

politically and intellectually. They took the political leaders, the university professors, the priests, the protestant clergy, the writers, the jurists, the national figures in every field.

The men and women they selected for deportation were in every case the leaders of the community and those capable of exercising leadership at every level.

They were taken in dead of night, without warning, and were shipped in crowded cattle cars to the wastelands of Siberia. Many of them died during the journey. Many more perished in Siberia. Those who survive are still scattered through the slave labor camps and remote settlements of the Soviet east.

But I am certain that the memory of their homeland and the love of their homeland and the belief that their homeland will some day be free, still remain strong in their hearts—as they do in the hearts of the hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians in this country and in other parts of the free world.

To those who believe that the present Soviet regime is somehow different from the regime that perpetrated these crimes against humanity, I would point to one simple fact: The monster responsible for Stalin's mass deportations from the Baltic countries was a man by the name of Gen. Ivan Serov. The same General Serov, now acting under orders of Khrushchev, was responsible for the suppression of the Hungarian revolution. And the same General Serov accompanied Khrushchev to this country, as Khrushchev's chief of security, and therefore as a guest of this country.

Mr. President, murder does not cease to be murder, nor does genocide cease to be genocide, after the passage of 20 years. I believe we should keep the facts about the Baltic nations constantly before world opinion. I believe we should raise the issue in the United Nations, at every available opportunity.

I believe that when the Communists demand that we get out of Berlin, we should ask them to get out of the Baltic countries and the other captive nations of Europe, and we should challenge them to permit the peoples of these countries to choose their own governments in elections under the supervision of the United Nations.

In commemorating the martyrs of the mass deportations from the Baltic countries, Mr. President, let us again dedicate ourselves to continue the struggle for the restoration of their lost freedoms.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

PROCUREMENT OF EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 338, S. 884.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 884) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce

to procure the services of experts and consultants.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 884) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to procure the services of experts and consultants, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, with an amendment, on page 2, line 1, after the word "rate", to insert "of the highest grade", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of February 14, 1903, 32 Stat. 826, as amended (5 U.S.C. 594), is hereby amended by the addition of the following sentence at the end of section 2 thereof: "The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to procure services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810, as amended (5 U.S.C. 55a)), at rates not to exceed \$100 per diem for individuals, and for not to exceed one hundred days in any calendar year in the case of any individual compensated at a rate in excess of the highest rate of the highest grade payable under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement in regard to the purpose of the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

S. 884, which was introduced at the request of the Secretary of Commerce, would amend the act of February 14, 1903, as amended (5 U.S.C. 594), to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to procure the services of experts and consultants at rates not to exceed \$100 per diem for individuals. Present law limits the per diem rate to \$50. Individuals compensated at a rate in excess of the highest rate of the highest grade (GS-18) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, could not be retained in excess of 100 days in any calendar year. With the present \$50 limitation, your committee is of the view that the Department of Commerce is seriously handicapped in obtaining the needed services of experts.

No opposition to enactment has been expressed.

AGENCY REPORTS

The following favorable agency reports and statements were received and considered by the committee:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., January 16, 1961.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are enclosed four copies of a draft bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to procure the services of experts and consultants, and copies of a statement of purpose and need in support thereof.

On January 12, 1961, the Bureau of the Budget advised that there would be no objection to the submission of this draft legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,
FREDERICK H. MUELLER,
Secretary of Commerce.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED

Section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of August 2, 1946, 60 Stat. 810, as amended (5 U.S.C. 55a), provides as follows:

"The head of any department, when authorized in an appropriation or other act, may procure the temporary (not in excess of 1 year) or intermittent services of experts or consultants or organizations thereof, including stenographic reporting services, by contract, and in such cases such service shall be without regard to the civil service and classification laws (but as to agencies subject to the Classification Act of 1949 at rates not in excess of the per diem equivalent of the highest rate payable under such act, unless other rates are specifically provided in the appropriation or other law) and, except in the case of stenographic reporting services by organizations, without regard to section 5 of title 41."

Under the foregoing provision and the current Department of Commerce Appropriation Act the Department is generally limited to payment of individuals at rates not in excess of \$50 per diem, specified in the appropriation act, unless otherwise specified by law.

The purpose of procuring the services of experts and consultants is ordinarily to accomplish one or more of the following objectives:

1. To secure specialized opinion not available within the Department or accessible within other Government agencies;
2. To obtain outside points of view, to avoid too limited judgment on critical issues of administrative or technical action;
3. To obtain advice regarding developments in industrial, college or university, or foundation research;
4. To obtain for specially important projects the opinion of noted experts whose national or international prestige is conducive to success of an undertaking;
5. To secure citizen advisory participation in developing or implementing Government programs that by their nature or by statutory provision call for such participation; and
6. To obtain the services of specialized personnel who are not needed by the Government on a full-time basis, or who cannot serve full time or regularly.

To accomplish the objectives listed above, it is necessary to obtain the services of individuals who are truly expert. Under civil service requirements (Federal Personnel Manual, p. A-7-13) an expert must be a person of excellent qualifications and a high degree of attainment in a professional, scientific, technical, or other field. His knowledge and mastery of the principles, practices, problems, methodology, and techniques of his field of activity, or of an area of specialization within the field, must be clearly superior to that possessed by persons of ordinary competence in the activity. His attainment must be such that he will usually be regarded as an authority or as a practitioner of unusual competence and skill by other persons engaged in the profession, occupation, or activity.

In years past a maximum limitation of \$50 per diem (equivalent to approximately \$13,000 per annum) has generally sufficed to enable the Department to procure the services of persons who meet Civil Service Commission's criteria for experts. In recent years, however, increasing difficulty has been experienced in obtaining the services of individuals who are truly qualified as experts because of the fact that such individuals in private employment now receive compensation at rates substantially in excess of the \$50 per diem (\$13,000 per annum) rate available for serving the Government. In numerous instances the experts whose services are desired receive twice as much as the maximum Government rate, or more. As a result, the Department is handicapped severely in procuring the services of experts and consultants under 5 U.S.C. 55a.

The authority requested is substantially similar to that recently approved by the Congress for the Federal Aviation Agency

(sec. 302(1), act of Aug. 23, 1958; 72 Stat. 731, 745; 49 U.S.C. 1343(g)); for the National Aeronautics and Space Agency (sec. 203, act of July 29, 1958; 72 Stat. 432; 42 U.S.C. 2473(b) (9)); for the Panama Canal Company (sec. 201, act of July 13, 1959; 73 Stat. 208; the Department of Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriation Act of 1960); and for the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation (sec. 301, act of July 13, 1959; 73 Stat. 208; the Department of Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1960).

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., March 27, 1961.

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On January 16, 1961, before the present administration took office, the Department of Commerce submitted to the 87th Congress for introduction the following item of draft legislation to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to procure the services of experts and consultants.

The draft legislation was referred to your committee for consideration and introduced as S. 884.

You are advised that the Department has reexamined this item and we continue to support its enactment.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to our continued support of this draft legislation.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD ENDEMAN,
Under Secretary of Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill (S. 884) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 339, S. 1371.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1371) to amend subsection (e) of section 307 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit the Commission to renew a station license in the Safety and Special Radio Services more than 30 days prior to expiration of the original license.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a statement in explanation of the measure before the Senate printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL STATEMENT

This bill would amend subsection (e) of section 307 of the Communications Act so as to permit the FCC to renew a license in the safety and special radio services field more than 30 days prior to the expiration of the original license. This bill was introduced by Senator MAGNUSON at the request of the Federal Communications Commission.

At the present time section 307(e) reads as follows:

"(e) No renewal of an existing station license shall be granted more than 30 days prior to the expiration of the original license."

The language as presently contained in the act is sufficiently broad to include all types of licenses issued by the FCC—those for broadcasters and common carriers, as well as those in safety and special services area.

The FCC proposal will maintain the present restriction insofar as broadcast and common carrier licenses are concerned and it is in this area that the restriction of section 307(e) is more appropriately applied since application for broadcast licenses and common carrier services are usually granted on a competitive basis and the nature of the services offered under these licenses affects a major segment of the population and the 30-day limitation acts as a useful limitation.

The 30-day requirement of section 307(e) creates an obstacle to the Commission's constant effort to timely process the ever-increasing number of applications for authorization in the various safety and special radio services.

In many cases, a needless duplication of effort could be avoided if an application for license modification could also be treated as a renewal application. Since no renewal can be granted more than 30 days prior to the expiration of the original license under the law as now written, the Commission, in those cases where it is considering an application for the modification of a license which has an expiration date occurring more than 30 days later, must act solely on the modification notwithstanding that the same license will thereafter come up for renewal. Such a practice seems inefficient and needlessly burdensome, especially when, as in all of these safety and special radio type cases, applications for license modification contain all information needed for renewal consideration. Also, such licenses are not mutually exclusive so the rights of others are not prejudiced by a grant.

The magnitude of the problem may be illustrated by examining some statistics in the amateur radio service which is just one of the numerous safety and special radio services. During the fiscal year 1959, 10,500 modified licenses were issued. Eventually, each of these 10,500 licenses must be processed again on renewal, even though all the information necessary for renewal was at hand when the modifications were granted.

The bill herein reported would permit the Commission to consider such applications for modification as applications for modification and renewal. Accordingly, the Commission could then issue such modified licenses for a regular license term, thus eliminating most of the duplicate effort. A similar reduction of workload in relation to the overall application processing activities in this area would be a great advantage to the public and the Commission, without any reduction in the Commission's current fulfillment of its public interest obligations.

The elimination of the 30-day restriction contained in the present law would eliminate needless duplication by authorizing the FCC to act on renewals at the same time they are modifying a license. In view of the sheer volume of applications in the safety and special services area, plus the noncompetitive nature of these licenses, the public interest would be served by minimizing the duplication and burdensome repetition now required because of the 30-day restriction. This is another step in the direction of making available to the FCC the flexibility that will lead to the reduction in workload and backlog of cases that has plagued the FCC for the past 10 years.

The letter from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission requesting this legislation, together with his explanatory statement, is set forth below for the information of the Senate. Neither the Department of Justice nor the General Accounting Office, to whom the bill was submitted for comment, has any objection to it. Your committee has received no protests from any source.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., March 8, 1961.

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

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The Commission has adopted, as a part of its legislative program for the 87th Congress, a proposal to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to authorize the Federal Communications Commission to limit the prohibition against renewing existing station licenses more than 30 days prior to the expiration of the original license to the broadcast and common carrier services. As a consequence, if this proposal were adopted, the Commission could then grant renewals of station licenses in the field of safety and special radio services more than 30 days prior to the expiration of the original license. The Communications Act currently provides that no renewal of an existing station license shall be granted more than 30 days prior to the expiration of the original license (47 U.S.C. 307(e)).

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 the Budget 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 on this subject and six copies of an explanatory statement with reference thereto.

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 which 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 SUBSECTION (E) OF SECTION 307 OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, AS AMENDED, TO PERMIT THE COMMISSION TO RENEW A STATION LICENSE IN THE SAFETY AND SPECIAL RADIO SERVICES MORE THAN 30 DAYS PRIOR TO EXPIRATION OF THE ORIGINAL LICENSE

The Commission recommends that section 307(e) of our act be amended so that the 30-day restriction on renewal of licenses would be deleted so far as the safety and special radio services are concerned (47 U.S.C. 307(e)). Language for the suggested amendment is attached hereto.

Section 307(e) now prohibits the granting of any renewal license more than 30 days prior to the expiration of the original license. This 30-day restriction creates an obstacle to the Commission's constant effort to timely process the ever-increasing number of applications for authorizations in the various safety and special radio services.¹

In many cases, a needless duplication of effort could be avoided if an application for license modification could also be treated as a renewal application. Since no renewal can be granted more than 30 days prior to the

¹ During the fiscal year 1959, the Commission received 250,000 applications for stations in the safety and special radio services.

expiration of the original license under the law as now written, the Commission, in those cases where it is considering an application for the modification of a license which has an expiration date occurring more than 30 days later, must act solely on the modification notwithstanding that the same license will thereafter come up for renewal. Such a practice seems inefficient and needlessly burdensome, especially when, as in all of these safety and special radio type cases, applications for license modification contain all information needed for renewal consideration. Also, such licenses are not mutually exclusive so the rights of others are not prejudiced by a grant.

The magnitude of the problem may be illustrated by examining some statistics in the amateur radio service which is just one of the numerous safety and special radio services. During the fiscal year 1959, 10,500 modified licenses were issued. Eventually, each of these 10,500 licenses must be processed again on renewal, even though all the information necessary for renewal was at hand when the modifications were granted.

Amendment of section 307(e), as recommended herein, would permit the Commission to consider such applications for modification as applications for modification and renewal. Accordingly, the Commission could then issue such modified licenses for a regular license term, thus eliminating most of the duplicate effort. A similar reduction of workload in relation to the overall application processing activities in this area would be a great advantage to the public and the Commission, without any reduction in the Commission's current fulfillment of its public interest obligations.

The 30-day limit also causes burdensome and needless repetition in processing renewal applications which are prematurely received by the Commission. In the fiscal year 1959, for example, approximately one-half of the 15,000 renewal applications received in the amateur radio service were submitted prematurely and had to be sorted and set aside until ripe for processing. An amended section 307(e) would eliminate this problem.

Moreover, it would appear that the restriction in section 307(e) is more appropriately applied exclusively to applications for broadcast licenses and common carrier services. Since these applications are often granted on a comparative basis, and the nature of the service offered affects a major segment of the population in the area proposed to be served, the 30-day limit would seem to have a useful purpose. On the other hand, the private, noncompetitive nature of the safety and special radio services would seem to make such a 30-day limit unnecessary.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1371) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (e) of section 307 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 1064; 47 U.S.C. 307(e)) is amended by striking out all after "(e)" and adding in lieu thereof the following:

"No renewal of an existing station license in the broadcast or the common carrier services shall be granted more than thirty days prior to the expiration of the original license."

AUTHORIZED STRENGTH OF METROPOLITAN POLICE FORCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the

consideration of Calendar No. 341, S. 1956.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

THE LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1956) to provide that the authorized strength of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia shall not be less than 3,000 officers and members.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that consideration of the Senate bill be indefinitely postponed and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 351, H.R. 7218, a bill which has already passed the House.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

THE LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 7218) to provide that the authorized strength of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia shall not be less than 3,000 officers and members.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before the Senate acts upon this measure, I wish to say I am extremely happy that the Senate and the House are both agreeing to increase the police force of the District of Columbia to 3,000 men. I hope that, under the outstanding Chief of Police and police force in the District, the employment of the additional officers and members will be completed shortly.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement regarding the bill be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Under existing law (Public Law 514, 84th Cong., 70 Stat. 148), the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia has an authorized strength of not less than 2,500 officers and members. At the present time, the Metropolitan Police Department consists of 2,714 officers and members. The excess of 214 men above the minimum authorized strength of 2,500 was approved by the Congress after justification had been submitted by the Commissioners and the Police Department to the Appropriations Committee. As of June 6, 1961, there were actually 2,700 officers and members in the Department. There are 4 men on military leave and 10 class I vacancies.

Fully cognizant of the problems involved in recruiting and training new members, the committee urges the Civil Service Commission and the Metropolitan Police Department to proceed with all possible dispatch toward meeting the goal of a 3,000-man police force as one of the steps to control the rapidly increasing number of serious crimes in the District of Columbia.

On behalf of the full committee, the chairman invited the District of Columbia Law Enforcement Council to meet in a joint public session on May 22, 1961, for the purpose of receiving suggestions and recommendations with respect to crime and relat-

ed problems in the District of Columbia. This Council, created by the District of Columbia Law Enforcement Act of 1953, is composed of the following:

President of the Board of Commissioners, Walter Tobriner.

Chief of the Metropolitan Police Department, Robert Murray.

Chief of the U.S. Park Police, Harold F. Stewart.

U.S. Attorney David C. Acheson.

Corporation Counsel Chester Gray.

U.S. Commissioner for the District of Columbia, Sam Wertlieb.

Director of the Department of Corrections, Donald Clemmer.

Parole executive of the Board of Parole, Hugh F. Rivers.

U.S. marshal, John McShane.

Chief probation officer, Edward W. Garrett.

Clerk of the Municipal Court, Walter F. Bramhall.

Judge of the Juvenile Court, Oram W. Ketchem.

Chairman of the Council, Oliver Gasch.

Washington Bar Association, DeLong Harris.

Citizens' Crime Commission of Metropolitan Washington, Robert C. Simmons.

The Council was requested to select a priority list of programs to help contain the growing crime rate of the District. The Council was unanimous in selecting the establishment of a 3,000-man police force as the first and most important step to be taken.

Thereafter, on May 24, 1961, the chairman of the committee, Senator ALAN BIBLE, introduced (for himself and the entire committee membership) S. 1956, to provide that the authorized strength of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia shall be not less than 3,000 officers and members. On June 9, 1961, the committee voted unanimously to report the bill favorably to the Senate.

The committee feels very strongly that the Metropolitan Police force should be strengthened by approximately 300 additional men in order to deal with the crime situation in the District of Columbia, and to provide more adequate protection to the citizens of the District of Columbia.

The enactment of this bill will cost the District of Columbia approximately \$1,659,800 annually after the police force reaches the authorized strength of 3,000 men.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 7218) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, S. 1956 will be indefinitely postponed.

DETERMINATION OF PETITION FOR ADOPTION FILED BY MARIE TALIAFERRO

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 342, S. 158.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

THE LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 158) to confer upon the domestic relations branch of the municipal court for the District of Columbia jurisdiction to hear and determine the petition for adoption filed by Marie Taliaferro.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that pertinent information relative to this particular measure may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the information was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Under the existing adoption statute for the District of Columbia, no petition shall be considered by the court unless petitioner's spouse, if he has one, joins in the petition, except that if either the husband or wife is a natural parent of the adoptee, such natural parent need not join in the petition with the adopting parent but need only give his or her consent to the adoption (sec. 16-211, D.C. Code, 1951 ed., as amended).

Neither the petitioner, Marie Taliaferro, nor her spouse are the natural parents of the adoptee. Both have had custody of the adoptee for several years. The petitioner is now living apart from her spouse. The latter will consent to the adoption but he will not join in the adoption petition.

Accordingly, under these circumstances the court is unable to assume jurisdiction of the adoption petition. Without interfering with the merits of the case, this bill will remove the jurisdictional impediment imposed by the existing adoption statute and permit the municipal court to consider the matter, and to render any decree that it finds appropriate upon consideration of all the facts.

The Commissioners for the District of Columbia offer no objection to the grant of discretionary relief as provided by the provisions of this bill.

Enactment of this measure will involve no additional expenditure to the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 158) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the domestic relations branch of the municipal court for the District of Columbia to hear, determine, and render a final or interlocutory decree of adoption upon, the petition for adoption filed by Marie Taliaferro and now pending before such court (adoption numbered A52-60).

(b) Proceedings for the determination of such petition shall be in the same manner as in the case of a petition for adoption regularly filed under the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to prescribe and regulate the procedure for adoption in the District of Columbia", approved June 8, 1954 (68 Stat. 240), except that the provisions of section 4 of such Act providing that no petition shall be considered by the court unless petitioner's spouse, if he has one, joins in the petition shall not be applicable.

SEC. 2. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as directing the domestic relations branch of the municipal court for the District of Columbia to grant the petition for adoption referred to in the first section of this Act.

EXEMPTION FROM PAYING FEES IN COURTS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 343, S. 558.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 558) to amend the acts of March 3, 1901, and June 28, 1944, so as to exempt the District of Columbia from paying fees in any of the courts of the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement in explanation of the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The purpose of this bill is to amend the act of March 3, 1901, as amended, and the act of June 28, 1944, so as to exempt the District of Columbia from paying fees as, for example, a fee for a certified copy of a judgment, in any of the courts of the District of Columbia.

Under existing law, the District of Columbia is exempted by the act of June 28, 1944 (sec. 11-1519, D.C. Code, 1951 ed.), from paying costs in any court in and for the District of Columbia, including the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. The act of March 3, 1901, as amended (sec. 11-1507, D.C. Code, 1951 ed.), exempts the United States from payment of both costs and fees in the U.S. district court. Under neither act is the District of Columbia exempted from the payment of fees, as distinct from costs, with the exception of fees payable to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. The result is that the District of Columbia is required to pay fees assessed by the courts of the District of Columbia, while it is exempted from paying costs.

The courts of the District of Columbia are an integral part of the government of the District of Columbia, and are either wholly or in large measure supported by it. The District of Columbia government is required to conduct a large volume of business in the courts. Consequently, the requirement that the District pay court fees merely operates to translate money made available by Congress for certain purposes to moneys credited to the District of Columbia without adding to the District's revenues.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have advised the committee that the conduct of the District's business in the courts would be greatly facilitated by the enactment of the bill, and would relieve the District of an unnecessary bookkeeping operation. An identical bill (S. 3194) passed the Senate in the 86th Congress, but failed of enactment in the House.

Enactment of this bill will involve no additional expenditure to the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 558) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of section 177 of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia", approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1219), as amended (sec. 11-1507, District of Columbia Code, 1951 edition), is amended by inserting "or the District of Columbia" immediately after "than the United States", and by inserting "or by the District of Columbia" immediately before the period.

SEC. 2. Section 16 of the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1945, approved June 28, 1944 (58 Stat. 533; sec. 11-1519, District of Columbia Code, 1951 edition), is amended by inserting "or fees" immediately following "court costs".

CASTRO'S BLACKMAIL

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the tractors for freedom committee has just returned from a meeting with Fidel Castro and his henchmen in regard to the exchange of prisoners for tractors.

As usual with blackmailers, Castro keeps asking. Now he declares he will go through with his tractor proposal providing we furnish tractors that cost \$24,000 each. This means, of course, that the freedom committee, which thought it was going to buy 500 tractors for an estimated cost of \$3½ million, now will be required to raise \$28 million. In addition to this, Castro, according to press dispatches from Jaguey Grande, Cuba, yesterday, boasted that he does not need tractors, but wants Cuba paid for invasion damages.

In an editorial which appeared recently in the Salina Journal, the statement was made:

What will be the next condition to be demanded is a matter of conjecture. Blackmailers, once they have suckers on the string, always figure new ways to make them jump.

This editorial, which I think is not only pointed, but very timely, makes the interesting comment:

We would gladly send not only tractors but also other forms of economic assistance to Cuba, provided:

1. Political and personal liberties are restored.
2. Freedom of radio and press is reestablished.
3. Constitutional government is re-created.
4. A general election is called.
5. Castro and his ministers resign in favor of a provisional government composed of representative Cubans that would govern only until the ballots are counted.

This editorial, it occurs to me, merits the consideration of every American interested in our future relationship with Cuba.

I think the time has arrived when we as a Nation should not be kowtowing to this dictator, but should demand that he take into account the rights and freedoms of our Cuban neighbors.

The editorial concludes by stating:

This is a chancy proposition, of course, but it would underscore two points, that