding by filing a petition for intervention showing the basis for his interest. " \* \* \* at any time not less than 10 days prior to the date of hearing." This procedure has interfered with the expeditious handling and disposition of hearing proceedings.

The Commission's proposed amendment to section 309(e) would require a party in interest who wishes to intervene in a hearing to signify his intention to do so " \* \* \* not more than 30 days after publication of the hearing issues, or any substantial amendment, thereto, in the Federal Register."

This amendment will enhance the effectiveness of the prehearing conference which is one of the chief techniques the Commission has for expediting formal hearings. The Commission is particularly concerned that prehearing conferences be utilized to the fullest extent possible in every proceeding, to the end that there may be no unnecessary delays in the progress of a formal hearing once it is commenced. Our experience has been that prehearing discussions and negotiations, and the stipulations and agreements of the parties reached as a result thereof, are an effective means of insuring, not only an expeditious hearing, but, as well, that the hearing record may be kept down in size to the minimum consistent with the rights of the participants. Obviously, the effectiveness of all prehearing techniques is destroyed when a party in interest, who as of right may be allowed to take part in the formal hearing if he seeks intervention 10 days before commencement thereof, may completely nullify the effect of valuable stipulations and timesaving agreements reached by the other participants during several prehearing conferences held over a period of months, simply because he did not

become a party to the case at an earlier date.

Once the hearing issues are published, any interested person knows at the time whether he will have to participate in the hearing to protect his own interests. There is no reason why parties should be given the legal right to delay their intervention when the issues are clear in advance of the hearing. The Commission feels that by requiring a party in interest to intervene within 30 days of publication of the hearing issues, an ample and reasonable period is afforded to parties to determine whether it is necessary for them to intervene to protect their interests and to indicate their intention to participate. The requirement will discourage the dilatory tactics now possible under the present provisions of section 309(e) and will substantially eliminate the need for holding repeated prehearing conferences. It will also have the virtue of providing a date certain for intervention, thus eliminating the present situation where the date for intervention changes every time the date for commencement of the hearing is changed.

The 30-day period provided in the proposal is consistent with the time allowed in many other sections of the Communications Act. For example, section 402(e) allows interested persons to intervene in appeals from Commission decisions within 30 days after filing of any such appeal with the court appeals. (See also sections 402(c) and 405). In addition, the 30-day time period takes into consideration the time necessary to comply with the requirement of section 311 of the act that local notice must be given of designation for hearing in broadcast proceedings.

We also wish to point out that section (e) deals only with the time within which parties in interest can intervene as of right. The Commission has the discretion to permit intervention by any person (including parties in interest) at any time (even after the period specified in the section or in the Commission's rules) where a showing of good cause and that the public interest would be served thereby, is made. See sections 4(j), 303(r) of the act; section 1.104(d) of the Commission's rules, 47 CFR 1.104(d). This discretion to permit intervention after the time specified in section 309(e), either on the Commission's own motion or on petition, would be equally true under the proposed amendment. Moreover, in any matter in which the hearing issues are substantially amended, it will be possible for new parties to intervene as of right if changes affect their interests.

#### REMOVAL OF PERCENTAGE LIMITATIONS ON RETIREMENT OF ENLISTED MEN OF THE COAST GUARD

**MAGNUSON.** Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to remove the percentage limitations on retirement of enlisted men of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1194) to remove the percentage limitations on retirement of enlisted men of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read

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

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,  
Washington, D.C., March 15, 1963.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is submitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill, "To remove the percentage limitations on retirement of enlisted men of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes."

Present law limits the number of enlisted men who may retire upon completion of 20 years of service in any 1 calendar year to not more than 1 percent of the total enlisted force of the Coast Guard. This limitation was enacted along with the adoption of 20-year retirements by the Coast Guard in 1939. One of the original purposes of this limitation was to prevent an excessive loss of experienced personnel. There is no comparable limitation on the retirement of officers. Nor is there a similar limitation applicable to enlisted men of the Navy.

In the years following World War II the large backlog of men who had been unable to retire during the war made it impossible to retire all those who wished to do so upon completion of 20 years of service. But by 1955 this backlog had been eliminated and all men who requested it were able to retire upon completion of 20 years of service or shortly thereafter. That situation has continued until the present. As a result most enlisted men in the service today have come to count on their right to retire at that time. They have made their plans on that basis and it has influenced their decisions as to whether to reenlist or not.

During 1962, 92 more men requested 20-year retirement than could be granted it under the 1-percent limitation. This development was a change which can be expected to continue and intensify as the large groups of men who served in World War II complete 20 years of service. From requests presently on hand it is estimated that at least 250 more enlisted men will request retirement in 1963 than can be granted it under existing law. This number will continue to increase and unless remedial measures are taken it is estimated that by 1968 enlisted men will have to complete over 26 years of service before they can be retired.

This inability to grant the retirement requests of those who have completed 20 years of service has created a morale problem which can be expected to become more serious each year. It will slow promotions to higher enlisted grades and make it more difficult for the career enlisted man to plan intelligently his service career and his post-service life.

The proposed bill would repeal the statutory limitation on retirements of enlisted men who have completed 20 years of service. Such retirements would continue to remain subject to the needs of the service and the availability of appropriated funds.

While removal of the 1-percent limitation on retirement would result in the loss of experienced personnel with over 20 years of service, this would be compensated for by the increased retention of men serving in their second or third enlistments. The absence of an assured 20-year retirement often is a deterrent to reenlistment for men in this latter group.

Removal of this limitation would result in increased retired pay costs. These would be partially compensated for by decreases in costs for active duty pay due to the decrease in average length of service of the active force. It is estimated that the net additional costs through 1970 resulting from removal

of the limitation on enlisted retirements would amount to an average of \$1,385,000 per year.

The bill would also equalize the Coast Guard's retirement laws with those of the other services in another respect. Coast Guard enlisted men retiring with over 20 years of service are presently eligible to receive an increase in retired pay amounting to 10 percent of their basic pay if they have maintained high marks in conduct during their service. The Comptroller General, in a recent report to Congress, has pointed out that enlisted men of the other armed forces do not receive this benefit and that it is no longer needed in order to insure good conduct. The Department agrees with the desirability of equalizing retirement benefits among the services but believes that this benefit should be retained for career enlisted men now in the service, since these men have probably taken this benefit into account in deciding on a career in the Coast Guard. The bill therefore would repeal the authority for this increased pay for all personnel with less than 4 years of service.

There would be no immediate savings due to repeal of this provision since it would not affect the rights of persons already retired or those who have at least 4 years of service. However, since it is estimated that this benefit amounts to \$12,600 for the average Coast Guard enlisted retiree, the eventual savings would be substantial.

A comparative type showing changes in existing law made by the proposed bill is attached.

It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection from the standpoint of the Administration's program to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

#### ESTABLISHMENT OF A SYSTEM OF TIME STANDARDS AND MEASUREMENT

**Mr. COTTON.** Mr. President, in another month much of the Nation will advance its clocks and go on daylight saving time, and we will again be caught up in another round of time juggling and clock confusion.

Widespread variation in standard and daylight saving time across the country, complicated by frequent time zone boundary disputes, differing standard-daylight changeover dates, and a wide assortment of local options have all combined to create bewildering uncertainty and confusion in the minds of the public.

The time scramble has complicated the operation and the scheduling problems of the transport industry at untold cost. It confuses communications, industrial and financial interests, and confounds the individual citizen who misses his appointment or has to wait an extra hour for a train, plane, or bus.

This confusion is costly, time consuming, and unnecessary. We now operate on a Standard Time Act, adopted in 1918 and modified but little, despite the tremendous change in our clock habits since then. Furthermore, the present act has serious shortcomings, including a total absence of enforcement provisions. In short, our river of time is heavily

shoaled, filled with jagged rocks and treacherous eddies. It is anything but a smooth highway of commerce and communications, and I think we should do something about it.

In its latest annual report, the Interstate Commerce Commission has pointedly called attention to the problems of clock confusion and recommended the enactment of legislation to end it.

The Transportation Association of America has launched a drive to promote greater standardization in the Nation's timekeeping, and has assembled some prime examples of the economic costs of clock confusion. There is, for example, the case of the confused driver and passengers on a bus which operates over the 35-mile stretch of highway between Steubenville, Ohio, and Moundsville, W. Va., and passes through seven different time changes.

I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in my remarks some excerpts from a pamphlet published by the Transportation Association of America entitled "Project Timesaver."

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

**EXCERPTS FROM A PAMPHLET PREPARED BY THE TRANSPORTATION ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA**

**PROJECT TIMESAVER**

It has been said wisely that "Time and tide wait for no man." The poignant tragedy is that considerable time—which can never be regained—is being wasted and lost daily as a result of clock confusion.

How widespread is the use of daylight saving time? Of the 50 States in the Union, 28 States and the District of Columbia observe daylight saving time during the year. Fourteen of these 28 States have it in effect on a statewide basis. The other 14 observe daylight saving time over different areas, ranging from a single city to practically statewide.

Do those States observing daylight saving time make their time changes on the same dates? No. Eleven of the States follow daylight saving time from the end of April to the end of October. The remainder begin or terminate daylight saving time in other months.

Would greater uniformity in the use of daylight saving time help the bus industry? Indeed so. This time problem is particularly aggravating for the bus operators which serve the crossroads and byways of America. The proof: The Carolina Coach Co. deplores the plight of the Salisbury, Md., passengers to New York City who must keep straight the frequent changes in scheduled departures set for 1:45 p.m. in early April, changed to 2:45 p.m. on April 29, changed to 1:45 p.m. on May 30, changed to 2:45 p.m. on September 3, changed to 1:45 p.m. on October 28. As the company aptly observes, the passengers "lay the blame on the bus companies and wind up driving their cars and we lose the revenue."

Trailways complains of the traffic losses, rescheduling of work, reassignment of equipment, excessive cost of publishing timetables, etc., and estimates that, up to 40 percent of the time devoted to preparation of schedules could be saved if greater time uniformity could be achieved. Trailways says that "the condition has worsened every year in the last few years."

The National Association of Motor Bus Owners asserts on behalf of the industry that "potential savings might reach a quarter of a million dollars on scheduling and timetable costs alone."

Would increased uniformity around the clock benefit the railroads? Undoubtedly yes. Modern railroading is precision railroading. For 80 years the railroads led the fight to eliminate confusion in time standards. This historical pioneering effort is well documented in "The Day of Two Noons," published by the Association of American Railroads.

In 1957, the New York Herald Tribune highlighted the impact of daylight saving time on the railroad industry under the title "Daylight Time Costs Railroads \$1 Million."

Because Federal law still requires the railroads to operate on standard time, many of them are forced to publish two kinds of timetables, one based on standard time for the use by carrier employees and the other reporting passenger train schedules on local time (standard and daylight) for the benefit of the traveling public.

A 1962 survey of more than 20 railroads identified the following areas of general confusion and difficulty attributable to lack of uniform time:

General confusion in passenger timetables.  
Difficulty in scheduling passenger trains to accommodate origin, intermediate, and destination requirements.

Extra expense of printing timetables.  
Difficulty in handling mail to meet Post Office Department requirements.

Necessity for rescheduling freight trains to meet market delivery times on perishables and livestock, and to maintain adequate interline service.

Work of operating employees on standard time while nonoperating employees work on daylight saving time, resulting in confusion and inconvenience.

Revision of switching crew schedules to meet requirements of local industry.

Confusion, particularly for train and engine-men, for employees who follow standard time at work while using daylight saving time at home.

Reducing communication time between widely separated stations on the same railroad.

Lengthened dining car meal service at increased labor costs.

Are the airlines also concerned? Yes, the airlines are seriously concerned with the confusion, the passenger inconvenience, and the additional expense, caused by variations in daylight saving time observance in different areas of the country.

**ITEMS**

An airport usually serves a large geographical area which may even extend across State boundaries. These service areas frequently include both daylight and standard time zones. This causes confusion to many passengers; some of whom might arrive at the airport an hour early for their flight or, even worse, arrive an hour late and miss their flight. This frustration also extends to families and friends of departing or arriving passengers.

A missed flight is of serious and expensive concern to both the passenger and the airline. For the airline, a missed passenger today may well become a nonairline passenger of tomorrow.

During certain times of the year, the non-uniformity in dates for daylight time observance results in as much as a 4-hour time change on a coast-to-coast flight, 1 hour beyond the normal 3-hour change. This extra hour which the transcontinental passenger experiences in these circumstances makes his physical adjustment to the new time zone that much more difficult. Anyone who has ever had to adjust to a 4-hour time change on a 5-hour flight will understand this problem.

A very definite and measurable expense to the airline is the required reprinting and re-

distribution of system timetables with each time change at some individual point on the system. If cutoff dates for daylight saving time were uniform in all areas, schedule reissuance based on time changes would take place only twice each year. This would result in substantial cost saving to the airline industry.

Would less clock juggling help other interests? It's about time to streamline the hourglass for everyone. For example: Oregon and Oregon State Universities are continuing their campus clocks this summer on standard time, yet their classes will begin an hour earlier on daylight saving time.

During a 2-month period in 1959, some offices in the Minnesota State Capitol Building observed daylight saving time while others used standard time.

For husbands who work on daylight saving time and wives who run the home on standard time, Thomas Wolfe in the Washington Post suggested "His" and "Her" clocks so that both will have the "time of their lives."

The West Coast States of Oregon and Washington shift back to standard time on the fourth Sunday in September while most of the rest of the country stays on daylight saving time until the last Sunday in October. This 1-month period of a 4-hour time lag means that the business day on the west coast in these States is only half over while the east coast offices close their doors.

In Pennsylvania, State law requires that official business be conducted on eastern standard time. Yet in 1962 more than 600 Pennsylvania communities observed daylight saving time from April 20 to October 28. What needless confusion.

It's time for a change in our time change.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the legislation recommended by the Interstate Commerce Commission has already been introduced in the Senate by Senator MAGNUSON, chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee. It is S. 1033.

As my own contribution toward the solution of this problem, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill which differs in many respects from the recommendation of the ICC.

Briefly, my bill would place the responsibility for setting the time zones and enforcing the act in the Department of Commerce, where all the commercial interests of the Nation can properly be focused on the problem.

Second, the ICC bill would effectively prevent any State or local community from determining for itself whether it wanted daylight saving time or not. The bill I present today would preserve this local option, but it would direct the Secretary of Commerce to use his considerable persuasive power to promote the adoption of uniform time.

It is my hope that the introduction of this bill will serve to further stimulate public awareness of the problems of clock confusion and lead to a quick, constructive solution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1195) to establish a system of time standards and measurement for the United States and to promote the uniform observance of such time standards for all purposes, introduced by Mr. COTTON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and Public Works, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Frank E. Moss:											
French Oceania.....	U.S. dollar		17.44		13.10		5.52		38.61		74.67
American Samoa.....	do.						1.50		1.66		3.16
Fiji Islands.....	do.		3.18		5.19				9.38		17.75
New Guinea.....	do.		11.17		9.11		11.13		3.68		35.09
Indonesia.....	do.		39.72		20.21		4.91		25.72		90.50
Malaya.....	Malayan dollar			167.75	54.92	68.03	22.88	11.22	3.74	247.00	81.54
Do.....	U.S. dollar		21.55		15.36		5.54		24.94		68.39
Cambodia.....	Riel	1,357	38.97	3,257	93.54	4,571	136.41	728	20.32	9,913	289.74
Do.....	U.S. dollar		21.35		29.02		2.68		17.06		71.01
Vietnam.....	Plaster	2,182	30.00	3,137	43.13	2,701	37.50	1,898	26.87	9,918	137.50
Do.....	U.S. dollar		24.66		.82				12.64		38.12
Philippines.....	Peso				90.65		25.87	20.00	115.20		28.80
Do.....	U.S. dollar				4.48		87.41		23.74		74.67
Hong Kong.....	Hong Kong dollar	320	55.83	503	83.68	167	27.75	189	31.54	859	28.87
Do.....	U.S. dollar		29.46		31.33		.61		15.30		76.70
Taiwan.....	New Taiwan dollar			845	21.16	888	22.26	806	20.18	2,539	63.60
Do.....	U.S. dollar		13.75		4.00				3.74		21.49
Korea.....	Wuan			2,215	17.11	2,067	15.96	31.02	23.95	7,384	57.02
Do.....	U.S. dollar		4.00		3.00				5.58		12.58
Okinawa.....	do.		1.50		5.07				8.22		14.79
Japan.....	Yen	21,983	87.45	23,541	92.06	34,750	139.51	9,250	31.26	89,624	350.28
Do.....	U.S. dollar		40.92		22.30		1.40		11.05		75.67
Total.....			440.95		596.36		456.31		388.48		1,882.10

## RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent).....	\$1,253.25
Appropriated funds: Defense.....	628.85
Total.....	1,882.10

FRANK E. MOSS.

## REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which were referred for examination and recommendation three lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, dated January 14, 1963, February, 20, 1963, and March 19, 1963, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon, pursuant to law.

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 1188. A bill for the relief of Miss Caterina Gadoni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 1189. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edward Schumann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALMADGE (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 1190. A bill to maintain the income of cotton producers, to permit cotton producers to grow and market cotton on a free enterprise basis, to protect the welfare of consumers and of those engaged in the manufacture of cotton textiles, to encourage the exportation of cotton, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

S. 1191. A bill to provide for punishment of certain offenses committed against postal officers or employees in the course of their employment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1192. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1193. A bill to amend section 309(e) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to require that petitions for intervention be filed not more than 30 days after publication of the hearing issues in the Federal Register; and

S. 1194. A bill to remove the percentage limitations on retirement of enlisted men of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 1195. A bill to establish a system of time standards and measurement for the United States and to promote the uniform observance of such time standards for all purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 1196. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Nowakowski Chandler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SYMINGTON (for himself and Mr. LONG of Missouri):

S. 1197. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to prepare a master plan for Squaw Creek National Wildlife Refuge in the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 1198. A bill to amend the act of April 22, 1960, entitled "An act to provide for

the establishment of the Wilson's Creek Battlefield National Park, in the State of Missouri"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and HUMPHREY):

S. 1199. A bill to amend section 9(b)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act so as to eliminate the provision thereof prohibiting the certification, as bargaining representative of persons employed as guards, of a labor organization which admits to membership, or is affiliated with an organization which admits to membership, employees other than guards; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. GRUENING (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, Mr. METCALF, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. CLARK, and Mr. DODD):

S. 1200. A bill to authorize the payment of certain claims for structural or other major defects in homes covered by Federal Housing Administration insured mortgages, and to require indemnification bonds in the case of certain new construction under Federal Housing Administration insured mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. STENNIS (for himself and Mr. EASTLAND):

S. 1201. A bill for the relief of Dr. James T. Maddux; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 1202. A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to convey