

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I have heard him many times. I would not be surprised that this is a correct conclusion.

Mr. ACHESON. Mr. Chairman, it might not be inappropriate to just flag for the record, just one example of a State having an almost duplicate of rule 5(a), and the question arose in a case in which a confession was obtained whether a ruling like the *Mallory* ruling should be employed by the State court to enforce that rule of speedy presentment and exclude the confession in the case.

The Supreme Court of Oregon held that they would not follow such a rule in *State v. Shipley*, 375 Pacific 2d 237. It is an interesting discussion of a problem that perhaps illustrates the division of philosophy between some of the State courts and the Federal courts.

The CHAIRMAN. The Supreme Court of Oregon said they would not follow the *Mallory* rule.

Mr. ACHESON. That is correct, even though they did have a counterpart of rule 5(a) in the State code.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand. May I ask just one final question. During some of the earlier testimony it was stated by one of the witnesses that the U.S. attorney's office has done a wonderful job, but that the number of assistants were inadequate and that more assistants were needed to carry out the day-to-day assignments. This should probably be directed to you, Mr. Acheson. Would you care to comment upon that particular statement?

I think all attorneys, the U.S. attorneys and assistant U.S. attorneys say they are overworked, but do you have a sufficient number of U.S. attorneys and assistants to handle the job in the District of Columbia?

Mr. ACHESON. In a job that is as hectic as mine perhaps the best distinction one can hope for is to be one public official that did not ask for a larger office. We try to take care of our manpower problems within the Department on a when, as, and if needed basis, and I think at the present time we are staffed adequately, even though it does involve a heavy pressure on the assistants.

The CHAIRMAN. You think you are adequately staffed?

Mr. ACHESON. Yes. They work hard, perhaps too hard, but I would not want to say that they can't do the job.

The CHAIRMAN. One of my own personal observations in the field of the U.S. attorneys and their assistants is that they are not paid a sufficient amount of money, and this is nationwide. I am not confining this to the District of Columbia.

My experience has been that they start an assistant U.S. attorney out at, I think this is correct, \$6,000 or \$6,500 now I think, and then after a year they are raised to \$7,500. This will attract a young attorney who wants the experience for about 2 years. As soon as he gets this experience to where he is helpful, he moves on into private practice.

Of course, I think this is a nationwide indictment of the system. It should be moved up so that you can have the best possible legal talent in the various U.S. attorneys' offices. Mr. Katzenbach might like to comment on that.

Mr. KATZENBACH. I agree with you, Senator. I think that we have improved in the last 2½ years the situation with respect to the pay of assistant U.S. attorneys, and, of course, have had some improvement within the Department of Justice as well.