

September 13, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

Frankly, I introduced these bills as a relative novice in this field. I was dumbfounded by the astonishing and shocking information that deluged me once I stirred up this issue. Letters poured in from motorists, tire dealers, Government purchasing agents, doctors, and attorneys representing accident victims.

The problem is far worse than I ever imagined. It seems clear that the concern for the public interest in automobile and tire design and manufacture is almost completely obliterated by the competitive pressures of these industries.

It is easy to hurl wild charges and to terrify the public with grisly statistics. But no charge by a politician, no statistics on highway slaughter, no pictures of mangled bodies in highway collisions could be as shocking as the facts brought out in the last few months.

The story begins with 3 days of hearings before the Federal Trade Commission early this year to consider whether tires are adequately labeled at the present time. The Federal Trade Commissioners were as stunned as I was when the highest officials in the automobile tire industry testified that:

Quality labels on tires, such as "deluxe," "premium," and "first line," have no meaning whatever and "there is no way to tell one tire grade from another."

Size labels on tires were never meant to indicate the precise size. The notion that these labels were meant to indicate the exact size is merely a recent misunderstanding on the part of the public. It is perfectly possible for a 7.50 by 14 tire to be larger than 8.00 by 14.

The ply or ply-rating labels on tires have no understandable meaning anymore.

Tires supplied by the auto industry with its new cars are not designed to carry the full load for which these automobiles are designed.

These are not charges made by a legislator trying to pass a bill. They are the official explanations of standard practices within a great American industry which affects the lives of almost every citizen and which is trying to avoid Federal regulation.

After studying the 635-page manuscript of the Federal Trade Commission hearings, I stated publicly that I thought it documented a national scandal in automobile tires. I made my arguments on the Senate floor and before the Senate Commerce Committee. They were given nationwide press coverage and yet, so far as I can tell, the responsible officials in industry paid no attention, although the Akron bureau of the Cleveland Plain-Dealer reported that an unidentified tire industry spokesman had rushed off my remarks as "a politician making a dull day in the Senate to read something into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD."

For that reason, I wrote to the presidents of the four major automobile manufacturing firms and asked them directly about these sensational disclosures. Their replies, as expected, made a strong defense of their present practices. Yet not a single one of the revelations from the FTC hearings was refuted. In fact, the replies from the automobile manufacturers added up to complete confirmation of the hearing disclosures.

One might have thought that these automobile manufacturers would write back and say, "Of course our tires are safe for any reasonable use to which our cars may be put."

But that is not what they said. Almost like lawyers drafting a contract, they worked in careful, qualifying language to protect themselves and to shift the responsibility to the motorist.

The simple fact brought out at the FTC hearings, and confirmed by the automobile manufacturers in their letters to me, is that

tires are selected for new cars on the assumption that they will carry approximately three passengers and no luggage—this, in an age when cars are bigger than ever, when they have monstrous trunks, when a fantastic array of accessories is available, and when many family cars and station wagons are put to a tremendous range of uses hardly known a few years ago.

The most important question I asked the auto makers was whether their tires could carry a full load in extended travel at modern highway speeds.

American Motors replied that its cars could carry a full load provided the tires were specially inflated. "The front tires should be inflated from 24 to 26 pounds and the rear tires to 30 pounds," American Motors said. When the tires are specially inflated in this manner, they are "adequate for occasional full load service," the company told me.

This is a shocking admission, but almost the same information came from the other manufacturers.

General Motors conceded that the "design guide in selecting tires" was three passengers, but said that its sedans could carry six passengers plus 200 pounds of luggage, provided the tires were specially inflated to 28 pounds in the front and 30 pounds in the rear. Chrysler said simply that its tires were adequate "provided they are properly maintained," but it uses similar tires and its cars have similar weights, so apparently the same principles apply as in General Motors' case.

Ford conceded that "it has been customary to make tire selections on the basis of a three-passenger load," but said that its sedans could carry six passengers plus luggage (up to a maximum of 1,100 pounds) if the tires were specially inflated to 30 pounds in front and 32 pounds in the rear. If a Ford station wagon is expected to carry a full load (which Ford considers to be six passengers and 400 pounds of luggage, or eight passengers and 100 pounds of luggage, totaling 1,300 pounds) then its tires must be specially inflated to 28 pounds in the front and 36 pounds in the rear.

What more sweeping confirmation could there be of the existence of a national tire scandal? The very companies which are pouring out automobiles at the rate of 7 million or more a year concede that their cars cannot safely carry their full, designed load unless the tires are constantly inflated and deflated according to a set of tables hidden somewhere in a driver's manual.

I wonder if there is a motorist on any highway in America today who is calculating the load of his car, his accessories, his passengers, and his luggage to within 100 pounds, then carefully adjusting his tire pressure in an attempt to stay alive. I doubt that most motorists could tell you the amount, within 5 pounds, of air pressure they have in their tires. I doubt that many could tell you the total loads they carry, either regularly or occasionally. Obviously it is ridiculous to expect American motorists to carry out the daily—or even hourly—inflation and deflation ritual prescribed by the auto makers. Do you think that the president of the Ford Motor Co., for instance, stops at a gasoline station on the way to work to inflate his tires if he has five of his associates riding with him? Will he stop again on the way home at night to deflate if only two of them ride back?

In addition to being unrealistic, this special inflation program, in my opinion, is downright dangerous. I asked a high official of the Tire and Rim Association, the accepted spokesman for the tire industry, what he thought of a suggestion that motorists should inflate their rear tires from 24 to as much as 36 pounds to increase their load-carrying

capacity. His answer was that there is a great disagreement within the industry as to proper tire pressure, but that the consensus is that 36 pounds would be too much pressure, would cause excessive wear, and could cause a blowout.

After poring over the automakers' replies, plus the beautiful manuals and accessory brochures which they sent along, I became convinced, more than ever, that only the Federal Government can protect the public interest in automobile safety.

The automakers know that their tires are not adequate. If you read their manuals, you will find this confirmed a hundred ways. You are supposed to switch to a larger tire if you add an air conditioning unit with its extra weight to some models, for instance. If we are that close to the edge of safety, why should not all of the cars of such models have the larger and safer tires?

At the same time, you are urged to load up your car with a fantastic array of accessories, including a camper top large enough for a small family to sleep under. How many cars loaded down with such accessories, or pulling heavy trailers, are speeding along our highways on tires overloaded by as much as 500 to 1,000 pounds each?

If you believe the automakers, no one can really answer such questions because no one knows what the maximum safe tire loads are.

The May issue of Consumer Bulletin states that the full-size Ford, Chevrolet, and Plymouth "have overloaded tires, and we suggest that the consumer order his car with tires of the next larger size." Paul Rand Dixon, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, testified before the Senate Commerce Committee that "anyone in his right mind" buying a new car would ask the dealer to install the next larger tire.

These statements were based on comparing official car weight figures with the tire load ratings of the Tire & Rim Association. Yet when these apparently irrefutable facts were presented to the automakers, their answer was simply that these association figures are not intended to be maximum loads.

"The Tire & Rim Association yearbook load inflation tables never have indicated maximum capacities," says Ford.

Apparently, we must fit tires to cars so as to carry certain maximum loads without knowing the maximum carrying capacity of a tire. The automakers' position seems to be that they test their cars carefully on proving grounds and elsewhere, and if the tires do not fail, they are considered adequate.

Certainly that is not enough assurance for the American public. In this age of advanced science and technology, there is no reason why we cannot develop sensible, reasonable, understandable standards for automobile tires to enable the automakers and the individual motorists to make a safe and intelligent selection.

I dwell on tires simply because that is the field in which we have gathered the most evidence, but the same problem of safety exists in the manufacture and sale of the modern American automobile.

The Federal Government cannot remain indifferent to automobile design when we are killing more than 47,000 people and disabling 1,700,000 more a year. We have an elaborate program of regulation and supervision in the aircraft industry, yet 50 times as many people are killed in auto accidents as in airplane accidents. Last year was the safest year in airline history and the worst year in highway traffic history.

The Federal Aviation Agency will spend \$40 million next year in research and development. The FAA is intimately connected with every phase in the construction of an airplane. As one commercial airline publication put it:

"From the time a designer first put pencil to paper, FAA inspectors carefully followed its development to make sure that design and production methods and facilities met rigid FAA standards. These inspectors lived with the first models as they came down the assembly line, and their aeronautical engineers were present when the FAA production test pilots took the plane aloft for a very thorough flight test program."

Think what we could do to reduce our appalling highway death rate if we were similarly concerned about safe automobile design.

Much of the criticism of unsafe features on automobiles runs the risk of sounding somewhat petty. It is true that a different knob on an ashtray or the elimination of reflections on the dashboard and windshield wipers probably would not greatly affect our national death toll.

But the real point is that basic principles of safety are not the controlling factor in automobile design. Cars today are designed to sell. And what sells are glamour and horsepower and a strange form of status which certainly have no connection with safety and may actually run counter to safety principles.

The money which the industry itself spends on safety research is often wasted when styling trends override sensible conclusions. There already is abundant expert know-how available to show us how we can improve automobile design in such a way as to sharply reduce highway fatalities.

The U.S. Public Health Service accident prevention bureau estimates that 43 percent of the people who die in auto accidents die under survivable conditions. A number of expert studies by university professors and scientists have reached conclusions such as these:

If cars were built so that heads would not strike windshields and dashboards, one out of five of those killed in accidents could be saved.

When a person is thrown from a car, the chance of being killed is five times as great.

Occupants could probably survive any crash up to 35 miles per hour if cars had shoulder-harness seat belts, doors which did not fly open, and steering wheels designed to protect the driver.

The steering column and the steering wheel are key factors. In many cars, the bottom of the steering column projects close to the front bumper. In a collision, it is driven back with tremendous force. In some cases, the steering column "spears" the driver. In other cases, the steering wheel strikes the abdomen or chest with such force as to cause fatal injuries.

Scientists have shown how this problem could be corrected by use of a flexible steering shaft instead of a rigid column, and through the redesign of the steering wheel itself. But this is a change which the industry resists very strongly.

The Federal General Services Administration has developed 17 safety features which will be required on all federally purchased cars beginning with the 1967 models. I hope that the States will set similar requirements for cars which they buy.

If we can set these safety standards for publicly owned vehicles, surely we can extend the same degree of safety to all automobile purchasers. These specific 17 features are not the perfect answers. The important thing is to have a responsible government agency with an official concern for automobile design, and the authority to set minimum safety standards to protect the motoring public.

It has been my experience over the years that all industries which deal with the public will oppose any attempts to regulate them in an effort to protect the public interest. They will say that we are destroying free enterprise, that we are substituting political

vote-getting for scientific expertise. But while they protest, they often begin to carry out the very reforms that they oppose. We have just seen this happen in the field of detergent pollution. Early in 1963, I introduced legislation to require the soap and detergent industry to convert, by July 1, 1965, to a new form of detergent which would decompose in the sewage treatment processes and would not pollute our water supplies. The industry howled in outrage and said such a move was unnecessary and impossible. Detergent pollution was good because it warned of other pollution, the industry argued. The bill has still not passed, but on July 1, 1965, the soap and detergent industry proudly announced that it had completed the changeover which it had said was not needed and could not be achieved.

I hope that the same thing might happen in the fields of automobile and tire safety. It has been suggested that the automakers equip their cars with the next larger size tire than those now used, to end the overloading which they now concede. Two of the four automakers have already announced that they will voluntarily include, on all their cars, some of the 17 safety features required on Federal cars by the General Services Administration. These features are required on all cars under the terms of my auto safety bill.

If the manufacturers will move voluntarily, it will certainly speed up some meaningful action to reduce highway deaths. But it will not provide a final answer.

Someone must speak for the public interest until safety is made an integral and lasting part of the design, manufacture, and sale of automobiles and tires. In a nation as far-flung and as widely traveled as ours, only a Federal agency, backed with enabling legislation, can provide an adequate voice.

#### WE ARE BUYING DEATH

Here are some typical letters from motorists received recently by Senator NELSON:

R. L. Templeton, Wellington, Tex.: "My only son was killed when a defective tire blew out on a new car. These new cars with 2-ply tires are a fraud and a shame. We think we are buying safety but we are buying death."

Paul Worland, Cheyenne, Wyo.: "At 800 miles I had my first blowout (on a new 1964 Oldsmobile). At 1,500 miles I had my second, and when the car was 3 months and 21 days old, I had another blowout—just as I was passing another car. My wife was painfully injured. I totally wrecked my new car and damaged the other to the extent of several hundred dollars."

Clifton D. Hill, Northville, Mich.: "In November 1963, I purchased a Ford Thunderbird which had new 2-ply tires (Goodyear tires). . . . When there was 6,000 miles on the car, one tire blew out and caused me to cross over a median of a superhighway in Canada and almost have a fatal accident. At 7,200 miles another tire blew out at Gaylord, Mich., causing me to go into a ditch."

Mrs. Richard A. Williams, Hermosa Beach, Calif.: "In November 1962, we bought a factory fresh new Mercury station wagon equipped with five brand new tires (Goodyear tires). . . . In the summer we left California for a 2-week trip to the Midwest. Before we returned we had blown out all five tires. . . . While traveling through Arizona, out in the middle of nowhere, we blew two tires at the same time. . . ."

#### ADJUSTMENT IN CIVIL SERVICE AND POST OFFICE ANNUITIES

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, recently it was my privilege to appear before the Subcommittee on Retirement of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in support of H.R. 8469.

At that time, it was made clear by my testimony and now it has been made clear by my vote that I supported H.R. 8469. However, as I said at the hearing and I say now after passage of H.R. 8469 that I do not feel that the provisions in this bill in many aspects are sufficient to correct the inequities now existing in the present annuities paid to civil service and post office retirees.

The responsibility to meet the exploding costs of living by adjustments in civil service and post office annuities belongs to us, the Senate, and our fellow colleagues in the House of Representatives. We are in agreement that necessary adjustments must be made, but we must go beyond H.R. 8469 and we must immediately begin considering future legislation to balance the annuities of retired employees and to compensate survivors' annuities further.

As of June 30, 1964, approximately 75,000 survivor annuitants are drawing less than \$50 per month; 50,000 retiree annuitants are drawing less than \$50 per month; and a shocking combination figure of 275,000 retiree annuitants and survivor annuitants are drawing less than \$100 per month, and 475,000, less than \$200. As you can see, Mr. President, there are inequities involved in the present civil service and post office annuity program.

Certainly, H.R. 8469, will bring these figures more in line, but still there is a need for future legislation. The sooner we act, the sooner the inequities will be resolved. So last week I urged passage of H.R. 8469, but today I ask Congress to begin considering future, more comprehensive legislation in this field.

#### MEDICARE AND THE PSYCHIATRIST

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in the recently enacted medical care bill, I supported amendments aimed at eliminating several discriminatory clauses relating to the treatment of mental illness. Though my own proposal would have provided the elderly with the same equal protection in psychiatric hospitals as provided in general hospitals, the final version retained a discriminatory feature by imposing an overall lifetime limitation of 190 days for inpatient psychiatric treatment.

Dr. Robert W. Gibson, director of the Sheppard & Enoch Pratt Hospital in Towson, Md., and spokesman for the American Psychiatric Association, noted in the September 1965 issue of Mental Hospitals the encouraging developments taken by Congress in providing for treatment of mental illness under the health care bill. Dr. Gibson's editorial points to the general trend of a more sympathetic understanding of mental illness. Congress, by passage of medicare, has moved in this direction. Dr. Gibson admonishes psychiatrists and private insurance to follow suit:

Medicare should serve as an example for private insurance programs to handle the mentally ill as they do persons suffering from other illnesses. It can even influence the opinion of the general public about the mentally ill. No longer will they be a group that must be treated differently and denied the benefits given to others.

# Pay Bill Provides Raise for 100,000 Unclassified Aides

By Jerry Klutts

Upwards of 100,000 Federal and District of Columbia government employes whose salaries are set administratively were brought in under the Federal pay raise bill yesterday.



Klutts

Included in this group are employes in a score of agencies such as CIA, TVA, Selective Service, National Security, Agriculture, Interior and Justice. Brought in by name were assistant U.S. attorneys. This group of employes are exempt from the salary-fixing Classification Act.

This was the only major amendment approved yesterday to the bill by Rep. Udall (D-Ariz.) which cleared the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee by a 20 to 1 vote. Rep. Gross (R-Iowa) cast the negative vote.

The bill also provides an increase for members of Congress, starting Jan. 1, 1967. Congressmen now get \$30,000 annually. Under the formula, members of the 90th Congress could find themselves making as much as \$34,500 a year.

Udall introduced a clean bill with all of the Committee changes and it will be formally recommended to the House at a routine Committee meeting today.

The Committee also voted to get the bill to the House floor at the earliest possible date. Rep. Morrison (D-La.), acting chairman, said an appeal will be made to the Rules Committee to clear the bill for House debate. A motion also will be filed to get the bill up under the 21-day rule on it.

Morrison and Rep. Olsen

(D-Mont.) both expressed hope that the Johnson Administration will go along with the bill, which they said had been reduced in first-year cost from \$970 million to \$730 million. They said "no growls" had been heard from the President's advisers since the cost of the bill had been reduced.

Administration sources, however, say the bill is "too rich" and they feel certain it is unacceptable to the President, who is standing by his original plan of a flat 3 per cent raise, effective next Jan. 1. The President's plan would cost \$400 million.

Mr. Johnson's advisers are pessimistic over the prospect of getting the House to reduce the bill's 4.5 per cent raise, effective next Oct. 1, plus numerous fringe benefits. They already are working to get the Senate to come up with a bill the President could accept.

An amendment by Gross was approved to make bipartisan the commission to be set up every four years to advise both the President and Congress on all Federal pay rates and their relationships.

The Committee shouted down a series of amendments offered by Rep. Henderson (D-N.C.) to reduce penalty pay provisions carried in the bill for postal employes.

Henderson supports the plan advanced by the Administration to pay overtime to postal employes after 40 hours weekly. The Committee went much further to provide overtime after eight hours daily, for Sunday work plus premium pay for holiday work.

Henderson said he sought to amend the bill to require Uncle Sam to pay overtime to

on official business in excess of eight hours a day or 40 hours a week.

In effect, the Committee deferred action on it. Udall promised to hold hearings within a couple of weeks on the extent of after-hours travel. Krebs plans to draft new legislation at that time.

Jobs: CSC has exams open for photographer, 9445-7220; communications specialist, 57220-10,250, and photographic equipment technologist, 35900-2045. Get full details from CSC.

Bureau of Standards needs GS 2 and 3 keypunch operators for openings at Springfield, Va. Call 321-8900, Branch 10.

Marines needs a GS 9 technical publications editor. Apply Room 1023, Arlington Annex.

FL. Retcon has openings for GS 4 experienced firefighters.

Weather Bureau is hiring GS 6 and 7 photographers. Apply at its Suitland, Md., office.

Military Sea Transportation needs a GS 9 budget analyst. Call OX 6-9262.

Smithsonian wants a GS 9 librarian. Call 381-5171.

## THE FEDERAL SPOTLIGHT

# Committee Approves Salary Bill Giving Lawmakers New Raise

By JOSEPH YOUNG  
Star Staff Writer

Another salary raise for members of Congress, who received a \$7,500 increase last year, is provided for in the government pay raise bill approved today by the House Civil Service Committee.

The committee vote was 22 to 3. The three dissenting vote were cast by Republicans H. P. Gross of Iowa, James Broyhill of North Carolina and Edward Derwinski of Illinois.

Salary increases would also be provided for top government executives such as Cabinet officers and agency heads.

These congressional and executive salary raises would go into effect on Jan. 1, 1967 when the next Congress convenes.

The amount will not be determined until next year because it is linked with whatever percentage increase grade 18 federal classified employes receive this year and next year under the bill. The bill provides a 4.5 percent increase for all federal classified and postal employes this year, including grade 18. But next year's raise is to be on a formula basis designed to trim the lag between government and industry pay by one-half, plus a cost-of-living raise.

Since grade 18 lags considerably behind comparable industry jobs, it has been estimated that in addition to this year's 4.5 percent pay raise, employes in this grade next year would be in line for at least a 10 or 11 percent increase.

Thus, members of Congress and government political appointees could expect a raise of 14 or 15 percent in 1967. In the case of members of Congress who now make \$30,000 a year, this could amount to a raise of \$4,500 a year or more.

Some Republican members of the House committee are angry about this provision and intend to make a fight of it on the House floor. Government and postal employe leaders, mindful of a similar hassle over

congressional pay raises last year which nearly killed federal pay raises, are hopeful that the issue can be resolved without jeopardizing the pay raise chances of federal and postal workers.

Some members of Congress who fearfully voted for pay raises for themselves last year are wondering how they can face their constituents back home in next year's election if they vote themselves another pay raise.

**BASE CLOSINGS** — Although House-Senate conferees eliminated the provision to give Congress veto power over Defense installation closings, they did adopt language stating that any proposed base closing in the future cannot be effected until 120 days after the secretary of defense reports the details and fully justifies the reasons for the proposed closing.

This does not prevent the Defense Department from going through with future closings, but it does give Congress the right to be heard on such actions and possibly use its power over appropriations and authorizations to stop unpopular closings of installations.

**JOB APPLICANTS** — The House Government Operations Committee has approved the administration - supported bill to provide for payment of travel costs of job applicants invited by government departments and agencies to visit them for interviews regarding placement in hard-to-fill federal jobs.

**PUBLIC RELATIONS APPROACH** — The AFL-CIO Government Employees Council has hired a public relations firm on a six-month trial basis to help improve the public image of government and postal employes as well as to line up public support against excessive government contracting-out of functions which the council feels should be retained by the government.

**RIGHT TO ARBITRARILY**

**RETIRE EMPLOYES** — Two government employe groups have endorsed proposals before the President's Committee on Federal Staff Retirement Systems to allow the government to arbitrarily retire employes past their peak after 30 years' service on full annuities. The groups are the Federal Professional Association and the National Association of Government Employees. Other federal and postal employe unions object to giving the government such arbitrary retirement powers.

\* \* \* \*

**NAVY OVERSEAS ROTATION** — Navy is following the Air Force's lead in requiring rotation of its overseas civilian personnel. Proposed regulations, which are strongly opposed by government employe unions, gives Navy commanders overseas the right to reassign employes to jobs in the continental United States.

\* \* \* \*

**YARBOROUGH'S PLANS** — There are reports from Texas that Sen. Ralph Yarborough, ranking majority member of the Senate Civil Service Committee, will run for governor next year against incumbent Gov. John Connolly.

\* \* \* \*

**CAPITAL ROUNDUP** — The League of Federal Recreation Associations will present a film-lecture program on Hawaii, Spain and Portugal at 7:45 p.m. Tuesday in the Commerce Department auditorium in connection with its forthcoming trips in October to these places. . . . Norman Sharpless of the Fairfax County government has been elected president of the National Capital Chapter of the Public Personnel Association. Others elected were Luther Steward jr., vice president; Gwendolyn Tise, treasurer; and Daniel Keenan, secretary. . . . Federal Aviation Agency needs two personnel management specialists, grades 11 and 12, for the sub-regional area office here of its Eastern Region. Call William Confalone at WO 2-5681.

C 171

January 25, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

1015

The Ukrainians have been persecuted and oppressed because they remember their heritage and history—and their dreams for self-determination as an independent nation. We are fighting in South Vietnam today for this same principle. While their Communist masters prohibit the Ukrainians in the Soviet Union from celebrating this anniversary, we in America join with our fellow American of Ukrainian descent in this celebration so that their history will not be forgotten. We will pay tribute to them in the Halls of Congress. We who are committed to defend freedom throughout the world will remember that 22d of January 1918.

The history of the Ukraine, studded with stories of courage and valor on the one hand, and of religion and culture on the other, should be told and retold. We join all Ukrainians and their descendants here and abroad in marking this anniversary during which we reaffirm our prayers and hopes for the return of freedom to the Ukraine and to captive nations throughout the world.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, in the past 21 years, or since the end of World War II, approximately 55 former colonies of Western countries have become independent nations of the world community. This group of newly independent countries constitutes about one-third of mankind now living, and this same group occupies about 23 percent of the world's inhabitable land mass.

For the past 21 years or so, as the number of these colonies began to dwindle and the number of free and independent states increased, the Soviet Union screamed its virulence at the West, and the issue of colonialism and imperialism became an issue in the East-West war of words, national prestige, and international propaganda. During these years the West worked toward the eventual independence of these countries, so that today, Western states have few overseas territories. During this time as the Russians tried to hang the albatross around our necks, we in the West suffered in quietude, righted a number of wrongs, and generally did a decent job of helping these countries prepare themselves for membership as responsible states in the family of nations.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come to remind our own people and the Soviet Union that we have not been fooled by the verbal trickery of the Marxist dialectic, and that we realize that the largest colonial master in the world today is the Soviet Union, followed closely by her alienated sister east of the Urals, Communist China. It is of the Soviet Union's relationship to the Ukrainian people, however, that I wish to speak today.

The age-old manifestations of colonialism are apparent in what the Soviets glibly refer to as the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. That is to say, the Russians have resorted to all possible means to deny the Ukrainian peoples their own distinct identity and culture. I should like to mention a few of these indicators.

The nourishment of any national identity is found in language, but today in the Ukraine, there is the Russification of language that would make the old West-

ern colonialists dignified in comparison. Russian is the official language, and is mandatory in the educational system. The arts speak of the glories of Russia, and opera and theater are overwhelmingly presented in Russian. The life spirit of the Ukrainian peoples and their glorious past are placed second to Russia in the educational system. The Ukrainian peoples see what is happening to their country and to their cultural and national identity. Russians in the Ukraine have the best jobs, hold most of the administrative posts, and maintain a better standard of living. The Ukrainian peoples see Russian exploitation of their natural resources, especially of the food that leaves the country, and exploitation of their human resources, as the Ukrainians, not the Russians, hold the menial jobs and in general have to struggle for a higher living standard in this workers' paradise. The classless society, indeed.

What we should do, Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate the 48th anniversary of Ukrainian independence, is remind ourselves and the Ukrainian people that we have not been fooled. The lessons of the past are clear: Russian colonialism shall not succeed.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, by setting aside a period today to commemorate the 48th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine, the House honors itself and its high principles just as it does the bravery and continued devotion to freedom and national independence of Ukrainians everywhere. It is a privilege, therefore, to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to a people whose love of freedom has withstood generations of persecution.

The people of Ukraine have a special claim to our understanding and support. Not only do they seek for themselves what we have found and firmly established in the United States—the right to self-government, a right we hold to be inalienable for all peoples—but America has been the beneficiary of the approximately 2 million people of Ukrainian ancestry who have brought to this country the spiritual qualities and human values of an old, distinctive and rich culture.

As the representative of a congressional district whose residents include thousands of persons of Ukrainian descent, I have appreciated at close range the important contributions they have made to our way of life. Because of their friendship, I have obtained a closer, more personal understanding of the dedication of Ukrainians everywhere to the goals of individual liberty and national self-determination.

Mr. Speaker, Ukraine is the largest and one of the oldest of the captive nations of Eastern Europe. Yet, the period of her independence as a nation in the 20th century is the shortest, the 2 years from 1918 to 1920, during which Ukrainians fought for and won their freedom from the corrupt tsarist government of Russia only to have it wrenched away by the brutal forces of the new Soviet government. Thus it is that Ukrainians know, perhaps better than most, the evils of tyranny and imperialism in whatever form they are manifested. To have kept alight the ideal of freedom and

liberty, to have refused to succumb to overwhelming oppression and virtually permanent persecution, is worthy of our deepest gratitude and admiration.

On this occasion, however, we should do more than salute a people's courage, more than indicate our understanding of their problems, more than pledge our support in general terms. We owe them action, effective action, even though we recognize the limits of our own national power. Among the concrete and positive steps this House can take, Mr. Speaker, is the creation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations which would bring into being an expert group of legislators devoting continuing attention to developments in those countries still dominated from Moscow.

This and related actions would help to give new emphasis to policies affecting Eastern Europe, new understanding of the opportunities we have to sustain hope and encourage freedom in this important area of the world, and renewed effectiveness to the exposure of the ugly record of Soviet colonialism in countries which were born to be free.

*Bill File*

#### PROPOSAL TO ADJUST THE RATE OF BASIC COMPENSATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

(Mr. DANIELS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation to adjust the rates of basic compensation of our Federal employees in all branches of the service who depend on congressional action for appropriate attention. The bill I have introduced provides an across-the-board 7-percent increase. Close students of the matter agree that such an increase at this time is fully justified.

In addition to adjusting the pay of our Federal employees, the legislation I have introduced corrects a number of existing inequities in connection with compensation for overtime, holiday, and Sunday work, and in so doing provides administrators in the Federal service, particularly the Post Office Department, with ample flexibility so that our governmental functions can be performed in an efficient manner.

It is recognized that the mail moves in all directions every day of the year, even including Sundays and holidays. The bill I have introduced recognizes this fact, but provides justifiable compensation for those who are required to work on such days.

In simple terms the bill provides time and one-half for overtime and Sunday work and double time for work on holidays.

I hope that hearings can be held on this bill and others with a similar purpose at an early date. I am sure the testimony will support me in the action I have taken.

#### CRIMINAL CONSPIRACIES CONTROL ACT OF 1966

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from

Georgia (Mr. WELTNER) is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. WELTNER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, today I propose a major revision of the internal security laws of the Nation.

No one conversant with present security statutes can deny that they are outmoded, both as to the factual bases upon which they were drawn and as to subsequent application of constitutional principles. A brief examination of the Internal Security Act of 1950 should suffice to establish these contentions.

First. In its legislative findings, Congress set forth what was then the case—that “the direction and control of the world Communist movement is vested in and exercised by the Communist dictatorship of a foreign country.” That was the case, Mr. Speaker, before the assumption by Communist China of ideological independence, and before the schism that exists today between China and Russia. It is no longer the case, and that change is clearly reflected by the existence within the United States of two contending Communist apparatus—the Communist Party and the Progressive Labor Party. The latter follows, not Moscow, but Peiping. It is in no way governed or controlled by the “foreign country” described in the 1950 act. To the contrary, the pronouncements of the Progressive Labor Party are couched in terms of scorn and derision for the revisionists and counter-revolutionaries of the Kremlin.

This struggle for leadership of the world Communist movement would be of no great moment insofar as our laws are concerned, except for one factor: the Internal Security Act of 1950 specifically defines both “Communist-action” and “Communist-front” organizations as groups which are “directed, dominated, or controlled by the foreign power controlling the world Communist movement,” meaning Soviet Russia. Therefore, strict interpretation of the act must, of necessity, exclude from its scope, except to limited degree, any action or front group that is not Russian dominated. The most militant and revolutionary American Communist organization, the Progressive Labor Party, is not covered by the Internal Security Act of 1950.

Second. The act is outdated legally, as well as factually. Since its passage, not a single Communist has complied with its requirements, notwithstanding 15 years of administration by the Subversive Activities Control Board and 15 years of litigation. One by one, its provisions have been invalidated by the Supreme Court, which must apply the protections of the Constitution to Communists as well as patriots. The passport restriction has been wiped out, as have limitations on holding of office in labor unions. Only last December the Court struck down the registration requirements applicable to Communist organizations, thereby vitiating the central scheme of the entire act.

As a result of these rulings, the Subversive Activities Control Board is re-

duced to near meaningless ritual. Whatever functions are left to it are clearly incapable of controlling subversive activities.

The present state of the law is indicative of our general failure to revise and renew concepts and procedures affecting national security. For example, every person entering his country's service, civil or military, must subscribe to a lengthy affidavit denying or explaining any affiliation, past or present, with any of several score organizations. Many of these are relevant only to the distant past. No names have been added to the Attorney General's list since 1955, and none has been stricken since its inception in 1947. The Ku Klux Klan groups included in the list have long since faded away, being replaced by new and more dangerous Klan organizations whose names are not included.

The list was compiled when Japan, Germany, and Italy—now among our closest allies—were our recent enemies. It contains the names of many military and patriotic societies of these present friends—including a Russo-Japanese war veterans group, along with Shinto Temples. It is strange that past association with the national religion of our strongest ally in the Far East is still proscribed as subversive. The time has indeed come for thoughtful, practical, and constitutional revision of the internal security laws.

There are other serious shortcomings in our laws. They apply to groups attempting to subvert lawful procedures only when those groups are pawn to one specified foreign power. Yet, Communists are not the only subversives within the plain meaning of the term.

There exists in America today a number of organizations which show no more regard for the Constitution and the rights of American citizens than the Communist Party. Like that party, they operate in secrecy and through deceptive fronts. Like the Communist Party, they employ pious preachments to cover their true intent. Like the Communist Party, their members are under discipline higher than the law, and under compulsion to practice deceit and intrigue. I am speaking of the Ku Klux Klan.

The Communist Party, Mr. Speaker, is a criminal conspiracy whose purpose is to deprive the people through forcible overthrow of their collective right to a republican form of government. Similarly, the Klan is a criminal conspiracy, whose purpose is to deprive the people of their individual rights through force, violence and intimidation. Differing in membership and pronouncement, they are nonetheless the same, each a criminal conspiracy, each acting in violation of the Constitution and laws of the United States.

Then, there is a third element akin to these two—a third force existing under rigid discipline and complete secrecy. It, too, is based upon force, violence, and intimidation. Like the Communist Party and the Klan, it recognizes no fealty to the Constitution, or to lawful authority. It is a law unto itself, binding its members by oath, on pain of death.

Here I speak of the vast criminal net-

work known varyingly as Cosa Nostra, Mafia, or the Syndicate.

I need not review the magnitude or scope of its activities. That, along with the identity of its leaders, is common knowledge. Its impetus is not political, as the Communist Party, nor social, as the Klan, but economic. The Cosa Nostra exists solely for the criminal gain of its members. And because the Constitution protects the guilty as well as the innocent, these criminals continue their careers of death and corruption, virtually beyond reach of the law.

These three, Mr. Speaker—Communists, Klan, and Cosa Nostra—are essentially the same. All are secret bodies acting beyond the law. All force upon their members a rigid discipline. All are engaged in planned and continued violations of the criminal statutes of the United States.

All jeopardize the internal security. All are criminal conspiracies.

I am today introducing a bill to revise the internal security laws, and to extend them to include other criminal conspiracies in addition to Communist organizations.

My bill recognizes the constitutional limitations enunciated by recent Supreme Court decisions on the subject, and works fully within those principles.

Styled “The Criminal Conspiracies Control Act of 1966,” the bill defines criminal conspiracies in three categories, as follows:

Sec. 3. (3) (a) Any organization in the United States having for one of its purposes or objectives the establishment, control, conduct, seizure, or overthrow of the Government of the United States, or the government of any State or political subdivision thereof, by the use of force or violence; or

(3) (b) Any organization in the United States which advocates or employs acts of violence or intimidation for the purpose of depriving citizens of the United States of the free exercise of rights guaranteed them by the Constitution and laws of the United States; or

(3) (c) Any organization having as its purpose the planned, continued, and consistent execution of acts which violate the criminal statutes of the United States.

It will be seen that this definition is directly related to acts which are violations of existing criminal laws of the United States. The first category includes conspiracies to violate the Smith Act; the second, violations of the several civil rights acts; the third covers violations of the general criminal statutes of the United States. I suggest no new political or social or economic crime, but only define certain combinations as “criminal conspiracies.”

A Criminal Conspiracies Control Board succeeds the present Subversive Activities Control Board, with all procedural safeguards continued. The new Board convicts of no crime, imposes no sanction, and administers no control. Its sole function is a judicial determination, upon petition of the Attorney General, that a named organization is, or is not, a criminal conspiracy as defined in the bill. Because Communist organizations come within the first category of conspiracies, the duties of the Board in that area will be little changed. But those

October 22, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

27555

South Fork of the Cumberland River in McCreary County, Ky. This project would appear to be a most worthy one, in terms of flood control, power, and recreation benefits.

While this project was not included in the rivers and harbors omnibus bill this session, Dr. CARTER has done a tremendous amount of essential preliminary work, informing Members of the great advantages that will accrue to his State and its people from this project, and its feasibility. Eventually the Devils Jumps Reservoir will be constructed—through the outstanding efforts of our esteemed colleague from Kentucky's Fifth District.

#### LOYAL AMERICAN SPEAKS

(Mrs. REID of Illinois (at the request of Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina) was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I bring to the attention of my colleagues a letter which was written to me by a resident of my congressional district, along with a letter which he sent to his son. This is just one loyal American speaking up for America, but I know his views are shared by the overwhelming majority of Americans in the 15th District of Illinois and throughout our great land.

ELGIN, ILL.,  
October 19, 1965.

Congresswoman CHARLOTTE T. REID,  
Congressional Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN REID: As a parent of a young man in college, I'm more than usually interested in the tragedy of last weekend. I am disgusted with the fact that publicity media has afforded such time to this fraction of young America which has been led down the garden path to rebellion without a cause—and the "fellow travelers" who rejoice in their misguided noise.

I thought perhaps you would be interested in one dad's letters to his son at college on the subject. I would hope the ground swell of disapproval from other moms and dads would echo throughout the land.

At the same time, we are veterans of World War II—10 years in the Marine Corps. I carry a piece of Japanese shrapnel and the Purple Heart—and I wear two Presidential Unit Citation Stars, four Combat Stars, including Saipan and Iwo Jima.

Last November we had our chance to express our opinions in the only place we have where our free America is perpetuated as a result of World War II—the polling place.

The choice now is not "whether" but rather "how" we can maintain our freedom and contain communism. For my own, I would rather draw the line in southeast Asia than in Elgin, Ill.

More than this, as Commander in Chief, our President is attempting to end this war as quickly as possible with the minimum of American lives lost.

Ours is now a commitment not a policy to dispute—a combined commitment of both Republican and Democrat citizens alike—Americans all. When our Armed Forces are involved, we must—all of us—back them up with every fiber we possess. To this end we must all be dedicated.

Activities to "beat the draft" are treacherous—truisms, clichés, etc., notwithstanding.

My son, and his fellows by the thousands,

understands this—as do we who stand behind as "veteran" parents.

Let's rent Soldier Field—fill it with 100,000 Americans and parade a pageant of college bands, scholars, football teams, ROTC cadets, just plain students who would be happy to "volunteer" for instead of against.

Let's not have another Korea—let's let the world see the real young Americans who are to inherit this country from this generation. Let's show "objectivity"—not bearded rebels without a cause. Let's put the "Red" back in "Red-blooded"—let's debate on issues—not immature idealism. No one, especially me, was in favor of World War II—who was? Who wants to die? But in the Marine Corps we have a motto "Semper fidelis," always faithful, faithful to our flag, our country, our democracy, even though we would debate as to its domestic application, at times.

Now is a time for unity. Now is a time to stand behind the man with the gun—as my letter to my son suggests—not because he is a gunfighter, but because he is carrying out our declaration of commitment, our country, our flag, our future.

Let's get the VFW and the Legion on their feet (I should say on our feet). Let's close ranks, let's disavow these "T" shirted souls with no purpose.

I hope the day never comes when it is unfashionable or improper to "rally round the flag, boys."

Sincerely,

ROY PROTZMAN.

ELGIN, ILL.,  
October 16, 1965.

ROBERT PROTZMAN,  
Theta Chi Fraternity,  
Ripon College,  
Ripon, Wis.

DEAR SON: The attached front page story in today's Chicago Sun-Times about the national organization set up to assist young men "Beat the draft" must concern you and your fellow students as much as it does those of us who, as parents, sit in amazement at what a tiny fraction of young unwashed, misguided beatniks and their fellow travelers are doing to discredit the strong red, white, and blue backbone that has been this Nation's heritage since 1776 and has made possible the position prominence we hold in the world today.

Usually, my letters to you are of your progress in school, and what Mom and the kids are doing, personal interest bits as you would say. Today, I think I'm writing not only to you, my son, but also to your brothers at Theta Chi, your fellow students at Ripon College, the young Republicans on campus you have been elected to represent, and to the 99.9 percent of young America who are going about the process of education in whatever manner it is available to them to better equip themselves for a life of contribution.

As has been documented at the Federal and local level, much of this business tagged as "student activity" is a highly organized national—probably international—program designed to undermine the genuine issues of our commitment in Vietnam.

I think the idea of debates as this SDS outfit suggests is good; not with the draft board members, or R.O.T.C. officers, not with recruiting personnel or others obviously doing a job as professional soldiers or support activities, but with "guys" like you, Larry, Bill and all equivalent inheritors of whatever this Nation is going to be in the next quarter century. I should like to see such debates, and I'd be proud, not ashamed, to see you "guys" in shirts, jackets, and ties as you represent your fellows, the status of the bearded, unwashed, T-shirt boys might just lose a little lustre in the bright light of genuine exposure to you fellows, and thousands like you, who are not too tired

after 15-30 hours of regular work, and a full week of studying to apply that which you are learning in a manner which might make at least a few of the discs in that red, white, blue backbone show themselves to the pride of all of us.

Next week is homecoming at Ripon. I'm sorry that Mom and I cannot be there, but as you know we too have to portion our money carefully as we both work our way through the school of life.

May I suggest a couple of ideas for your consideration at this time, nonetheless?

Why not add to your house outside decorations, a big sign saying, "Theta Chi is mighty high—on the good old U.S.A.". An inside placard might say "Theta Chi has 36 ROTC cadets active on campus, and we're proud of every one of them." Why not ask your ROTC company officer if those of you who cared to could wear your uniform next Saturday? There's a lot of alumni our age and younger and older who would like to see that the Nation is preparing young men for the defense of the country if necessary with some order, and hope, not as a growing aggressive armed force, but a Reserve (that's what ROTC means, Reserve Officers Training Corps) and further that Ripon College is proud to wave the flag a little.

How about a telegram to every Ripon alumni in Vietnam right now to arrive next Saturday "Sorry you can't be here today at homecoming, but we're thinking of you, and thanking you for holding the line over there. The Redmen will hold the line against Lawrence a little better today because of you."

These young people who are too agitated to study, too sophisticated to sing "Fight team fight", too spineless to put on the pads of life, and feel the impact of that tackle across the way, are the same people who in the next few years will bemoan the fact that you fellows have taken all the good jobs. What a pity. Theodore Roosevelt once said, "Show me not the critic who sits in the arena and denounces those upon the field, but rather show me the man who has the dirt of combat in the arena upon him, who at best, knows the sweet smell of success but for a second, and at worst rises only to be smitten again in effort. To him will I listen."

You know your dad. You can take the boy out of the Marine Corps, but not the Marine Corps out of the boy. I hope I never fail to tingle when the flag goes by, or never fail to wipe a tear when the globe and anchor is displayed.

It may be "corny", Semper fidelis, always faithful, but can anyone aspire to more?

Let's go, Ripon. Let's win, Redmen. Stand up, the flag is passing by.

Much love,

Dad,  
ROY PROTZMAN.

#### PUBLIC HEARINGS ON NEW ROUTES NORMAL PROCEDURE OF STATE

(Mr. GOODELL (at the request of Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, the reply of the New York State Superintendent of Public Works, Mr. J. Burch McMorran, to one of our colleagues should, I believe, be a matter of public record. I ask unanimous consent to place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

#### PUBLIC HEARINGS ON NEW ROUTES NORMAL PROCEDURE OF STATE, SUPERINTENDENT NOTES

The following statement was issued today (October 15, 1965) by Superintendent of Public Works J. Burch McMorran in response



to an announcement by Representative RICHARD L. OTTINGER of Westchester (on October 12) that he had been "assured" by the U.S. Secretary of Commerce no Federal funds will be committed for the proposed new north-south route in Westchester, Putnam and Dutchess counties until studies are completed and a public hearing held on the proposal:

"Mr. OTTINGER's service in Washington obviously has taught him nothing regarding the State's procedures for planning and financing construction of new highways on the urban and primary systems such as that authorized by the legislature last spring. His announcement was not news in any sense, since it is our standard practice to hold public hearings on preliminary plans and seek Federal funds for construction only after final plans are completed—some time after hearings have been conducted.

"Mr. OTTINGER also was quoted as saying the proposed highway would destroy settled communities, bar access to the Hudson River and create traffic problems on routes into or in New York City. These are spurious arguments. Rather than destroy local communities, the new route will assist them by relieving existing roads of much of their heavy traffic, promoting highway safety, and enabling orderly growth and development of the area. Access to the river already is barred—and has been barred for years—by the existence of the railroad tracks along the shore. The route as now proposed, with railroad crossovers and attendant recreational development is, in fact, the best guarantee that the people will have increased and improved access to their river. The riverside location proposed for about 5 miles of the route in Westchester would bypass such communities as Philipse Manor, Scarborough and Sicepy Hollow Manor, whose scenic areas Mr. Ottinger claimed would be destroyed.

"As to the funneling of vehicles into New York City, I have previously pointed out that greater capacity can and will be provided along present major traffic corridors below the Tappan Zee Bridge in Westchester. Additional capacity in New York City is being provided or planned to meet both current and future needs, which will continue to grow with or without the Hudson Valley route.

"In maintaining that the proposed highway should be built along Route 9A, Mr. OTTINGER demonstrates his unawareness of or his unwillingness to recognize the fact this would not provide ready access to the riverfront communities, their industry or their shoreline, and would not solve the really pressing traffic problems on Route 9, particularly in Tarrytown. Traffic volumes on much of Route 9 between Tarrytown and Ossining have increased an average of 59 percent—21 percent above the Statewide urban area average—in the past dozen years. Route 9 traffic at several points in the area is already greater than that on much of the Thruway, and unless we provide an improved route—where the need exists—the communities of western Westchester will become hopelessly strangled in their congestion. This is a matter of such critical importance it should transcend all political goalsmanship."

#### CONTRIBUTION OF WOMEN TO OUR WORLD

(Mrs. BOLTON (at the request of Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina) was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I want to say a word about the contribution women make to our world. But I do not wish to discuss myself or the women

of this Congress, I want to talk about a very young woman. Miss Linda Samples of Brunswick Center, Ohio, is only 16 years of age. She is a junior in high school, an outstanding student, and even while she learns her lessons well, she does not wait for her working mother to supply funds but she earns money cooking and cleaning.

Linda has the kind of loyalty to her country that is an inherent quality, and she has the kind of love and understanding of her fellowman that makes me proud to say—"she is a woman"—though she is a very young woman.

Like some of the rest of the women of our country, Linda has been worried about evidences of disloyal people who have the freedom of America. But Linda did something about it. She wrote a letter "To the Men in Vietnam" and not knowing just how to post it, she asked the Cleveland Press to handle it. I know how the editor must have felt when he read it, for Linda's letter appeared on the front page of my hometown paper yesterday. The message is clear and I want to share it with you:

*To the Men in Vietnam:*

Today is a beautiful fall day. The trees are changing color, the sky is deep blue. Many Americans are enjoying this Sunday. Why?

Because you are there in Vietnam, fighting, being wounded, and even dying, for us—for our freedom.

You have said that you feel the people of the United States do not think you are fighting for a worthwhile cause. I can think of no better cause than freedom. Our God-given freedom is our most precious earthly possession.

America could not be what she is without the freedom you are preserving.

I know that I am not the only person in the United States who prays for you daily and gives thanks you are there protecting our lives our freedom, our Nation and our existence.

Thank you, every one, and may God keep and bless you all.

Sincerely yours,

LINDA SAMPLES.

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD (at the request of Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.)

#### FEDERAL PAY RAISE BILL

(Mr. LINDSAY (at the request of Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States said on May 12:

We do not have two standards of what makes a good employer in the United States: One standard for private enterprise and another for the Government. A double standard which puts the Government employee at a comparative disadvantage is shortsighted.

I fully agree. I believe that the Government employee pay increase passed by the House of Representatives will help

to eliminate the double standard between private and Government employment.

I regret that I was unable to return to Washington for the vote on the salary raise bill September 30. Had it not been for prior commitments in New York, I would have been able to vote for this needed and equitable legislation.

The bill, in my judgment, translated into action the very words of the President. It keeps faith with the principle of comparability; that Federal employees should receive the same salaries paid in private employment for the same skills, experience and responsibility.

The 4½-percent general salary increase will, perhaps, not achieve full comparability. But it moves in the right direction. Had the increase been higher, it would have had my wholehearted support.

Among the 1.7 million Federal employees who will benefit from the pay raises are those in the Post Office Department. Some of these workers walk 10 miles a day with a 35-pound bag, need to memorize 900 pages of regulations and know 3,000 names and addresses. For this work, the typical postal employee makes about \$5,400 per year. The AFL-CIO estimates that it requires an annual salary of \$6,400 for a family of four in the Nation's major cities for a modest, but adequate standard of living.

Accordingly, postal workers in New York City, which have one of the highest cost-of-living indexes in this country, are most deserving of the increase provided in the bill.

In conclusion, then, my absence from the floor when the vote on the salary bill was taken September 30 did not reflect a disinterest in this legislation. I would have returned to Washington if it had been at all possible. I would have argued in favor of this bill and cast my vote for passage.

(Mr. KING of New York (at the request of Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

(Mr. KING of New York's remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.)

#### INTIMIDATION OF ITS BEST POTENTIAL CUSTOMERS APPEARS TO BE THE NEW POLICY OF OFFICIALS OF KENNEDY ARTS CENTER; WHITE HOUSE ARTS ADVISER ENDORSES THREATS OF REPRIISALS AGAINST WASHINGTON'S CULTURAL ORGANIZATIONS

(Mr. WIDNALL (at the request of Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned by a letter I have received from Roger L. Stevens, the White House Special Assistant on the Arts. Under date of October 11, he refers to and adopts as his own a statement which appeared on October 7, 1965, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This same state-

October 22, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

27165

of Alaska has altered the course of history—and it is scarcely arguable that it has not been altered for the better.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the senior Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I subscribe to the celebration of this important event. However, I cannot approve spending \$1,200,000 to build an auditorium for convention purposes in Sitka, with a population of 5,000 people. There are hundreds of places throughout the country which might ask for similar contributions.

Why did the Senator not ask to build something in Nome, further north, so that we might put \$1 or \$2 million there?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Ohio what the population of Cincinnati and Cleveland were 5 years after the State was admitted to the Union.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, we are going to celebrate the 180th anniversary of the establishment of six States in the Northwest Territory. That will be in 1967.

I suppose that I ought to add an amendment to the bill of the Senator and provide that we should give \$10 million each to the States of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio

for the purpose of building an auditorium.

It would be the same principle. We have sesqui-centennials, and centennials every year. There would be no end to it.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, by the purchase of Alaska our country acquired an area one-fifth the size of all the existing and subsequently admitted 48 States of the United States. It extended the territory of the United States to the northern-most and western-most parts of America. It acquired an area of inestimable strategic value, of vast resources, of unparalleled scenic beauty. Attracted to it have come a rugged pioneering and friendly breed of our fellow Americans—people who prize its freedoms and are determined to make of Alaska a State as great in quality as it is in area.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in answer to the inquiry of the distinguished Senator from Alaska as to the population of the State of Ohio on the date of its admission to the Union, on March 1, 1803, it was 41,915.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma has the floor.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES SALARY ACT OF 1965

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate

proceed to the consideration of H.R. 10281, the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1965.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 10281) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government to establish the Federal Salary Review Commission, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma?

There being no objection the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Employees Salary Act of 1965".

EMPLOYEES SUBJECT TO CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1949

SEC. 2. (a) Section 603(b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (78 Stat. 400; 5 U.S.C. 1113(b)), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The compensation schedule for the General Schedule shall be as follows:

"Grade	Per annum rates and steps									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
GS-1	\$3,607	\$3,626	\$3,745	\$3,864	\$3,983	\$4,102	\$4,221	\$4,340	\$4,459	\$4,578
GS-2	3,814	3,843	4,072	4,201	4,330	4,459	4,588	4,717	4,846	4,975
GS-3	4,140	4,289	4,429	4,569	4,709	4,849	4,989	5,129	5,269	5,409
GS-4	4,641	4,797	4,953	5,109	5,265	5,421	5,577	5,733	5,889	6,045
GS-5	5,181	5,352	5,523	5,694	5,865	6,036	6,207	6,378	6,549	6,720
GS-6	5,702	5,894	6,086	6,278	6,470	6,662	6,854	7,046	7,238	7,430
GS-7	6,269	6,476	6,683	6,890	7,097	7,304	7,511	7,718	7,925	8,132
GS-8	6,890	7,097	7,305	7,513	7,721	7,929	8,137	8,345	8,553	8,761
GS-9	7,470	7,733	7,987	8,241	8,495	8,749	9,003	9,257	9,511	9,765
GS-10	8,184	8,464	8,744	9,024	9,304	9,584	9,864	10,144	10,424	10,704
GS-11	8,961	9,267	9,573	9,879	10,185	10,491	10,797	11,103	11,409	11,715
GS-12	10,610	10,987	11,355	11,723	12,091	12,459	12,827	13,195	13,563	13,931
GS-13	12,510	12,945	13,380	13,815	14,250	14,685	15,120	15,555	15,990	16,425
GS-14	14,680	15,198	15,690	16,204	16,712	17,220	17,728	18,236	18,744	19,252
GS-15	17,055	17,645	18,235	18,825	19,415	20,005	20,595	21,185	21,775	22,365
GS-16	19,610	20,297	20,975	21,653	22,331	23,009	23,687	24,365	25,043	
GS-17	22,217	22,994	23,771	24,548	25,325					
GS-18	25,382									

(b) Except as provided in section 504(d) of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962 (78 Stat. 412; 5 U.S.C. 1173(d)), the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees to whom the compensation schedule set forth in subsection (a) of this section applies shall be initially adjusted as of the effective date of this section, as follows:

(1) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at one of the rates of a grade in the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the corresponding rate in effect on and after such date.

(2) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a rate between two rates of a grade in the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the higher of the two corresponding rates in effect on and after such date.

(3) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a rate in excess of the maximum rate for his grade, he shall receive (A) the maximum rate for his

grade in the new schedule, or (B) his existing rate of basic compensation if such existing rate is higher.

(4) If the officer or employee, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, is receiving, pursuant to section 2(b) (4) of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, an existing aggregate rate of compensation determined under section 208(b) of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1111), plus subsequent increases authorized by law, he shall receive an aggregate rate of compensation equal to the sum of his existing aggregate rate of compensation, on the day preceding the effective date of this section, plus the amount of increase made by this section in the maximum rate of his grade, until (1) he leaves his position, or (2) he is entitled to receive aggregate compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of this Act or any other provision of law; but, when such position becomes vacant, the aggregate rate of compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with applicable provisions of law. Subject to clauses (1) and (2) of the immediately preceding sentence of this paragraph, the amount of the increase provided by this section shall be held and considered for the purposes of section 208(b) of the Act of Sep-

tember 1, 1954, to constitute a part of the existing rate of compensation of the employee.

REDETERMINATIONS OF ACCEPTABLE LEVELS OF COMPETENCE

SEC. 3. Section 701 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 1121), is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(c) Whenever a determination is made under subsection (a) of this section that the work of an officer or employee is not of an acceptable level of competence, he shall be given prompt written notice of that determination and an opportunity for reconsideration of the determination within his department under uniform procedures established by the Commission. If the determination is affirmed upon reconsideration, the employee shall have a right of appeal to the Commission. If the reconsideration or appeal results in a reversal of the earlier determination, the new determination shall supersede the earlier determination and shall be deemed to have been made as of the date of the earlier determination. The authority of the Commission to establish procedures and the right of appeal by the officer or employee to the Commission shall not apply to determinations of acceptable level of competence made by the Librarian of Congress."

27166

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

October 22, 1965

POSTAL FIELD SERVICE EMPLOYEES

Sec. 4. (a) Section 3542(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) There is established a basic compensation schedule for positions in the postal field service which shall be known as the Postal Field Service Schedule and for which

the symbol shall be 'PFS'. Except as provided in sections 3543 and 3544 of this title, basic compensation shall be paid to all employees in accordance with such schedule.

"POSTAL FIELD SERVICE SCHEDULE

"PFS	Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	\$4,086	\$4,221	\$4,356	\$4,491	\$4,626	\$4,761	\$4,896	\$5,031	\$5,166	\$5,301	\$5,436	\$5,571
2	4,424	4,569	4,714	4,859	5,004	5,149	5,294	5,439	5,584	5,729	5,874	6,019
3	4,762	4,911	5,060	5,209	5,358	5,507	5,656	5,805	5,954	6,103	6,252	6,401
4	5,101	5,252	5,403	5,554	5,705	5,856	6,007	6,158	6,309	6,460	6,611	6,762
5	5,440	5,592	5,744	5,896	6,048	6,200	6,352	6,504	6,656	6,808	6,960	7,112
6	5,779	5,932	6,084	6,236	6,388	6,540	6,692	6,844	6,996	7,148	7,300	7,452
7	6,118	6,271	6,423	6,575	6,727	6,879	7,031	7,183	7,335	7,487	7,639	7,791
8	6,457	6,610	6,762	6,914	7,066	7,218	7,370	7,522	7,674	7,826	7,978	8,130
9	6,796	6,949	7,101	7,253	7,405	7,557	7,709	7,861	8,013	8,165	8,317	8,469
10	7,135	7,288	7,440	7,592	7,744	7,896	8,048	8,200	8,352	8,504	8,656	8,808
11	7,474	7,627	7,779	7,931	8,083	8,235	8,387	8,539	8,691	8,843	8,995	9,147
12	7,813	7,966	8,118	8,270	8,422	8,574	8,726	8,878	9,030	9,182	9,334	9,486
13	8,152	8,305	8,457	8,609	8,761	8,913	9,065	9,217	9,369	9,521	9,673	9,825
14	8,491	8,644	8,796	8,948	9,100	9,252	9,404	9,556	9,708	9,860	10,012	10,164
15	8,830	8,983	9,135	9,287	9,439	9,591	9,743	9,895	10,047	10,199	10,351	10,503
16	9,169	9,322	9,474	9,626	9,778	9,930	10,082	10,234	10,386	10,538	10,690	10,842
17	9,508	9,661	9,813	9,965	10,117	10,269	10,421	10,573	10,725	10,877	11,029	11,181
18	9,847	9,999	10,151	10,303	10,455	10,607	10,759	10,911	11,063	11,215	11,367	11,519
19	10,186	10,338	10,490	10,642	10,794	10,946	11,098	11,250	11,402	11,554	11,706	11,858
20	10,525	10,677	10,829	10,981	11,133	11,285	11,437	11,589	11,741	11,893	12,045	12,197

(b) Section 3543(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) There is established a basic compensation schedule which shall be known as the Rural Carrier Schedule and for which the symbol shall be 'RCS'. Compensation shall

be paid to rural carriers in accordance with this schedule.

"RURAL CARRIER SCHEDULE

	Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Carrier in rural delivery service: Fixed compensation per annum	\$2,301	\$2,412	\$2,523	\$2,634	\$2,745	\$2,856	\$2,967	\$3,078	\$3,189	\$3,300	\$3,411	\$3,522
Compensation per mile per annum for each mile up to 30 miles of route	86	88	90	92	94	96	98	100	102	104	106	108
For each mile of route over 30 miles	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25

(c) Section 3544(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) There is established a basic compensation schedule which shall be known as the Fourth Class Office Schedule and for which the symbol shall be 'FOS' for postmasters in post offices of the fourth class which is based on the revenue units of the post office for the

preceding fiscal year. Basic compensation shall be paid to postmasters in post offices of the fourth class in accordance with this schedule.

"FOURTH CLASS OFFICE SCHEDULE

"Revenue units	Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
30 but fewer than 36	\$3,006	\$4,035	\$4,164	\$4,293	\$4,422	\$4,551	\$4,680	\$4,809	\$4,938	\$5,067	\$5,196	\$5,325
24 but fewer than 30	3,610	3,720	3,848	3,967	4,086	4,205	4,324	4,443	4,562	4,681	4,800	4,919
18 but fewer than 24	2,978	3,079	3,180	3,281	3,382	3,483	3,584	3,685	3,786	3,887	3,988	4,089
12 but fewer than 18	2,339	2,415	2,491	2,567	2,643	2,719	2,795	2,871	2,947	3,023	3,099	3,175
6 but fewer than 12	1,887	1,741	1,796	1,849	1,903	1,957	2,011	2,065	2,119	2,173	2,227	2,281
Fewer than 6	1,399	1,403	1,447	1,491	1,535	1,579	1,623	1,667	1,711	1,755	1,799	1,843

(d) The basic compensation of each employee subject to the Postal Field Service Schedule, the Rural Carrier Schedule, or the Fourth Class Office Schedule immediately prior to the effective date of this section shall be determined as follows:

POSTAL SERVICE OVERTIME AND HOLIDAY COMPENSATION

Sec. 5. (a) Section 3571 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Each employee shall be assigned to the same numerical step for his position which he had attained immediately prior to such effective date. If changes in levels or steps would otherwise occur on such effective date without regard to enactment of this Act, such changes shall be deemed to have occurred prior to conversion.

"(2) If the existing basic compensation is greater than the rate to which the employee is converted under paragraph (1) of this subsection, the employee shall be placed in the lowest step which exceeds his basic compensation. If the existing basic compensation exceeds the maximum step of his position, his existing basic compensation shall be established as his basic compensation.

"(a) A basic workweek is established for all postal field service employees consisting of five eight-hour days. The work schedule of employees shall be regulated so that the eight hours of service does not extend over a longer period than ten consecutive hours.

"(b) The Postmaster General shall establish work schedules in advance for annual rate regular employees consisting of five eight-hour days in each week.

"(c) Except for emergencies as determined by the Postmaster General, the hours of service of any employee shall not extend over a longer period than twelve consecutive hours, and no employee may be required to work more than twelve hours in one day.

"(d) To the maximum extent practicable,

senior regular employees shall be assigned to a basic workweek Monday through Friday, inclusive, except for those who express a preference for another basic workweek."

(b) Section 3573 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 3573. Compensatory time, overtime, and holidays

"(a) In emergencies or if the needs of the service require, the Postmaster General may require employees to perform overtime work or to work on holidays. Overtime work is any work officially ordered or approved which is performed by—

"(1) an annual rate regular employee in excess of his regular work schedule,

"(2) an hourly rate regular employee in excess of eight hours in a day or forty hours in a week, and

"(3) a substitute employee in excess of forty hours in a week.

The Postmaster General shall determine the

October 22, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

27167

day and week used in computing overtime work.

"(b) For each hour of overtime work the Postmaster General shall compensate an employee in the 'PFS' Schedule as follows:

"(1) He shall pay each employee in or below salary level PFS-7 compensation at the rate of 150 per centum of the hourly rate of basic compensation for his level and step computed by dividing the scheduled annual rate of basic compensation by two thousand and eighty.

"(2) He shall grant each employee in or above salary level PFS-8 compensatory time equal to the overtime worked, or in his discretion in lieu thereof pay such employee compensation at the rate of 150 per centum of the hourly rate of basic compensation of the employee or of the hourly rate of the basic compensation for the highest step of salary level PFS-7, whichever is the lesser.

"(c) For officially ordered or approved time worked on a day referred to as a holiday in the Act of December 26, 1941 (55 Stat. 362; 5 U.S.C. 87b), or on a day designated by Executive order as a holiday for Federal employees, under regulations, prescribed by the Postmaster General, an employee in the PFS schedule shall receive extra compensation, in addition to any other compensation provided for by law, as follows:

"(1) Each regular employee in or below salary level PFS-7 shall be paid extra compensation at the rate of 100 per centum of the hourly rate of basic compensation for his level and step computed by dividing the scheduled annual rate of basic compensation by two thousand and eighty.

"(2) Each regular employee in or above salary level PFS-8 shall be granted compensatory time in an amount equal to the time worked on such holiday within thirty working days thereafter or, in the discretion of the Postmaster General, in lieu thereof shall be paid extra compensation for the time so worked at the rate of 100 per centum of the hourly rate of basic compensation for his level and step computed by dividing the scheduled annual rate of basic compensation by two thousand and eighty.

"(3) For work performed on Christmas Day (A) each regular employee shall be paid extra compensation at the rate of 150 per centum of the hourly rate of basic compensation for his level and step, computed by dividing the scheduled annual rate of basic compensation by two thousand and eighty, and (B) each substitute employee shall be paid extra compensation at the rate of 50 per centum of the hourly rate of basic compensation for his level and step.

"(d) The Postmaster General shall establish conditions for the use of compensatory time earned and the payment of compensation for unused compensatory time.

"(e) Each regular employee whose regular work schedule includes an eight-hour period of service any part of which is within the period commencing at midnight Saturday and ending at midnight Sunday shall be paid extra compensation at the rate of 25 per centum of his hourly rate of basic compensation for each hour of work performed during that eight-hour period of service.

"(f) If an employee is entitled under this section to unused compensatory time at the time of his death, the Postmaster General shall pay at the rate prescribed in this section, but not less than a sum equal to the employee's hourly basic compensation, for each hour of such unused compensatory time to the person or persons surviving at the date of such employee's death. Such payment shall be made in the order of pre-

cedence prescribed in the first section of the Act of August 3, 1950 (5 U.S.C. 61f), and shall be a bar to recovery by any other persons of amounts so paid.

"(g) Notwithstanding any provision of this section other than subsection (f), no employee shall be paid overtime or extra compensation for a pay period which when added to his basic compensation for the pay period exceeds one twenty-sixth of the annual rate of basic compensation for the highest step of salary level PFS-17.

"(h) For the purposes of this section and section 3571 of this title—

"(1) 'Annual rate regular employee' means an employee for whom the Postmaster General has established a regular work schedule consisting of five eight-hour days in accordance with section 3571 of this title.

"(2) 'Hourly rate regular employee' means an employee for whom the Postmaster General has established a regular work schedule consisting of not more than forty hours a week.

"(3) 'Substitute employee' means an employee for whom the Postmaster General has not established a regular work schedule."

(c) Section 3575 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 3575. Exemptions

"(a) Sections 3571, 3573 and 3574 of this title do not apply to postmasters, rural carriers, postal inspectors, and employees in salary level PFS-15 and above.

"(b) Sections 3571 and 3573 of this title do not apply to employees referred to in section 3581 of this title.

"(c) Sections 3571 (a), (b), and (d), and 3573 (e) of this title do not apply to substitute employees.

"(d) Section 3571 (b) of this title does not apply to hourly rate regular employees."

POSTAL EMPLOYEES RELOCATION EXPENSES

Sec. 6. (a) That part of chapter 41 of title 39, United States Code, which precedes the center heading "Special Classes of Employees" and section 3111 thereof, is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 3107. Postal employees relocation expenses

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, each employee in the postal field service who is transferred or relocated from one official station to another shall, under regulations promulgated by the Postmaster General, be granted the following allowances and expenses:

"(1) Per diem allowance, in lieu of subsistence expenses, for each member of his immediate family while en route between his old and new official stations, not in excess of the maximum per diem rates prescribed by or pursuant to law for employees of the Federal Government.

"(2) Subsistence expenses of the employee and each member of his immediate family for a period of not to exceed thirty days while occupying temporary quarters at the place of his new official duty station, but not in excess of the maximum per diem rates prescribed by or pursuant to law for employees of the Federal Government.

"(3) Five days of leave with pay which shall not be charged to any other leave to which he is entitled under existing law."

(b) That part of the table of contents of such chapter 41 under the heading "Employees Generally" is amended by inserting "3107. Postal employees relocation expenses." immediately below

"3106. Special compensation rules."

EMPLOYEES IN THE DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Sec. 7. Section 4107 of title 38, United States Code, relating to grades and pay scales for certain positions within the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 4107. Grades and pay scales

"(a) The per annum full-pay scale or ranges for positions provided in section 4103 of this title, other than Chief Medical Director and Deputy Chief Medical Director, shall be as follows:

"SECTION 4103 SCHEDULE

"Assistant Chief Medical Director, \$25,382.

"Medical Director, \$22,217 minimum to \$25,325 maximum.

"Director of Nursing Service, \$17,055 minimum to \$22,365 maximum.

"Director of Chaplain Service, \$17,055 minimum to \$22,365 maximum.

"Chief Pharmacist, \$17,055 minimum to \$22,365 maximum.

"Chief Dietitian, \$17,055 minimum to \$22,365 maximum.

"(b) (1) The grades and per annum full-pay ranges for positions provided in paragraph (1) of section 4104 of this title shall be as follows:

"PHYSICIAN AND DENTIST SCHEDULE

"Director grade, \$19,619 minimum to \$25,043 maximum.

"Executive grade, \$18,291 minimum to \$24,024 maximum.

"Chief grade, \$17,055 minimum to \$22,365 maximum.

"Senior grade, \$14,680 minimum to \$19,252 maximum.

"Intermediate grade, \$12,510 minimum to \$16,425 maximum.

"Full grade, \$10,619 minimum to \$13,931 maximum.

"Associate grade, \$8,961 minimum to \$11,715 maximum.

"NURSE SCHEDULE

"Assistant Director grade, \$14,680 minimum to \$19,252 maximum.

"Chief grade, \$12,510 minimum to \$16,425 maximum.

"Senior grade, \$10,619 minimum to \$13,931 maximum.

"Intermediate grade, \$8,961 minimum to \$11,715 maximum.

"Full grade, \$7,479 minimum to \$9,765 maximum.

"Associate grade, \$6,540 minimum to \$8,502 maximum.

"Junior grade, \$5,702 minimum to \$7,430 maximum.

"(2) No person may hold the director grade unless he is serving as a director of a hospital, domiciliary, center, or outpatient clinic (independent). No person may hold the executive grade unless he holds the position of chief of staff at a hospital, center, or outpatient clinic (independent), or the position of clinic director at an outpatient clinic, or comparable position."

FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS; STAFF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

Sec. 8. (a) The fourth sentence of section 412 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 867), is amended to read as follows: "The per annum salaries of Foreign Service officers within each of the other classes shall be as follows:

Class 1	\$23,465	\$24,264	\$25,282					
Class 2	18,964	19,612	20,270	\$20,928	\$21,586	\$22,244	\$22,902	
Class 3	15,965	16,679	16,463	15,927	17,581	18,066	18,569	
Class 4	12,810	12,946	13,280	13,815	14,260	14,665	15,120	
Class 5	10,303	10,561	11,019	11,377	11,782	12,063	12,451	
Class 6	8,594	8,869	9,184	9,479	9,774	10,069	10,364	
Class 7	7,262	7,306	7,740	7,994	8,238	8,482	8,726	
Class 8	6,269	6,476	6,883	6,960	7,087	7,304	7,511	

(b) The second sentence of subsection (a) of section 415 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 870(a)) is amended to read as follows: "The per annua salaries of such staff officers and employees within each class shall be as follows:

Class 1	\$15,305	\$15,929	\$16,463	\$16,997	\$17,521	\$18,055	\$18,589	\$19,133	\$19,667	\$20,201
Class 2	12,810	12,946	13,280	13,815	14,260	14,665	15,120	15,555	15,990	16,425
Class 3	10,303	10,661	11,019	11,377	11,735	12,093	12,451	12,809	13,167	13,525
Class 4	8,594	8,889	9,184	9,479	9,774	10,069	10,364	10,659	10,954	11,249
Class 5	7,749	8,013	8,277	8,541	8,805	9,069	9,333	9,597	9,861	10,125
Class 6	6,998	7,231	7,464	7,697	7,930	8,163	8,396	8,629	8,862	9,095
Class 7	6,428	6,640	6,852	7,064	7,276	7,488	7,700	7,912	8,124	8,336
Class 8	5,658	5,850	6,072	6,264	6,456	6,648	6,840	7,032	7,224	7,416
Class 9	5,190	5,361	5,532	5,703	5,874	6,045	6,216	6,387	6,558	6,729
Class 10	4,611	4,797	4,953	5,109	5,265	5,421	5,577	5,733	5,889	6,045

(c) Foreign Service officers, Reserve officers, and Foreign Service staff officers and employees who are entitled to receive basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at one of the rates provided by section 412 or 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 shall receive basic compensation, on and after such effective date, at the rate of their class determined to be appropriate by the Secretary of State.

SEVERANCE PAY

Sec. 9. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, this section applies to each civilian officer or employee in or under—

- (1) the executive branch of the Government of the United States, including each corporation wholly owned or controlled by the United States;
- (2) the Library of Congress;
- (3) the Government Printing Office;
- (4) the General Accounting Office; or
- (5) the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

This section also applies to person employed by the county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590h(b)), and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to prescribe and issue such regulations as may be necessary to provide a means of effecting the application and operations of the provisions of this section with respect to such persons.

(b) This section does not apply to—

- (1) an officer or employee whose rate of basic compensation is fixed at a rate provided for one of the levels of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule or is in excess of the highest rate of grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended;
- (2) an officer or employees serving under an appointment with a definite time limitation, except one so appointed for full-time employment, without a break in service or after a separation of three days or less, following service under an appointment without time limitation;
- (3) an alien employee who occupies a position outside the several States, the District of Columbia, and the Canal Zone;
- (4) an officer or employee who is subject to the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, or any other retirement law or retirement system applicable to Federal officers or employees or members of the uniformed services, and who, at the time of separation from the service, has fulfilled the requirements for immediate annuity under any such law or system;
- (5) an officer or employee who, at the time of separation from the service, is receiving compensation under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended, except one receiving this compensation concurrently with salary or on account of the death of another person;

(6) an officer or employee who, at the time of separation from the service, is entitled to receive other severance pay from the Government;

(7) officers and employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority; and

(8) such other officers or employees as may be excluded by rules and regulations of the President or of such officer or agency as he may designate.

(c) An officer or employee to whom this section applies who is involuntarily separated from the service, on or after the effective date of this section, not by removal for cause; on charges of misconduct, delinquency, or inefficiency, shall, under rules and regulations prescribed by the President or such officer or agency as he may designate, be paid severance pay in regular pay periods by the department, independent establishment, corporation, or other governmental unit, from which separated.

(d) Severance pay shall consist of two elements, a basic severance allowance and an age adjustment allowance. The basic severance allowance shall be computed on the basis of one week's basic compensation at the rate received immediately before separation on each year of civilian service up to and including ten years for which severance pay has not been received under this or any other authority and two weeks' basic compensation at such rate for each year of civilian service beyond ten years for which severance pay has not been received under this or any other authority. The age adjustment allowance shall be computed on the basis of 10 per centum of the total basic severance allowance for each year by which the age of the recipient exceeds forty years at the time of separation. Total severance pay received under this section shall not exceed one year's pay at the rate received immediately before separation.

(e) An officer or employee may be paid severance pay only after having been employed currently for a continuous period of at least twelve months.

(f) If an officer or employee is reemployed by the Federal Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia before the expiration of the period covered by payments of severance pay, the payments shall be discontinued beginning with the date of reemployment and the service represented by the unexpired portion of the period shall be credited to the officer or employee for use in any subsequent computations of severance pay. For the purposes of subsection (e), reemployment which causes severance pay to be discontinued shall be considered as employment continuous with that serving as the basis for the severance pay.

(g) If the officer or employee dies before the expiration of the period covered by payments of severance pay, the payments of severance pay with respect to such officer or employee shall be continued as if such officer

or employee were living and shall be paid on a pay period basis to the survivor or survivors of such officer or employee in accordance with the first section of the Act of August 3, 1950 (5 U.S.C. 81f).

(h) Severance pay under this section shall not be a basis for payment, nor be included in the basis for computation, of any other type of Federal or District of Columbia Government benefits and, any period covered by severance pay shall not be regarded as a period of Federal or District of Columbia Government service or employment.

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION COUNTY COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

Sec. 10. The rates of compensation of persons employed by the county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590h(b)) shall be increased by amounts equal, as nearly as may be practicable, to the increases provided by section 2(a) of this Act for corresponding rates of compensation.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Sec. 11. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this section, each officer or employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government, whose rate of compensation is increased by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946, shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of 3.6 per centum of his gross rate of compensation (basic compensation plus additional compensation authorized by law).

(b) The total annual compensation in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this section of each officer or employee of the House of Representatives, whose compensation is disbursed by the Clerk of the House and is not increased by reason of any other provision of this section, shall be increased by an amount which is equal to the amount of the increase provided by subsection (a) of this section; except that this section shall not apply to the compensation of student congressional interns authorized by H. Res. 416 of the Eighty-ninth Congress.

(c) The rates of compensation of employees of the House of Representatives whose compensation is fixed by the House Employees Schedule under the House Employees Position Classification Act (78 Stat. 1079; Public Law 88-652; 2 U.S.C. 291-303) shall be increased by amounts equal, as nearly as may be practicable, to the increases provided by subsection (a) of this section; except, that this section shall not apply to the compensation of those employees whose compensation is fixed by the House Wage Schedule of such Act.

(d) The additional compensation provided by this section shall be considered a part of basic compensation for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2251 and the following).

(e) Section 601(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (2 U.S.C. 31), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall be at the rate of \$30,000 per annum each. The compensation of the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall be at the rate of \$43,000 per annum. The compensation of the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader of the Senate and the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives shall be at the rate of \$35,000 per annum each."

(f) The basic compensation of each employee in the office of a Senator is hereby adjusted, effective on the first day of the month following the date of enactment of this Act, to the lowest multiple of \$60 which will provide a gross rate of compensation not less than the gross rate such employee was receiving immediately prior thereto, except that the foregoing provisions of this subsection shall not apply in the case of any employee if on or before the fifteenth day

October 22, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

27169

following the date of enactment of this Act, the Senator by whom such employee is employed notifies the disbursing office of the Senate in writing that he does not wish such provisions to apply to such employee. No employee whose basic compensation is adjusted under this subsection shall receive any additional compensation under subsection (a) for any period prior to the effective date of such adjustment during which such employee was employed in the office of the Senator by whom he is employed on the first day of the month following the enactment of this Act. No additional compensation shall be paid to any person under subsection (a) for any period prior to the first day of the month following the date of enactment of this Act during which such person was employed in the office of a Senator (other than a Senator by whom he is employed on such day) unless on or before the fifteenth day following the date of enactment of this Act such Senator notifies the disbursing office of the Senate in writing that he wishes such employee to receive such additional compensation for such period. In any case in which, at the expiration of the time within which a Senator may give notice under this section, such Senator is deceased, such notice shall be deemed to have been given.

(g) Notwithstanding the provision referred to in subsection (h), the rates of gross compensation of the Secretary for the Majority of the Senate, the Secretary for the Minority of the Senate, the Chief Reporter of Debates of the Senate, the Parliamentarian of the Senate, the Senior Counsel in the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate, the Chief Clerk of the Senate, the Chaplain of the Senate, and the Postmaster and Assistant Postmaster of the Senate are hereby increased by 3.6 per centum.

(h) The paragraph imposing limitations on basic and gross compensation of officers and employees of the Senate appearing under the heading "SENATE" in the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956, as amended (74 Stat. 304; Public Law 86-568), is amended by striking out "\$22,945" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$23,770".

(i) The limitation on gross rate per hour per person provided by applicable law on the effective date of this section with respect to the folding of speeches and pamphlets for the Senate is hereby increased by 3.6 per centum. The amount of such increase shall be computed to the nearest cent, counting one-half cent and over as a whole cent. The provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall not apply to employees whose compensation is subject to such limitation.

## FEDERAL JUDICIAL SALARIES

SEC. 12. (a) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in or under the judicial branch of the Government whose rates of compensation are fixed by or pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision a of section 62 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 102(a)(2)), section 3656 of title 18, United States Code, the third sentence of section 603, sections 671 to 675, inclusive, or section 604(a)(5), of title 28, United States Code, insofar as the latter section applies to graded positions, are hereby increased by amounts reflecting the respective applicable increases provided by section 2(a) of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees holding ungraded positions and whose salaries are fixed pursuant to such section 604(a)(5) may be increased by the amounts reflecting the respective applicable increases provided by section 2(a) of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) The limitations provided by applicable law on the effective date of this section with respect to the aggregate salaries payable to secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges are hereby increased by amounts which reflect the respective applicable increases provided by section 2(a) of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(c) Section 753(e) of title 28, United States Code (relating to the compensation of court reporters for district courts), is amended by striking out the existing salary limitation contained therein and inserting a new limitation which reflects the respective applicable increases provided by section 2(a) of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

## INCREASED UNIFORM ALLOWANCE

SEC. 13. The Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act, as amended (68 Stat. 1114; 5 U.S.C. 2131), is amended by striking out "\$100" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "\$125".

## MAXIMUM SALARY INCREASE LIMITATION

SEC. 14. Except as otherwise provided in section 11(e), no rate of salary shall be increased, by reason of the enactment of this title, to an amount in excess of the salary rate now or hereafter in effect for Level V of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule.

## ADJUSTMENT OF SALARY RATES FIXED BY ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION

SEC. 15. (a) The rates of basic compensation of assistant United States attorneys whose basic salaries are fixed pursuant to section 508 of title 28, United States Code, shall be increased by 3.6 per centum effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after October 1, 1965.

(b) Notwithstanding section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government and of the municipal government of the District of Columbia whose rates of compensation are fixed by administrative action pursuant to law and are not otherwise increased by this Act are hereby authorized to be increased effective on or after the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after October 1, 1965, by amounts not to exceed the increases provided by this Act for corresponding rates of compensation in the appropriate schedule or scale of pay.

(c) Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to authorize any increase in the rates of compensation of officers and employees whose rates of compensation are fixed and adjusted from time to time as nearly as is consistent with the public interest in accordance with prevailing rates or practices.

(d) Nothing contained in this section shall affect the authority contained in any law pursuant to which rates of compensation may be fixed by administrative action.

## TRAVEL ON OFFICIAL DUTY TIME

SEC. 16. Section 204 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended (68 Stat. 1110; 5 U.S.C. 912b), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "To the maximum extent practicable, the head of any department, independent establishment, or agency, including Government-owned or controlled corporations, or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, or the head of any legislative or judicial agency to which this title applies, shall schedule the time to be sent by an officer or employee in a travel status away from his official duty station within the regularly scheduled workweek of such officer or employee."

## EFFECTIVE DATES

SEC. 17. This title shall become effective as follows:

(1) This section and sections 1, 9, 13, 15, 16, and 18, and section 3107(3) of title 39, United States Code, as contained in the amendment made by section 6(a) of this Act, shall become effective on the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) Section 5 shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) Sections 2, 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, and 14 shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after October 1, 1965.

(4) Section 3 shall become effective on the ninetieth day following the date of enactment of this Act.

(5) Section 6(b), and section 3107 (1) and (2) of title 39, United States Code, as contained in the amendment made by section 6(a) of this Act, shall become effective as of July 1, 1965.

(6) For the purpose of determining the amount of insurance for which an individual is eligible under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, all changes in rates of compensation or salary which result from the enactment of this Act shall be held and considered to be effective as of the date of such enactment.

## PAYMENT OF RETROACTIVE SALARY

SEC. 18. (a) Retroactive compensation of salary shall be paid by reason of this Act only in the case of an individual in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this Act, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid (1) to an officer or employee who retired during the period beginning on the effective date prescribed by section 17(3) and ending on the date of enactment of this Act for services rendered during such period and (2) in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 3, 1950 (Public Law 836, Eighty-first Congress), as amended (5 U.S.C. 61f-61k), for services rendered during the period beginning on the effective date prescribed by section 17(3) and ending on the date of enactment of this Act by an officer or employee who dies during such period. Such retroactive compensation or salary shall not be considered as basic salary for the purpose of the Civil Service Retirement Act in the case of any such retired or deceased officer or employee.

(b) For the purposes of this section, service in the Armed Forces of the United States, in the case of an individual relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or discharged from hospitalization following such training and service, shall include the period provided by law for the mandatory restoration of such individual to a position in or under the Federal Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, after careful consideration of the proposals originally submitted to the Congress by the President on Federal salary legislation and the House-passed bill, H.R. 10281, has reported to the Senate and recommends enactment of its amendment to H.R. 10281, which varies considerably from the President's proposals and the House-passed bill.

The committee amendment does not grant to Federal employees all they desire or will eventually get

27170

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

October 22, 1965

when it is possible to make the full comparability policy of the 1962 Federal Salary Reform Act a reality. But it is a bill which gives a 3.6-percent, across-the-board increase to all Federal civilian employees—thus making the salaries paid to the lowest grades and levels of Government employees comparable with the salaries paid to their counterparts in private enterprise based on the latest available statistics and preventing the gap in the higher levels from widening further.

The amount of the increase—3.6 percent—goes beyond what the President originally recommended in salary and fringe benefits, but it is carefully designed to remain within the President's wage-price guideposts which have been so effective in maintaining price stability in this country and which have been accepted voluntarily by the leaders of private employee organizations as the basis for settlement of wage negotiations.

The committee amendment does not contain the procedural reforms recommended by the President, nor the automatic second-stage increases next year contained in the House-passed bill and implied in the President's original proposals. But it does give to Federal employees this year a substantial pay increase—certainly in terms of increase in employee productivity—and it reserves to the Congress and to the President the right to consider additional salary legislation next year with the latest figures on private enterprise salaries in hand and with the benefit of firm knowledge of the state of our economy and the requirements of our continuing struggle in Vietnam.

Above all, Mr. President, the bill recommended by the committee is a good bill. It is a responsible bill. It is an attainable bill. It is a noninflationary bill that will not be vetoed.

Before discussing in greater detail the committee's reasons for eliminating the second stage automatic increase contained in the House-passed bill and reducing the 4 percent raise to 3.6, I want to point out the liberalizations in fringe benefits for employees which, although not as great as those in the House-passed bill, represents a change in the Government's official attitude toward fringe benefits and will put into the pockets of Government employees benefits long overdue.

**The committee amendment—**

Liberalizes the overtime pay for postal employees by paying them premium pay for work in excess of 40 hours a week at the rate of 150 percent of their basic pay;

Provides premium pay for Sunday work at the rate of 125 percent of basic compensation where Sunday is one of the employee's 5 regular workdays;

Makes mandatory the payment of premium pay for work on official holidays for postal employees in PFS-7 and below;

Provides special relocation expenses for postal employees who have been forced to move as a result of the modernization of postal operations, such as the introduction of the ZIP code and sectional center concepts;

Increases the uniform allowance for Federal employees by 25 percent from the current \$100 a year to \$125 a year;

Authorizes payment for the first time of severance pay to Federal employees who through no fault of their own and because of the dislocations resulting from technological innovations and improved governmental efficiency, have lost their jobs;

Amends the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962 to give employees a right to appeal to the Civil Service Commission from adverse determinations of acceptable levels of competence;

Establishes a policy that to the maximum extent practicable Government employees' travel should be scheduled during the regular workweek; and

Gives preference to senior postal employees for a Monday through Friday work schedule.

One of the major differences between the House-passed bill and the committee amendment is the elimination of the automatic second-stage increase in Federal salaries in October 1966. The amount of the increase in the House bill would have depended upon evidence available to the Bureau of Labor Statistics at that time, but it was indicated that closing one-half of the comparability gap plus granting all of the anticipated 1965-66 percentage increase in private enterprise would have resulted in increases from perhaps 3 percent in the lower grades to as much as 8 percent in the higher grades. The estimated cost of the increase was \$800 million.

The automatic increase had the advantages of being based on statistical evidence of rates being paid in the private sector and partially fulfilling the policy of comparability enacted in 1962. It had the disadvantages of anticipating differences in private and public pay which cannot be ascertained in advance and might not be ascertainable in October, 1966, and committing public funds in advance during a period when our needs in Vietnam are uncertain and when caution should be exercised in maintaining the delicate balance required to keep our economy from overheating or cooling off.

The committee has not concluded that Congress is unable to enact fair and equitable salary legislation. Indeed, by adhering to wage-price guide lines for 1965, the committee is deeply committed to undertake consideration of salary legislation early in the second session of the 89th Congress. The committee will make every effort to accelerate the achievement of comparability and reduce the 15 to 18-month lag which occurs between the date the Bureau of Labor Statistics report is available and the time Congress usually enacts salary legislation.

Before the end of calendar year 1965, the committee will have available the annual report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics on salary rates paid in private enterprise in the spring of 1965. The committee will give prompt consideration to this report at the earliest possible time next year. Congress has in the past few years enacted progressive and far-reaching compensation legislation. Next year

and in the years to follow Congress will strive to make the policy of the 1962 act a reality in as short a time period as possible.

The other major difference between the House-passed bill and the committee amendment is the reduction of the increase from 4 to 3.6 percent. The reduction was based, not on the amount of money entailed, but on the President's strong recommendation and the committee's agreement that salary increases for Federal employees in 1965 should be within the wage-price guideposts which have been used in arriving at equitable wage settlements in private enterprise during the past few years.

The Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, which established comparability with private enterprise salaries as the Government's basic compensation policy, was a landmark in Federal salary legislation. The 1962 salary increases, in two stages which averaged more than 10 percent for all employees—and substantially more in the upper grades where the gap between private employment and Federal employment was greatest—did much to attain comparable rates. The 1964 salary legislation, which increased executive rates by about 30 percent and provided further adjustments for all employees averaging more than 4 percent, was another significant step toward attaining comparability.

No one believed that this goal would be easily or quickly achieved. President John F. Kennedy, in his proposals to the 87th Congress, suggested a three-staged increase in an effort to ease the budgetary implications of salary increases. President Johnson in 1965 proposed a 3-percent increase in an effort to close the gap of comparability at the lower levels of employment, and to keep pace with rising costs in annual salary increases at the upper levels.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from New York. I should like first to take up the amendments which I have sent to the desk, and ask that they be considered and agreed to en bloc.

On page 66, in respect to the maximum increase limitation, the language should be changed to read: "Act" instead of "title" and on page 68, where it sets out the effective dates in this act, the word should be "Act" rather than "title."

The second amendment is also technical and clarifying. It would provide for payment of retroactive compensation to employees who have been promoted between the effective date of this act, October 1, 1965, and the date of enactment of the act, which will probably be some time in the next week. Any employee who is promoted to a higher grade during that short period of time would be paid retroactive compensation at the rate of pay he was receiving during the period from the effective date of the act to the date of his promotion, and at the rate of pay he received after promotion from the date of his promotion until the date of the enactment of this act.

In other words, this amendment recognizes the rate of pay the employee re-

October 22, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

27171

ceived after promotion for this brief period of time. Inclusion of this provision in the legislation may thus prevent some employees, who have received promotions in the interim, from losing some of their pay to which they are entitled, and which they should receive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 66, line 11, in the committee amendment, strike out "title" and substitute "Act". On page 68, line 5, strike out "title" and substitute "Act".

And on page 41, after line 23, insert the following:

(5) If the officer or employee, at any time during the period beginning on the effective date of this section and ending on the date of enactment of this Act, was promoted from one grade under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to another such grade at a rate which is above the minimum rate thereof, his rate of basic compensation shall be adjusted retroactively from the effective date of this section to the date on which he was so promoted, on the basis of the rate which he was receiving during the period from such effective date to the date of such promotion and, from the date of such promotion, on the basis of the rate for that step of the appropriate grade of the General Schedule contained in this section which corresponds numerically to the step of the grade of the General Schedule for such officer or employee which was in effect (without regard to this Act) at the time of such promotion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing, en bloc, to the amendments of the Senator from Oklahoma to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendments to the amendment were agreed to.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of asking for the yeas and nays on the pending legislation?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Senator probably knows that we operate the biggest post office in the country in New York, and that thousands of postal workers are concerned. The Senator knows, too, how hard they have fought through the years for the idea of comparability, and how disappointed they are now that the increase which is contemplated being granted by Congress is not based, as the Senator has frankly and typically stated, on complete comparability, but on the overall economic situation in the country.

I feel, notwithstanding my deep concern and deep advocacy of what postal workers wish and what the law promises them in terms of its purposes, that undoubtedly considering the fact that this is near the end of a session, the committee has done what it could legitimately do, to consider that the national economy should observe the benefit and the impact of the guidelines. I feel that there is a rather special case to be made for justice to the postal workers, and I am glad to see the statement in the

committee report, on page 4, that next year Congress will endeavor to make a reality of the comparability concept.

Knowing the Senator as well as I do, I am sure that he does not even have to give me any assurance that he will—

Mr. MONRONEY. Let me say to the Senator from New York that we intend to support the policy and to move closer toward it. I am afraid, however, that there will still be some gaps, because of the wide disparity in the grades under the comparability level. But it is our goal to try to close those gaps as fast as budgetarily possible.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to the Senator for that assurance. Let me emphasize the positive point that the severance-pay provision in section 9 of the bill is a most extraordinarily important one, especially in the closing of any governmental installation. For example, Navy yard workers in New York would naturally hope for retroactivity. I believe that retroactivity would have been just. Again, I appreciate the need for empirical judgment and the fact that there is a provision for severance pay which involves \$50 million, which is itself, notwithstanding that it falls short of the mark in its effective date, an important point, and I express my gratitude to the committee for it. It will be of substantial assistance to many workers affected by installation closings.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Postal workers, especially those with modest seniority rights, are deeply concerned about section 3571 (b), which vests in the Postmaster General the power to establish work schedules in advance for annual-rate regular employees consisting of five 8-hour days in each week. They have feared that this would result in the Postmaster General, possibly, in his own judgment—whatever that may be—imposing upon regular employees work on Sunday. They came to me with the idea of an amendment which would exclude Sunday from this provision.

I have discussed this matter with the distinguished chairman, especially in view of the attitude of the committee, which is set forth on pages 5 and 6 of the report, in which the committee states that it "has encouraged the Department to give preference to the maximum extent practicable to senior regular employees for a basic workweek of Monday through Friday."

I ask the Senator this question: If we left it solely at that, without any color, without any feeling of emphasis on the part of the committee for the maximum extent practicable—and the chairman has been in the Senate a long time, and he knows that the administrator can forget about it and do what he pleases—I do not say that he is going to do wrong, but he is going to do pretty much what he pleases—I believe it would be extremely helpful if the chairman of the committee, as a part of the legislative record, would give us some feeling as to two points: one, the basic feeling of the committee, which I understand from him

is that they will look with disfavor upon the inclusion of Sundays, unless the employee himself wishes it, under the continuous workweek discretion given under the bill to the Postmaster General; and second, and equally important, it seems to me, that the committee will exercise its important oversight jurisdiction to see that the spirit in which it has written this provision, to give the Postmaster General more flexibility than the worker, is carried out in the way that the committee desires, consistent with its view on pages 5 and 6 of the report.

Mr. MONRONEY. Let me refer the Senator from New York to page 46 of the bill, on line 4.

The language reads:

To the maximum extent practicable, senior regular employees shall be assigned to a basic workweek Monday through Friday, inclusive, except for those who express a preference for another basic work week.

This is to emphasize that the assignment of work as a matter of right will go to those who have seniority rights and will be entitled to those days which generally are considered choice in selection. It was impossible, as we had hearings and studied the situation, to make Saturdays and Sundays volunteer days on which only those regular clerks who would offer to serve on those two important days would work. It is true that only a small crew works on those days, but their work is so important to the efficient movement of the mail on a 7-day basis that, if we left the Post Office Department without the right to assign, on an equitable basis, some regulars to work with the substitutes, we could not guarantee the regular movement of the mail.

Mr. JAVITS. I am aware of this provision. This means with some system on a seniority basis, generally speaking.

Mr. MONRONEY. It is written into the bill "to the maximum extent practicable senior regular employees shall be assigned to the basic workweek Monday through Friday."

Mr. JAVITS. If the Senator objects to the way I phrase it, he is a good enough friend of mine to correct me—but is it the desire of the committee, when the Postmaster General or his subordinates order a senior regular employee to work on a Saturday or a Sunday against his wishes, that they should consider it to be a situation which would have to be justified. That does not mean the committee will haul them up; but, prima facie, the Senator expects the Department not to do it, unless it has some particularly good reason for doing it, and the committee expects the Department not to do it; is that not correct?

Mr. MONRONEY. We must have some regular employees.

Mr. JAVITS. I agree.

Mr. MONRONEY. And we must not leave a great institution like the Post Office Department without the ability to have control over its clerical work on a Sunday. It would be unthinkable and an impediment to the efficient movement of the mail.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not say that.



27172

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

October 22, 1965

Mr. MONRONEY. I am sure the Senator does not want that. I wish to make myself clear as to exactly how the committee felt on these requirements.

Mr. JAVITS. Of course.

Mr. MONRONEY. I do believe, however, that all senior regular employees should have preference in the choice of the workweek.

Mr. JAVITS. Good.

Mr. MONRONEY. Which is Monday through Friday.

Mr. JAVITS. It is the Senator's preference and he intends it to be a preference?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. Good. That is the main point; so that the Department will have to bear in mind that it has to account for the fact that it may be going against this preference if Department officials feel strongly that they must do so, and they must fully justify their action.

Mr. MONRONEY. We feel that only the younger men who have less experience, and less seniority rights, would be involved in the Saturday and Sunday work, but there must be some.

Mr. JAVITS. I understand. I understand also the concept of preference, which is a good one.

I have one other question: Does the committee contemplate that, generally speaking, the size of the staffs that have to handle the weekend mail will continue, and is this drawn up in light of the fact that it is expected that the size of the staff which has handled weekend mail will continue? Is that going to be about the same?

Mr. MONRONEY. Perhaps a little less, because of the overtime provisions. The overtime provisions will be expensive. I would think such work as has been done on nonpriority mail on Saturdays and Sundays would be largely dispensed with, because of the higher cost of handling it.

Mr. JAVITS. But certainly the Senator does not expect an enlargement of it.

Mr. MONRONEY. I would think the reverse.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. There are discrepancies in the present law as between both Houses of the Congress in the manner in which the chairman of each committee in each House and Members of each House may exercise their authority with respect to the compensation received by their respective staffs.

The distinguished Republican Senate leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] and I have drafted a memorandum and amendment which would provide that the chairmen of the committees in the Senate might appoint as professional staff members those whom they considered qualified to receive salaries at the top of the present Classification Act. This, generally speaking, is what the law is with respect to the chairmen of House committees today.

In addition, our amendment would provide that a Senator, if he so desired, might place one individual on his own staff at compensation not to exceed the

highest grade—GS-18—of the Classification Act as amended, and two individuals at not to exceed the compensation received by a GS-17.

I ask my friend the floor manager of the bill, the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma, whether or not he would accept the amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. I would have to decline, because the committee made a preliminary study of the amendment the distinguished Senator from California outlined and found it would complicate greatly the entire salary structure of the Senate. For that reason it was the unanimous view of the committee that we should give study to this matter next year, when we can have committee chairmen and Members of Congress before us to outline what they need and want. So I think that should be done so that the salary schedule may be kept consistent and well balanced throughout the range of the important positions in the Senate.

Mr. KUCHEL. Under the circumstances, I ask my friend the floor manager of the bill, if it is contemplated that in the beginning of the second session of this Congress exertions will be made with respect to holding early hearings which will be necessary to arrive at a just decision on this matter which is presently inequitable between the Senate and the House and between the Congress and the executive branch of our Government?

Mr. MONRONEY. We would like to have hearings as early as possible, because considerable study will be required. We found that out in going into some of the legislative employee salaries. We will take another look at the differences between the Senate and House in the payment of top legislative employees, while some House staff position grades are higher than those of the Senate, some of these House employees are not compensated at the highest rate. We would like to go into the whole matter.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my friend.

The distinguished Senator from Illinois, the Republican leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], has not desired to press the amendment unless it were acceptable to the chairman. Under these circumstances, I shall not offer the amendment on his and my behalf, but I am also grateful for this colloquy as to what we may look forward to.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia, who has had such a great interest in the postal and classified workers over a period of many years, both in the House and in the Senate, and who has been interested in getting the maximum that can be given those workers consistent with the President's antiinflationary program.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has tried to bring to the Senate a measure which would do justice and bring equity to Federal employees, keeping in mind the position of the President of the United States as publicly announced, and realizing that we must

be both reasonable and realistic at this period in the final hours of the 1st session of the 89th Congress.

Although there are differences in degree between the House position and Senate position in respect to certain provisions, the discussions were weighed most carefully within the committee.

I would like the Record to reflect that there is no partisanship in this committee. I make that statement very firmly. I express my appreciation not only to the chairman of the committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], but I speak with equal commendation of the distinguished minority member of the committee, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and I speak of the members of the committee, both Democrats and Republicans, who attempted very sincerely to draft legislation which would receive the signature of the President of the United States.

Mr. President, I believe a motion which I had the opportunity and responsibility to make within the committee has, the endorsement of every Member of the Senate, regardless of party.

It is my belief that the distinguished majority leader, MIKE MANSFIELD, and the distinguished minority leader, EVERETT DIRKSEN, or the men who may in the future hold these positions, should receive \$5,000 a year more than other Members of the Senate. There was a unanimous agreement with the motion that was presented. I am sure that in doing what we did and incorporating in the measure this provision, we acted in a manner which not only these two men would naturally be delighted to know about, but I believe we recognized in a responsible fashion the increased pressure which is upon these two leaders of the Senate. I speak of them not in any political sense. They are men whose initiative and industry must at all times be used for the Senate itself, the Senate as an institution of legislative leadership.

I feel that the explanation of the measure itself is, of course, in the capable hands of the chairman of our committee. It is not my desire to prolong the discussion. I do feel, however, that there is a constant cry in some quarters against what is known as so-called inefficiency of our Federal workers.

I become weary when these charges are made, because I am not thinking in terms of persons in the Federal structure who are Democrats or who are Republicans. By and large, those who are employed in the District of Columbia and the metropolitan area of our Capital City, including our effective and loyal personal and committee staffs, those who labor in our home districts and States, are diligent and dedicated. In many instances they are not only capable, but courageous.

I think the action of Congress, reflected in increases in wages and salaries, is an action which is merited by these people, who not only work for themselves through the jobs they hold, but in a sense are representatives of the Federal Government in the communities all over the United States.

October 22, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

27173

Mr. President, I am grateful for the opportunity to join in the discussion of this legislation, and I underscore the desire of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to bring to fruition legislation at this time, so that in a degree, if not in a complete and full degree, the Senate recognizes the outstanding services of the splendid men and women employed in our federal system.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

The committee amendment recognizes the reality of budgetary problems, the increased costs pertaining to the Defense Department, and the costs of other programs of vital importance enacted in the 89th Congress. The committee amendment eliminates the gap in salaries between private and public employment, based on the most recent evidence available to Congress, for all employees in the first five grades of the Classification Act and the first four levels of the postal field service schedule. For those in higher levels of pay, the 3.6-percent increase will go a long way to bridge the gap.

The dollar difference between 3.6 and 4 percent is small when compared to the total Federal payroll. But the American economy and the guideposts for maintaining the purchase value of the dollar and avoiding the serious threat of inflation in the coming years requires Congress to take other factors into account. The importance of the wage-price guideposts must be recognized.

In reducing the increase from 4 to 3.6 percent, the committee has paid particular attention to the overall package of benefits included in H.R. 10281. Evidence presented to the committee indicated that the 4-percent salary increase—costing \$545 million—coupled with \$210 million in fringe benefits and other liberalizations would substantially exceed the guideposts which private enterprise employees and their elected union officials have agreed to in various labor-management negotiations in the past few years and in recent months.

The committee does not believe it would be in the best interests of the Government, the economy, or the Federal service to upset a policy which has resulted in the observance of 3.2-percent wage-price guideposts in the private sector of the economy by enacting Federal salary legislation amounting to a total increase of more than 5 percent. Nor does it believe that less stringent sacrifices should be asked of Federal employees than are asked of those in private enterprise.

The general guide for noninflationary wage policy has been that the rate of increase in wage rates—including fringe benefits—in each industry be equal to the trend rate of overall productivity increases. If the trend of annual increases in productivity for the whole economy has been 3 percent, the wage rates should rise on the average by 3 percent a year.

Under ideal conditions, the gain from increases in employee productivity throughout the economy would be shared between wage and nonwage incomes by allowing each to grow at the same percentage rate. Business and labor would

share in the gains of the advancing economy and industrial productivity. But at the same time the average of all the unit labor costs in the economy would remain stable.

From 1962 until the present time, wage increases have stayed close to national productivity changes—about 3.2 percent each year. Most of the wage settlements negotiated in collective bargaining fell within the standards set by the guideposts. This, combined with satisfactory productivity gains, has led to a stability of unit labor costs and to the unusual degree of overall price stability in 56 months of uninterrupted progress that has brought many gains to labor and to industry.

The direct role of wage-price guideposts in contributing to this stability has been made clear in the recent contract negotiations in the steel industry. The Government surely must abide by those guideposts itself if it expects private industry to abide by them. How else could the Government request—and achieve—compliance with such principles by the leaders of labor and management?

The U.S. Government is not a business enterprise, and the measurement of productivity gains is difficult to ascertain. In the postal service, which is the largest Government agency in the world, it is estimated that mail volume increases by about 3 percent each year and that employee productivity and additional manpower must absorb that 2-billion-piece increase. Because public pay is fixed by legislation rather than collective bargaining contracts of fixed duration, adjustments have to be made for the period between pay increases.

When allowance is made for the full 15-month period since the last adjustment of Federal salaries, the annual average rate of increase of employees' basic compensation is less than 3 percent. But the additional costs of fringe benefits and other cost items—which are considered part of compensation in the establishment of wage-price guideposts—raises the total cost of the committee amendment to a percentage compatible with the wage-price guideposts. Federal salaries should not exceed that point by a greater margin in 1965.

Of vital importance, the committee amendment of 3.6 percent can be enacted into law in 1965, while the House-passed bill cannot. It will provide the real gains in income which are, in the final analysis, the only way by which the living standards of 2½ million Federal employees and their families can improve.

The decision which the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee had to make last week and which we must make today is whether or not Federal civilian employees shall be granted a pay increase and substantial fringe benefits this year. The President has said that he could not accept the House-passed bill. The Senate committee has reported a bill which it believes the President can and will accept.

There are those on the committee, and I am sure there are others in the Senate, who are displeased that the President expressed his opinion on this bill. There

are others who disagree with the committee's decision to adhere to the wage-price guideposts.

I personally believe that the arguments presented by the administration on the necessity of complying with the wage-price guideposts are wise, persuasive, and compelling. I also believe that the President, just as we, has constitutional duties and responsibilities among which are his right to make recommendations to the Congress, to take firm positions, and to refuse to sign into law bills enacted by the Congress which he does not believe are in the public interest. The strong expression of presidential opinion and intention prior to final enactment of legislation by Congress is certainly not unique. In fact, it is a tradition respected and previously exercised by Presidents of all parties.

I believe the President wants to give Federal employees a pay increase this year, as does the Senate committee. But it should be a pay raise in terms of real dollars. It would be a cruel hoax to pass a bill which could spark a widespread inflationary spiral that would erode the value of the dollar and leave Federal employees and other workers with less real benefits than they had before.

Before closing I want to express my profound gratitude and appreciation for the understanding and cooperation of the ranking minority members of the committee, the senior Senator from Kansas, all of the Senators on that side of the aisle, as well as Senators on my side of the aisle for their determination and understanding, and to the other members of the committee on both sides of the table.

We do nothing in this bill that would instigate in this country a widespread wage-price cycle that would destroy the constantly rising economy we have experienced in the past few years.

I also wish to express my deep appreciation and respect for the responsible attitude taken by the leaders of the Federal employee organizations.

I urge the Senate to approve the committee amendment as reported so that Federal employees will receive the benefits in their next paychecks.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. FONG. I commend the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for a fair statement. The statement was very comprehensive and covered the subject in great detail. He has set forth the many problems the members of the committee faced in this bill and has shown where the present bill differs from that which was passed by the House of Representatives.

The distinguished Senator from Oklahoma has said that not everyone is pleased with the bill. I am not pleased with the bill, but I will support it. I would have preferred a 4-percent increase in base pay rather than the 3.6-percent increase contained in the bill before us. I feel certain that all Members of the minority would prefer a 4-percent increase rather than this 3.6-percent increase.

Much valid testimony was presented to the committee justifying the bill providing for a 4-percent increase, which came to the Senate from the House. The evidence presented in committee justified an increase even as high as 11 percent in some grades. But we were faced with the situation of either having a 3.6-percent bill this session or having no bill at all. We in the committee were faced with a Presidential edict that the President could not accept the House bill providing for a 4-percent increase. Therefore, the committee was forced to reduce the amount to 3.6 percent, which the President said he could accept.

We shall be back in session within two and a half months, and as stated by the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, we shall surely take up again the proposals of a new pay bill, to bring the salaries of Federal classified and postal employees into comparability with the pay of their counterparts in private industry. Therefore, at this time, although reluctantly, I shall support the chairman in the presentation of this bill. I voice the sentiment of my committee colleagues on this side of the aisle—the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], and the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON]—to go along with this bill. We urge all Senators to support this measure so that at least at this session we shall be able to provide a pay increase for Federal classified and postal employees. They deserve a salary increase, although we believe the increase should be more than 3.6 percent.

We are willing to go along with an increase of 3.6 percent this year. We hope that next year we shall be able to lessen the gap between the pay of statutory-salaried Federal employees and the pay of employees in private industry.

Again, I commend the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma for his fine leadership, his painstaking study of the bill, and for granting to every member of the committee, especially those on this side of the aisle, every consideration in discussing the bill. He has done an excellent job and deserves the finest commendation.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Hawaii, who has done so much to help in the formulation of this legislation, as he has of other legislation in the past.

Mr. President, I wish to return to a discussion I had with the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] with respect to seniority preference on a Monday-through-Friday workweek and to make it absolutely clear in the Record that in the bill the Postmaster General retains the full and absolute authority to base his scheduling of employees on what is necessary to move the mail.

The preference contained in the language on page 46 refers to the senior regular employees' preference rights over junior regular employees and substitutes. We would expect that even though there preferences exist, they will be administered compassionately and with an understanding of the problems

of the various employees, and thus make the act more just in its applicability.

If the mail volume requires many regular employees, senior or junior, to work on Sunday, the bill authorizes the Postmaster General to so require it. But that should be done, again, with a consideration for the employees and for their working period.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have always supported legislation to ensure an adequate salary and pay scale for our civil service employees. Of the various groups, including the postal clerks and others, who have come to see me about the pay raise, I have assured them of my interest in their welfare and of my intention to support legislation which would assure them of a fair and equitable salary.

I am very much opposed to section 11 of this bill, which increases the salaries of employees of Congress. A large increase was granted last year both to Members of Congress and their employees. I opposed the legislation then as not being realistic with their responsibilities and duties. It was passed over my objections, even though there was no justification for such large increases. I am opposed to the increases for the legislative branch again this year, not only for the same reasons I expressed last year, but also because the large increases then make this year's provision entirely unconscionable. We cannot pretend to exercise economy in Government on the one hand and pass exorbitant pay increases on the other.

In spite of the fact that H.R. 10281 contains section 11 covering the legislative branch, I do support the bill and I wish to go on record as being in favor of its passage.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, it is a great pleasure for me to be able to join in support of the Federal employees pay raise of 1965. Action on this bill this year demonstrates that Congress is working toward its obligation to provide pay for the Federal worker comparable to that received in similar jobs in private industry. This desirable policy was written into law in the Pay Act of 1962; by our pay bills of 1964 and 1965 we have shown that we are working to meet the obligation that we incurred, but we have not yet reached full comparability.

To get good competent employees the Federal Government has to pay salaries as good as people with comparable abilities can get in private industry. We demand our Government and the Federal employees if we fail to negate any idea that we intend to run this great Government with anything less than the most competent workers available. For a long period, Federal pay did lag far behind the salary raises being given by private business, but now we are catching up. The "comparability gap" has been cut down by these pay acts of 1962, 1964, and 1965, and we expect now to be able to go far toward liquidating the gap next year.

These gains for the Federal employee and the dignity of the Federal Government have been achieved through the leadership of the two chairmen of the

Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee whom I have known. The late beloved Olin Johnston was the man who got this basic policy enacted into law in 1962; the Federal Government workers never had a more faithful friend.

However, the sad passing of Olin Johnston this spring brought to the chairmanship of our Committee another man who is destined to write a great record in his work on Federal employee matters. The senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has proved himself as an able and dedicated leader for our Post Office and Civil Service Committee. In the very difficult and trying circumstances that preceded the reporting of this bill from our committee, Senator MONRONEY used the utmost skill and patience to bring about the final result. The aim to which he adhered was to bring to the Senate floor the best bill possible in the interests of Federal employees. Although in the committee we had sharp differences of opinion as to the best means to obtain this end, there was no doubt of the sincerity of the Senator from Oklahoma, in using his best judgment to attain the desired goal. I salute him for his accomplishment.

I am hopeful that next year—1966—we will be able to close this comparability gap, and give the Federal workers equal treatment with workers in private employment.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, for a private businessman the task of setting wages for his employees is not a particularly difficult one. He is bound by certain inextorable factors of the marketplace, including his balance sheet. He must pay his workers on a par with employees of other companies who are doing similar jobs to those done in his plant. He has, of course, certain factors to guide him.

But in the Federal Government, with certain market rules suspended, we are faced with a unique problem in determining fair and adequate compensation for Federal employees. We do not have the advantage of profit and loss to guide our actions.

In such a situation, the best we can do is to exercise discretion, study salary decisions as they are currently being made in private industry, and rely heavily on this evidence in drafting legislation.

H.R. 10281 was suggested to remedy the inequities which presently exist between the Federal salary structure and salaries being paid in private industry. We know that salaries paid Federal workers do lag behind those paid their counterparts who perform similar functions in private industry. In private industry, adjustments are more easily determined, but, as the Senate knows, we must enact special legislation for the adjustment to take place in the Government structure.

I believe, Mr. President, that wise discretion has been exercised by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee in reporting H.R. 10281. This legislation goes a long way toward remedying the present inequities, and I feel the wage

October 22, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

27175

Increases suggested in this legislation are most reasonable.

I am indeed satisfied, on the basis of the committee's report, that careful attention was paid to the status of wages and salaries in private industry. The committee relied heavily—as it properly should have—on the evidence of wage scales in private employment.

Too often, neither deserved personal credit nor adequate salary compensation accorded our many thousands of dedicated Federal employees. Their task of running our national machinery is awesome, but seldom do they get the pat on the back which their meritorious service deserves.

Mr. President, we can today help to recognize at least in part such meritorious service. I support wholeheartedly the attempt which is being made to fairly adjust the rates of compensation for Federal employees. It shall be my pleasure to vote for H.R. 10281, doing so with the knowledge that it is a reasonable and just measure.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee I am very disappointed that the committee has recommended a pay increase of only 3.6 percent. There is substantial evidence indicating the need for a larger increase. We are to pursue a policy of comparability in wages for Federal employees, we must increase their wages more than the 3.6 percent the President has said we would allow.

I resent the White House pressures that were applied on committee members and, thus, voted in opposition to reporting out a bill which I thought was adequate.

It had been my intention to propose an amendment calling for the 4-percent increase which had been approved by the House of Representatives. Unfortunately, President Johnson is unwilling to back up a policy of comparability in pay for our civil servants at this time. Consequently, I am compelled to go along with the majority of the Senators in voting for this bill so that we can assure our Federal employees, both classified and postal, some sort of pay raise. I ask for unanimous consent to have printed in the Record, at this point, the individual views which I have prepared for the committee report on this bill, H.R. 10281.

There being no objection, the individual views were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

## INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF Mr. SIMPSON

I believe Government employees, both classified and post office, should receive wages as near as possible to those earned by persons working at comparable tasks in private industry. Both the House and Senate committees have compiled a great deal of evidence that indicates there is a real need for a substantial pay raise to obtain this objective. I believe that H.R. 10281, as passed by the House of Representatives, which added Federal employees a 4-percent increase, across the board, was a good bill and that a few minor changes was prepared to support it and did support it in the committee. I plan to support, on the Senate floor, an amendment increasing the pay raise to the 4-percent level adopted by the House of Representatives.

In 1962 this committee adopted and the Congress passed legislation establishing the principle of comparability for salaries of Federal employees.

In each succeeding year in which a salary bill has been enacted, this committee has been working toward full comparability for our Federal employees.

The bill that is now reported by this committee does not bring about this desired comparability in pay.

In March of this year, President Johnson, in a letter to Speaker of the House JOHN MCCORMACK, said:

"It is false economy to offer salaries that will attract the mediocre but repel the talented. \* \* \* I need your help in my program to get a dollar's worth of value for every dollar's worth of pay \* \* \* and the dollars paid to attract brains and ability to the Federal service will come back to the American people many times over in more economical and effective government."

I support that statement fully and am sorry that the President is not willing to back it up.

The committee was forced by the threat of a Presidential veto to report a bill that doesn't begin to come close to enabling Federal employees to keep pace with their counterparts in private industry.

I resent the Presidential coercion that was used in the considerations of this needed pay raise bill.

The White House laid down the terms and we were told to take them or face a veto. I refuse to yield to such pressures. I believe our civil servants and postal employees deserve comparable pay and I will continue to work for it.

Our Federal employees, both in the classified service and in the postal service, are the backbone of our Government. Their talents, their dedication, their devotion to duty are responsible for bringing sound administration and effectiveness to the myriad of Government programs that aid our people.

They deserve more than they are getting in this bill and I intend to do all in my power to get early consideration of another pay bill next session that will carry out the principle of comparability enunciated time and time again by this committee and subscribed to by this administration.

MILWARD L. SIMPSON.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] had to leave for his home State last night to keep a long-standing speaking engagement. I do not believe Senator COOPER will be able to be back in time to vote on the Federal pay raise bill today, but before he left for Kentucky, he prepared a statement on his position on the bill. I ask unanimous consent that the following statement of Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER be printed at this point in the Record.

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

## STATEMENT BY SENATOR COOPER

I will vote for H.R. 10281, as amended and reported by the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I do not serve on this committee, but I have followed its hearings, and I have read the report made on this pay raise bill for postal and classified employees.

The provisions of this bill are reasonable, and they are in keeping with the guidelines indicated as helping to maintain a non-inflationary policy among employees of the Government and in private industry. In the last Congress, I could not support the bill which provided large increases for Members of the Congress and for other high Federal

officials, when so many people remained unemployed across the Nation and when the effect of the tax cut on the deficit was still not known.

I am glad this bill before the Senate today, which would provide increases averaging 3.6 percent, is basically limited to the Federal employees who need to be able to keep up with advances in the cost of living. I am for the bill, I will vote for it, and I hope it will become law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

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

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I observe the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LAUSCHE (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. NELSON, the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senators from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON and Mr. PEARSON], the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER and Mr. MORTON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 67, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 300 Leg.]  
YEAS—67

Alken	Hart	Murphy
Allott	Hayden	Pell
Bartlett	Hickenlooper	Prouty
Bass	Hill	Proxmire
Bennett	Holland	Randolph
Bible	Hruska	Ribicoff
Brewster	Inouye	Robertson
Burdick	Jackson	Russell, S.C.
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Russell, Ga.
Cannon	Jordan, N.C.	Saltonstall
Case	Jordan, Idaho	Scott
Cotton	Kuchel	Smathers
Curtis	Long, La.	Smith
Dirksen	Mansfield	Stennis
Dodd	McCarthy	Symington
Douglas	McGee	Thurmond
Eustland	McIntyre	Tower
Ervin	McNamara	Williams, N.J.
Fannin	Metcaif	Yarborough
Fong	Mondale	Young, N. Dak.
Fulbright	Monroney	Young, Ohio
Gruening	Montoya	
Harris	Mundt	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—33

Anderson	Clark	Kennedy, Mass.
Bayh	Cooper	Kennedy, N.Y.
Boggs	Dominick	Lausche
Byrd, Va.	Ellender	Long, Mo.
Carlson	Gore	Magnuson
Church	Hartke	McClellan

McGovern	Muskie	Simpson
Miller	Neison	Sparkman
Morse	Neuberg	Talmadge
Morton	Pastore	Tydings
Moss	Pearson	Williams, Del.

So the bill (H.R. 10281) was passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

SUPPLEMENTAL INCOME TAX PROTOCOL WITH BELGIUM—TAX PROTOCOL WITH THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Executive G and Executive I on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in the Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the protocol, Executive G (89th Cong., 1st sess.), a supplementary income tax proposal with Belgium; and Executive I (89th Cong., 1st sess.), a tax protocol with the Federal Republic of Germany, which were read the second time, as follows:

PROTOCOL

Modifying and supplementing the Convention between the United States of America and Belgium for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income signed at Washington on October 28, 1948, as amended by the supplementary conventions, signed at Washington on September 9, 1952, and on August 22, 1957

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND HIS MAJESTY THE KING OF THE BELGIANS,

Desiring to modify and supplement in certain respects the Convention for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, signed at Washington on October 28, 1948, as amended by the supplementary conventions, signed at Washington on September 9, 1952 and on August 22, 1957,

Have decided, primarily for the purpose of permitting its application as soon as possible to the taxes instituted by the Belgian law of November 20, 1952, to conclude a protocol for that purpose and have appointed as their respective Plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America:

John M. McSweeney,  
Chargé d'Affaires a.i. of the United States of America;

His Majesty the King of the Belgians:

Paul Henri Spaak,  
Minister for Foreign Affairs;

Who, having communicated to each other their full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed as follows:

Article I

The provisions of the Convention between the United States of America and Belgium, signed at Washington on October 28, 1948, as previously amended, are hereby modified and supplemented as follows:

(1) In article I, paragraph (1)(b) is replaced by the following:

(b) In the case of Belgium:

(1) The individual income tax (l'impôt des personnes physiques);

(ii) The corporate income tax (l'impôt des sociétés);

(iii) The income tax on legal entities (l'impôt des personnes morales);

(iv) The income tax on nonresidents (l'impôt des nonrésidents);

(v) The prepayments (précomptes) and additional prepayments (compléments de précomptes) relating to the taxes referred to in (1) through (iv); and

(vi) The proportional taxes (centimes additionnels) supplementing each of the taxes referred to in (1) through (v) above including the communal supplement to the individual income tax (taxe communale additionnelle à l'impôt des personnes physiques).

(2) In article II(1)(a), the following words are deleted: "the Territories of Alaska and of Hawaii,"

(3) In article VIII, paragraph (2) is replaced by the following:

(2) The rate of Belgian tax on dividends derived from sources within Belgium by a resident, corporation or other entity of the United States not having a permanent establishment within Belgium with respect to shares held in registered form for the period of 12 months immediately preceding the date on which such dividends become payable (or for such portion of that period as the paying corporation has been in existence) shall not exceed 15 percent of the amount actually distributed. In all other cases, the rate of Belgian tax on dividends derived from sources within Belgium by a resident, corporation or other entity of the United States not having a permanent establishment within Belgium shall not exceed 15 percent of the taxable amount of such dividends determined in accordance with the Belgian law in force on the date of signature of the protocol inserting this provision in the Convention. In applying this paragraph, the term "dividends" shall include income from invested capital taxable as such to members of Belgian companies other than joint stock companies.

(4) After article VIII A, the following new Article is inserted:

Article VIII B

(1) Dividends and interest paid to a resident, corporation or other entity of the United States not having a permanent establishment within Belgium shall be exempt from the Belgian additional personal property prepayment (complément de précompte mobilier) provided for in the Belgian law in force on the date of the signature of the protocol inserting this provision in the Convention.

(2) Dividends and interest paid by a Belgian corporation to a person other than a citizen, resident, corporation or other entity of the United States shall be exempt from United States tax.

(3) Dividends and interest paid by a United States corporation to a person other than a resident, corporation or other entity of Belgium shall be exempt from Belgian tax unless such income is collected in Belgium.

(5) In article IX (1) the words "on such income" are inserted in the second sentence after the word "tax" and before the word "as".

(6) In article XII, paragraphs (2) and (3) are replaced by the following:

(2) The United States agrees to allow as a credit against the Federal income taxes payable by a citizen, resident or corporation of the United States the appropriate amount of the taxes mentioned in article I, paragraph (1)(b) and paid to Belgium. Such appropriate amount shall be based on the total amount of such taxes paid to Belgium, but it shall not exceed that proportion of the United States taxes which net income from sources within Belgium bears to the total net income of such citizen, resident or corporation.

October 22, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

27307

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 7 o'clock p.m.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 509. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings on crime in the District of Columbia and House Report No. 176, entitled "District of Columbia Crime";

H. Con. Res. 512. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearing on home rule for the District of Columbia;

H. Con. Res. 513. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of hearings on "Lower

Colorado River Basin Project," 89th Congress, 1st session; and

H. Con. Res. 519. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on H.R. 2580 (89th Cong., 1st sess.), to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes, before the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

The message also announced that the House had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 10281. An act to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, to establish the Federal Salary Review Commission, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (7812) entitled "An act to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate has passed Senate Resolution 156 notifying the House of the election of

Emery L. Frazier of Kentucky as Secretary of the Senate effective January 1, 1966.

FEDERAL SALARY ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1965

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 10281) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, to establish the Federal Salary Review Commission, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Employees Salary Act of 1965".

EMPLOYEES SUBJECT TO CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1949

SEC. 2. (a) Section 603(b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (78 Stat. 400; 5 U.S.C. 1113(b)), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The compensation schedule for the General Schedule shall be as follows:

"Grade	Per annum rates and steps									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
GS-1	\$3,507	\$3,626	\$3,745	\$3,864	\$3,983	\$4,102	\$4,221	\$4,340	\$4,459	\$4,578
GS-2	3,814	3,943	4,072	4,201	4,330	4,459	4,588	4,717	4,846	4,975
GS-3	4,140	4,289	4,429	4,569	4,709	4,849	4,989	5,129	5,269	5,409
GS-4	4,641	4,797	4,953	5,109	5,265	5,421	5,577	5,733	5,889	6,045
GS-5	5,181	5,352	5,523	5,694	5,865	6,036	6,207	6,378	6,549	6,720
GS-6	5,702	5,894	6,086	6,278	6,470	6,662	6,854	7,046	7,238	7,430
GS-7	6,269	6,478	6,683	6,890	7,097	7,304	7,511	7,718	7,925	8,132
GS-8	6,869	7,097	7,325	7,553	7,781	8,009	8,237	8,465	8,693	8,921
GS-9	7,479	7,733	7,987	8,241	8,495	8,749	9,003	9,257	9,511	9,765
GS-10	8,184	8,464	8,744	9,024	9,304	9,584	9,864	10,144	10,424	10,704
GS-11	8,961	9,267	9,573	9,879	10,185	10,491	10,797	11,103	11,409	11,715
GS-12	10,619	10,987	11,355	11,723	12,091	12,459	12,827	13,195	13,563	13,931
GS-13	12,510	12,945	13,380	13,815	14,250	14,685	15,120	15,555	15,990	16,425
GS-14	14,680	15,188	15,696	16,204	16,712	17,220	17,728	18,236	18,744	19,252
GS-15	17,055	17,646	18,235	18,826	19,415	20,005	20,595	21,185	21,775	22,365
GS-16	19,619	20,297	20,975	21,653	22,331	23,009	23,687	24,365	25,043	
GS-17	22,217	22,994	23,771	24,548	25,325					
GS-18	25,382									

(b) Except as provided in section 504(d) of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962 (78 Stat. 412; 5 U.S.C. 1173(d)), the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees to whom the compensation schedule set forth in subsection (a) of this section applies shall be initially adjusted as of the effective date of this section, as follows:

(1) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at one of the rates of a grade in the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the corresponding rate in effect on and after such date.

(2) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a rate between two rates of a grade in the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the higher of the two corresponding rates in effect on and after such date.

(3) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a rate in excess of the maximum rate for his grade, he shall receive (A) the maximum rate for his grade in the new schedule, or (B) his existing rate of basic compensation if such existing rate is higher.

(4) If the officer or employee, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, is

receiving, pursuant to section 2(b)(4) of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, an existing aggregate rate of compensation determined under section 208(b) of the act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1111), plus subsequent increases authorized by law, he shall receive an aggregate rate of compensation equal to the sum of his existing aggregate rate of compensation, on the day preceding the effective date of this section, plus the amount of increase made by this section in the maximum rate of his grade, until (1) he leaves his position, or (2) he is entitled to receive aggregate compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of this Act or any other provision of law; but, when such position becomes vacant, the aggregate rate of compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with applicable provisions of law. Subject to clauses (1) and (2) of the immediately preceding sentence of this paragraph, the amount of the increase provided by this section shall be held and considered for the purposes of section 208(b) of the Act of September 1, 1954, to constitute a part of the existing rate of compensation of the employee.

REDETERMINATIONS OF ACCEPTABLE LEVELS OF COMPETENCE

SEC. 3. Section 701 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 1121), is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(c) Whenever a determination is made under subsection (a) of this section that the work of an officer or employee is not of an acceptable level of competence, he shall be given prompt written notice of that determination and an opportunity for reconsideration of the determination within his department under uniform procedures established by the Commission. If the determination is affirmed upon reconsideration, the employee shall have a right of appeal to the Commission. If the reconsideration or appeal results in a reversal of the earlier determination, the new determination shall supersede the earlier determination and shall be deemed to have been made as of the date of the earlier determination. The authority of the Commission to establish procedures and the right of appeal by the officer or employee to the Commission shall not apply to determinations of acceptable level of competence made by the Librarian of Congress."

POSTAL FIELD SERVICE EMPLOYEES

SEC. 4. (a) Section 3542(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) There is established a basic compensation schedule for positions in the postal field service which shall be known as the Postal Field Service Schedule and for which the symbol shall be "PFS". Except as provided in sections 3543 and 3544 of this title, basic compensation shall be paid to all employees in accordance with such schedule.

"PFS"	Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	\$4,065	\$4,221	\$4,356	\$4,491	\$4,625	\$4,761	\$4,896	\$5,031	\$5,166	\$5,301	\$5,436	\$5,571
2	4,424	4,579	4,714	4,859	4,994	5,129	5,264	5,399	5,534	5,669	5,804	5,939
3	4,780	4,941	5,102	5,263	5,424	5,585	5,746	5,907	6,068	6,229	6,390	6,551
4	5,161	5,322	5,483	5,644	5,805	5,966	6,127	6,288	6,449	6,610	6,771	6,932
5	5,536	5,722	5,908	6,094	6,280	6,466	6,652	6,838	7,024	7,210	7,396	7,582
6	5,941	6,138	6,335	6,532	6,729	6,926	7,123	7,320	7,517	7,714	7,911	8,108
7	6,361	6,573	6,785	6,997	7,209	7,421	7,633	7,845	8,057	8,269	8,481	
8	6,888	7,116	7,344	7,572	7,800	8,028	8,256	8,484	8,712	8,940		
9	7,449	7,697	7,945	8,193	8,441	8,689	8,937	9,185	9,433	9,681		
10	8,110	8,365	8,620	8,875	9,130	9,385	9,640	9,895	10,150	10,405		
11	8,911	9,267	9,623	9,979	10,335	10,691	11,047	11,403	11,759	12,115		
12	9,914	10,251	10,588	10,925	11,262	11,599	11,936	12,273	12,610	12,947		
13	10,656	11,334	11,712	12,090	12,468	12,846	13,224	13,602	13,980	14,358		
14	12,077	12,497	12,917	13,337	13,757	14,177	14,597	15,017	15,437	15,857		
15	13,349	13,810	14,271	14,732	15,193	15,654	16,115	16,576	17,037	17,498		
16	14,751	15,264	15,777	16,290	16,803	17,316	17,829	18,342	18,855	19,368		
17	16,320	16,890	17,460	18,030	18,600	19,170	19,740	20,310	20,880	21,450		
18	18,075	18,710	19,342	19,974	20,606	21,238	21,870	22,502	23,134	23,766		
19	20,042	20,741	21,440	22,139	22,838	23,537	24,236	24,935				
20	22,217	22,994	23,771	24,548	25,325							

(b) Section 3543(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: "(a) There is established a basic compensation schedule which shall be known as the Rural Carrier Schedule and for which the symbol shall be 'RCS'. Compensation shall be paid to rural carriers in accordance with this schedule."

"RURAL CARRIER SCHEDULE"

	Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Carrier in rural delivery service: Fixed compensation per annum	\$2,801	\$2,412	\$2,523	\$2,634	\$2,745	\$2,856	\$2,967	\$3,078	\$3,189	\$3,300	\$3,411	\$3,522
Compensation per mile per annum for each mile up to 30 miles of route	86	88	90	92	94	96	98	100	102	104	106	108
For each mile of route over 30 miles	25	26	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	24	26"

(c) Section 3544(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: "(a) There is established a basic compensation schedule which shall be known as the Fourth Class Office Schedule and for which the symbol shall be 'FOS', for postmasters in post offices of the fourth class which is based on the revenue units of the post office for the preceding fiscal year. Basic compensation shall be paid to postmasters in post offices of the fourth class in accordance with this schedule."

"FOURTH CLASS OFFICE SCHEDULE"

"Revenue units"	Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
30 but fewer than 36	\$3,906	\$4,035	\$4,164	\$4,293	\$4,422	\$4,551	\$4,680	\$4,809	\$4,938	\$5,067	\$5,196	\$5,325
24 but fewer than 30	3,610	3,729	3,848	3,967	4,086	4,205	4,324	4,443	4,562	4,681	4,800	4,919
18 but fewer than 24	2,978	3,079	3,180	3,281	3,382	3,483	3,584	3,685	3,786	3,887	3,988	4,089
12 but fewer than 18	2,339	2,415	2,491	2,567	2,643	2,719	2,795	2,871	2,947	3,023	3,099	3,175
6 but fewer than 12	1,687	1,741	1,795	1,849	1,903	1,957	2,011	2,065	2,119	2,173	2,227	2,281
Fewer than 6	1,359	1,403	1,447	1,491	1,535	1,579	1,623	1,667	1,711	1,755	1,799	1,843"

(d) The basic compensation of each employee subject to the Postal Field Service Schedule, the Rural Carrier Schedule, or the Fourth Class Office Schedule immediately prior to the effective date of this section shall be determined as follows:

(1) Each employee shall be assigned to the same numerical step for his position which he had attained immediately prior to such effective date. If changes in levels or steps would otherwise occur on such effective date without regard to enactment of this Act, such changes shall be deemed to have occurred prior to conversion.

(2) If the existing basic compensation is greater than the rate to which the employee is converted under paragraph (1) of this subsection, the employee shall be placed in the lowest step which exceeds his basic compensation. If the existing basic compensation exceeds the maximum step of his position, his existing basic compensation shall be established as his basic compensation.

POSTAL SERVICE OVERTIME AND HOLIDAY COMPENSATION

SEC. 5. (a) Section 3571 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 3571. Maximum hours of work

"(a) A basic workweek is established for all postal field service employees consisting of

five eight-hour days. The work schedule of employees shall be regulated so that the eight hours of service does not extend over a longer period than ten consecutive hours.

"(b) The Postmaster General shall establish work schedules in advance for annual rate regular employees consisting of five eight-hour days in each week.

"(c) Except for emergencies as determined by the Postmaster General, the hours of service of any employee shall not extend over a longer period than twelve consecutive hours, and no employee may be required to work more than twelve hours in one day.

"(d) To the maximum extent practicable, senior regular employees shall be assigned to a basic workweek Monday through Friday, inclusive, except for those who express a preference for another basic workweek."

(b) Section 3573 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 3573. Compensatory time, overtime, and holidays.

"(a) In emergencies of if the needs of the service require, the Postmaster General may require employees to perform overtime work or to work on holidays. Overtime work is any work officially ordered or approved which is performed by—

"(1) an annual rate regular employee in excess of his regular work schedule,

"(2) an hourly rate regular employee in excess of eight hours in a day or forty hours in a week, and

"(3) a substitute employee in excess of forty hours in a week.

The Postmaster General shall determine the day and week used in computing overtime work.

"(b) For each hour of overtime work the Postmaster General shall compensate an employee in the 'PFS' Schedule as follows:

"(1) He shall pay each employee in or below salary level PFS-7 compensation at the rate of 150 per centum of the hourly rate of basic compensation for his level and step computed by dividing the scheduled annual rate of basic compensation by two thousand and eighty.

"(2) He shall grant each employee in or above salary level PFS-8 compensatory time equal to the overtime worked, or in his discretion in lieu thereof pay such employee compensation at the rate of 150 per centum of the hourly rate of basic compensation of the employee or of the hourly rate of the basic compensation for the highest step of salary level PFS-7, whichever is the lesser.

October 22, 1965

"(c) For officially ordered or approved time worked on a day referred to as a holiday in the Act of December 26, 1941 (55 Stat. 862; 5 U.S.C. 87b), or on a day designated by Executive order as a holiday for Federal employees, under regulations prescribed by the Postmaster General, an employee in the PFS schedule shall receive extra compensation, in addition to any other compensation provided for by law, as follows:

"(1) Each regular employee in or below salary level PFS-7 shall be paid extra compensation at the rate of 100 per centum of the hourly rate of basic compensation for his level and step computed by dividing the scheduled annual rate of basic compensation by two thousand and eighty.

"(2) Each regular employee in or above salary level PFS-8 shall be granted compensatory time in an amount equal to the time worked on such holiday within thirty working days thereafter or, in the discretion of the Postmaster General, in lieu thereof shall be paid extra compensation for the time so worked at the rate of 100 per centum of the hourly rate of basic compensation for his level and step computed by dividing the scheduled annual rate of basic compensation by two thousand and eighty.

"(3) For work performed on Christmas Day (A) each regular employee shall be paid extra compensation at the rate of 150 per centum of the hourly rate of basic compensation for his level and step, computed by dividing the scheduled annual rate of basic compensation by two thousand and eighty, and (B) each substitute employee shall be paid extra compensation at the rate of 50 per centum of the hourly rate of basic compensation for his level and step.

"(d) The Postmaster General shall establish conditions for the use of compensatory time earned and the payment of compensation for unused compensatory time.

"(e) Each regular employee whose regular work schedule includes an eight-hour period of service any part of which is within the period commencing at midnight Saturday and ending at midnight Sunday shall be paid extra compensation at the rate of 25 per centum of his hourly rate of basic compensation for each hour of work performed during that eight-hour period of service.

"(f) If an employee is entitled under this section to unused compensatory time at the time of his death, the Postmaster General shall pay at the rate prescribed in this section, but not less than a sum equal to the employee's hourly basic compensation, for each hour of such unused compensatory time to the person or persons surviving at the date of such employee's death. Such payment shall be made in the order of precedence prescribed in the first section of the Act of August 3, 1950 (5 U.S.C. 61f), and shall be a bar to recovery by any other persons of amounts so paid.

"(g) Notwithstanding any provision of this section other than subsection (f), no employee shall be paid overtime or extra compensation for a pay period which when added to his basic compensation for the pay period exceeds one twenty-sixth of the annual rate of basic compensation for the highest step of salary level PFS-17.

"(h) For the purposes of this section and section 3571 of this title—

"(1) 'Annual rate regular employee' means an employee for whom the Postmaster General has established a regular work schedule consisting of five eight-hour days in accordance with section 3571 of this title.

"(2) 'Hourly rate regular employee' means an employee for whom the Postmaster General has established a regular work schedule consisting of not more than forty hours a week.

"(3) 'Substitute employee' means an employee for whom the Postmaster General has not established a regular work schedule."

(c) Section 3575 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 3575. Exemptions

"(a) Sections 3571, 3573 and 3574 of this title do not apply to postmasters, rural carriers, postal inspectors, and employees in salary level PFS-15 and above.

"(b) Sections 3571 and 3573 of this title do not apply to employees referred to in section 3581 of this title.

"(c) Sections 3571 (a), (b), and (d), and 3573(e) of this title do not apply to substitute employees.

"(d) Section 3571(b) of this title does not apply to hourly rate regular employees."

POSTAL EMPLOYEES RELOCATION EXPENSES

Sec. 6. (a) That part of chapter 41 of title 39, United States Code, which precedes the center heading "Special Classes of Employees" and section 3111 thereof, is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 3107. Postal employees relocation expenses

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, each employee in the postal field service who is transferred or relocated from one official station to another shall, under regulations promulgated by the Postmaster General, be granted the following allowances and expenses:

"(1) Per diem allowance, in lieu of subsistence expenses, for each member of his immediate family while en route between his old and new official stations, not in excess of the maximum per diem rates prescribed by or pursuant to law for employees of the Federal Government.

"(2) Subsistence, expenses of the employee and each member of his immediate family for a period of not to exceed thirty days while occupying temporary quarters at the place of his new official duty station, but not in excess of the maximum per diem rates prescribed by or pursuant to law for employees of the Federal Government.

"(3) Five days of leave with pay which shall not be charged to any other leave to which he is entitled under existing law."

(b) That part of the table of contents of such chapter 41 under the heading "Employees Generally" is amended by inserting "3107. Postal employees relocation expenses." immediately below

"3106. Special compensation rules."

EMPLOYEES IN THE DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Sec. 7. Section 4107 of title 38, United States Code, relating to grades and pay scales for certain positions within the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 4107. Grades and pay scales

"(a) The per annum full-pay scale or ranges for positions provided in section 4103 of this title, other than Chief Medical Direc-

tor and Deputy Chief Medical Director, shall be as follows:

"SECTION 4103 SCHEDULE

"Assistant Chief Medical Director, \$25,382.  
 "Medical Director, \$22,217 minimum to \$25,325 maximum.

"Director of Nursing Service, \$17,055 minimum to \$22,365 maximum.

"Director of Chaplain Service, \$17,055 minimum to \$22,365 maximum.

"Chief Pharmacist, \$17,055 minimum to \$22,365 maximum.

"Chief Dietitian, \$17,055 minimum to \$22,365 maximum.

"(b)(1) The grades and per annum full-pay ranges for positions provided in paragraph (1) of section 4104 of this title shall be as follows:

"PHYSICIAN AND DENTIST SCHEDULE

"Director grade, \$19,619 minimum to \$25,043 maximum.

"Executive grade, \$18,291 minimum to \$24,024 maximum.

"Chief grade, \$17,055 minimum to \$22,365 maximum.

"Senior grade, \$14,680 minimum to \$19,252 maximum.

"Intermediate grade, \$12,510 minimum to \$16,425 maximum.

"Full grade, \$10,619 minimum to \$13,931 maximum.

"Associate grade, \$8,961 minimum to \$11,715 maximum.

"NURSE SCHEDULE

"Assistant Director grade, \$14,680 minimum to \$19,252 maximum.

"Chief grade, \$12,510 minimum to \$16,425 maximum.

"Senior grade, \$10,619 minimum to \$13,931 maximum.

"Intermediate grade, \$8,961 minimum to \$11,715 maximum.

"Full grade, \$7,479 minimum to \$9,765 maximum.

"Associate grade, \$6,540 minimum to \$8,502 maximum.

"Junior grade, \$5,702 minimum to \$7,430 maximum.

"(2) No person may hold the director grade unless he is serving as a director of a hospital, domiciliary, center, or outpatient clinic (independent). No person may hold the executive grade unless he holds the position of chief of staff at a hospital, center, or outpatient clinic (independent), or the position of clinic director at an outpatient clinic, or comparable position."

FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS; STAFF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

Sec. 8. (a) The fourth sentence of section 412 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 867), is amended to read as follows: "The per annum salaries of Foreign Service officers within each of the other classes shall be as follows:

Class 1	\$23,465	\$24,284	\$25,382	\$20,928	\$21,536	\$22,244	\$22,902
Class 2	18,964	19,612	20,270	16,997	17,531	18,065	18,599
Class 3	15,395	15,920	16,463	13,815	14,250	14,685	15,120
Class 4	12,510	12,945	13,380	11,377	11,735	12,093	12,451
Class 5	10,303	10,661	11,019	9,479	9,774	10,069	10,364
Class 6	8,594	8,889	9,184	7,697	7,900	8,103	8,306
Class 7	7,262	7,506	7,750	6,404	6,594	6,784	6,974
Class 8	6,269	6,476	6,683	5,494	5,684	5,874	6,064

(b) The second sentence of subsection (a) of section 415 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 870(a)) is amended to read as follows: "The per

annum salaries of such staff officers and employees within each class shall be as follows:

Class 1	\$15,395	\$15,929	\$16,463	\$16,997	\$17,531	\$18,065	\$18,599	\$19,133	\$19,667	\$20,201
Class 2	12,510	12,945	13,380	13,815	14,250	14,685	15,120	15,555	15,990	16,425
Class 3	10,303	10,661	11,019	11,377	11,735	12,093	12,451	12,809	13,167	13,525
Class 4	8,594	8,889	9,184	9,479	9,774	10,069	10,364	10,659	10,954	11,249
Class 5	7,249	7,493	7,737	7,981	8,225	8,469	8,713	8,957	9,201	9,445
Class 6	6,098	6,291	6,484	6,677	6,870	7,063	7,256	7,449	7,642	7,835
Class 7	5,428	5,580	5,732	5,884	6,036	6,188	6,340	6,492	6,644	6,796
Class 8	4,688	4,801	4,914	5,027	5,140	5,253	5,366	5,479	5,592	5,705
Class 9	3,948	4,041	4,134	4,227	4,320	4,413	4,506	4,599	4,692	4,785
Class 10	3,208	3,281	3,354	3,427	3,500	3,573	3,646	3,719	3,792	3,865



(c) Foreign Service officers, Reserve officers, and Foreign Service staff officers and employees who are entitled to receive basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at one of the rates provided by section 412 or 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 shall receive basic compensation, on and after such effective date, at the rate of their class determined to be appropriate by the Secretary of State.

## SEVERANCE PAY

Sec. 9. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, this section applies to each civilian officer or employee in or under—

(1) the executive branch of the Government of the United States, including each corporation wholly owned or controlled by the United States;

(2) the Library of Congress;

(3) the Government Printing Office;

(4) the General Accounting Office; or

(5) the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

This section also applies to persons employed by the county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590b (b)), and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to prescribe and issue such regulations as may be necessary to provide a means of effecting the application and operations of the provisions of this section with respect to such persons.

(b) This section does not apply to—

(1) an officer or employee whose rate of basic compensation is fixed at a rate provided for one of the levels of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule or is in excess of the highest rate of grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended;

(2) an officer or employee serving under an appointment with a definite time limitation, except one so appointed for full-time employment, without a break in service or after a separation of three days or less, following service under an appointment without time limitation;

(3) an alien employee who occupies a position outside the several States, the District of Columbia, and the Canal Zone;

(4) an officer or employee who is subject to the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, or any other retirement law or retirement system applicable to Federal officers or employees or members of the uniformed services, and who, at the time of separation from the service, has fulfilled the requirements for immediate annuity under any such law or system;

(5) an officer or employee who, at the time of separation from the service, is receiving compensation under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended, except one receiving this compensation concurrently with salary or on account of the death of another person;

(6) an officer or employee who, at the time of separation from the service, is entitled to receive other severance pay from the Government;

(7) officers and employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority; and

(8) such other officers or employees as may be excluded by rules and regulations of the President or of such officer or agency as he may designate.

(c) An officer or employee to whom this section applies who is involuntarily separated from the service, on or after the effective date of this section, not by removal for cause on charges of misconduct, delinquency, or inefficiency, shall, under rules and regulations prescribed by the President or such officer or agency as he may designate, be paid severance pay in regular pay periods by the department, independent establishment, corporation, or other governmental unit, from which separated.

(d) Severance pay shall consist of two elements, a basic severance allowance and an age adjustment allowance. The basic severance allowance shall be computed on the basis of one week's basic compensation at the rate received immediately before separation for each year of civilian service up to and including ten years for which severance pay has not been received under this or any other authority and two weeks' basic compensation at such rate for each year of civilian service beyond ten years for which severance pay has not been received under this or any other authority. The age adjustment allowance shall be computed on the basis of 10 per centum of the total basic severance allowance for each year by which the age of the recipient exceeds forty years at the time of separation. Total severance pay received under this section shall not exceed one year's pay at the rate received immediately before separation.

(e) An officer or employee may be paid severance pay only after having been employed currently for a continuous period of at least twelve months.

(f) If an officer or employee is reemployed by the Federal Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia before the expiration of the period covered by payments of severance pay, the payments shall be discontinued beginning with the date of reemployment and the service represented by the unexpired portion of the period shall be credited to the officer or employee for use in any subsequent computations of severance pay. For the purposes of subsection (e), reemployment which causes severance pay to be discontinued shall be considered as employment continuous with that serving as the basis for the severance pay.

(g) If the officer or employee dies before the expiration of the period covered by payments of severance pay, the payments of severance pay with respect to such officer or employee shall be continued as if such officer or employee were living and shall be paid on a pay period basis to the survivor or survivors of such officer or employee in accordance with the first section of the Act of August 3, 1950 (5 U.S.C. 81f).

(h) Severance pay under this section shall not be a basis for payment, nor be included in the basis for computation, of any other type of Federal or District of Columbia Government benefits, and any period covered by severance pay shall not be regarded as a period of Federal or District of Columbia Government service or employment.

## AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION COUNTY COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

Sec. 10. The rates of compensation of persons employed by the county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590b (b)) shall be increased by amounts equal, as nearly as may be practicable, to the increases provided by section 2(a) of this Act for corresponding rates of compensation.

## LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Sec. 11. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this section, each officer or employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government, whose rate of compensation is increased by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946, shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of 3.6 per centum of his gross rate of compensation (basic compensation plus additional compensation authorized by law).

(b) The total annual compensation in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this section of each officer or employee of the House of Representatives, whose compensation is disbursed by the Clerk of the House and is not increased by reason of any other provision of this section, shall be increased by an amount which is equal to the amount of the increase provided by sub-

section (a) of this section; except that this section shall not apply to the compensation of student congressional interns authorized by H. Res. 416 of the Eighty-ninth Congress.

(c) The rates of compensation of employees of the House of Representatives whose compensation is fixed by the House Employees Schedule under the House Employees Position Classification Act (78 Stat. 1079; Public Law 88-652; 2 U.S.C. 291-303) shall be increased by amounts equal, as nearly as may be practicable, to the increases provided by subsection (a) of this section; except that this section shall not apply to the compensation of those employees whose compensation is fixed by the House Wage Schedule of such Act.

(d) The additional compensation provided by this section shall be considered a part of basic compensation for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2251 and the following).

(e) Section 601(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (2 U.S.C. 31), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall be at the rate of \$30,000 per annum each. The compensation of the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall be at the rate of \$43,000 per annum. The compensation of the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader of the Senate and the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives shall be at the rate of \$35,000 per annum each."

(f) The basic compensation of each employee in the office of a Senator is hereby adjusted, effective on the first day of the month following the date of enactment of this Act, to the lowest multiple of \$60 which will provide a gross rate of compensation not less than the gross rate such employee was receiving immediately prior thereto, except that the foregoing provisions of this subsection shall not apply in the case of any employee if on or before the fifteenth day following the date of enactment of this Act, the Senator by whom such employee is employed notifies the disbursing office of the Senate in writing that he does not wish such provisions to apply to such employee. No employee whose basic compensation is adjusted under this subsection shall receive any additional compensation under subsection (a) for any period prior to the effective date of such adjustment during which such employee was employed in the office of the Senator by whom he is employed on the first day of the month following the enactment of this Act. No additional compensation shall be paid to any person under subsection (a) for any period prior to the first day of the month following the date of enactment of this Act during which such person was employed in the office of a Senator (other than a Senator by whom he is employed on such day) unless on or before the fifteenth day following the date of enactment of this Act such Senator notifies the disbursing office of the Senate in writing that he wishes such employee to receive such additional compensation for such period. In any case in which, at the expiration of the time within which a Senator may give notice under this subsection, such Senator is deceased, such notice shall be deemed to have been given.

(g) Notwithstanding the provision referred to in subsection (h), the rates of gross compensation of the Secretary for the Majority of the Senate, the Secretary for the Minority of the Senate, the Chief Reporter of Debates of the Senate, the Parliamentarian of the Senate, the Senior Counsel in the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate, the Chief Clerk of the Senate, the Chaplain of the Senate, and the Postmaster and Assistant Postmaster of the Senate are hereby increased by 3.6 per centum.

October 22, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

27311

(h) The paragraph imposing limitations on basic and gross compensation of officers and employees of the Senate appearing under the heading "SENATE" in the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956, as amended (74 Stat. 304; Public Law 86-568), is amended by striking out "\$22,945" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$23,770".

(i) The limitation on gross rate per hour per person provided by applicable law on the effective date of this section with respect to the folding of speeches and pamphlets for the Senate is hereby increased by 3.6 per centum. The amount of such increase shall be computed to the nearest cent, counting one-half cent and over as a whole cent. The provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall not apply to employees whose compensation is subject to such limitation.

## FEDERAL JUDICIAL SALARIES

Sec. 12. (a) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in or under the judicial branch of the Government whose rates of compensation are fixed by or pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision a of section 62 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 102(a)(2)), section 3656 of title 18, United States Code, the third sentence of section 603, sections 671 to 675, inclusive, or section 604(a)(5), of title 28, United States Code, insofar as the latter section applies to graded positions, are hereby increased by amounts reflecting the respective applicable increases provided by section 2(a) of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees holding ungraded positions and whose salaries are fixed pursuant to such section 604(a)(5) may be increased by the amounts reflecting the respective applicable increases provided by section 2(a) of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) The limitations provided by applicable law on the effective date of this section with respect to the aggregate salaries payable to secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges are hereby increased by amounts which reflect the respective applicable increases provided by section 2(a) of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(c) Section 753(e) of title 28, United States Code (relating to the compensation of court reporters for district courts), is amended by striking out the existing salary limitation contained therein and inserting a new limitation which reflects the respective applicable increases provided by section 2(a) of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

## INCREASED UNIFORM ALLOWANCE

Sec. 13. The Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act, as amended (68 Stat. 1114; 5 U.S.C. 2131), is amended by striking out "\$100" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "\$125".

## MAXIMUM SALARY INCREASE LIMITATION

Sec. 14. Except as otherwise provided in section 11(e), no rate of salary shall be increased, by reason of the enactment of this title, to an amount in excess of the salary rate now or hereafter in effect for Level V of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule.

## ADJUSTMENT OF SALARY RATES FIXED BY ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION

Sec. 15. (a) The rates of basic compensation of assistant United States attorneys whose basic salaries are fixed pursuant to section 508 of title 28, United States Code, shall be increased by 3.6 per centum effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after October 1, 1965.

(b) Notwithstanding section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government and of the municipal government of the District of Columbia whose rates of compensation are fixed by administrative action pursuant to law and are not otherwise increased by this Act are hereby authorized to be increased effective on or after the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after October 1, 1965, by amounts not to exceed the increases provided by this Act for corresponding rates of compensation in the appropriate schedule or scale of pay.

(c) Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to authorize any increase in the rates of compensation of officers and employees whose rates of compensation are fixed and adjusted from time to time as nearly as is consistent with the public interest in accordance with prevailing rates or practices.

(d) Nothing contained in this section shall affect the authority contained in any law pursuant to which rates of compensation may be fixed by administrative action.

## TRAVEL ON OFFICIAL DUTY TIME

Sec. 16. Section 204 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended (68 Stat. 1110; 5 U.S.C. 912b), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "To the maximum extent practicable, the head of any department, independent establishment, or agency, including Government-owned or controlled corporations, or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, or the head of any legislative or judicial agency to which this title applies, shall schedule the time to be spent by an officer or employee in a travel status away from his official duty station within the regularly scheduled workweek of such officer or employee."

## EFFECTIVE DATES

Sec. 17. This title shall become effective as follows:

(1) This section and sections 1, 9, 13, 15, 16, and 18, and section 3107(3) of title 39, United States Code, as contained in the amendment made by section 6(a) of this Act, shall become effective on the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) Section 5 shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) Sections 2, 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, and 14 shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after October 1, 1965.

(4) Section 3 shall become effective on the ninetieth day following the date of enactment of this Act.

(5) Section 6(b), and section 3107 (1) and (2) of title 39, United States Code, as contained in the amendment made by section 6(a) of this Act, shall become effective as of July 1, 1965.

(6) For the purpose of determining the amount of insurance for which an individual is eligible under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, all changes in rates of compensation or salary which result from the enactment of this Act shall be held and considered to be effective as of the date of such enactment.

## PAYMENT OF RETROACTIVE SALARY

Sec. 18. (a) Retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid by reason of this Act only in the case of an individual in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this Act, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid (1) to an officer or employee who retired during the period beginning on the effective date prescribed by section 17(3) and ending on the date of en-

actment of this Act for services rendered during such period and (2) in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 3, 1950 (Public Law 636, Eighty-first Congress), as amended (5 U.S.C. 611-61k), for services rendered during the period beginning on the effective date prescribed by section 17(3) and ending on the date of enactment of this Act by an officer or employee who dies during such period. Such retroactive compensation or salary shall not be considered as basic salary for the purpose of the Civil Service Retirement Act in the case of any such retired or deceased officer or employee.

(b) For the purposes of this section, service in the Armed Forces of the United States, in the case of an individual relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or discharged from hospitalization following such training and service, shall include the period provided by law for the mandatory restoration of such individual to a position in or under the Federal Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

## CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL (interrupting the reading of the Senate amendments). Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOGGS. 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. 382]

Abbott	Frelinghuysen	O'Neal, Ga.
Albert	Friedel	Passman
Anderson, Tenn	Fulton, Pa.	Poage
Andrews,	Fulton, Tenn.	Pool
George W.	Fuqua	Powell
Andrews, Glenn	Griffiths	Purcell
Annunzio	Hagen, Calif.	Quire
Aspinall	Halleck	Reifel
Ayres	Hansen, Wash.	Reinecke
Bates	Hardy	Resnick
Battin	Harris	Reuss
Bell	Hawkins	Rivers, S.C.
Berry	Hays	Rogers, Tex.
Bingham	Hébert	Roncallo
Blatnik	Henderson	Rooney, Pa.
Bolling	Holfield	Roudebush
Bonner	Hosmer	Roybal
Bray	Howard	Saylor
Brock	Hull	Schlesler
Broomfield	Hungate	Schmidhauser
Burton, Calif.	Jacobs	Schweiker
Cahill	Jarman	Scott
Callaway	Jennings	Shriver
Cameron	Johnson, Pa.	Sikes
Cederberg	Jones, Ala.	Sisk
Celler	Keith	Slack
Chelf	Keogh	Smith, N.Y.
Clausen,	Kluczynski	Springer
Don H.	Kunkel	Staggers
Conte	Landrum	Stratton
Conyers	Leggett	Sullivan
Corman	Lennon	Sweeney
Cramer	Lindsay	Talcott
Culver	Long, La.	Tenzer
Curtis	McCarthy	Thomas
de la Garza	McDade	Thompson, N.J.
Devine	McMillan	Thompson, Tex.
Dickinson	Macdonald	Thomson, Wis.
Diggs	MacGregor	Toll
Dingell	Madden	Tuck
Dorn	Martin, Ala.	Tunney
Edwards, Ala.	Martin, Mass.	Van Deerlin
Edwards, Calif.	Martin, Nebr.	Vanik
Edwards, La.	Matthews	Vivian
Erlenborn	Michel	Watson
Evans, Colo.	Miller	Widnall
Evins, Tenn.	Mize	Williams
Fallon	McLagan	Wilson, Bob
Farnum	Mosher	Wilson,
Feighan	Nix	Charles H.
Fino	O'Konski	Wright
Fogarty	Olson, Minn.	Wyatt

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 279 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the amendment.

The Clerk resumed the reading of the Senate amendment.

Mr. MORRISON (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the Senate amendment be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Mr. Speaker, I would feel that the bill should be explained, at least in the important differences between the Senate bill as sent to us here and the House bill as previously passed sometime last summer, since this is a new bill that very few Members of the House have had an opportunity to see or read.

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

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, the House bill provided for a 4 percent pay increase. The 4 percent pay increase in the House bill has been reduced by the Senate amendment to 3.6 percent. The second pay raise provision has been omitted. This second year pay raise was in the House bill. The overtime pay for postal workers on Sundays and holidays has been replaced so that instead of time and a half it is time and a quarter differential. The overtime pay for postal substitutes in excess of 8 hours a day has been omitted. The \$150 uniform allowance has been cut to \$125. The commission to review the salaries of Federal officials, executives, judges, and Members of Congress has been eliminated.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman further, since all these items were considered to be so good when the House passed the bill nearly 370 to 7 and when we felt they were necessary to maintain the principle of comparability and when we felt that certain cost-of-living increases must be met, what has happened in the intervening period of time to show that these things are no longer necessary or desirable?

Mr. MORRISON. I am sure the gentleman takes the position that they are necessary, and I likewise do, also. However, the Senate saw fit to do otherwise and we are faced with the situation here at this time where we have to take the Senate amendments. The Senate did not see fit to go along with the House.

Mr. CORBETT. I recall, and I know that the gentleman does, also, that we have been in disagreement with the Senate before and we have insisted on our position. We even made so bold, when Mr. Eisenhower was President of these United States, to override his veto on the pay raise. Now it seems the mere hint from the other end of the avenue causes the Senate to cut our bill and causes us

to come in here and say, well, we will recede and concur in the Senate provisions. If comparability was a good thing before, it is a good thing now. If the cost of living has gone up, it is still up. If the pay raises were necessary and desirable in August, why are they not today?

Mr. MORRISON. The gentleman is certainly taking a very logical position as far as I see his position, and I am in accord with it, but the Senate did not decide to go along with our position.

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

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The cold fact of life is that the President sent word to the Congress that he would veto anything above 3.6 percent.

I join the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT] in asking what has happened to the pay provision of the bill, other than the threat of a veto, to cause the abdication of the House position that was taken by an almost unanimous vote on September 30. What has happened to change the situation?

Mr. MORRISON. The Senate delayed taking up the bill until today. That is the reason why it is before us now. I think this: Had the Senate taken it up earlier, we would not be quite the position we are in tonight.

Mr. GROSS. So we are commanded here tonight, in the closing hours of this session, to bend the knee to the White House and cut back on this bill simply because the President wants it that way. I would remind the House that when the military pay bill was passed the word came down from the White House that there would be a veto of anything above 5 percent. The House passed a bill calling for 10 percent. It was not vetoed, because Lyndon Johnson knew it would be passed over his veto.

I only wish there was the time here and now; that the other body had moved to dispose of this bill as it should have done, days and days ago, so that we could have sent this bill to the White House to learn whether Congress was going to cringe and bend the knee to the President or whether we are still in possession of our independence and freedom of action—whether we still have any independence of mind and body. I regret that this bill comes to the House under the circumstances that it does here tonight.

Mr. MORRISON. There has been a great deal of discussion about whether the President would sign the bill or whether he would veto the bill and all that I think is a matter of opinion. I think that the House acted in plenty of time in passing this bill. I think our committee performed a long, hard job in going over this bill to the fullest possible degree. We acted on it in time. The Senate did not see fit to take action on it until today. That is the reason we are in our present position.

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

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska, a member of the committee.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to follow up what was said by the gentleman from Louisiana. The House Post Office and Civil Service Committee has worked long and hard on this bill. I have been a member of this committee for 9 years. I have seen some pay bills go through haphazardly. But this bill was very carefully worked out, primarily under the direction and supervision of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

I have not known of a bill in the 9 years that I have been here that has been so carefully worked out. I am very disappointed that the other body has emasculated this bill so that we have to start all over again, so to speak.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to congratulate the gentleman from Arizona for his leadership. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Louisiana for his leadership, and the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN], for his leadership, as well as many other Members who worked months and months and months on this bill.

And while we have worked months and months on this bill the other body has worked days. I certainly am disappointed that we are confronted with this situation at this time.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I recognize that the gentleman from Louisiana may be performing a rather unpleasant task here, and I would like to ask him just this question, and then I shall yield further.

Mr. CORBETT. Does the gentleman from Louisiana believe that in accepting the Senate bill we have for the predictable future repudiated the principle of comparability?

Mr. MORRISON. Well, I believe that is certainly a debatable question and I think it could be debated for a long time. I believe the Senate certainly cut out a lot of comparability features of the bill on which we worked so hard and long to try to incorporate in our bill that we sent over to the other body.

Mr. CORBETT. Well, there have been many famous retreats in history.

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

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

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman yielding and I would like to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania and other members of the committee for bringing this back to us. I believe the question before the House here tonight, on the eve of adjournment, is whether we are going to capitulate and whether we will accept the Senate version being rammed down our throats.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make simply two inquiries:

First, do I understand from the statement of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] in opening this discussion and colloquy here tonight that the congressional pay raise, including automatics, future considerations clause or otherwise, is out of the bill as passed by the other body?

Mr. MORRISON. That is correct.

Mr. HALL. Secondly, has there been a promise on the part of the other body

October 22, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

27313

or the potential conferees, or the leadership, or any others, that there will be consideration of an additional pay raise next year in the 2d session of the 89th Congress?

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I believe the chairman of the committee of the other body in his speech today on the floor of the other body said that next year the other body would have ample time in which to go into all comparability features of the problem.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and I appreciate the gentleman's yielding to me, and I compliment the gentleman.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], before I do yield to him, if the gentleman would not agree that the other body really had ample time in which to act on these features? Was not this bill finally reported and passed here in the House of Representatives about September 13?

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, September 30 was the day of its passage.

Mr. CORBETT. But we had been working on the bill practically all year; is that not true?

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, this is correct.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, now I would be very happy to yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me and let me say, before we take final action on this, we may not be fair to the Federal employees and honest with the Federal employees, and we are not in this bill but we ought to be fair and honest with ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, before we take action on this matter we ought to know what we are doing.

Mr. Speaker, this bill left the House of Representatives as one of the best pay bills that has ever been carefully drafted and sent to the other body.

Mr. Speaker, I was the "father" of it, because it had my name on it, although it should have carried the names of many other sponsors of this legislation.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I was the proud parent. But this bill comes back tonight, as a watered down, toothless, illegitimate, emaciated, outrage. That is about all I can say about it.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe I am going to deny paternity but perhaps I ought to do so.

But, Mr. Speaker, let me tell the Members of the House another thing about this bill and what the other body has done to us. They have deliberately put us in a situation here tonight where we have to take it or leave it.

First, Mr. Speaker, this is not a compromise. It is a total capitulation. The House of Representatives has been had. We have not had an opportunity to work on it. They have sent it back to us in a situation where we have no choice but to accept it.

Second, Mr. Speaker, this is not a bill that has been written by the Congress.

This is a bill that was written by the Bureau of the Budget and the White House. It was passed under pressure and under the threat of veto.

Mr. Speaker when we accept this monstrosity tonight we have abrogated our function in formulating pay legislation for some 2 million Federal employees.

In this bill, as the gentleman stated a moment ago, in my judgment this great, glorious principle of comparability is dead. Four years ago we said to the Federal employees "This is what we are going to do. Now we have a standard of pay. It is equality with private enterprise." By this bill we postpone any action. The second phase we had for next year would go about one-half the way toward comparability. We say now "Wait until next year. Maybe we will begin to move." I do not think we will then if the actions of this year are any indication.

The next thing we ought to keep in mind is the point about passing a pay bill in an election year. For 10 years we have had a Federal pay bill in every election year. We could have avoided this situation. Now this too goes down the drain. Next year we will be back here with a good old election year bill. I can say to the people in the Budget Bureau they will not save any money, because it is going to cost more, it will be a bigger bill, and I will probably support it in light of what has occurred.

One more point. The attempt to make some sense out of keeping the judicial and congressional and executive pay in line with the other pay in the four Federal pay systems has gone down the drain. We did do it in the House when we knocked out the automatic feature to keep it in line with the GS-18 scales. But we did say every 4 years we would take a look at the military pay and other pay systems, and attempt to make some recommendations and keep them in line. The administration wanted this. But the Senate threw this overboard, too.

We tried to adjust some overtime inequities among the classified. This went overboard also. The things we carefully put together over the weeks of study and hearings have been thrown overboard also.

So tonight, if we approve this, we bow to the guidelines. The guidelines are apparently sacred and all important. The guidelines didn't mean anything, however, when we passed the military pay bill. It was a half billion dollars more than the administration recommended, but tonight the Federal employees have to make way for the guidelines.

So I am not at all happy about the bill. I am somewhat like the small-town editor who was asked if he had any opinion on a burning issue and he said, "Well, I have not made up my mind, but when I do I will be bitter."

I have made up my mind about this thing. I am bitter, I guess, but I am not going to object. However, when you go home tonight or tomorrow, and meet with your postal employees, do not brag about this bill. The average letter carrier is going to get about \$3 a week in-

crease, although he is entitled to a minimum of \$700 a year. As I stated, I am not going to object. Maybe I ought to, but in light of the realities of the situation we ought to know what we are doing tonight.

I think we all will agree with the thoughtful comment of a great statesman that the key to successful legislation is the art of compromise. To be perfectly blunt, what we have done here is substitute capitulation for compromise in accepting the amendment written in the other body that masquerades under the guise of a reasonable Federal Salary Act.

I hasten to say that all the blame should not be placed on that body. There is plenty to go around among the bureaucrats, advisers, and self-styled experts who helped shape the aborted form of H.R. 10281 that was laid before this House—on a take-this-or-nothing basis—in the dying hours of this session of the 89th Congress. The one bright ray in an otherwise dismal prospect is the wise judgment of the House of Representatives in passing H.R. 10281 by an overwhelming vote on September 30.

Our House bill was a good bill, a statesmen like bill—indeed, a bill that exemplified the art of legislative compromise in its best sense. It was the refined product of careful and extensive consideration in the Post Office and Civil Service Committee and thorough debate in the House. No one gained everything asked or wanted, and everyone had to yield something in a spirit of give and take to work the will of the House. The result was an act that was meaningful and encouraging to 1.8 million employees and promised even greater value in the management of the vast affairs of our National Government.

The bill was reported to the House only after careful and exhaustive hearings before our standing Subcommittee on Compensation. The subcommittee members applied themselves with utmost diligence and attention to develop all of the information and evidence needed by the committee and the House to make sound decisions. The subcommittee met in a number of executive sessions, as well as in informal conferences and meetings with both administration and employee representatives, and the committee itself deliberated extensively over a period of 8 days before reporting the bill on a vote of 20 to 3.

Mr. Speaker, Federal salary policy is not only complex, it is critically important to the success of our defense effort and other domestic and worldwide commitments of the Government. It is a matter—like marriage vows—not to be entered into lightly. The determination of a sound and useful salary policy is a task you have got to give your whole mind to.

Our House bill was a sincere, moderate, and wholly reasonable attempt to move toward comparability between Federal and private enterprise salaries, in accordance with the congressional policy laid down in Public Law 87-793; and to remedy certain long-standing inequities in the pay statutes. I will not say the path was easy or deny that a good deal

of courage was required in the face of pressures that were just as heavy here as in the other body. It is to the eternal credit of our Members that the House produced a bill that at least met the minimum standards we were in honor bound to observe. We kept the trust imposed on us when we committed ourselves to the comparability principle 3 short years ago.

Now, I ask, where does our magnificent comparability policy stand in the bill forced on us today? Were all of the great principles of Public Law 87-793 mere platitudes, to lull postal and other Federal employees—to say nothing of Members of Congress—into a false hope that we had finally laid the foundation for a sensible and workable salary system? Is Federal salary comparability, after all, only a myth?

We were happy and proud when our 1962 and 1964 salary bills were hailed as great advances in public administration. Should we take equal shame when we hear this measure described, on all sides, as at best as woefully inadequate and at worst a breach of trust and a miserable abomination?

In the House, public hearings were conducted on 11 separate days extending over a period from June 1 to June 29. The subcommittee met in executive session three times over a 7-day period, and the committee met in executive session on July 29, August 3, August 4, and August 5, to perfect the bill finally reported to the House. There were, as I have noted, many other informal meetings between our Members and representatives of the administration and employee groups. I think it is fair to add that the vast majority of my personal time and attention throughout this session has been devoted to this Federal salary legislation.

The committee in the other body, in sharp contrast, held only 2 days of public hearings on the House bill, into which all of the testimony and the views of interested parties were crammed. With this attenuated public exposure the Senate—under harsh threat of veto and unrelenting pressures—struck out all of the carefully prepared House bill and in its place wrote an amendment that leaves the whole subject of Federal salary policy in utter chaos. I forecast, with no hesitancy, that it will work out more to the detriment of the Government—and the taxpayers—than to the employees, whom it also cheats.

In the first place, one of the most obvious practical advantages of the comparability policy adopted in 1962 was its promise of orderly and precise salary adjustments to go hand in hand with those in the private sector, thus avoiding the danger of over-liberal and distorted pay raises enacted during election years under the attendant pressures and influences. With H.R. 10281 in the shape enacted by the other body, no one is so naive as to believe there will not be a pressure-laden salary bill enacted by the Congress next year—with great acclamation.

For another thing, this aborted version of a pay bill is pennywise and pound foolish. Our House bill provided

a 4 percent general increase this month, and a second-phase increase a year later that would have averaged out at approximately 4¼ percent, with the latter covering only three-fourths of the fiscal year 1967. With that second-phase raise removed from our bill, and in the light of past experience, it is a foregone conclusion that next year will see a pay raise of 6 percent or more taking effect for the full 1967 fiscal year. The meager four-tenths of 1 percent saving which the Senate amendment purports to achieve will be far outweighed by next year's handsome increase.

But however, those practical aspects may be, the most damaging loss from the striking of the second-phase increase is that it may be the death-knoll of Federal salary comparability in our time. One of the great values of the second-phase increase was its movement of middle- and upper-level Federal salaries toward reasonably current comparability with private enterprise salary rates for positions of equal levels of responsibility. The Senate's 3.6 percent increase leaves the lower salary grades and levels roughly comparable with private enterprise rates for February-March 1964, but relegates the middle and upper grades to 1963 and 1962 comparability, respectively. If we are unable to correct even a part of these glaring deficiencies in the middle and upper grades as part of a bill granting but a 3.6-percent general increase, how in the name of logic can we hope to improve the situation next year along with a far more costly general percentage increase?

Mr. Speaker, to this point I have dealt only with the impact of our Federal statutory salary systems of the toothless and watered down version of our pay bill that came back to us today. The crowning irony of the Senate amendment is that, in its blunderbuss efforts to pacify administration objectors, it has not only destroyed comparability, but for all intents and purposes, it has knocked out even those things the administration agrees to or most dearly desires.

The first of these is the Federal Salary Review Commission. John W. Macy, Jr., Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, appearing before our Compensation Subcommittee, stated:

The quadrennial reviews by a Federal Salary Review Commission should result in reduction of the time-lag in statutory schedule adjustments, substantial saving of the time of Congress, and more orderly relationships among top Federal salaries, career-level civilian rates, and compensation of the uniformed services.

I agree with Chairman Macy, and the House Members must agree with him since they included this section in the House-passed bill. But the Senate rejected the opinion of both the administration and the House of Representatives.

Next is the perplexing problem in connection with the salaries of Members of Congress, Federal executives, and Judges.

In submitting its salary recommendations to the Congress the administration had recommended that we include in our bill a provision that would set up an automatic salary adjustment procedure

for the officials on an orderly and timely basis. Our bill, as reported from the committee, modified the administration's proposal but did establish a responsible method of dealing with this problem. It was a well-considered procedure that we are confident would have eliminated the chaos we confront approximately every 20 years when it becomes necessary to jump the salaries of Members of Congress, executives, and Judges in a high percentage amount.

Last year the Congress was forced to face this dilemma because of the compression that existed in the statutory salary systems and the Congress was forced to raise the salaries of its own Members, Federal executives, and Judges by \$7,500. The Congress simply had no choice in the matter.

However, the other body saw fit to reject any proposal in its bill that would attempt to solve the agonizing problem of keeping the salaries of Members of Congress in an orderly relationship with all other salary systems.

Mr. Speaker, it was my earnest hope, and one that I am sure most Members of the House shared with me, that here in the closing days of this session of Congress, we would be implementing and enunciating anew the cherished promise of comparability. The nearly 2 million citizens of this country who have chosen a career of service to their Government have been looking to us for further assurances that they would not be treated as second-class citizens and that they would not have to suffer economically simply because they chose to work for the Federal Government rather than for private enterprise.

Unfortunately, no other conclusion can be reached today than that we have forsaken the promise of comparability and that we have bowed to the expediency of simply granting another across-the-board pay raise.

If we cannot be fair and honest with our Federal employees, we have simply got to be fair and honest with ourselves. We have got to admit our complicity in the collapse of comparability.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. I would like to ask the gentleman from Louisiana what happens to the pay raise we had in the original bill concerning the members of the Parole Commission?

Mr. MORRISON. The Senate took that out too.

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

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to associate myself with the position of the subcommittee chairman [Mr. UDALL]. I feel precisely the same as he does.

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

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. I would like to ask the gentleman from Louisiana a question: If this bill is so bad, which I think it is, we had it under consideration over

October 22, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

27315

10½ months. What is wrong with sending this bill back to conference, and staying here another day? We have been meeting 10½ months. One day longer is not going to be a hardship.

Mr. MORRISON. As I say, the bill is not what we want, but I think at this time we have to take this bill or nothing.

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

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. UDALL. This was my reaction originally. I have spoken as the gentleman from Louisiana has, in the last few hours, to the leaders of the employee organizations who came in here asking and justifying, perhaps, a 6-percent or a 7-percent raise. We put it to them cold turkey—do you want this watered-down bill or do you want to come back next year and try to improve it? It is the recommendation and judgment of the leaders of the major Federal employee organizations that they would rather have this than to go in the other direction. That is the main reason I am taking the position I am taking tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks as I have some more things I want to say about this bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I want to enquire in what the gentleman from Arizona just said. This is a bad bill. I have been in touch with the leaders of the postal unions and the other Federal employee organizations. I guess we are going to have to take this or nothing. So I guess we are going to have to take this.

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

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

Mr. BELCHER. I would like to ask the gentleman from Arizona if it is fair to say that the postal workers and the Federal workers are going to have to pay part of the bill for the war on poverty in Appalachia?

Mr. UDALL. This is precisely the case. We have increased Federal spending this year by some \$4 or \$5 billion. No one raised these guidelines when these bills were up. But the guideline question came up and the brunt of it all is borne by the Federal workers who already are 3 to 5 years behind the pay scales in private industry. This is the thing I do not like about it.

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

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

Mr. DENT. I want to tell my colleagues the true story of what has happened in the State of Pennsylvania. In 1913 the first workmen's compensation act was passed in the State of Pennsylvania. Every 2 years in the biennial ses-

sion of the State legislature a modest increase was asked for in the workmen's compensation act. But certain very good friends of the workingman always tried to double or triple the amount of benefits that were asked for. So for 20 long years not 1 cent of increase was ever given to the workingman of Pennsylvania because when their friends—their real friends—wanted to give them a little, some of their enemies wanted to give them too much—and so for 20 long years they never got anything.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Folks, the hour is getting late. I think we ought to get back to the real central point. The real central point is that we only have one thing left that we really can support and that is the annual review of the salaries and wages of Federal employees. However, my dear friend, UDALL, of Arizona, does not like this bill. I want you to know I dislike it more than he does. But I do like the proposition—and it is a good proposition—that we are going to establish a precedent tonight that we are going to review the wages and salaries of Federal employees just as often—and not more often—but just as often as they are reviewed in private employment.

So while I do not like the terms of this bill, I am going to support it. I recommend everybody here now—let us take it. Then let us follow the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] again next year when he calls his committee together and we will review the whole situation all over again. Please vote for this bill.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] for what he promises will be the shortest speech of the session.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, to what has been said by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT], the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], and the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN], I merely say, "Amen."

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say finally that these gentlemen have told us one thing one time and another thing another time. I hope next year they will be able to tell us which time they mean it and which time they do not mean it.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, a man—or a woman—is worth his pay. As much so in Government as in private employment. From the recitals which we have heard on the floor tonight of the changes made by the Senate in the bill which passed the House, apparently at the instigation of the Bureau of the Budget, little remains of the carefully thought-out work of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] and his colleagues.

The Senate version appears to meet with universal condemnation by the members of the House committee. Yet we are urged to accept it with the alternative being no bill at all.

I raise no objection solely because the

gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON], the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], and the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] indicate their judgment that the Senate amendments should be accepted.

My own judgment is that it should not be done but we should refuse to concur in the Senate amendments and request a conference. Though everyone in the House is anxious to adjourn, similar conditions must and do exist in the Senate; the same pressures that affect us here tonight will, likewise, affect them. In any event, anxious as I am to adjourn, I do not want to adjourn such an outstanding session on a sour note, leaving behind us a job which we know is not well done. For my part, I am prepared to stay in session until this matter is not just resolved but resolved properly. I recall the late, great Ambassador Stevenson's reply to the Russian delegate during the Cuban confrontation where he said words to this effect: "I am prepared to sit here 'till Hell freezes over waiting for your answer." I am prepared to sit here for a similar period while we negotiate a satisfactory compromise to this disagreement over the Federal pay bill rather than capitulate, simply to adjourn.

I am constrained, nevertheless, to bow to the judgment of the gentleman from Arizona and to follow, not the leadership of the Bureau of the Budget nor the leadership of the Senate, but the leadership of our own House who have spent infinite amounts of time and study on this matter. I do so, however, with regret.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the pay raise bill that we have just discussed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE TO WAIT UPON THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 623) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 623

Resolved, That a committee of two Members be appointed by the House to join a similar committee appointed by the Senate, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed their business of the session and are ready to adjourn, unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

27316

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

October 22, 1965

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as Members of the committee on the part of the House to notify the President the gentleman from Louisiana Mr. Boggs, and the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. GERALD R. FORD.

#### SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 49 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 49

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation pursuant to the provisions of section 244(a) (2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended (86 Stat. 204; 8 U.S.C. 1251):*

A-8240034, Plich, Jan.  
A-4291563, Placzkiewicz, Stanley James.  
A-12358710, Hoy, Hom Fook.  
A-2563752, Ninomiya, Issaku.  
A-4291730, Palumbo, John.  
A-5972279, Rieger, Ferenz.  
A-4262857, Rosen, Morris.  
A-7962109, Tomczak, Michael.  
A-1149855, Bohun, Sil.  
A-5829164, Cricus, Franciszkus.  
A-4986241, Jiminez-Gomez, Rafael.  
A-11199183, Kong, Dunn Chong.  
A-11926583, Louie, King Fong.  
A-4169178, Mejia-Cortes, Anacleto.  
A-1614102, Rosenberg, Ben.  
A-13165748, Wong, Wing Art.  
A-4705363, Lubin, Irving.  
A-3840332, Sanchez-Monroy, Jose.  
A-5055592, de la Trinidad-Berroteran, Jesus.  
A-1565564, Vargas-Barrera, Pedro.  
A-7930331, Altman, Nathan.  
A-7222730, Bach, Harry.  
A-10162061, Goom, Phillip Que.  
A-12360130, Son, Tom.  
A-5848373, Arroyo-Olague, Pedro.  
A-6777333, Cornez, Edward A.  
A-4360830, Pulido-Hernandez, Julie.  
A-3925714, Sobona, Karl.  
A-13020489, Suey, Fun Jung.  
A-6008514, Vda De Delgado, Antonia Rios.  
A-5999916, Pospasil, Rose Antoinette.  
A-5621715, Remenyi, Alajos Aladar.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### LEGISLATION FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE VICTIM OF CRIMINAL ASSAULT

(Mrs. GREEN of Oregon asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the victim of a crime is in a very real sense a double victim. He is attacked by the assailant and left with the loss of his possessions. At time

ment injury to one who supports a family or is responsible for the care of children.

The assault victim also loses in another way. Society, which takes upon itself the responsibility of repressing crime and prosecuting those who violate its law, at present shows little concern for the victim of the mugger, the rapist, or the murderer. Too often, the only interest in the victim is that he is in good enough condition to be a possible witness in a prosecution.

While the criminal is given every protection of the Constitution and the law and free legal counsel—if he needs it, the victim is afforded little, even though it is he who has suffered the most.

The distinguished Senator YARBOROUGH, of Texas, has introduced legislation to better balance the values of police protection and constitutional rights for the accused and community care for the victim. The theory under which this legislation is introduced—to compensate the victims of crimes of violence for injuries to the person—is fairly new in this country. Great Britain and New Zealand already have compensation plans, and the State of California recently embarked on such a program. The distinguished Senator from Texas, Mr. YARBOROUGH, has introduced similar legislation.

Compensation plans have the backing of some of the Nation's most distinguished jurists. As former Supreme Court Justice Arthur Goldberg pointed out, the victim of a violent crime "has been denied the protection of the laws in a very real sense, and society should assume some responsibility for making him whole."

This legislation proposes setting up a Federal Violent Crimes Compensation Commission, a three-man tribunal chosen for their legal prowess, which would consider the claims of those who suffer physical injuries during the commission of crimes. The Commission will decide if the victim is actually an innocent party and it will determine the level of compensation. In setting the compensation the Commission will provide only for actual medical costs suffered by the victim, including rehabilitation services involved. In the event of a murder, the victim's dependents would be paid but in no event would the compensation exceed \$25,000. A victim of a crime of violence, to receive compensation, would have to give notice of intent to submit his claim within 1 month of injury. The Commission would set up the standards of evidence. There would be no appeal from the decision of the Commission.

Such a law, it seems to me, is the very least that we can do for those who innocently suffer from the wanton assaults of those who have no respect for law or authority—or who decide to take the law into their own hands. So far, society has shown little concern for those who are the victims of these crimes. There are the days lost, the medical costs of recovery, the pain and suffering, the years of physical and mental torment. It is hoped that

in a small way this bill can start the national effort necessary to insure that victims of crimes are protected by society and returned to their jobs and families as quickly and painlessly as possible.

I am introducing similar legislation to Senator YARBOROUGH's on this, the closing day of the 1st half of the 89th Congress, hoping that some staff work will be done during the recess and that the attention of the committee can be directed to it early next year.

#### MILTON J. SHAPP, PENNSYLVANIA INDUSTRIALIST AND PUBLIC SERVANT, SPEAKS ON THE PROPOSED PENN-CENTRAL RAILROAD MERGER

(Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, when my friend, Milton Shapp, a successful businessman with a heart, speaks or argues on a matter of public concern, I generally have but one observation to make—he is a serious student of whatever he undertakes and the public interest is his.

Yesterday, he appeared before the Interstate Commerce Commission, to argue against the proposed Penn-Central Railroad merger. I have not studied firsthand this most involved question. At this moment, I cannot even say whether I believe Milton Shapp is right or wrong in his viewpoint. I do know that he is now and will always remain a singular businessman.

He knows the value of business profit. He also knows the profit that comes from correctly evaluating that which affects all our daily lives. This includes economics that are affected by such gigantic joining together of two giant transportation systems such as the Pennsylvania Railroad with the New York Central Railroad.

The Washington Post this morning ran a story which mentioned Milton Shapp's testimony as well as that of Leon Keyserling, the chief economist of former President Harry Truman, as well as Joseph J. Saunders, who spoke for the Justice Department.

With permission of the House, Mr. Speaker, I include Milton Shapp's testimony and the Washington Post article:

ORAL ARGUMENT BEFORE THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION, BY MILTON J. SHAPP, OF PHILADELPHIA, PA.

(Finance Docket No. 21989, Pennsylvania Railroad Co., merger, New York Central Railroad Co., Finance Docket No. 21990, Pennsylvania Railroad Co., stock issuance, October 21, 1965)

During the past 15 years I have visited almost every community in Pennsylvania; devoting considerable time to studying the problems of the Commonwealth and working on plans to redevelop its falling economy. For the last 3 years I have followed closely the proposals advanced by the PRR-NYC railroads to merge their companies, and have analyzed in depth the effect such a merger would have upon the economy of the Commonwealth.