

TAB

Mr. SPEAKER, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 734)

to revise the basic compensation schedules of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 16, 1958.)

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORRECTION IN ENROLLMENT OF S. 734

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (S. Con. Res. 93) to provide for correction in the enrollment of S. 734, to revise the basic compensation schedules of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That in the enrollment of the bill (S. 734) to revise the basic compensation schedules of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes, the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to make the following correction:

In the sixth line of the salary schedule in section 6 (a) (3) strike out "8,955" and insert in lieu thereof "8,755."

The concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks in the Record on the bill S. 734.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, this legislation provides for general salary increases for Federal employees paid under a number of different basic acts. The net result will be to boost the salaries of most Federal employees by 10 percent, retroactive to the first pay period which begins after January 1, 1958. It includes employees of the Federal Government paid under the Classification Act schedules, officers and employees of the judicial and legislative branches of the Government, doctors, dentists, and nurses of the Department of Medicine

and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration, and foreign service employees.

This bill also provides a temporary 2½ percent increase to supervisors and postmasters and others in level 7 and above paid under the Postal Field Service Schedules, comparable to the increase given other postal field service employees under Public Law 426, recently enacted. This amendment, as well as several other minor and technical amendments, was concurred in by the Senate with several added numbered amendments.

The conference was limited to consideration of the several additional Senate amendments. The first amendment provided that the full pay raise would not apply to scientists and engineers in the Federal Government who had been raised to a higher within-grade step under authority of the Civil Service Commission. Under this amendment these scientists and engineers would have the option of either their present salary or 10 percent of their former salary, whichever was the higher. The Senate amendment was struck out by the conferees and the language of the bill as it passed the House is the language of the conference agreement. In other words, these scientists and engineers will get their 10 percent salary increase on their present salary. In taking this action, the conferees point out that the Civil Service Commission has ample authority to make equitable adjustments in the future in the compensation of these employees.

The second Senate amendment related to the manner in which the Senators handle the payroll in their own offices and, of course, is an amendment in which we concurred, since it is a prerogative of that body to handle its payroll in a manner which they prescribe.

The third amendment is one requested by our own Disbursing Office as a means of clarifying the manner in which the salaries of the employees of the Folding Room will be set. Since this was a request from the House side, we concurred in this amendment.

The fourth amendment provides that while retroactive salary and compensation will be paid to employees who retired during the retroactive period and to the estate of those who died during that period, the retroactive pay will not be used as a basis for recomputing the retirement annuities. This is the same provision which is contained in the postal rate and pay act which recently became law. We concurred in this amendment.

Senate amendment 5 was the most far-reaching. It struck out two important provisions in the House bill. The first provides for a proper salary adjustment for the Chief Postal Inspector of the Post Office Department. It was our view, after looking into this matter, that the Chief Postal Inspector should be paid the same salary as the General Counsel of the Post Office Department, which is \$19,000 per annum, since they have comparable responsibilities. The Senate receded on this point and the provision of the House bill relating to the Chief Postal Inspector's salary is in the conference agreement.

The second provision under amendment No. 5 which was struck out by the Senate is a requirement that henceforth all individuals appointed to positions at salaries of grades 16, 17, and 18, under the classification act schedules, must receive approval as to their qualifications before being assigned to positions in these salary grades. The Senate struck out this provision and the conference agreement has reinstated it in a modified form so as to exclude from this requirement appointments of the President alone or by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

The balance of amendment No. 5 is concerned with increases in the number of positions paid grades 16, 17, and 18 salary levels—the so-called supergrades—and calls for additional positions provided for under Public Law 313, 80th Congress—scientific and professional positions. The supergrade salaries range from \$14,190 to \$17,500 under the new bill, while the Public Law 313 position salaries range from \$12,500 to \$19,000 per annum. Taking into consideration the fact that our committee at the present time is holding hearings on specific requests for such additional positions, we felt that they should not be authorized at this time. However, a compromise was reached whereby approximately half of these positions provided for by the Senate amendment were approved. It is also pointed out that the need for these positions in the 16, 17, and 18 category was to meet outside competition and that the 10-percent salary rise will give grade 15 the pay of the present 16.

Public Law 313 positions—scientific and professional positions—were increased for the Department of Defense by 157, the National Security Agency by 25, the Department of Interior by 5, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics by 60, the Department of the Interior by 5, the Department of Commerce by 25, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare by 5.

An increase of 287 supergrade positions were allocated to be distributed by the Civil Service Commission as they deem necessary under authority of section 505 (b) of the Classification Act and 38 additional supergrades were given to the Federal Bureau of Investigation and 4 grades No. 17 were given to the Administrative Office of the United States Courts.

This makes a total of 329 additional supergrade positions allotted, 282 additional scientific and professional positions and 25 special positions for the Public Health Service, making a total of 636 additional positions under these categories.

The conference agreement also contains a suggestion that Congress, when making appropriations for use by the States for cooperative agricultural extension work and agricultural extension stations for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1958, take into consideration the need for an equivalent increase of 10 percent to the employees who work on these programs.

There were also a number of additional technical amendments to conform

to the 5 numbered Senate amendments. These, of course, were concurred in to the extent that they affect the numbered amendments which were retained in the conference agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this rather completely covers the situation as it relates to the Federal employees salary increase legislation and the conference report.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on S. 734, the Federal classified pay increase bill. This conference report will provide a much-needed increase of 10 percent to Federal classified employees. This increase is very badly needed, as these Federal classified employees have received no pay increase since 1955.

I am particularly pleased that the conferees agreed with the original position of the House of Representatives and deleted the Senate amendment which would have restricted the increases for scientists, engineers, and technical personnel. I am convinced that it is most essential that these technical personnel receive the full 10 percent pay increase which is provided for other classified employees in this bill. One of the most difficult problems of the Federal Government in recent years has been its loss of scientists, engineers, and technical people to industry, where wage scales are much more attractive for such highly skilled personnel.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement on S. 734 is essentially the same, in respect to salary increases for Federal employees and related provisions, as provided in the bill which passed the House by an overwhelming majority on June 2.

The purpose of this legislation is to provide salary adjustments for approximately 1,021,000 Federal workers, including 978,632 under the Classification Act, 19,485 doctors, dentists, and nurses in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, 12,636 in the Foreign Service, 6,200 in the legislative branch, and 4,119 in the judicial branch. As passed by the House, the bill also removed an inequity relating to the salaries of postmasters and supervisors, resulting from enactment of the recent postal rate and postal pay legislation, by granting postmasters and supervisors the same 2½ percent cost-of-living increase provided in the postal pay bill to all other postal employees.

In other words, S. 734 as amended and passed by the House on June 2 provided for a 10 percent salary increase for all these Federal employees retroactive to the first pay period in January. The purpose of the bill is not changed by the conference agreement. The Senate has agreed to the House provisions for these salary increases.

All of the provisions of the House engrossed amendment are contained in the conference agreement, with certain technical modifications designed to carry out these provisions more effectively. For example, section 11 of the House engrossed amendment, requiring Civil Service Commission approval of qualifications of appointees to supergrade positions under the Classification Act, was amended to provide exceptions in cases of Presidential appointees and

certain positions in the Executive Office of the President. Another change provides a salary step-rate in the adjusted postal field service schedule inadvertently omitted when the Post Office Department submitted its schedule. Two other Senate amendments agreed to by the committee of conference make technical changes to clarify the provisions of the bill relating to employees in offices of Senators and to conform the language with respect to maximum pay of House folding room employees to appropriation procedures.

It should be pointed out that the provision of the House engrossed amendment granting the 10 percent salary increase to some 67,000 scientists, engineers, and other employees in personnel-shortage categories—who have received adjustments over the past several years—are contained in the conference agreement. Under the Senate amendment, a great many of these essential employees would have been subject to greatly reduced increases in their salaries.

The principal change contained in the conference agreement relates to the authorization of additional positions in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the general schedule of the Classification Act—the so-called supergrade positions—in the salary range of \$14,190 to \$17,500 per annum, and additional professional and scientific positions authorized under Public Law 313, 80th Congress, and the Public Health Service Act, as amended, in the salary range of \$12,500 to \$19,000. The Senate amendment would have provided an increase of 547 supergrade positions and changed 11 existing grade GS-16 positions to grade 17 of the general schedule, none of which were authorized in the House engrossed amendment. The Senate amendment also would have increased the number of scientific and professional positions under Public Law 313 by 515 and the number of such positions under the Public Health Service Act by 25; none of such increases were contained in the House engrossed amendment.

The conference agreement in general provides for 50 percent of the increases in supergrade positions and professional and scientific positions which would have been authorized by the Senate amendment, with certain necessary exceptions. The exceptions as to the supergrades, which are approved in the conference agreement, are four new grade 17 positions in the Administrative Office of the United States Courts and adjustment of 11 existing grade 16 positions in the Immigration and Naturalization Service to grade 17, as provided by the Senate amendment.

The exceptions as to scientific and professional positions included approval of increases of 25 in the National Security Agency, 5 each in the Departments of Agriculture and Health, Education, and Welfare, and 25 in the Public Health Service—bringing the total in Public Health Service to 85, of which 73 must be in the National Institutes of Health.

It was felt by the majority of the conferees that a strong case has been presented by the departments and agencies concerned, in justification of some in-

crease in their top-level classified and professional and scientific positions in order to recruit and to retain qualified personnel in defense and other essential functions. However, the conferees recognized that hearings presently are in progress before our House Post Office and Civil Service Committee to develop complete information on the need for increases in the numbers of these positions and that, pending completion of the hearings and analysis of the information developed, only one-half of the requested increases should be approved in this legislation, aside from the special exceptions I have mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, I feel this legislation represents the best and most equitable agreement that could be worked out, and urge its approval by the House.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1959

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 12540) making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection. The Clerk read the statement. (For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 16, 1958.)

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered. The conference report was agreed to. The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows: Senate amendment No. 5: Page 5, line 4, insert the following: "Provided further, That the Administrator is authorized, subject to the procedures prescribed in the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, but without regard to the numerical limitations contained therein, to place 10 General Schedule positions in the following grades: 1 in grade GS-18, 2 in grade GS-17, and 7 in grade GS-16; and such positions shall be in addition to positions previously allocated to this agency under section 505 of said act."

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to. The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows: Senate amendment No. 21: Page 12, line 22, insert the following: "Provided, That effective December 31, 1958, the unexpended balance remaining in this account is hereby rescinded and carried to the surplus fund in the Treasury."

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

1958: And provided further, That the requirements of paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of this section shall be applicable to the loans authorized to be made under this paragraph.

"Sec. 208. Unemployment compensation: (a) (1) The Secretary of Labor (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary') shall on behalf of the United States enter into an agreement with any State in which an enterprise, or community, with respect to which a certificate of eligibility has been issued under this title, is located, under which the State, an agent of the United States, will make supplementary payments of compensation to unemployed individuals in the State as provided for in this section, and will otherwise cooperate with the Secretary and with other State agencies in making payments of compensation under this section.

"(2) Supplementary payments of unemployment compensation under this section shall be made only to individuals within the class of individuals determined by the Board under section 205 of this title to be eligible to receive the benefits provided for in this title.

"(3) If the amount of unemployment compensation payable to an individual under the law of the State in which he is eligible to receive unemployment compensation is less than 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ percent of his average weekly wage, as determined under such law, then the amount of the supplementary payment of unemployment compensation to an individual under this section for a week of total unemployment shall be an amount equal to the amount by which 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ percent of such average weekly wage exceeds the amount paid to the individual under the unemployment compensation law of the State (including payments made by reason of dependents).

"(4) In any case where an unemployed individual receiving supplementary compensation under this section is no longer entitled to payment of compensation under the unemployment-compensation laws of the State solely by reason of the expiration of the period for which such compensation is payable under such laws, there shall be paid to such individual, out of amounts paid to such State by the United States for such purpose and without cost to such State, compensation in an amount equal to the rate of State unemployment compensation and any supplementary compensation under this section which he was receiving immediately prior to the time he was no longer entitled to receive such rate. In order to remain eligible for compensation under this paragraph, an individual must comply with the provisions of State law with respect to ability and availability for work, and with respect to the acceptance of offers of suitable work, and failure to so comply shall result in immediate cessation of payment under this paragraph. The total period during which an unemployed individual may receive benefits under this section shall not exceed 52 weeks.

"(5) The amount of the Federal supplementary payment of unemployment compensation to an individual for a week of partial unemployment shall be the amount necessary to provide such individual with a weekly benefit equal to the aggregate he would have received under paragraph (3) of this subsection for a week of total unemployment, less his earnings for such week in excess of the partial earnings allowance, if any, permitted by the unemployment-compensation law of the State.

"(6) Any agreement under this section shall provide that compensation otherwise payable to any individual under the State's unemployment-compensation law will not be denied or reduced for any week by reason of any payment made pursuant to such agreement. No agreement under this section for payment of compensation by a State agency shall be valid if compensation payable

to any individual under the law of such State is less than it would have been under such law as it existed on January 1, 1958.

"(b) Whenever the Board either upon application of an interested party or upon its own motion, determines that unemployment among individuals found by the Board to be eligible to receive the benefits provided for in this title is no longer attributable to the trade policy of the United States, no further payments shall be made under this section to such individuals with respect to weeks of unemployment occurring after the date of such determination by the Board, or occurring during any period for which there is not in effect a certification under section 205 describing such individuals.

"(c) Each State shall be entitled to be paid by the United States an amount equal to the additional cost to the State of payments of compensation made under and in accordance with an agreement under this section which would not have been incurred by the State but for the agreement.

"(d) In making payments pursuant to this section, there shall be paid to the State, either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be determined by the Secretary, such sum as the Secretary estimates the State will be entitled to receive under this section for each calendar month, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which the Secretary finds that his estimates for any prior calendar month were greater or less than the amounts which should have been paid to the State. Such estimates may be made upon the basis of such statistical sampling, or other method, as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State agency.

"(e) The Secretary shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payments to each State sums payable to such State under this section. The Secretary of the Treasury, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, shall make payment to the State in accordance with such certification, from the funds available for carrying out the purposes of this title.

"(f) All money paid to a State under this section shall be used solely for the purposes for which it is paid; and any money so paid which is not used for such purposes shall be returned, at the time specified in the agreement under this section, to the Treasury and credited to current applicable appropriations, funds, or accounts from which payments to States under this section may be made.

"(g) An agreement under this section may require any officer or employee of the State certifying payments or disbursing funds pursuant to the agreement, or otherwise participating in its performance, to give a surety bond to the United States in such amount as the Secretary may deem necessary, and may provide for the payment of the cost of such bond from funds available for carrying out the purposes of this section.

"(h) No person designated by the Secretary, or designated pursuant to an agreement under this section, as a certifying officer shall, in the absence of gross negligence or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to the payment of any compensation certified by him under this section.

"(i) No disbursing officer shall, in the absence of gross negligence or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to any payment by him under this section if it was based upon a voucher signed by a certifying officer designated as provided by this section.

"(j) For the purpose of payments made to a State under title III of the Social Security Act, administration by the State agency of such State pursuant to an agreement under this title shall be deemed to be a part of the administration of the State unemployment compensation law.

"(k) The agency administering the unemployment compensation law of any State shall furnish to the Secretary such informa-

tion as the Secretary may find necessary or appropriate in carrying out the provisions of this title, and such information shall be deemed reports required by the Secretary for the purposes of paragraph (6) of subsection (a) of section 303 of the Social Security Act.

"(l) Whoever makes a false statement or representation of a material fact knowing it to be false, or knowingly fails to disclose a material fact, to obtain or increase for himself or for any other individual any payment authorized to be paid under this section or under an agreement thereunder shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

"(m) The Secretary is hereby authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. The Secretary shall insofar as practicable consult with representatives of the State unemployment compensation agencies before prescribing any rules or regulations which may affect the performance by such agencies of functions pursuant to agreement under this section.

"Sec. 209. Training and transportation: (a) The Secretary shall provide adequate facilities and instruction for suitable training for unemployed individuals eligible for the benefits of this title who are in need of retraining, reemployment, vocational education, or vocational rehabilitation, through the following measures:

"(1) by arranging for the utilization and extension of all existing Federal governmental facilities, and utilization of the facilities of any other governmental agency maintained by joint Federal and State contributions, to carry out the purposes of this section; and

"(2) by entering into agreements or contracts with public or private institutions or establishments, to provide for such additional training facilities as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this section.

"(b) The Secretary shall have the power and the duty to cooperate with existing Federal, State, and local agencies and officials in charge of existing programs relating to retraining, reemployment, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation for the purpose of coordinating his activities with those of such Federal, State, and local agencies.

"(c) Whenever the Secretary shall determine that (1) no job opportunity for an unemployed individual found eligible for the benefits of this title exists within his own current labor market area, (2) a job opportunity for such individual equivalent to his former employment is available at a place in the United States outside of his current labor market area, (3) such individual agrees to take the job opportunity outside of his labor market area, and (4) the acceptance of such employment would be in the best interest of the United States, then the Secretary is authorized to make available to such individual at Government expense, facilities for the movement of such individual, his dependents and his household effects to a location designated by such individual and approved by the Secretary, by using Government or commercial means of transportation, not to exceed the value of \$150.

"Sec. 210. Retirement: (a) Whenever the Secretary shall determine that any individual, 60 years or older, included within a certificate of eligibility issued by the Board is unemployed as a result of the national trade policy of the United States and is unable to find employment because of his advanced age, the Secretary shall issue a certificate containing such a finding.

"(b) Section 216 (a) of the Social Security Act is hereby amended by striking out 'or' at the end of paragraph (1) thereof; by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (2) thereof and inserting in lieu of such period a comma followed by 'or'; by

adding after such paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

"(3) in the case of an individual who is certified by the Secretary of Labor as unemployed by reason of the trade policy of the United States and unable to find employment because of advanced age, age 60."

"(c) The amendment made by this section shall take effect with respect to payments made for months beginning more than 1 month after the date this act is enacted."

"SEC. 211. Accelerated amortization: Insert (a) section 168 (e) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is hereby amended—

"(1) by striking out 'or' at the end of subparagraph (A) thereof, by inserting 'or' at the end of subparagraph (B) thereof, and by adding after subparagraph (B) the following:

"(C) to develop new or different lines of production by an eligible business enterprise of a more balanced economy in an eligible community;" and

"(2) by adding after the words 'attributable to defense purposes' the words 'or the national trade policy of the United States, as the case may be.'"

"(b) Section 168 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is hereby amended by adding the following:

"(3) Eligible business enterprise, community: For purposes of this section, the terms "eligible business enterprise" and "eligible community" mean business enterprises or communities holding certificates of eligibility under the Trade Adjustment Act of 1958."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to provide assistance to communities, industries, business enterprises, and individuals to facilitate adjustments made necessary by the trade policy of the United States, and for other purposes."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the amendments may lie on the desk until the close of Senate business on Monday, next, in order that interested Senators may have the opportunity to add their names as cosponsors. I shall welcome their support.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendments will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, these amendments are a revision of S. 751 and the trade adjustment amendment to H. R. 1, which I had the honor of submitting in the 84th Congress with my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. The amendments which I now send to the desk would add a title to the Trade Agreements Extension Act. The new title provides in detail for a program of adjustment assistance to communities, enterprises, and individuals who suffer economic hardship because of the trade policy of the United States.

Yesterday I submitted another trade adjustment assistance amendment of a more general nature, which can be found on page 9834 of the Record. At that time I stated that I would discuss the whole subject of trade adjustment as a part of a general elaboration of my support for the reciprocal trade program next week.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1959—AMENDMENT

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to a supplemental appropriation bill which may come before the Senate in the near future.

My reason for doing so is that it is proposed to make available in the supplemental appropriation bill the sum of \$685,000 for the international exhibit at Brussels. I feel we should increase the appropriations for the Brussels fair.

I visited the fair last week. My observation was that about many of the exhibits of other countries were found pamphlets which were distributed free to visitors. Those pamphlets portrayed what the exhibitor country was endeavoring to present to the visitor.

The Russians were doing a very able job of publicizing themselves, propagandawise. The United States had no such free pamphlets. The United States was missing an opportunity. Most visitors were picking up pamphlets in the French, Canadian, British, and other exhibits. They had no such opportunity in connection with United States exhibits.

We have a magnificent pavilion, a magnificent approach, and a very impressive display in many respects, but we are missing the opportunity to get our literature into the hands of those who visit the fair.

It may be that only one member of a family will visit the fair, but there may be half a dozen at home who will read the literature when the visitors returns to his home, and perhaps many friends in the community will have the privilege of seeing the literature.

The United States has made a considerable investment in this world's fair, but it had better invest a little more and do the job well, rather than do the job partially.

That is the purpose of my amendment. I shall speak at greater length on this question at a later time. I now submit the amendment for appropriate reference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. BEALL:

Commencement day address by Gov. Theodore R. McKeldin, Governor of Maryland, at the University of Maryland, June 7, 1958.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

Address entitled "Abraham Lincoln," delivered by Col. Paul Griffith, on May 3, 1958.

Notes on Department of Defense surplus commodity housing programs, as of February 28, 1958.

By Mr. WILEY:

Letter from Gen. David Sarnoff and address delivered by him on the subject Electronics and Biology.

Excerpts from an article entitled "One-third of a Billion for Overseas Relief," from the current issue of National Council Outlook.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

Editorial entitled "Mr. Adams and Friend," published in the Washington Evening Star of June 13, 1958.

By Mr. BUTLER:

Editorial entitled "Benson Hits Back," published in the Baltimore Sun of June 7, 1958.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Editorial entitled "Featherbunking Bill Might Strangle Shipping on Seaway," published in the Milwaukee Journal of June 7, 1958; which will appear hereafter in the Appendix.

Editorial entitled "Unwise Oil Import Curb," published in the Minneapolis Star of June 10, 1958.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

Editorial entitled "Hermen Kenin Will Serve Union Well," published in the Portland (Oreg.) Journal of June 9, 1958.

Article entitled "Another Earth Custom," written by William H. Stringer, and published in the Christian Science Monitor of June 12, 1958.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

News article on the book entitled "The Strength To Move a Mountain," by Prof. W. Storrs Lee.

Article entitled "Down in Maryland With That Sailor Band," written by Maj. Joseph C. McDonough, United States Army, comparing the curriculums of Annapolis and West Point.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES SALARY INCREASE ACT OF 1958

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I was not on the floor of the Senate yesterday when the conference report was agreed to enacting the classified pay bill, because I was tied up in the Committee on Public Works which was getting ready to report the rivers and harbors bill. Therefore I desire to comment briefly on the classified pay bill, because it originally came from our Subcommittee on Federal Employees Compensation, of which I am chairman. In addition, I was a member of the conference committee.

I do not care to duplicate what was said on the Senate floor by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or the ranking minority member of the committee, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]; but I do wish to emphasize the fact that, in my opinion, one of the greatest advances accomplished by the passage of the classified pay bill was the fact that we retained, within the legislative authorization, the full additional 25 supergrades provided for the National Institutes of Health. This amendment was originally included in the bill several months ago on my motion, and I am particularly pleased that the conferees of both the Senate and the House retained it in the final measure which will go to President Eisenhower for his signature. They deserve great credit.

1958

All of us know that in few fields have incomes risen more than in the medical profession. I understand that the cost of medical care has gone up more in recent years than has nearly any other single phase of the cost of living. This means that when the Government has on its payroll skilled medical researchers, those men are under compulsion to enter private practice, so they can more adequately provide for their families. Thus, if the provision for supergrades had not been concurred in, the National Institutes of Health, which are undertaking vital research in such diseases as cancer, heart disease, blindness, mental disease, and other urgent fields, would have been in danger of losing some of their best and most capable men.

For example, I have heard of a skilled researcher at the National Institutes of Health, who is receiving \$12,500, who has been assured an annual income of at least \$40,000 if he will resign and enter private practice. We cannot ask men to make such a financial sacrifice when they have families to raise and children to educate.

Mr. President, I am particularly gratified and especially pleased that the 25 additional supergrades for the National Institutes of Health are now a part of the bill which will go to the White House, and which I am satisfied will become law.

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Does my friend agree with my suggestion that it was unfortunate the House cut back the number of supergrades which the Senate had provided, and that inevitably we are going to have to increase the number of supergrades, and increase the number substantially, if we are going to obtain and hold able people for the Federal service?

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator from Pennsylvania could not be more correct. We have only 1,300 or 1,400 supergrades, in a total payroll of about 2 million. It is becoming increasingly difficult for the Federal Government to compete with the tempting financial allure offered by private industry.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article I wrote for the February 1957 number of Eagle magazine, entitled "Crash Program for Health," which emphasizes the strategic role played by the National Institutes of Health in trying to move back the frontiers against the most deadly diseases plaguing mankind.

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

to read
CRASH PROGRAM FOR HEALTH
 (By RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, United States Senator from Oregon)

"Give me health and a day, and I will make the pomp of emperors ridiculous."
 —Ralph Waldo Emerson.

With one of America's most famous female radiologists at my side, I looked through the slit-like glass window which had been niched in concrete walls 30 inches thick. Beneath a great cone-shaped apparatus, a woman lay on a table. A bathrobe covered her body. The room was darkened. The

tiny point of the equipment seemed to pick out her chest and throat. She was receiving radiation treatment from a cobalt bomb for deep-seated cancer. The mysterious Roentgen rays made no sound.

Would the treatment be successful? Would it arrest the deadly march through her system of malignant cells? Would she survive?

These questions flashed across the innermost frontier of my mind. Another question lurked there, too. Would the woman on the table ever know a moment's peace or contentment again? During her entire life, be it long or short, could she ever spend a fleeting hour free of anxiety and terror? Would each twinge of pain mean that the fatal killer had returned?

The woman on the table was obviously younger than my wife or I. What if it had been one of us on that table beneath the cone—the cone from which came the unseen rays that might mean a reprieve, if only the malignancy had been detected in time? Cold drops of perspiration dotted my forehead as I harbored these thoughts.

And yet, I mused how little we actually know about the rampant behavior of cells and tissue which men call cancer. The cobalt bomb was not a certain cure even though nuclear fission had made it possible. It was a hope—a faint hope, though nonetheless genuine. And as I stood outside the vault of concrete and lead where the rays from a tiny inner cylinder of plutonium were working their mission which might mean life or death, I wondered why the richest Nation on earth was not investing more of its effort, resources, and wealth toward the possible liberation of mankind from cancer. Surely few battlefronts could be more crucial.

Cancer is a threat which hangs over us all from the bassinet to the tomb; yet we spend far less attempting to solve it than we do, for example, on the fittings for one aircraft carrier of the *Forrestal* class.

As the radiologist and I peered through the narrow window at the young woman on the table, few things loomed as important as cracking the terrible riddle of cancer. All else—politics, money, personal ambition—faded into comparative insignificance.

What America needs today is a crash program of medical research. It should be a program proportionate to the \$40 billion which we seem able to spend annually on weapons of war. What war, after all, can compare with that against cancer, heart disease, mental disturbances, and other sinister maladies wracking mankind?

Mike Gorman, 43-year-old executive director of the National Mental Health Committee, points out that, despite its inadequate support from governmental appropriations, medical research during the past decade has added 5 years to the life expectancy of the average American. Translated into earning capacity alone, the people whose existence has thus been prolonged have paid seven times as much into the Treasury in personal income taxes as has been invested in the United States Public Health Service. And Gorman adds this further heartening note:

"In an age when the Communists and their satellites outnumber the forces of the free world by better than 2 to 1, medical research has bolstered our manpower resources and increased our productive strength. It has reduced immeasurably the tragic toll of human suffering."

Yet we in the Congress, as well as the public at large, still think in pygmy terms with respect to combat against disease. Unhesitatingly, we will spend billions for tanks or battleships or bombing planes. By contrast, we are stingy with mere millions when sickness is the enemy, rather than a foreign foe. And when we contemplate that the United States Government is spending \$48 million

on the National Cancer Institute as contrasted with \$10 billion on naval vessels, we must keep in mind that it takes \$1 million multiplied 1,000 separate times to amount up to just \$1 billion.

Nor was even the \$48 million investment achieved for the onslaught against cancer without persistent and tireless effort on the part of certain members of Congress.

When I was a candidate for the Senate in 1954, few topics held audiences more attentive than my insistence that Federal expenditures for medical research generally—and in the field of cancer in particular—should be increased many times. I even proposed an ultimate outlay of \$1 billion for cancer research alone, if necessary. This statement was repeated by me at trade unions, civic clubs, Eagle Aeries, Grange halls, before veterans' groups, and women's organizations. It drew almost universal support and interest, especially when people learned that we were then spending \$63,980,000 on the Inter-American Highway and only \$24,978,000 on cancer research. Was greater knowledge of mankind's grimmest killer a mere 38 percent as urgent as the Inter-American Highway through distant jungles?

As a newcomer to the Senate, I have served as a private in the ranks of an all-out attempt to bolster our attack against the disease which is nearly the equivalent of a death sentence to all afflicted by it. Leaders in this effort were members of both major political parties—LISTER HILL, of Alabama; WARREN G. MAGNUSON, of Washington; and WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, Democrats; and MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Maine, and EDWARD J. THYE, of Minnesota, Republicans. Encouragement was received from CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona, a Democrat, who is chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee and has served in Congress ever since his State was admitted to the Union in 1912.

This bipartisan undertaking brought about the doubling of Federal funds available for cancer research at the National Cancer Institute, from \$24,978,000 to \$48,432,000.

As we worked to achieve this goal, I thought of the fact that man has learned to conquer the air, the waters under the sea, to ascend Mount Everest, and even to influence the weather under certain circumstances. But cancer remains the inexorable assassin. Neither wealth nor fame nor power can stay its ravages. It killed valiant Babe Didrikson Zaharias, Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg, Senator Robert A. Taft, John P. Weyerhaeuser, Jr., of the vast timber corporation, and many others who still had much to contribute to American progress.

Although a crash program of medical research into the ominous roots of cancer would come too late to prolong their lives, perhaps it might help to spare the cancer victims of a later generation—in our own country and elsewhere in the world. Mercy knows no national boundaries.

MARGARET CHASE SMITH, only woman Member of the Senate, effectively emphasized the disproportionate sums which we spend on frivolities and on grappling with the most dreadful diseases plaguing the human race. Senator LISTER HILL, chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee handling health funds, insisted that top salaries in Public Health Service laboratories be increased from \$15,000 to \$20,000 annually. "The productivity of any research organization depends upon the quality of the staff," said Senator HILL.

Furthermore, during our discussion of health appropriations on the Senate floor, Senator HILL assured me that the increased funds for cancer research were not a goal in and of themselves but simply part of an onward march which must continue.

Partly because of the great impetus for an all-out program in the realm of malignant diseases like cancer, research expenditures by the Government for the fiscal year of

1957 also have been vastly expanded in other fields. The National Institutes of Health, located in Bethesda, Md., are now in the midst of their most active 12-month period. Note this contrast in all major classes of appropriations.

| | 1956 | 1957 |
|---|-------------|--------------|
| General operating expenses..... | \$5,929,000 | \$11,922,000 |
| National Cancer Institute..... | 24,978,000 | 48,432,000 |
| Mental Health Institute..... | 18,001,000 | 35,197,000 |
| National Heart Institute..... | 18,898,000 | 33,896,000 |
| Dental Health Institute..... | 2,176,000 | 6,026,000 |
| Arthritic disease activities..... | 10,840,000 | 15,885,000 |
| Microbiology activities..... | 7,775,000 | 13,289,000 |
| Neurology and blindness disease activities..... | 9,861,000 | 18,650,000 |
| Total..... | 98,458,000 | 182,807,000 |

Thus, United States Government expenditures for medical research have been increased 85 percent in one year. Even teeth and gums had participated in the advance. Yet is this disbursement enough?

In Washington, D. C., our residence has been next door to that of Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, a tall 49-year-old man who recently retired as Surgeon General of the Public Health Service. One sultry evening, seated in our patio over coffee and cake, I asked my neighbor: "Leonard, what is probably the maximum amount of money which the National Cancer Institute could spend in one year for research and study, if given reasonable notice in advance."

The Surgeon General pondered for a moment. "Half a billion dollars," he answered.

"What would be the usefulness of that quantity of money?" I asked.

"You would be certain that you could carry on your program from year to year without delay or interruption," Dr. Scheele replied. "Your top doctors and scientists would know their continued employment, at fair and adequate pay, was assured. They would not be tempted to break off their work to enter lucrative private practice. In addition, you could follow every possible lead or hope, no matter how remote or elusive it might seem. You would not have to budget so carefully and pursue only the most promising discoveries. In a war, the military often overspends because it might be fatal to the country to underspend. We could do that in the area of cancer research if we had a billion dollars or even half a billion dollars at our disposal."

The sums which Dr. Scheele and I discussed may loom as fantastic. But are they? Americans spend over \$15 billion a year on liquor and tobacco. They even spend \$280 million for chewing gum and \$116 million for shampoos. Why not twice as much for cancer research as for gum?

Whenever I urge a vast increase in Federal funds for medical research, people invariably inquire about the sums raised for this purpose by voluntary agencies. "Don't they do the job?" is the perennial question.

The voluntary agencies do a magnificent job. In 1954, for example, the American Cancer Society collected \$21,670,000 in private contributions and the Damon Runyon Cancer Fund an additional \$1,751,000. Organizations such as the Eagles, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the AFL-CIO, and others have helped generously toward this private total of over \$23 million. Yet only \$7,189,000 of the private donations were allocated for research. The rest had to go—and properly so—for the treatment of pitiful and agonizing cancer cases in families lacking sufficient financial resources for their care. It is obvious, therefore, that the Government must carry on the major responsibility in cancer research, or it will not be carried on at all.

Research into all potentially fatal diseases, and particularly cancer, is one avenue for liberating mankind from a grim fear and a painful reality. Should not our Government

share in such a responsibility? We would scoff if some official in our town proposed that the fire department be entirely reliant on voluntary contributions. Yet which is the more imminent menace to the average person, fire or cancer? Ask a cancer sufferer.

Although I have been a legislator at both the State and national level, I still am unable to fathom the legislative mind when it comes to this vital human problem. Such famous Senators as Taft, Vandenberg, and Wherry have been fatally stricken by cancer. Yet the Senate will move with alacrity to vote \$4 billion for B-52 bombing planes, but it can cavil over barely more than 1 percent of this for cancer research. We will appropriate limitlessly to combat the foe we can visualize, whether it be the Soviets, Nazis, or Imperial Japanese. But stinginess and hesitancy cloud the picture when the enemy is an insidious disease which strikes silently and invisibly, but nonetheless murderously.

As a member of Oregon's House of Representatives, my wife had to struggle for almost 4 months to persuade her colleagues to vote a trifling \$80,000 for pilot courses aimed at rehabilitating retarded children. The lack of trained teachers and classes for these unfortunate youngsters brings heartache to thousands of families. It also dooms the children to lives of public dependency and helplessness. Skilled teaching can enable them to read, to play happily, to feed themselves, maybe even to work at a trade. Yet Mrs. Neuberger, herself a former teacher of physical education, found the legislature quicker to appropriate \$150 million for roads and highways than a tiny fraction of this for retarded children.

One night during the 1953 legislative session, when her retarded-children bill languished in committee, she said to me desperately, "It's easier to get funds for inanimate objects than for human beings. It hardly seems possible that human beings do the voting on these appropriations."

Yet this mental block on the part of legislators may be waning. Under the leadership of an Eagle Congressman from Rhode Island, JOHN E. FOGARTY, Congress has just allocated over \$2 million for programs aimed at rehabilitating retarded children. Another goal of the program is to try to discover why some children have congenital defects which render it difficult for them to lead normal lives. The sum is by far the most generous benefaction ever set aside for such a purpose. In his campaign for the children's funds, Representative FOGARTY had the active and fervent support of a fellow Rhode Island colleague, Congressman AIME J. FORAND. Mr. FORAND is likewise a faithful member of the Eagles.

Slowly but inevitably, Americans are coming to realize that every dollar invested in medical research can be amortized in longer, happier, and healthier lives.

Some of this understanding is due to the leadership of a remarkable and attractive woman named Mary Lasker. She has used the fortune inherited from her late husband to encourage study of the ailments which cripple and kill people. The Albert and Mary Lasker Foundation gives substantial awards each year for achievements in the area of psychiatric and medical research. Writers and journalists, for example, are rewarded for outstanding contributions on these topics. Mrs. Lasker also helps to support such projects as the National Mental Health Committee and the New York Memorial Hospital for Cancer and Allied Diseases.

Each of us sees illness only as an isolated occurrence. It may happen to us or to a loved one. This is tragic, but we still do not see how it affects America as a whole. How many realize that mental sickness deprived our Armed Forces of over 2,500,000 young men in the prime of life during World War II? Are we aware that more than half the

hospital beds in the United States are required for mentally disturbed men and women, and that even these are not enough? On the Senate floor I pointed out that almost 2½ times as many people died of cancer during World War II as we're killed in action in all our farflung battles over the face of the world. Furthermore, in 1 year cancer killed nearly 10 times the number of Americans who were killed in action throughout 3 years of the war in Korea.

Medical research has begun to unlock some strategic doors. The Salk antipolio vaccine is a sample of what prolonged and well-financed medical research can accomplish. The vaccine is not perfect, but it provides children with 70 to 90 percent protection against the crippling havoc of infantile paralysis. We take for granted today such antibiotics as penicillin, streptomycin, terramycin, and aureomycin. All are the products of medical research. They have helped to reduce the death rate from tuberculosis 73 percent, from kidney disease 60 percent, from pneumonia 43 percent. As a result, the life expectancy of the average American increased from an age of 60 in the year 1937 to 68.8 by 1953. Phenomenal new discoveries with respect to the fat content of diets may contribute toward cutting down fatal heart disease in the decade ahead.

These developments, it seems to me, are overwhelming arguments for vast expenditures in medical research. What can be more important than human happiness and human life? These are geared directly to good health. For a country spending \$40 billion a year for armaments there is no sum too high to invest in the well-being of its citizens. I still recall what my wife, Maurine, said to me when she was fighting for a paltry \$80,000 in the Oregon Legislature, to spend in behalf of retarded little children.

"The beasts of the field on my mother's farm will do anything for their young," she said. "Can we look the next generation of human beings in the face if we have not done everything possible for them in the vital area of sound bodies and medical care?"

THE RECIPROCAL TRADE BILL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, when I arrived in my office this morning I found on my desk the following telegram:

Please reply my wire June 11 advising your stand on Reciprocal Trade Act extension. Unless this bill is defeated in the Senate I promise you that I will do everything in my power to see that you are not reelected to the Senate. We want Senators who work for the best interests of the American people and not foreign countries.

GEO. M. GRADY.

I made a reply this morning to Mr. Grady, as follows:

In reply to your wire promising that you will do everything in your power to defeat me for reelection unless the reciprocal-trade bill is defeated in the Senate, my answer to you is: I accept your challenge gladly. I will vote for the reciprocal-trade bill. I will work hard to secure its enactment. I welcome your all-out opposition. I am reading your telegram to the Senate to day as a prime example of attempted intimidation by those who oppose a program that has been specifically requested by President Eisenhower, Vice President Nixon, as well as top Democratic leaders. The evidence is overwhelming that freer trade will greatly help Wisconsin as well as America. More jobs, more prosperous business throughout Wisconsin and a greater chance for peace throughout the world are the fruits of free trade.

WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
United States Senator.

1958

9975

committee's proposals would relieve unions of this obligation, and would instead force local members to go to Washington to obtain such information.

Certainly one of the most distinguished members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], recognized the loophole and was successful in having adopted an amendment which he offered. So again Secretary Mitchell was right.

The Secretary continued:

The legislative proposals reported by the committee give certain duties and enforcement obligations to the Secretary of Labor, but they provide the Secretary with inadequate powers to properly discharge his responsibilities. For instance, the proposals would require the Secretary to make investigations and inspect books and records of unions when he has "probable cause" to believe that anyone had violated the law. However, the Secretary is denied the power to compel testimony, hold hearings, or to issue subpoenas for persons or records, and he appears further to be subject to injunctive processes which would impair and hinder him from carrying out even the limited authority the bill provides.

Mr. President, again the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], a hard-working, diligent member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, recognized the truth of the Secretary's statement when he offered an amendment which would close the loophole, and was instrumental in having it adopted. So, again, the Secretary of Labor was correct.

I read further from the Secretary's statement:

Other serious deficiencies in the committee's proposals include the destruction of the present rights of union members to seek State and Federal court relief to enforce their democratic rights; the continuation of a no-man's land between State and Federal labor laws which denies legal protection to thousands of workers; and the relaxation and in some cases total destruction of the present legal protections provided union members.

Mr. President, one might argue that there is a provision in the Kennedy bill which purports to take care of that situation; but it takes care of it in liberal fashion, by turning over the jurisdiction to the Federal Government, instead of letting the authority rest with the States, where we who believe in States rights think it should rest. But today, I feel certain, an amendment will be offered which will take care of that deficiency in the bill.

I shall not comment on the next two paragraphs of the Secretary's statement, because I do not believe either the distinguished senior Senator from New York or the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts found fault with them.

In conclusion, I think it was disclosed yesterday that the Secretary of Labor not only was right in his opinions of the bill, but that he was following his duty as Secretary of Labor in pointing out deficiencies in the bill. In one day, I suggest, almost all the deficiencies which were called to the attention of the Senate by the Secretary of Labor were recognized by the Senate and were corrected.

I apologize for taking so much of the time of the Senate to make the RECORD clear in respect to the feelings both of the Secretary of Labor and myself.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES SALARY INCREASE ACT OF 1958—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a very important conference report which affects more than 1 million persons is ready, and awaits our action.

I wish to state that the distinguished chairman, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, and the ranking minority member, Mr. CARLSON, of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service have done an excellent job in bringing the conference report to us.

The Senate must act first. The action has been long delayed. I am informed that it will probably take less than 5 minutes to dispose of the conference report, which is a highly privileged matter.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the conference report be laid before the Senate; and, when that is done, I ask the distinguished chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from South Carolina, to make a brief statement in explanation of the report, and I also ask the ranking minority member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] to make a statement on the report.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 734) to revise the basic compensation schedules of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 734) entitled "An Act to revise the basic compensation schedules of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes", having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment Numbered 1: That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 1.

Amendments Numbered 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13, and agree to the same.

Amendment Numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 10. Section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U. S. C. 1105), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(f) The Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts is authorized to place a total of four positions in grade 17 of the General Schedule. Such positions shall be in addition to the number of positions authorized to be placed in such grade by subsection (b).

"(g) The Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization is authorized to place a total of eleven positions in grade 17 of the General Schedule. Such positions shall be in addition to the number of positions authorized to be placed in such grade by subsection (b).

"(h) In any case in which, subsequent to February 1, 1958, provisions are included in a general appropriation Act authorizing an agency of the Government to place additional positions in grade 16, 17, or 18, the total number of positions authorized by this section to be placed in such grades shall, unless otherwise expressly provided, be deemed to have been reduced by the number of positions authorized by such provisions to be placed in such grades. Such reduction shall be deemed to have occurred in the following order: first, from any number specifically authorized for such agency under this section, and second, from the maximum number of positions authorized to be placed in such grades under subsection (b) irrespective of the agency to which such positions are allocated.

"(i) Appointments to positions in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule shall be made only upon approval by the Civil Service Commission of the qualifications of the proposed appointees, except that this subsection shall not apply to those positions—

"(1) provided for in subsection (e) of this section;

"(2) to which appointments are made by the President alone or by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; and

"(3) for which the compensation is paid from (A) appropriations for the Executive Office of the President under the headings "The White House Office", "Special Projects", "Council of Economic Advisers", "National Security Council", "Office of Defense Mobilization", and "President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization", or (B) funds appropriated to the President under the heading "Emergency Fund for the President, National Defense" by the General Government Matters Appropriation Act, 1959, or any subsequent Act making appropriations for such purposes."

"Sec. 11. (a) Section 505 (b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by striking out 'twelve hundred and twenty-six' and inserting 'fifteen hundred and thirteen', by striking out 'three hundred and twenty-nine' and inserting 'four hundred and one', and by striking out 'one hundred and thirty' and inserting 'one hundred and fifty-nine'.

"(b) Section 505 (e) of such Act is amended by striking out 'thirty-seven' and inserting in lieu thereof 'seventy-five'.

"Sec. 12. (a) The first section of the Act of August 1, 1947 (Public Law 313, Eightieth Congress), as amended, is amended by striking out 'one hundred and twenty' and 'twenty-five' in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof 'two hundred and ninety-two' and 'fifty', respectively.

"(b) Such section is further amended by striking out 'thirty' in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof 'ninety'.

"(c) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(d) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for not more than five scientific or professional positions in the Department of the Interior, each such position being established to effectuate those research and develop-

ment functions of such Department which require the services of specially qualified personnel.

"(e) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for not more than five scientific or professional positions in the Department of Agriculture, each such position being established to effectuate those research and development functions of such Department which require the services of specially qualified personnel.

"(f) The Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for not more than five scientific or professional positions in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, each such position being established to effectuate those research and development functions of such Department which require the services of specially qualified personnel.

"(g) The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for not more than 25 scientific or professional positions in the Department of Commerce, of which not less than five shall be for the United States Patent Office in its examining and related activities, each such position being established to effectuate those research and development functions of such Department which require the services of specially qualified personnel.

"(h) In any case in which, subsequent to February 1, 1958, provisions are included in a general appropriation Act authorizing an agency of the Government referred to in this Act to establish and fix the compensation of scientific or professional positions similar to those authorized by this Act, the number of such positions authorized by this Act shall, unless otherwise expressly provided, be deemed to have been reduced by the number of positions authorized by the provisions of such appropriation Act."

"(d) Section 3 of such act is amended by inserting after 'Secretary of Defense' a comma and the following: 'the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare,' and by inserting after 'Military Establishment' a comma and the following: 'the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare,'."

"(e) Section 208 (g) of the Public Health Service Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 210 (g)), is amended by striking out 'sixty positions' and inserting in lieu thereof 'eighty-five positions, of which not less than seventy-three shall be for the National Institutes of Health'."

"(f) The annual rate of basic compensation of the position of Chief Postal Inspector in the Post Office Department shall be \$19,000.

"Sec. 13. (a) (1) Clause (2) of that paragraph of section 602 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U. S. C. 1112), which defines the level of difficulty and responsibility of work in grade 5 of the General Schedule (GS-5) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) to perform, under immediate supervision, and with little opportunity for the exercise of independent judgment, simple and elementary work requiring professional, scientific, or technical training; or"

"(2) Clause (2) of that paragraph of the same section which defines the level of difficulty and responsibility of work in grade 7 of the General Schedule (GS-7) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) under immediate or general supervision, to perform somewhat difficult work requiring (A) professional, scientific, or technical training, and (B) to a limited extent, the exercise of independent technical judgment; or"

"(b) The Civil Service Commission shall exercise its authority to issue such standards or regulations as may be necessary for the administration of subsection (a) of this section."

"Sec. 14. It is the sense of the Congress that appropriations for cooperative agricultural extension work and appropriations for payments to State agricultural experiment stations for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1958, should include additional amounts sufficient to provide increases in the portion of the compensation of persons employed in such work or by such stations, which is paid from such appropriations, corresponding to the increases provided for employees under this Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
MIKE MONRONEY,
DICK NEUBERGER,
FRANK CARLSON,
WILLIAM E. JENNER,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

TOM MURRAY,
JAMES H. MORRISON,
JAMES C. DAVIS,
EDWARD H. REES,
ROBERT J. CORBETT,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JACKSON in the chair). Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as I understand, the conference report is a unanimous one.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I am certainly glad to report that the conference report on Senate bill 734, the classified pay bill, is a unanimous report.

The conference agreement accepts in principle the bill as amended and passed by the Senate only a few days ago.

Major modifications of that bill, as agreed to in conference, are as follows:

First, the conference agreement gives professional and scientific personnel, whose positions have been up-graded by Civil Service Commission action, the full amount of the increase provided by the bill.

Second, the number of supergrades and high level professional and scientific positions authorized by the Senate version of the bill are reduced by approximately one-half.

Third, the conference agreement accepts a number of clarifying and perfecting amendments which were adopted by the Senate.

In brief, this measure provides an across-the-board 10 percent increase to employees in the executive branch, the legislative branch, and the judicial branch.

The increase is retroactive to the first pay period beginning on or after January 1 of this year.

Of course, that provision was not before the conferees, inasmuch as both Houses had already passed favorably on that feature.

In addition to the employees mentioned, this measure provides an adjust-

ment in the upper levels of the Post Office field schedule, thereby giving all Federal employees equal treatment. That provision, and also the one to which I referred a few moments ago—that dealing with the scientific positions—were requested by the administration.

Mr. President, the conference agreement provides a proper increase, and accords all employees equal treatment. The report, as agreed to by all the conferees, is good, fair, and long overdue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I should like to ask the Senator from South Carolina the cost of the retroactive provision. As I understand, this measure will be retroactive so far as it concerns the civil service employees, those in the legislative branch, and those in the judicial branch.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. What will the extra cost?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It will be five-twelfths of the annual cost of the bill, or approximately \$200 million. But both Houses had previously passed on that provision, as the Senator from Virginia knows, so it was not before the conferees.

Mr. BYRD. Is not the Senator from South Carolina mistaken as to the amount? Certainly, the cost for 5 months will be considerably larger than the amount he has stated; would it be closer to \$500 million?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. No; the total cost for 1 year is that amount; and the cost of the retroactive provision will be five-twelfths of that.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from South Carolina handled the original bill. What was the justification for making the increase effective as of January 1958?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The justification was that these employees should have received the increase then, instead of later this year.

My BYRD. That is the Senator's opinion?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. Congress did not enact the bill then; but the conference report would require that the increase be made effective as of 5 months ago.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator from Virginia will recall that last year the Congress passed the pay increase bill, but the President vetoed it.

Mr. BYRD. So the bill did not then become a law.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I wish to express my opposition to retroactive salary increases. I think that is a very bad policy. I am now advised that the retroactive pay features in the classified bill will cost \$260 million; that the retroactive features in the postal pay act will cost \$118 million; and that the military

1958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9977

pay bill will be effective for 1 month in fiscal year 1958. The cost of this bill for June will be approximately \$50 million. The total cost of what may be regarded as retroactive features in pay legislation thus far in the current session of Congress will be in excess of \$425 million. I shall cast my vote against the conference report.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wish it clearly understood that the conferees' hands were tied, insofar as the retroactive feature was concerned, because that provision was contained in both the House of Representatives version and the Senate version of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I wish to commend the conferees for the fine work they have done on this measure.

As a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I can state from my personal knowledge that both the distinguished chairman of the committee, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, and its ranking minority member, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], worked for many months on this measure. The committee received testimony over a period of many weeks.

I particularly wish to congratulate the conferees for extending the 10-percent salary increase to scientific personnel, inasmuch as the testimony showed that the Government was losing some of its very valuable scientific employees who are engaged in some of the most critical governmental work; and included among them are Navy personnel who are engaged in underwater sound research at the Philadelphia Navy Laboratory and also personnel who are engaged in research work in various places, including both Army and Navy research work at Governors Island. Many other critical programs of the Government are affected. It is obvious that the continued loss of service of such valuable scientific personnel in programs of that kind has a very direct bearing on the efficiency or lack of efficiency of the national-defense effort.

I believe the testimony which has been received shows clearly that the salary increases provided by the conference report are modest, as compared to the pay increases which have been provided by private employers throughout the country.

I believe the increases provided by the report will help answer the problem of how to persuade personnel of ambition and ability to continue in the Government service, rather than to leave it and enter private employment.

One million and thirty thousand Government employees are covered by this measure; and the evidence received by the committee shows that virtually all of them are faithful and loyal, and many of them are highly dedicated. The testimony also shows that many of the

scientific personnel, particularly, could receive double their present salaries if they were to leave the Government service and enter private employment. I believe that this bill is a good Government bill, and that its adoption will increase the morale and efficiency of the Government service.

Therefore, Mr. President, I believe our sincere thanks are due to the conferees on the part of the Senate for their very fine and speedy work. In fact, I think our thanks are particularly due to them because the conference report is a unanimous one on the part of all the conferees.

In conclusion, let me say that I have enjoyed very much the privilege of serving on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service under the excellent leadership of the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. I am for these salary increases, and have supported this measure since before my election to the Senate. I have supported it with diligence in the committee and urge its adoption.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Texas, not only for the statement he has made, but also for the very fine work he has done as a member of the committee.

As he recalls, in the course of the hearings we ascertained that private firms and corporations throughout the country have increased the salaries of their employees by about twice the 10-percent increase which, as a result of the enactment of this measure, will be made in the salaries of these Government employees.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I am pleased that this morning there has been laid before the Senate the conference report which provides for a 10-percent pay increase for the classified employees of the Federal Government. I am also pleased that the report is a unanimous one.

Furthermore, when this bill was considered by the Senate, I stated that whatever pay increase the Senate voted for the postal employees I would insist also be provided for the classified employees. The pending report includes that very provision.

I should also like to state that at this session the Congress has taken the same action in regard to increasing the pay of the retired employees or annuitants who formerly were employed in the Federal civil service.

So the Congress has—to the credit of the distinguished chairman of our committee—handled three rather difficult, rather controversial bills, in dealing with pay legislation for the postal employees, the classified employees, and the retired Federal employees or annuitants. The postal-pay legislation was particularly difficult, because it carried with it a postal-rate increase. Our committee has labored literally for years, and certainly all of last year and a great portion of this one, on these three bills.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am pleased that today we have brought a unanimous conference report to the Senate.

I should like to refer to 1 or 2 items in the conference report. In order to come to an agreement, we were forced

to reduce by about 50 percent the number of supergrade positions which had been requested by the executive branch of the Government, and which were reported by the Senate committee and passed by the Senate. I wish to state I regret that it was necessary to do that, because I firmly believe the executive branch of the Government needs a number of additional supergrade positions.

There are 2 million Federal employees, and presently there are about 1,300 supergrade positions. No private employer, no business would operate with that percentage of top administrative or executive positions.

The executive branch of the Government had asked for 568 additional supergrade positions, and 555 additional professional-scientific positions. As I stated, we were forced to reduce that number by practically 50 percent, in order to arrive at an agreement.

I regard this action as an unduly restrictive attitude toward the establishment of badly needed positions. I regret that such action was necessary to reach a conference agreement.

Like the chairman of the committee, I shall look forward to further requests from the departments; and, if the departments can justify their requests, we hope to establish such positions in other legislation.

The second point I wish to make is that when the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service does not act to create new supergrade positions, the Appropriations Committee from time to time includes in its bills increases in the number of supergrade positions. I see present on the floor the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], who this week handled the Department of Commerce appropriation bill. In it were provided 20 new supergrade positions. If the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service does not act in the matter, then the only way a department can get the positions it needs is through the action of the Appropriations Committee. That not only is a poor way to legislate, but it is unfair to our committee. I hope that it will not be necessary for the Appropriations Committee to provide supergrade positions, and that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will be permitted to handle such matters.

I wish to refer to the section of the bill which provides the Civil Service Commission shall check on the appointments to positions in grades 16, 17, and 18 in the General Schedule, regarding what we call positions outside the civil-service classification. We wrote into the bill a provision requiring the Civil Service Commission approval of appointees to GS 16, 17, and 18 positions. I sincerely hope the Commission will keep in mind that this will not be the start of a program whereby the executive branch will be limited to appointments without regard to the type of persons they need, and have to secure them through the Civil Service Commission. The executive branch must have and should have some leeway in making appointments to administrative and executive positions.

Mr. President, I am happy the three bills to which I have referred have

passed. I know they will result in great benefit to all Government employees and to retired employees. It has been a pleasure to have been associated with this legislation.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the lead and zinc mining industry in my State—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri defer his statement? The Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] wants to speak on the conference report, which will affect about 1 million persons. We would like to have it acted on.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I understand that pending before the Senate is the conference report on the classified Federal employees' wage increase bill. When that bill was originally acted upon by the Senate I indicated in the Record that if there had been a yea and nay vote I would have cast my vote in the negative. I did so on the basis that the President's original recommendation was that the pay increase should be limited to 6 percent. Then there was a feeling that the pay increase would be fixed at 7½ percent. It finally was pushed up to 10 percent and beyond. I now understand that out of the conference has come a recommendation that, in substance at least, the pay increase should be 10 percent.

I cannot subscribe to that recommendation. I cannot do so because of the fact that the 10 percent wage increase fixed by the Senate will be used as an index throughout the country in the making of demands for increased wages, and thus contribute to the unbearable inflation from which we are suffering. We in the Congress will be setting the index. We will be declaring that a 10 percent wage increase is justifiable.

I desire to repeat what I said when the bill was voted upon. The dollar today is worth only 48 cents. We have a \$280 billion debt. We shall have a \$3 billion deficit in 1958. If we keep moving in the direction we have been moving, there will be a \$10 billion deficit in 1959.

Those who have bonds or who receive annuities or retirement payments can sit at home and look, and while they are doing so they will see the savings they have built up dwindling before their very eyes.

Inflation is one of the menaces facing our country. I do not think Congress should, by example, give word to labor leaders and to industrialists: "Keep pumping up your prices. The public will pay."

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. I understand there will be a voice vote on the conference report. I shall vote against the recommendation of the conferees.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Ohio that I am in accord with what he has said. I think percentage-wise the pay raise cannot be justified. The retroactive features also raise some very serious questions.

In all this spending, we are not spending our own money; we are not spending the money of this generation's taxpayers; we are spending money which will have to be raised by somebody else.

I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of action on the conference report the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I wish to supplement the statement which I made. I, too, feel that the retroactive feature of the bill is not sound, and I state for the Record that in 10 years in the governor's office in Ohio I saw no semblance of retroactive features such as I have witnessed in the bills passed by Congress. Retroactivity has been injected into practically every bill which provides for the expending of the public's money.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wish to associate myself with the fear the Senator from Ohio has expressed of what will result from the principle we are establishing. This bill will result in the expenditure of from \$250 million to \$275 million in retroactive payments, which will be made about the 1st of August. Other bills which we have passed will embrace another \$250 million.

Of course, the nearest estimate we can get is that under such provisions, \$500 million of retroactive payments will be made around the first of August. Certainly we should take recognition of the fact, as has been pointed out, that the Federal Government does not have the money. Not only does the Federal Government not have it, but it cannot borrow the money until an increase in the ceiling for the national debt has been provided. I think it is time Congress should wake up to the fact that the American taxpayers are paying just about all they can afford to pay.

The present proposal goes far beyond the needs brought about by an increase in the cost of living.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I want the Record to show that had there been a record vote I would have voted in the negative on the conference report.

REVISION OF BASIC COMPENSATION SCHEDULES OF CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1949—CORRECTION IN ENROLLMENT OF S. 734

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas subsequently said: Mr. President, the engrossed copy of Senate bill 734, the classified pay bill, which affects more than 1 million Federal Government workers, and which earlier today was passed by the Senate, contains an incorrect figure in the schedule for staff officers and employees of the Department of State. In the sixth line of the salary schedule in section 6 (a) (3) the figure is "8,955," whereas the correct figure is "8,755."

I submit and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration, a concurrent resolution for the purpose of authorizing the correction of that figure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be read.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 93) was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (S. 734), to revise the basic compensation schedules of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes, the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to make the following correction:

In the sixth line of the salary schedule in section 6 (a) (3) strike out "8,955" and insert in lieu thereof "8,755."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 93) was considered and agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered into, the Senator from Missouri is recognized.

THE CRISIS IN THE LEAD AND ZINC INDUSTRY

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the lead and zinc mining industry in my State, and also in other States throughout the country, is in a serious depression.

In Missouri, employment in this industry is down about 25 percent from what it was only a year ago. Furthermore, those who have retained their jobs have taken severe wage cuts, as well as reductions in their workweek.

A substantial number of miners have already exhausted their unemployment benefits, and, unless something is done promptly, the unemployment will increase and the distress of these workers and their families will worsen.

As is true in many basic extractive industries, entire communities are adversely affected when the lead and zinc mining business is depressed. No one in these mining communities is untouched by the spread of economic distress.

The various proposals which have been made for assisting the lead and

As a practical matter, the maximum increase to a surviving child is \$72 a year.

Subsection (d) of the first section of the House amendment provided that no increase in annuity under such section shall exceed the sum necessary to increase such annuity, exclusive of annuity purchased by voluntary contributions, to \$4,104. The conference substitute omits this provision.

Section 2 of the House amendment provided annuities for certain unmarried widows and widowers of those employees and retired former employees who died, prior to February 29, 1948, either in the service or after retirement from the service, after having performed at least 10 years of creditable service.

To qualify for annuity under section 2 of the House amendment, the widow or widower must have been married to the employee or retired former employee for at least 10 years immediately prior to the death of such employee or retired former employee. In addition, the widow or widower must not be entitled to any other annuity from the civil service retirement and disability fund based on the service of the employee or retired former employee.

The amount of the annuity under section 2 of the House amendment was to be equal to one-half of the annuity which the employee was receiving on the date of his death, if retired, or would have been receiving, if retired for disability on such date. However, this survivor annuity was not increased by the provisions of the House amendment or of any other law. Such annuity would not have exceeded \$750 per annum in any case and would cease on the death or remarriage of the widow or widower.

Section 2 of the conference substitute is identical to section 2 of the House amendment except that the requirement that the survivor be married for at least 10 years to the employee or retired former employee is changed to a marriage requirement of 5 years.

Section 3 of the House amendment related, in part, to the effective dates of the annuity increases and annuity entitlements provided by the first section and section 2 of the House amendment.

Section 3 (a) of the House amendment established the first day of the second month following the date of enactment as the effective date of the annuity increases for both retired former employees and survivors, except that in the cases of the survivors of those retired former employees on the annuity roll on October 1, 1956, but who die after such date, the annuity increase cannot be effective before the commencing date of the survivor annuity.

Section 3 (b) of the House amendment provided that the survivor annuities provided by section 2 of the House amendment to the widows and widowers described in such section 2 would have the commencing date of the first day of the second month following the date of enactment or the first day of the month in which application for the annuity is received in the Civil Service Commission, whichever date shall have occurred later.

Section 3 (a) and section 3 (b) of the conference substitute are identical to section 3 (a) and section 3 (b) of the House amendment, except that the language designating the effective date is simplified to read August 1, 1958, consistently with subsections (a) and (b) of the first section of the conference substitute.

Section 5 of the House amendment provided that the annuity increases under subsection (a) of the first section of the House amendment (that is, the principal annuity increases rather than the survivor annuity increases) shall terminate, in accordance with the provisions of such section 5, on April 30 of any year following a calendar year in which the annuitant earned more than \$1,200 from gainful employment. The annuity increases would be resumed under

certain conditions if it were demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Civil Service Commission that the \$1,200 amount was not exceeded during the appropriate period.

The conference substitute omits the provisions of section 5 of the House amendment.

Section 7 of the House amendment provided that the civil service retirement and disability fund shall be made available for payment of expenses incurred by the Civil Service Commission in the administration of the provisions of the House amendment for the period beginning with the date of enactment and ending with the last day of the sixth month which begins after the date on which the first payment of any benefit (except sec. 6 benefits) provided by the House amendment is made.

The conference substitute omits the provisions of section 7 of the House amendment.

TOM MURRAY,
JAMES H. MORRISON,
JAMES C. DAVIS,
EDWARD H. REES,
ROBERT J. CORBETT,

Managers on the Part of the House.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' SALARY ADJUSTMENTS, 1958

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 734) an act to revise the basic compensation schedules of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes, disagree to the amendments of the Senate to the House amendment, and request a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, just what is the gentleman calling us now?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I am requesting a conference on the amendments approved by the Senate to the bill S. 734.

Mr. MARTIN. Does the minority Member, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] agree to it?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Oh, surely. We discussed it this morning.

Mr. MARTIN. I am advised there is no objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. CORBETT, and Mr. REES of Kansas.

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 87, I was present and voted for the amendment. I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD be corrected to show that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to call of the Chair.

Thereupon, at 11:57 a. m., the House stood in recess.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES OF CONGRESS TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY THE PRESIDENT OF THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

The SPEAKER of the House of Representatives presided.

At 12 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m. the Doorkeeper announced the President pro tempore and Members of the United States Senate, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the President pro tempore taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. On the part of the House the Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort His Excellency the President of the Federal Republic of Germany into the Chamber the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. McCORMACK, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. MARTIN, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. MORGAN, and the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. CHIPERFELD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On the part of the Senate the Chair appoints as members of the committee of escort the Senator from Texas, Mr. JOHNSON, the Senator from California, Mr. KNOWLAND, the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. GREEN, the Senator from Montana, Mr. MANSFIELD, and the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DIRKSEN.

The Doorkeeper announced the following guests, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them:

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments.

The members of the President's Cabinet.

At 12 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m. the Doorkeeper announced His Excellency the President of the Federal Republic of Germany.

His Excellency the President of the Federal Republic of Germany, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, I deem it a high privilege, and certainly it is a great pleasure to me, as I am sure it is to all of you, to welcome into this Chamber a man who represents a great, a proud, and a free people; and, as I said when I presented the Chancellor to this House, a people who are determined to remain free. [Applause.]

I take pleasure in presenting the head of the German Government, the President of the Federal Republic of Germany. [Applause, the Members rising.]

ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY THEODOR HEUSS, PRESIDENT OF THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GER- MANY

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, Members of the Congress of the United States, permit me first to make a personal remark.

I have chosen not without hesitation to address this august assembly in my own language. I would much rather have addressed the Congress of the United States in English—and have established thereby, perhaps, a more immediate communication with Members of both Houses. But I have come reluctantly to the conclusion that my command of your language is not what it used to be—that it has, in fact, become somewhat rusty. I must ask your indulgence, therefore, to allow me to speak to you in German.

I am grateful to President Eisenhower for his invitation because it gives me an opportunity to see for myself the reality of these United States. I think I know a little about this country's history. I know many of its citizens and I have had a great many discussions about the development and mentality of the people of this vast country. But already I feel that I shall not advance on my visit here beyond some very modest elementary lessons; and I, who have written a number of books, promise you that I shall not write a book as an expert on the United States when I return home. Nor do I want to compete with de Tocqueville. The dimensions to be grasped compel humility. But I do appreciate the honor of being able to address this distinguished assembly whose debates and acts today profoundly influence the world's destiny. It is a world responsibility which the American citizens has not sought but which he does not shirk.

I shall speak to you with the utmost candor. After Hitler's recklessness had forced the United States as well into his war, a shadow fell upon the American view of the German people: Every German seemed to be a Nazi. Today there is not much point in complaining about this distortion of the picture. After 1945 I said to many an officer of the occupation forces: You, who have never experienced the meanness and technical perfection of a totalitarian dictatorship, you are in the happy position in which you cannot even imagine the terrible moral pressure to which a people can be subjected. When we attempted, after 1945, to reestablish something like public life on the basis of justice and democracy we, too, suffered much distress resulting from an outlook distorted by the passions of war. After a time, however, we saw how the reality of German life, little by little, was understood and interpreted.

Ten years ago I said that this was something quite new in world history: Up to May 8, 1945, the American citizen had to pay heavy taxes in order to destroy the German State whereas after May 8 he had to pay taxes in order to save the German people. But there was not merely the taxpayer's burden which after a few years was absorbed into the grand design of the Marshall Plan which, in turn, had evolved from the Hoover Report. In addition there was the aid given by the individual American, by the churches, the charitable organizations, by the countless and uncountable men and women no matter whether they were of German origin or not. The love of one's fellow man dissolved fear and hatred. I do not come

to you as a petitioner. I wish simply to express my gratitude for the action which your Government has taken as well as for the help rendered by millions of individual Americans. The material side of this assistance was important but not decisive: It gave us moral uplift and encouragement. Without the help of the United States it would have been inconceivable for 10 million Germans expelled from their homeland to be offered food, work and shelter. The fact that week after week several thousand people flee to the West from intellectual and spiritual slavery in the Soviet-occupied zone continues to weigh heavy on the Federal Republic—their numbers have swelled to many hundreds of thousands. That stream of human beings is at once a lasting grievance and a perpetual reproach.

I do not wish to take up the time at my disposal by discussing, in terms of personalities, the German contribution to the growth of American statehood and the development of the American way of life. But I think I may say this much: The two great Presidents of the United States, who have become legendary figures, come to mind—George Washington knew that he could depend on the solid work of organization done by the German General von Steuben just as Abraham Lincoln could rely on the German champion of freedom, Carl Schurz, the most prominent representative of the many young Germans who came to the United States in quest of those civic and political rights for which they had fought vainly in Germany in 1848. The liberal and idealistic element represented by those groups was easily integrated into the American historical concept. And this concept was expanded and strengthened by the tradition of diligent, skilful labor of the millions of people of German descent who have been absorbed—for which they are grateful, I may say—into the substance of the American Nation.

We in Germany found ourselves in a strange situation after 1945. The people were exhausted and starving; the attitude of many toward the victorious powers was "Do what you like with us." At that time the reproach was heard—also from this country—that the Germans were sorry for themselves. There was something in that. But with the coming of a sound currency and of the Marshall Plan, people in Germany saw that there was purpose again in hard work and effort. So the Germans set to work and put life into their economy again. In 1949 and 1950, I told prominent American businessmen frequently that the Marshall Plan funds were well-invested in Germany. Can you hold this against a people that they have regained economic strength through industriousness and skill, and thanks to the economic commonsense displayed by the United States which was the essential condition for German economic recovery? I find nothing more interesting than to read in some newspapers of the Western world—though not in the United States—that the Germans are once more becoming imperialists because they have more or less recovered their share of the world's market.

Surely, there is no imperialism but much useful work in building sturdy cranes and manufacturing medical supplies.

During the past 50 years Germany has had the misfortune to acquire the reputation of being the nation which embodied, so to speak, eternal unrest and overweening ambition. A hundred years earlier—following the French revolution and the first Napoleon—other countries enjoyed this reputation. It would seem to me a good idea to get rid of such clichés encountered here and there in newspapers and schoolbooks.

We, all of us, must shed this habit of thinking, while, at the same time, not abandoning our traditional values. The German people—who here and there are still strangely suspected of exemplifying aggressive nationalism—existed as the Holy Roman Empire, as a European entity, imbued with a sense of responsibility toward Europe as a whole. And that was at a time when Spain, Britain, France, and later Russia, had long embarked upon a very concrete policy of expansion. I do not say this because I want to engage in polemics against historic events of bygone centuries—that is always a senseless thing to do—but in order to make the discussion about our present situation a little easier.

It is remarkable: The Korean crisis—a scene of secondary importance in the traditional European concept of history—has laid open, both materially and psychologically, the fundamental issue—respect for law or for arbitrary power, for violent action or for free self-determination. I cannot here dwell on this. But I can say what the effect has been on us in Germany. National freedom—including that aspect of it which concerns the social order—is a value which must be defended. It must be defended not only by those who are immediately affected but by all those to whom peace is a value per se and democracy a moral value. Believe me, it was not easy in Germany to explain the duty to do military service to the man-in-the-street who had been persuaded by propaganda that his military service had been some sort of crime because the supreme command had been in the hands of criminals. And yet it was possible to establish in people's consciousness the natural feeling—that he who cherishes the security of his native soil and the maintenance of freedom must also help to safeguard them.

You must not expect of me a detailed exposition of our domestic German difficulties. National reunification not only remains the object of German longing but also the prerequisite for Europe's recovery. The slogan of coexistence may imply the coexistence of different ideologies in different national territories but it is absurd to base it on a relationship of total power on the one hand and total impotence on the other, which—look at the situation of 1945—disrupts a nation and denies it democratic self-determination.

The settlement of the Saar question has shown that a patient policy which recognizes democratic rights can lead to a happy result. An onerous burden has been lifted from German-French under-

Dr. Brooks and his associates at St. Louis University, for example, have found that by placing vents in buildings, pressure caused by tornadoes can be dissipated and damage reduced.

Along this same line, the Southern Fine Association, a trade group, made a study of wind damage at Cameron, Tex., following the hurricane there last year, and issued a booklet of 15 cardinal points of construction. While even the association doubts any wooden structure can withstand the direct onslaught of a tornado, it claims damage to a building standing near a funnel can be cut substantially.

TORNADO-BRED BUSINESS

Tornado-bred businesses thrive in the Southwest, especially during the spring. Joe Doresey, president of Tornado, Inc., an Oklahoma City company making storm warning devices, says he has sold 10,000 of the gadgets since they went on the market last September. This battery-powered horn, small enough to fit in an automobile glove compartment, sounds whenever barometric pressure drops to 29.1 inches. Air pressure drops in advance of an actual tornado.

The once nearly-extinct storm cellar is making a comeback, too. Notes Boude Storey, Sr., president of Atlas Metal Workers: "Every time a storm blows up somewhere, we get more inquiries."

Stormmaster Tornado Shelter, Inc., of Durant, Okla., has built 2,500 of its 1-piece poured concrete shelters since 1954, says Lee Harris, president. The underground shelter, notes Mr. Harris, "can be adapted as an atomic shelter simply by adding lead doors and air filters."

THE RECORD OF ACHIEVEMENTS OF SENATOR LANGER OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, an outstanding American, the late Alfred E. Smith, used to say "Let's look at the record."

From time to time it is appropriate, in the career of public servants, that a look be taken at the record which they have compiled. Those of us who have had the privilege of serving for a goodly number of years in the Congress know that a periodic, factual review is helpful both to us and to our constituents.

A great deal has occurred since I first became a Member of the Senate on January 3, 1939. At that time the fortunes of my party were at low ebb. Two years later, on January 3, 1941, additional Republic Senators added to our ranks. Among them was my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

During the years which have followed, it has been my pleasure to know BILL LANGER and his fine family. I have known BILL, not only as a legislator representing a neighbor State of the upper Midwest in the Senate Chamber, but I have known him in committee. I have worked side by side with him on the Senate Judiciary Committee, where both he and I have served as chairmen. And I have known him on the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

Frankly, we have disagreed at times, and we may disagree in the future. But one always knows exactly where BILL LANGER stands. He is a rugged, outspoken battler. I respect him for his courage. He does not shrink from battle.

We of Wisconsin know him as a determined champion of the St. Lawrence seaway—a great project—which will mean much to North Dakota and Wisconsin farmers and city people.

We who know how important REA and co-ops are for our farmers, and they do not forget BILL LANGER's many battles for rural electrification and cooperatives. We, his neighbors, do not purport to know all about North Dakota. But we do know that he has been tireless here in Washington in fighting for his convictions.

These are facts. They speak from the record of 1941 to date, here in the Nation's Capitol.

My colleague now is third highest in seniority in the Senate on the Republican side. It is my privilege to serve as second in seniority, with our colleague the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] as first in seniority.

It may be asked, What has been achieved by my colleague from North Dakota during these 17½ years of service in the Senate?

I have in my hands a memorandum of his work and legislative activities. It was prepared on the basis of facts compiled by researchers, none of whom were on my own or on Senator LANGER's staff. This is the record. As Al Smith would say, "Let's look at this record."

I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum, outlining my colleague's record, be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

A RESEARCH REPORT ON BILL LANGER'S RECORD

Since Senator LANGER has been in the Senate, 49 major bills that he has sponsored have become the law of the land.

Forty-eight additional bills which he has sponsored have passed the United States Senate, but were not enacted into law because of failure to pass the House of Representatives, of which he is, of course, not a Member.

Thus, 97 Langer bills have passed, with success, through the Halls of Congress.

WIDE VARIETY OF LANGER-SPONSORED LAWS

The Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress has compiled a complete list of the many major bills bearing Senator LANGER's name which have either become law or have passed the United States Senate.

These Langer bills not only affect the interests of the entire country, but are understandably, of great significance to the people of North Dakota. The bills deal with veterans rights, post office and civil service employees, farmers, REA, and RTA, irrigation and reclamation, Indians, judges and judicial districts, Federal public works, roads, bridges, rivers and harbors, small business, tax benefits, encouraging industry for the State of North Dakota, railroad retirement, schools and school districts, cattle, sheep and wool industry, mining, airports, and military construction.

PAST CHAIRMAN OF TWO KEY COMMITTEES

It should be further borne in mind that Senator LANGER, in his 18 years as United States Senator, not only has attained seniority, but because of his seniority became chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Employees Committee during the 83d Congress.

An examination of his record as chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Commit-

tee reveals there were 15 public laws passed bearing his name and 5 bills bearing his name which passed the United States Senate. As an example, one of these bills provided for the complete overhauling of the entire post office and civil service retirement system.

This record reveals the importance of seniority. A chairman of a key committee is in a highly advantageous position to get major bills enacted into law.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN 83d CONGRESS

In the 83d Congress when he was chairman of the Judiciary Committee, eight bills bearing Senator LANGER's name became public law. Five additional bills bearing his name passed the United States Senate. Further, during his chairmanship of the Judiciary Committee, one of the finest records of number of bills clearing the committee was achieved.

ACHIEVEMENTS IN THE 84TH AND 85TH CONGRESS

In the 84th Congress, a 2-year period under Democratic leadership, he succeeded in getting nine laws bearing his name enacted into law. At that time, 16 bills bearing his name passed the Senate.

In the present 85th Congress which has yet to be completed, seven bills bearing his name have been enacted into law.

Moreover, four bills bearing his name have passed the Senate and they may be enacted into law before the second session is over.

Also, several important bills bearing his name dealing with antitrust and monopoly matters are pending before the Judiciary Committee, and these bills also have a chance of being enacted into law before this session closes.

Thus, even though the 85th Congress is under Democratic administration, his high-ranking seniority in the Senate and in three key committees has enabled him to maintain a high record of passage of important legislation bearing his name.

What are these three key committees? Judiciary, Post Office and Civil Service, and Foreign Relations.

TRIBUTES FROM OTHER SENATORS

Now, let us see what some other Senators themselves have said of Senator LANGER's effectiveness:

Senator JOHNSTON of South Carolina: "Senator LANGER has been excellent as a chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and has been most active in almost every major legislation aiding post office and civil service employees."

Senator HENNINGS of Missouri: "Senator LANGER has always acted with great zeal in bills affecting youth and his work among the American Indians is well reflected in the progress of the Rolla Jewel Bearing Plant."

Senator CLEMENTS of Kentucky: "I desire to commend my friend from North Dakota [Senator LANGER] for his success in having a new judicial district created in his State. Some of us have tried very hard to do likewise in our States, but have not been so successful as has my friend from North Dakota. My hat is off to him."

Senator WAYNE MORSE of Oregon: "Senator LANGER is one of the greatest friends of the American farmer, REA, and public power interests."

Senator COOPER of Kentucky: "Senator WILLIAM LANGER is one of the grandest of them all."

Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH: "Senator WILLIAM LANGER is one of the greatest fighters in the United States Senate for the cause of the small-business man, the worker, and the farmer."

These are not token testimonials but actual statements from the heart made by these Senators.

Additional comments could be listed if space permitted.

WORK ON BEHALF OF CONSTITUENTS

Nor does space permit a detailed discussion of Senator LANGER's effective work in committee and on the floor of the Senate on legislation which does not bear his own sponsorship. But the statements of other Senators herein does illustrate Senator LANGER's fine work in these other respects.

Also, North Dakotans know of Senator LANGER's excellent work on behalf of North Dakota and her citizens before Federal agencies. An example is his work in connection with the Uranium Processing Plant.

FOUR CONCLUSIONS

- In conclusion, what does the record show?
1. BILL LANGER has vital seniority.
 2. Seniority is extremely advantageous for a State and its chosen legislators.
 3. He has utilized his seniority for what he feels is in the best interest of the people of North Dakota and the Nation.
 4. He gets results. Specific laws now in effect attest to the strength of his record.

COMMENDATION OF CHAIRMAN LEWIS STRAUSS, ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, it has been reported recently that Chairman Lewis Strauss may soon resign from the Atomic Energy Commission, which he has directed with such ability, energy, and high devotion for the past 5 years. It has also been said that a major factor in his decision not to accept another 5-year term, which the President has offered him, is his patriotic recognition that the unjust and personal criticisms which have been increasingly leveled against him might seriously impede the work and policies of the Commission.

This is indeed a regrettable situation for, as Mr. Arthur Krock pointed out in a recent column, the American people stand deeply in debt to Admiral Strauss. The production of the H-bomb was largely the result of his successful fight against formidable scientific opposition. He played a major part in establishing our system for detecting Russia's atomic tests.

He has also been a chief architect of our policy of insistence that any disarmament plan must be based on a truly sound inspection system. It is precisely for his strong convictions on this subject that he has been subjected to increasingly bitter criticism from some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Yet Admiral Strauss' insistence on an adequate inspection system is, as the New York Times pointed out editorially this morning, "a virtue rather than a fault."

The Times continues:

An inspection system which looked good on paper, but which failed in reality to assure complete access to on-the-spot information, could create a false sense of security that might well have disastrous results. And the worth of a Soviet pledge has been tested often enough to demonstrate its lightness.

This Nation can be thankful that the leadership of President Eisenhower has been courageous enough and wise enough to ignore the carping critics and insist that adequate inspection must be the basis of any disarmament plan. I ask

unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point in my remarks the editorial from this morning's New York Times, which is entitled "Looking Before Leaping."

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

LOOKING BEFORE LEAPING

Our Washington dispatches reported yesterday that there is Democratic criticism of Chairman Strauss of the Atomic Energy Commission because "the chairman is skeptical of the feasibility of an inspection system (for bomb tests) and the reliability of a Soviet pledge."

This is a case, it seems to us, when skepticism is a virtue rather than a fault. An inspection system which looked good on paper, but which failed in reality to assure complete access to on-the-spot information, could create a false sense of security that might well have disastrous results. And the worth of a Soviet pledge has been tested often enough to demonstrate its lightness.

On the initiative of President Eisenhower, discussions are now about to be held with the Soviets and other governments concerning the technical problems of establishing an adequate system of inspection. There is every reason to begin these discussions, to work hard at them and to hope that they will get somewhere. But from the point of view of our national security it must be clear that no system of inspection will be adequate unless it is genuinely self-enforcing.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to add a word about my own high regard for Admiral Strauss. During my long friendship with him, dating back to 1920, I have come to believe profoundly in his great ability. He has compiled a truly distinguished record in the affairs of this country.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2060) for the relief of Elizabeth Biro, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 734) to revise the basic compensation schedules of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. DAVIS, of Georgia, Mr. REES, of Kansas, and Mr. CORBETT were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 9147. An act to provide for the disposal of certain Federal property in the Boulder City area, to provide assistance in the establishment of a municipality incorporated under the laws of Nevada, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 12052. An act to designate the dam and reservoir to be constructed at Stewarts Ferry, Tenn., as the J. Percy Priest Dam and Reservoir.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 9147. An act to provide for the disposal of certain Federal property in the Boulder City area, to provide assistance in the establishment of a municipality incorporated under the laws of Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 12052. An act to designate the dam and reservoir to be constructed at Stewarts Ferry, Tenn., as the J. Percy Priest Dam and Reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

REVISION OF BASIC COMPENSATION SCHEDULES OF CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1949

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORTON in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 734) to revise the basic compensation schedules of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. JENNER conferees on the part of the Senate.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE BY UNIVERSITY OF OREGON TO EDUCATION IN NEPAL UNDER POINT 4

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, today the Senate will vote on mutual-security authorizations for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1958. I desire to invite to the attention of my colleagues some of the most convincing reasons I have ever heard for the continuation and maintenance of mutual security, as recommended by the President and supported by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

On June 4, my guests at breakfast in the Senate dining room were Dr. Paul B. Jacobson, dean of the School of Education at the University of Oregon; Prof. Hugh B. Wood, professor of education at the University of Oregon; and Mr. W. N. McLaughlin, assistant business manager of the University of Oregon. They are in Washington to negotiate a new contract with the International Cooperation Administration for further operation of the very outstanding project which the University of Oregon has undertaken to educate teachers in Nepal, that fabled kingdom on the frontier between the free world and the Soviet world.

respect to a specifically described category or categories of property as determined by the Administrator;

"(B) the public health, safety, or national security will thereby be promoted;

"(C) public exigency will not admit of the delay incident to advertising;

"(D) the property involved is of a nature and quantity which, if disposed of under paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection, would cause such an impact on an industry or industries as adversely to affect the national economy, and the estimated fair market value of the property and other satisfactory terms of disposal can be obtained by negotiation;

"(E) the estimated fair market value of the property involved does not exceed \$1,000;

"(F) bid prices after advertising therefor are not reasonable (either as to all or some part of the property) or have not been independently arrived at in open competition;

"(G) with respect to real property only, the character or condition of the property or unusual circumstances make it impractical to advertise publicly for competitive bids and the fair market value of the property and other satisfactory terms of disposal can be obtained by negotiation;

"(H) the disposal will be to States, Territories, possessions, political subdivisions thereof, or tax-supported agencies therein, and the estimated fair market value of the property, and other satisfactory terms of disposal are obtained by negotiation; or

"(I) otherwise authorized by this act or other law.

"(4) Disposals and contracts for disposal of surplus real and related personal property through contract realty brokers employed by the Administrator shall be made in the manner followed in similar commercial transactions under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Administrator: *Provided*, That such regulations shall require that wide public notice of availability of the property for disposal be given by the brokers.

"(5) Negotiated sales of personal property at fixed prices may be made by the Administrator either directly or through the use of disposal contractors without regard to the limitations set forth in paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection: *Provided*, That such sales be publicized to the extent consistent with the value and nature of the property involved, that the prices established shall reflect the estimated fair market value thereof, and that such sales shall be limited to those categories of personal property as to which the Administrator determines that such method of disposal will best serve the interests of the Government.

"(6) Except as otherwise provided by this paragraph, an explanatory statement of the circumstances of each disposal by negotiation of any real or personal property having a fair market value in excess of \$1,000 shall be prepared. Each such statement shall be transmitted to the appropriate committees of the Congress at least 30 days (or such shorter period as may be concurred in by such committees in advance of such disposal, and a copy thereof shall be preserved in the files of the executive agency making such disposal. No such statement need be transmitted to any such committee with respect to any disposal—

"(A) of any perishable food or other property which may become useless by deterioration within 30 days;

"(B) required to be made immediately for the preservation of human life or the alleviation of human suffering;

"(C) required in the public interest to be made within 30 days during a period of national emergency declared by the President or the Congress;

"(D) of real property made through a contract realty broker pursuant to paragraph (4);

"(E) of personal property made under paragraph (5) at a fixed price; or

"(F) authorized by section 3709 of the Revised Statutes or any other provision of law to be made without advertising.

"(7) Section 3709, Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U. S. C. 5), shall not apply to disposals or contracts for disposal made under this subsection."

With the following committee amendments:

1. On page 3, line 1, immediately before the word "property" insert the word "personal."

2. On page 3, line 8, immediately before the word "property" insert the word "personal."

3. On page 3, line 8, following the word "promoted," strike the semicolon and add the words "by a particular disposal of personal property."

4. On page 3, line 8, following the word "advertising," strike the semicolon and add the words "certain personal property."

5. On page 3, line 9, immediately before the word "property" insert the word "personal."

6. On page 3, line 14, strike the word "the" and insert in lieu thereof the word "such."

7. On page 5, strike out line 3 and all that follows down through line 5 on page 6, and insert the following:

"(6) Except as otherwise provided by this paragraph, an explanatory statement of the circumstances of each disposal by negotiation of any real or personal property having a fair market value in excess of \$1,000 shall be prepared. Each such statement shall be transmitted to the appropriate committees of the Congress in advance of such disposal, and a copy thereof shall be preserved in the files of the executive agency making such disposal. No such statement need be transmitted to any such committee with respect to any disposal of personal property made under paragraph (5) at a fixed price, or to property disposals authorized by any other provision of law to be made without advertising."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a few questions about the bill. I would like to ask him if this is the type of legislation under which telephone facilities have been declared surplus to Government needs and then sold?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Actually, not. This is an extension of negotiating authority of the GSA to dispose of surplus property.

The question the gentleman raises deals with property that has previously been declared surplus by another Government agency.

Mr. BARTLETT. Then may I ask the gentleman if it can be stated legally that the facilities are surplus when the Government sells them and then turns around and buys the same services from the telephone company?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. This is a practice which I think is reprehensible and has been followed by the Department of Defense in several instances.

We are now in the Government Operations Committee looking into several such instances whereby the Department of Defense or one of its agencies has declared a usable facility surplus when it is being used every day. They declare it surplus with the apparent hope that as surplus property it can be disposed

of to one of the telephone companies and then the United States Government would be immediately required to release it and pay considerable moneys for that same service or an amended service of that character.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the gentleman from Texas. I may say I am interested in this bill because it is planned to declare the Alaska Communication System surplus under this or a special act; then the Government or the public will obtain service from a private company.

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

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

Mr. FORD. I am sure the gentleman is familiar with the fact that every year for the last 5 years anyway the Federal Government has had to put in an appropriation through the Department of the Army of \$5½ million annually for the operation of this facility. It is a pure subsidy of the service. Up until about 2 or 3 years ago the rates which were charged were totally inadequate and were not sufficient on a comparable basis to pay for the operation of the facility. If it is a good business investment for Uncle Sam to get out of business and a report will determine that, I personally think they should want to dispose of the service.

Mr. BARTLETT. I may say to the gentleman from Michigan that I am not unalterably opposed to that. I do not know how much it cost the Government to provide the military service. I merely wanted to find out what can be done regarding the ACS in this particular act. It may be that proof will be offered that it should be sold to a private company. I well appreciate the expressions of the Appropriations Committee in that regard.

Mr. FORD. It costs about \$5½ million to \$6 million a year plus the cost of military personnel which is not included to operate this facility. There are many people who feel that it is a pure subsidization and an unnecessary business operation of the Federal Government. There is a report being prepared to determine which is the better procedure. I think we ought to await that determination.

Mr. BARTLETT. I agree with the gentleman absolutely that we should await the submission of a report.

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

DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS FOODS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 12164) to amend the Agriculture Act, as amended, to permit use of Federal surplus foods in nonprofit summer camps for children.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That clause (3), section 416, of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding after the words "nonprofit school lunch programs," the words "in nonprofit summer camps for children."

SEC. 2. Public Law 165, 75th Congress, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the words "and for use in nonprofit summer camps for children."

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in support of H. R. 12164 which I introduced in the interests of thousands of children attending summer camps.

The bill amends the Agriculture Act, as amended, to permit use of Federal surplus foods in nonprofit summer camps for children. It has been reported upon favorably and without amendment by the House Agriculture Committee and has the approval of the Department of Agriculture. Agriculture Department support for a bill I introduced is a pretty fair indication that there is no controversy over the matter.

The purpose of this bill is to clarify the law relating to the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make available without cost, surplus food commodities to nonprofit children's summer camps. As you know, nonprofit school-lunch programs receive surplus food commodities. The Department of Agriculture has considered summer camping an extension of school activities in the past and has donated surplus food to nonprofit camps. I am informed that nationally, more than 850,000 children attended camps last year which received some surplus food.

Since specific regulations concerning food donations are being written by the Department with the possibility that this particular activity might be discontinued under a strict interpretation of the new rules, I decided to introduce this bill to continue what I believe to be the intent of Congress in the matter.

The purpose of this bill is to clarify this provision of law so there will be no doubt that nonprofit summer camps for children have the same kind of eligibility to draw surplus foods as do nonprofit school-lunch programs.

This program is a natural companion to a special summer-camp milk-donation bill the Congress passed and the President signed after I introduced it in 1956. It will benefit youngsters at thousands of camps conducted by charitable, welfare, civic, and religious organizations—such groups as the 4-H, YMCA, YWCA, Boy and Girl Scouts and others.

Children will receive wholesome foods such as butter, cheese, dried milk, rice, flour, and cornmeal.

But what is even more important, the budgets of the nonprofit groups involved will be stretched a bit by this grant of surplus food so that I am certain many more youngsters than otherwise might have gone, will have a chance to vacation in the great outdoors. I hope there will be a prompt acceptance of this bill as this summer's camping activities might be affected.

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

The title was amended to read as follows: "A bill to permit the use of Federal surplus foods in nonprofit summer camps for children."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTABLISHMENT OF PLANS FOR THE PEACEFUL EXPLORATION OF OUTER SPACE

The Clerk called House Concurrent Resolution 322.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as this bill is calendared to be brought up under suspension of the rules, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That concludes the call of the Consent Calendar.

| Grade | Per annum rates | | | | | |
|-------|-----------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| | \$3,055 | \$3,150 | \$3,245 | \$3,340 | \$3,435 | \$3,530 |
| GS-1 | 3,255 | 3,445 | 3,540 | 3,635 | 3,730 | 3,825 |
| GS-2 | 3,405 | 3,595 | 3,685 | 3,780 | 3,875 | 3,970 |
| GS-3 | 3,755 | 3,850 | 3,945 | 4,040 | 4,135 | 4,230 |
| GS-4 | 4,040 | 4,190 | 4,340 | 4,490 | 4,640 | 4,790 |
| GS-5 | 4,490 | 4,640 | 4,790 | 4,940 | 5,090 | 5,240 |
| GS-6 | 4,980 | 5,130 | 5,280 | 5,430 | 5,580 | 5,730 |
| GS-7 | 5,470 | 5,620 | 5,770 | 5,920 | 6,070 | 6,220 |
| GS-8 | 5,985 | 6,135 | 6,285 | 6,435 | 6,585 | 6,735 |
| GS-9 | 6,505 | 6,655 | 6,805 | 6,955 | 7,105 | 7,255 |
| GS-10 | 7,030 | 7,270 | 7,510 | 7,750 | 7,990 | 8,230 |
| GS-11 | 8,330 | 8,570 | 8,810 | 9,050 | 9,290 | 9,530 |
| GS-12 | 9,890 | 10,130 | 10,370 | 10,610 | 10,850 | 11,090 |
| GS-13 | 11,355 | 11,595 | 11,835 | 12,075 | 12,315 | 12,555 |
| GS-14 | 12,770 | 13,070 | 13,370 | 13,670 | 13,970 | 14,270 |
| GS-15 | 14,190 | 14,430 | 14,670 | 14,910 | 15,150 | 15,390 |
| GS-16 | 15,375 | 15,615 | 15,855 | 16,095 | 16,335 | 16,575 |
| GS-17 | 17,500 | | | | | |

(b) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees to whom this section applies shall be adjusted 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 scheduled or longevity 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 scheduled or longevity 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 scheduled or two longevity rates, or between a scheduled and a longevity rate, of a grade in the general schedule, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the higher of the two corresponding rate in effect on and after such date.

(3) If the officer or employee (other than an officer or employee subject to paragraph (4) of this subsection), immediately prior to the effective date of this section, is receiving basic compensation at a rate in excess of the maximum longevity rate of his grade, or in excess of the maximum scheduled rate of his grade if there is no longevity rate for his grade, he shall receive basic compensation at a rate equal to the rate which he received immediately prior to such effective date, increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase made by this section in the maximum longevity rate, or the maximum scheduled rate, as the case may be, of his grade until (A) he leaves such position, or (B) he is entitled to receive basic compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; but, when his position becomes vacant, the rate of basic compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with such act, as amended.

(4) If the officer or employee, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, is receiving, pursuant to paragraph (4) of section 2 (b) 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; Public Law 763,

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' SALARY ADJUSTMENTS, 1958

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 734) to revise the basic compensation schedules of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes, with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1958."

Sec. 2. (a) Section 608 (b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (69 Stat. 172, 70 Stat. 740; 5 U. S. C. 1113 (b)), is amended to read as follows:

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

83d Congress), plus the amount of the increase provided by section 2 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, he shall receive an aggregate rate of compensation equal to the sum of (A) his existing aggregate rate of compensation determined under such section 208 (b) of the act of September 1, 1954, and (B) the amount of the increase provided by section 2 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955 and (C) the amount of the increase made by this section in the maximum longevity rate of his grade, until (1) he leaves his position, or (ii) 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 (ii) 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 (3) of such act of September 1, 1954, to constitute a part of the existing aggregate rate of compensation of such employee.

(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.

(6) If the officer or employee on the rolls has had his rate of basic compensation es-

established, under authority of section 803 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (68 Stat. 1106; 5 U. S. C. 1133), at any time during the period beginning on September 1, 1954, and ending on the date of enactment of this act, his rate of basic compensation shall be adjusted retroactively in accordance with one or more of the following provisions of this paragraph (6), as applicable:

(A) If his rate of basic compensation was established under authority of such section 803 after September 1, 1954, and prior to the effective date of this section such rate shall be adjusted retroactively, for the period of time served by him in a pay status under the Classification Act of 1949 in the position concerned on and after such effective date and prior to the date of enactment of this act, 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 which was in effect for such officer or employee, without regard to this act, as a result of such adjustment under such section 803;

(B) If his rate of basic compensation was established under authority of such section 803 on or after the effective date of this section and prior to the date of enactment of this act, such rate shall be adjusted retroactively for the period of time served by him in a pay status under the Classification Act of 1949 in the position concerned on and after such effective date and prior to such date of enactment, as follows—

(i) for the period of time prior to the effective date of the establishment of his rate of basic compensation under such section 803, on the basis of the rate of basic compensation which he was receiving during such period, and

(ii) for the period of time on and after the effective date of the establishment of his rate of basic compensation under such section 803, 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 which was in effect for such officer or employee, without regard to this act, as a result of such adjustment under such section 803,

and such basic compensation adjusted under subparagraphs (A) and (B) (ii) of this paragraph (6) shall be paid in accordance with such subparagraphs until—

(a) he leaves such position, or

(b) he is entitled to receive basic compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of any provision of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(7) If the officer or employee became subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, at any time during the period beginning on September 1, 1954, and ending on the date of enactment of this act, at a rate of basic compensation which was established under authority of section 803 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (68 Stat. 1106; 5 U. S. C. 1133), his rate of basic compensation shall be adjusted retroactively, for the period of time served by him in a pay status under the Classification Act of 1949 in the position concerned on and after the effective date of this section and prior to the date of enactment of this act, 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 which was in effect for such officer or employee, without regard to this act, as a result of such adjustment under such section 803, and such basic compensation shall be paid in accordance with this paragraph (7) until—

(A) he leaves his position, or

(B) he is entitled to receive basic compensation at a higher rate by reason of the

operation of any provision of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(8) 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, became subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, at a rate of basic compensation which was fixed on the basis of a higher previously earned rate and which is above the minimum rate of the grade of such officer or employee, his rate of basic compensation shall be adjusted retroactively to the date on which he became subject to such act, 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 he became subject to the Classification Act of 1949 as in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this section.

(9) Each officer or employee—

(A) (i) who with his position has been transferred under authority of the Classification Act of 1949, at any time during the period beginning on the effective date of this section and ending on the date of enactment of this act, from the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949 to a prevailing rate schedule, or (ii) who, at any time during such period, transferred from a position subject to the Classification Act of 1949 to a position subject to a prevailing rate schedule.

(B) who, at all times subsequent to such transfer, was in the service of the United States (including the Armed Forces of the United States) or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, without break in such service of more than 30 consecutive calendar days and, 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, without break in service in excess of 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,

(C) who, on such date of enactment, is being compensated under a prevailing rate schedule, and

(D) whose rate of basic compensation on such date of enactment is less than the rate to which he would have been entitled on such date if such transfer had not occurred (unless he is receiving such lesser rate by reason of an adverse personnel action resulting from his own fault),

shall be paid basic compensation at a rate equal to the rate which he would have been receiving on such date of enactment (including compensation for each within-grade and longevity step-increase which he would have earned) if such transfer had not occurred until the day immediately following such date of enactment, for all time in a pay status on and after the effective date of this section in a position subject to a prevailing rate schedule under the circumstances prescribed in this subsection, until—

(a) he leaves the position which he holds on such date of enactment, or

(b) he is entitled to receive basic compensation at a higher rate under a prevailing rate schedule;

but when such position becomes vacant, the rate of basic compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with prevailing rate schedules.

Sec. 3. (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 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 of the United States Code, the third sentence of section

603, section 604 (a) (5), or sections 672 to 675, inclusive, of title 28 of the United States Code are hereby increased by amounts equal to the increases provided by section 2 of this act in corresponding rates of compensation paid to officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) The limitations of \$13,485 and \$18,010 with respect to the aggregate salaries payable to secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges, contained in the paragraph designated "Salaries of supporting personnel" in the Judiciary Appropriation Act, 1958 (71 Stat. 65; Public Law 85-49), or any subsequent appropriation act, shall be increased by the amounts necessary to pay the additional basic compensation provided by this act.

(c) Section 753 (e) of title 28 of the United States Code (relating to the compensation of court reporters for district courts) is amended by striking out "\$6,450" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$7,095."

Sec. 4. (a) Each officer and 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 10 percent of his gross rate of compensation (basic compensation plus additional compensation authorized by law).

(b) 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 (1) the provisions of this subsection shall not apply in the case of any employee if on or before the 15th 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 this subsection to apply to such employee, and (2) no employee whose basic compensation is adjusted under this subsection shall receive any additional compensation or increase in compensation under this act for any period prior to the effective date of such adjustment.

(c) Notwithstanding the provision referred to in subsection (d), the rates of gross compensation of each of the elected officers of the Senate (except the presiding officer of the Senate), the Parliamentarian of the Senate, the Legislative Counsel of the Senate, the Senior Counsel in the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate, and the Chief Clerk of the Senate are hereby increased by 10 percent.

(d) 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 (69 Stat. 510; Public Law 242, 84th Cong.), is amended to read as follows:

"No officer or employee, whose compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate shall be paid basic compensation at a rate in excess of \$3,880 per annum, or gross compensation at a rate in excess of \$16,300 per annum, unless expressly authorized by law."

(e) The provisions of subsection (a) shall not apply to employees whose compensation is paid from the appropriation contained in the paragraph designated "Folding documents" under the heading "Contingent Expenses of the Senate" in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1958 (71 Stat. 246; Public Law 85-75), or in any subsequent appropriation act, but the limitation contained in such paragraph is hereby increased by the amount necessary to provide increases corresponding to those provided by subsection (a).

(f) The official reporters of proceedings and debates of the Senate and their employes shall be considered to be officers or employees in or under the legislative branch of the Government within the meaning of subsection (a).

(g) 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. 2251-2267).

(h) The paragraph relating to rates of compensation of employees of committees of the Senate, contained in the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956 (69 Stat. 505; Public Law 242, 84th Cong.), is amended by striking out so much of the second sentence thereof as follows the words "First Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1947," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "the basic compensation of any employee of a standing or select committee of the Senate (including the majority and minority policy committees and the majority conference of the Senate and minority conference of the Senate), or a joint committee of the two Houses the expenses of which are paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, whose basic compensation may be fixed under such provisions at a rate of \$8,000 per annum, may be fixed at a rate not in excess of \$8,040 per annum, except that the basic compensation of one such employee may be fixed at a rate not in excess of \$8,880 per annum and the basic compensation of two such employees may be fixed at a rate not in excess of \$8,460 per annum."

(i) No officer or employee shall be paid increased or additional compensation for any period prior to the first day of the month following the date of enactment of this act at a rate in excess of 10 percent of his gross rate of compensation computed without regard to the amendment made by subsection (d) and without regard to subsections (m), (n), (o), and (p).

(j) The position of chief nurse in the Senate Office Building, under the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, shall be established and allocated to grade 9 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1940, as amended, so long as such position is held by the present incumbent.

(k) The rate of gross annual compensation of each of the elected officers of the House of Representatives (except the Presiding Officer of the House and the Chaplain of the House) is hereby increased by 10 percent.

(l) The aggregate rate of the rate of basic annual compensation and the rate of additional annual compensation authorized by law of the Chaplain of the House of Representatives and of the coordinator of information of the House of Representatives is hereby increased by 10 percent.

(m) The rate of gross annual compensation of the legislative counsel of the House of Representatives shall be an amount which is equal to the rate of gross annual compensation of the legislative counsel of the Senate on the day following the effective date of this subsection.

(n) The basic compensation of the administrative assistants to the Speaker, majority leader, minority leader, majority whip, and minority whip shall be at the rate of \$8,880 per annum.

(o) Subsection (e) of section 202 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (2 U. S. C. 72a (e)), is amended (1) by striking out "\$8,820" where it first appears in such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof "\$8,880," and (2) by striking out "\$8,820" at the second place where it appears in such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof "\$8,880."

(p) (1) This subsection is enacted as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House of Representatives to change the rule

amended by this subsection at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the House of Representatives.

(2) Clause 27 (c) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended (A) by striking out "\$8,820" where it first appears in such clause and inserting in lieu thereof "\$8,880," and (B) by striking out "\$8,820" at the second place where it appears in such clause and inserting in lieu thereof "\$8,880."

(q) The limitations in the paragraph designated "Folding documents" under the heading "Contingent Expenses of the House" in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1958 (71 Stat. 249; Public Law 85-75), or in any subsequent appropriation act, are hereby increased by 10 percent.

(r) Each employee in the legislative branch of the Government whose compensation—

(1) is disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives,

(2) is not increased by any other provision of this act, and

(3) is fixed at a gross aggregate rate per annum, shall receive additional compensation at the rate of 10 percent of the rate of his existing gross annual compensation.

(s) The increases in compensation provided by this section shall not be applicable with respect to the Office of the Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives and to any employee in such office.

(t) Subject to subsection (j) of this section, each position of nurse under the Architect of the Capitol shall be allocated by the Architect to that grade of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, which is recommended to the Architect by the Attending Physician of the Congress. Any such allocation shall not be subject to post audit, review, or change by any authority in the executive branch.

Sec. 5. (a) Section 1403 (b) of the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 (71 Stat. 130; Public Law 85-56), relating to the annual salary of the Chief Medical Director of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended by striking out "\$17,800" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$19,580."

(b) Section 1403 (c) of such act, relating to the annual salary of the Deputy Chief Medical Director of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended by striking out "\$16,800" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$18,480."

(c) Section 1403 (d) of such act, relating to the annual salaries of the Assistant Chief Medical Directors and the directors of service or chiefs of division of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended—

(1) by striking out "\$15,800" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$17,280";

(2) by striking out the word "twenty" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "twenty-five"; and

(3) by striking out "\$13,225 minimum to \$14,300 maximum" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$14,545 minimum to \$16,500 maximum."

(d) Section 1403 (e) of such act, relating to the annual salaries of the Director of Nursing Service and the Deputy Director of Nursing Service of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended—

(1) by striking out "\$11,610" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$12,770 minimum to \$13,970 maximum"; and

(2) by striking out "\$10,320" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$11,355 minimum to \$12,555 maximum."

(e) Section 1403 (f) of such act, relating to the annual salaries of the chief pharmacist, the chief dietitian, the chief physical therapist, and the chief occupational therapist of the Department of Medicine and

Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended to read as follows:

"(f) The Administrator may appoint a chief pharmacist, a chief dietitian, a chief physical therapist, and a chief occupational therapist. During the period of his service as such, the chief pharmacist and the chief dietitian shall be paid a salary of \$12,770 minimum to \$13,970 maximum a year and the chief physical therapist and the chief occupational therapist shall be paid a salary of \$11,355 minimum to \$12,555 maximum a year."

(f) Section 1407 (a) of such act, relating to maximum and minimum annual rates of salary of certain employees of the Medical Service, Dental Service, and Nursing Service of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The grades and per annum full-pay ranges for positions provided in paragraph (1) of section 1404 shall be as follows:

"MEDICAL SERVICE

"Chief grade, \$12,770 minimum to \$13,970 maximum.

"Senior grade, \$11,355 minimum to \$12,555 maximum.

"Intermediate grade, \$9,890 minimum to \$11,090 maximum.

"Full grade, \$8,330 minimum to \$9,530 maximum.

"Associate grade, \$7,030 minimum to \$8,230 maximum.

"Junior grade, \$6,505 minimum to \$7,405 maximum.

"DENTAL SERVICE

"Chief grade, \$12,770 minimum to \$13,970 maximum.

"Senior grade, \$11,355 minimum to \$12,555 maximum.

"Intermediate grade, \$9,890 minimum to \$11,090 maximum.

"Full grade, \$8,330 minimum to \$9,530 maximum.

"Associate grade, \$7,030 minimum to \$8,230 maximum.

"Junior grade, \$6,505 minimum to \$7,405 maximum.

"NURSING SERVICE

"Assistant Director, \$11,330 minimum to \$9,530 maximum.

"Senior grade, \$7,030 minimum to \$8,230 maximum.

"Full grade, \$5,985 minimum to \$6,885 maximum.

"Associate grade, \$5,205 minimum to \$6,165 maximum.

"Junior grade, \$4,425 minimum to \$5,385 maximum."

(g) Section 1408 (d) of such act, prescribing the maximum amount of pay and allowances of medical, surgical, and dental specialists of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Any person, rated as a medical surgical, or dental specialist, under the provisions of this section or prior corresponding provisions of law, shall receive, in addition to his basic pay, an allowance equal to 15 percent of such pay, but in no event shall the pay plus the allowance authorized by this subsection exceed \$16,000 per annum."

(h) Section 1411 of such act, relating to appointment of additional employees, is amended—

(1) by inserting "(a)" immediately following "Sec. 1411.," and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the per annum rate of salary of each individual serving as a manager of a hospital, domiciliary, or center who is not a physician in the medical service shall not be less than the rate of salary which he would receive under section 1407 if his service as a manager of a hospital, domiciliary, or center had been service as a physician in the

medical service in the chief grade. This subsection shall not affect the allocation of any position of manager of a hospital, domiciliary, or center to any grade of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, except with respect to changes in rate of salary pursuant to the preceding sentence, and shall not affect the applicability of the Performance Rating Act of 1950 to any individual."

(1) Paragraph (2) of section 1404 of such act, relating to additional appointments, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) Managers, pharmacists, physical therapists, occupational therapists, dietitians, and other scientific and professional personnel, such as optometrists, pathologists, bacteriologists, chemists, biostatisticians, and medical and dental technologists."

(j) Paragraph (5) of section 1405 of such act, relating to qualifications of appointees, is amended—

| | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|
| Class 1..... | \$16,060 | \$16,500 | \$16,940 | \$17,380 | \$17,820 | \$18,260 | \$18,700 | |
| Class 2..... | 13,860 | 14,190 | 14,520 | 14,850 | 15,180 | 15,510 | 15,840 | |
| Class 3..... | 11,660 | 11,990 | 12,320 | 12,650 | 12,980 | 13,310 | 13,640 | |
| Class 4..... | 9,900 | 10,175 | 10,450 | 10,725 | 11,000 | 11,275 | 11,550 | |
| Class 5..... | 8,140 | 8,415 | 8,690 | 8,965 | 9,240 | 9,515 | 9,790 | |
| Class 6..... | 6,710 | 6,930 | 7,150 | 7,370 | 7,590 | 7,810 | 8,030 | |
| Class 7..... | 5,610 | 5,775 | 5,940 | 6,105 | 6,270 | 6,435 | 6,600 | |
| Class 8..... | 4,730 | 4,895 | 5,060 | 5,225 | 5,390 | 5,555 | 5,720 | \$5,885." |

(3) The second sentence of section 415 of such act (22 U. S. C. 870) is amended to read as follows: "The per annum rates of

| | | | | | | | |
|---------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|---------|---------|
| Class 1..... | \$11,770 | \$12,120 | \$12,480 | \$12,830 | \$13,160 | | |
| Class 2..... | 10,920 | 11,205 | 11,485 | 11,770 | 12,120 | | |
| Class 3..... | 10,030 | 10,320 | 10,600 | 10,885 | 11,165 | | |
| Class 4..... | 9,095 | 9,380 | 9,665 | 9,945 | 10,230 | | |
| Class 5..... | 8,395 | 8,610 | 8,815 | 9,030 | 9,315 | \$9,600 | |
| Class 6..... | 7,690 | 7,905 | 8,120 | 8,325 | 8,540 | 8,955 | |
| Class 7..... | 6,990 | 7,200 | 7,415 | 7,630 | 7,840 | 8,050 | |
| Class 8..... | 6,285 | 6,495 | 6,710 | 6,925 | 7,140 | 7,350 | |
| Class 9..... | 5,585 | 5,795 | 6,005 | 6,220 | 6,435 | 6,650 | |
| Class 10..... | 5,115 | 5,260 | 5,400 | 5,540 | 5,755 | 5,970 | \$6,175 |
| Class 11..... | 4,650 | 4,790 | 4,930 | 5,070 | 5,215 | 5,355 | 5,500 |
| Class 12..... | 4,180 | 4,320 | 4,460 | 4,605 | 4,745 | 4,890 | 5,025 |
| Class 13..... | 3,730 | 3,870 | 4,010 | 4,155 | 4,295 | 4,440 | 4,580 |
| Class 14..... | 3,300 | 3,445 | 3,585 | 3,730 | 3,870 | 4,010 | 4,155 |
| Class 15..... | 3,090 | 3,165 | 3,230 | 3,300 | 3,445 | 3,585 | 3,730 |
| Class 16..... | 2,875 | 2,950 | 3,020 | 3,090 | 3,165 | 3,230 | 3,300 |
| Class 17..... | 2,660 | 2,735 | 2,805 | 2,875 | 2,950 | 3,020 | 3,090 |
| Class 18..... | 2,455 | 2,520 | 2,590 | 2,660 | 2,735 | 2,805 | 2,875 |
| Class 19..... | 2,240 | 2,310 | 2,380 | 2,455 | 2,520 | 2,590 | 2,660 |
| Class 20..... | 2,025 | 2,095 | 2,165 | 2,240 | 2,310 | 2,380 | 2,455 |
| Class 21..... | 1,810 | 1,880 | 1,955 | 2,025 | 2,095 | 2,165 | 2,240 |
| Class 22..... | 1,600 | 1,670 | 1,745 | 1,815 | 1,880 | 1,955 | 2,025" |

staff officers and employees within each class shall be as follows:

(b) 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 step rates provided by sections 412 or 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, shall receive basic compensation on or after the effective date of this section at the corresponding step rate as provided by such sections 412 or 415 as amended by this section.

SEC. 7. (a) 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 began on or after January 1, 1958, by amounts not to exceed the increases provided by this act for corresponding rates of compensation in the appropriate schedule or scale of pay.

(b) 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.

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) thereof as subparagraphs (C) and (D) thereof, respectively; and

(2) by inserting immediately below subparagraph (A) thereof the following:

"(B) optometrist—
"be licensed to practice optometry in one of the States, Territories, or Commonwealths of the United States, or in the District of Columbia."

SEC. 6. (a) The Foreign Service Act of 1946 as amended as follows:

(1) The third sentence of section 412 of such act (22 U. S. C. 867) is amended by striking out "\$17,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$19,250."

(2) The fourth sentence of section 412 of such act is amended to read as follows: "The per annum salaries of Foreign Service officers within each of the other classes shall be as follows:

(c) 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.

SEC. 8. (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 first day of the first pay period which began on or after January 1, 1958, 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 636, 81st Cong.), as amended (5 U. S. C. 611-61k), for services rendered during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began on or after January 1, 1958, and ending on the date of enactment of this act by an officer or employee who dies during such period.

(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.

SEC. 9. (a) The Director of the Bureau of the Budget is authorized and directed to provide by regulation for the absorption from the respective applicable appropriations or funds available for the fiscal year in which this act is enacted and for the immediately succeeding fiscal years, by the respective departments, agencies, establishments, and corporations in the executive branch, to such extent as the Director deems practicable, of the costs of the increases in basic compensation provided by this act.

(b) Nothing contained in subsection (a) of this section shall be held or considered to require (1) the separation from the service of any individual by reduction in force or other personnel action or (2) the placing of any individual in a leave-without-pay status.

(c) Subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall not apply to the field service of the Post Office Department and to such other departments, agencies, establishments, and corporations in the executive branch as the Director, with the approval of the President, may designate.

SEC. 10. Section 505 (e) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U. S. C. 1105 (e)), is amended by striking out "thirty-seven" and inserting in lieu thereof "seventy-five."

SEC. 11. Section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U. S. C. 1105), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) Appointments to positions in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule, except positions provided for in subsection (e) of this section, shall be made only upon approval by the Civil Service Commission of the qualifications of the proposed appointees."

SEC. 12. The annual rate of basic compensation of the position of Chief Postal Inspector in the Post Office Department shall be \$19,000.

SEC. 13. Section 604 (d) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended (5 U. S. C. 944), is amended to read as follows:

"(d) (1) Hereafter, for all pay computation purposes affecting officers or employees in or under the executive branch, the judicial branch, or the District of Columbia municipal government, basic per annum rates of compensation established by or pursuant to law shall be regarded as payment for employment during 52 basic administrative workweeks of 40 hours.

"(2) Whenever for any such purpose it is necessary to convert a basic annual rate to a basic biweekly, weekly, daily, or hourly rate, the following rules shall govern:

"(A) An hourly rate shall be derived by dividing the annual rate by 2,080;

"(B) A daily rate shall be derived by multiplying the hourly rate by the number of daily hours of service required; and

"(C) A weekly or biweekly rate shall be derived by multiplying the hourly rate by 40 or 80 as the case may be.

"(3) All rates shall be computed in full cents, counting a fraction of a cent as the next higher cent."

SEC. 14. (a) The Postal Field Service Schedule contained in section 301 (a) of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955, as amended by section 401 (a) of the act of May 27, 1958 (72 Stat. 145; Public Law 85-426), is amended by striking out levels

Computation of Rates

7 to 20, inclusive, and the respective per annum rates and steps for such levels and inserting in lieu of such levels and per annum rates and steps the following:

| | \$4,870 | \$5,085 | \$5,200 | \$5,365 | \$5,530 | \$5,695 | \$5,860 |
|-------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| 7. Temporary rate..... | 4,990 | 5,160 | 5,330 | 5,500 | 5,670 | 5,840 | 6,010 |
| 8. Temporary rate..... | 5,255 | 5,440 | 5,626 | 5,810 | 5,995 | 6,180 | 6,365 |
| 9. Temporary rate..... | 5,575 | 5,765 | 5,955 | 6,145 | 6,335 | 6,525 | 6,715 |
| 10. Temporary rate..... | 5,875 | 6,075 | 6,275 | 6,475 | 6,675 | 6,875 | 7,075 |
| 11. Temporary rate..... | 6,235 | 6,450 | 6,665 | 6,880 | 7,095 | 7,310 | 7,525 |
| 12. Temporary rate..... | 6,590 | 6,810 | 7,030 | 7,250 | 7,470 | 7,690 | 7,910 |
| 13. Temporary rate..... | 6,945 | 7,170 | 7,395 | 7,620 | 7,845 | 8,070 | 8,295 |
| 14. Temporary rate..... | 7,300 | 7,530 | 7,760 | 7,990 | 8,220 | 8,450 | 8,680 |
| 15. Temporary rate..... | 7,655 | 7,890 | 8,125 | 8,360 | 8,595 | 8,830 | 9,065 |
| 16. Temporary rate..... | 8,010 | 8,250 | 8,490 | 8,730 | 8,970 | 9,210 | 9,450 |
| 17. Temporary rate..... | 8,365 | 8,610 | 8,855 | 9,100 | 9,345 | 9,590 | 9,835 |
| 18. Temporary rate..... | 8,720 | 8,970 | 9,220 | 9,470 | 9,720 | 9,970 | 10,220 |
| 19. Temporary rate..... | 9,075 | 9,330 | 9,585 | 9,840 | 10,095 | 10,350 | 10,605 |
| 20. Temporary rate..... | 9,430 | 9,690 | 9,950 | 10,210 | 10,470 | 10,730 | 11,000 |

(b) (1) The provisions of sections 402, 403, 404, and 405 of the act of May 27, 1958 (72 Stat. 146; Public Law 85-426), shall be applicable and effective, as of the effective date of this section, with respect to the application and operation of the amendment made by subsection (a) of this section.

(2) For the purposes of paragraph (1) of this subsection,—

(A) The terms "This title" and "this title", as used in such sections 402 (a), 403, and 404, mean the amendment made by subsection (a) of this section; and

(B) The term "This act", as used in such section 405, means the provisions of this section 14.

Sec. 15 (a) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c) of this section, this act shall take effect as of the first day of the first pay period which began on or after January 1, 1958.

(b) This section, the first section, and sections 4 (b), 4 (e), 4 (h), 4 (j), 4 (q), 4 (t), 5 (i), 5 (j), 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 shall take effect on the date of enactment of this act.

(c) Sections 5 (h), 12, and 13 shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of enactment of this act.

(d) 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 first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of such enactment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this legislation as provided by the committee amendment would increase the annual rates of compensation of approximately 1,064,072 officers and employees in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Federal Government. The main difference between this bill as passed by the Senate and as recommended by your Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is the amount of salary increase given the employees covered by this legislation.

The bill as it passed the Senate provided 7½ percent salary increase. The

salary increase our committee recommended is 10 percent. Both the Senate and our committee recommended that that increase be retroactive to the first day of the first pay period which began on or after January 1, 1958.

I will say that I thought the 10 percent increase provided by this amendment was too high and should have been somewhere around 7½ or 8 percent. I was also strongly opposed to the retroactive feature making this pay increase effective on the first pay period after January 1, 1958. This retroactive feature will cost the Government over \$200 million, but since the postal pay and rate bill has already been passed and signed by the President, and since that bill gives the postal employees retroactive pay back to January 1, I feel that the classified and other employees of the Federal Government are entitled to the same treatment and the same consideration as the postal employees.

I do not think it is fitting for me to be complaining at this time since the postal employees have already received retroactive pay to January 1, and like treatment should certainly be accorded other employees of our Government.

The bill also increases from \$16,000 to \$17,500 the existing maximum salary rate of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

The salary increases apply to these categories of officers and employees:

First. Employees whose positions are subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

Second. Officers and employees in the judicial branch of our Government, including court reporters for district courts of the United States, secretaries and law clerks of Federal, circuit, and district judges, and certain others.

Third. Officers and employees in the legislative branch of the Federal Government, with certain exceptions.

Fourth. Officers and employees of the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration.

Fifth. Officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States under the Department of State.

This legislation also provides in the amendment that an additional 2½-percent cost-of-living increase be paid, effective for 3 years, for postal employees in levels 7 to 19.

As the Members know, when the postal pay bill was enacted, a 7½ percent permanent increase was given to all postal employees. Those employees who were in levels 1 to 6 were given an additional 2½ percent temporary increase for 3 years and the employees in level 7 were given 1½ percent for a temporary period of 3 years and the supervisory officials in level 8 and above were not given any temporary increase. When the President approved this legislation, he complained strongly about this discriminatory feature. He said that all employees, whether supervisors or higher officials or not, were entitled to the same consideration as those in the first seven levels.

I heartily agree with this statement of our President and for that reason this amendment provides that those supervisory officials, including postmasters in the larger cities, would have the 2½ percent temporary increase for a period of 3 years as those in the first 6 levels. For level 7, where a 1½ percent increase was given, this amendment adds an extra 1 percent, giving them the same 2½ percent temporary increase as those in the first 6 levels.

The President said that when Congress stopped the temporary increase at level seven, it was a distortion of the postal field service pay schedule and that such action was inconsistent with the basic principles of equal pay for equal work, and recognition that postal salaries offer substantial differences according to the difficulty and the degree of responsibility of the work performed by employees.

I have just received the following letter from Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield in strong support of this amendment:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., June 2, 1958.

HON. TOM MURRAY,
Chairman, Post Office and Civil Service
Committee, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: You will recall our recent conversation concerning the salary inequities created by the enactment of Public Law 85-426 affecting thousands of postal supervisors and postmasters.

Knowing your keen interest in fair salary treatment for all postal employees, the Post Office Department strongly recommends prompt action to eliminate this discrimination.

This can be accomplished by extending the same percentage pay increase provided in Public Law 85-426 for the first 6 levels of the postal field service salary schedule to all the remaining levels. The cost of such an extension is estimated at \$5½ million a year, which is nominal in comparison with the \$265 million in pay increases for postal employees provided by the legislation recently enacted.

Postal supervisors are chosen from the ranks. Equitable salary treatment for them will restore the incentive to all employees to seek advancement to the more difficult and responsible positions.

Postmasters who are responsible for handling an ever increasing volume of mail, controlling substantial sums of money and directing large numbers of employees, should also be accorded fair treatment and have their salaries increased proportionately.

It is my understanding that you will offer an amendment to S. 734 to accomplish this

1958

8877

purpose. Such an amendment has my wholehearted endorsement.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD,
Postmaster General.

I realize the tremendous cost of this legislation. No one is stronger for holding down the cost of the operation of our Government than I, but at the same time I fully realize that the classified and other employees included in this legislation are entitled to a reasonable increase. They have received only one increase since 1951. That only increase was in 1955 when they were given a 7½ percent increase. I feel that in view of the postal pay legislation which has already been approved by the President, this legislation should also be approved for the classified and other employees, including the judicial, those in the Foreign Service and in the Veterans' Administration, and the differences in pay is set forth in S. 734 and the House committee amendment should be adjusted in conference.

As I said before, the cost of this legislation will be \$547,669,447. That is a tremendous amount of money—I am very hopeful that the Director of the Budget will carry out section 9 of our amendment which provides as follows:

SEC. 9. (a) The Director of the Bureau of the Budget is authorized and directed to provide by regulation for the absorption from the respective applicable appropriations or funds available for the fiscal year in which this act is enacted, by the respective departments, agencies, establishments, and corporations in the executive branch, to such extent as the Director deems practicable, of the costs of the increases in basic compensation provided by this act.

This amendment provides that it is applicable to not only this fiscal year but succeeding fiscal years. I am quite confident that the Director of the Budget can hold down the cost of this legislation due to changes in service, and due to retirements, resignations, and deaths of employees. Having great confidence in the present Director of the Budget, I feel sure he will carry out the provisions of section 9 of the amendment.

Certainly we must do everything we can to reduce the cost of our Government, and I have long been disturbed at the tremendous cost of our Government. As long as we keep increasing expenditures, I do not see how we can ever decrease taxes. It is a serious proposition, but at the same time we must treat our employees fairly, and I think this legislation is proper and should be approved by this body and then the difference between the 7½-percent approval of the Senate and the 10-percent approval of the House can be adjusted in conference.

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

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. Assume that a Congressman had a clerk who worked in April and May. This bill becomes effective January 1. Does that affect getting the 10-percent increase for those employees?

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct. It is retroactive in pay to January 1.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Even though that employee does not work any more?

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct. If the employee retires or if he should die then the amount due will go to his survivor.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How much bookkeeping will that take?

Mr. MURRAY. Quite a little.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Even if he was fired for incompetency he would still get the 10 percent?

Mr. MURRAY. No; that is not correct.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. As I understand it, this takes in the medical profession, the nurses and doctors in the various Government services? Is that correct?

Mr. MURRAY. That is entirely correct. The amendment includes an amendment offered by the gentleman's committee, by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], the chairman of the committee, who worked this out.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes; it is my understanding they would be included. But this does not include the unclassified workers?

Mr. MURRAY. Those who are on per diem are not included with those who get salaries.

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

Categories and number of employees affected and estimated increased annual cost of S. 734, as reported by the House committee

| Section of bill | Coverage | Number of employees | Annual cost |
|--------------------------|--|---------------------|---------------|
| Sec. 2..... | Classification Act of 1949, as amended..... | 978,632 | \$513,205,700 |
| Sec. 5..... | Doctors, dentists, and nurses, Department of Medicine and Surgery in Veterans' Administration. | 19,485 | 12,850,647 |
| Sec. 6..... | Foreign Service..... | 12,636 | 9,792,400 |
| Sec. 4..... | Officers and employees in or under the legislative branch. | 6,200 | 4,090,000 |
| Sec. 3..... | Officers and employees in or under the judicial branch. | 4,119 | 2,230,700 |
| Sec. 14 (amendment)..... | 2½ percent only increase for post office supervisory employees. | 43,000 | 5,500,000 |
| | Total..... | 1,064,072 | 547,669,447 |

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

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

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, as one who represents more Federal employees in the Congress than any other Member, I rise in vigorous, enthusiastic, and sincere support of this legislation. I believe my colleagues will agree that my position is consistent with the best principles of representative government.

I recognize however, that my appeal here has to be based upon more than just a personal desire to serve my people; it has to be based on what is in the best interests of the Nation as a whole and what is fair and proper for both sides.

Mr. Speaker, you have heard the story many times before, and whenever you have heard this story and heard the recommendations made by our committee, you have gone along with it rather overwhelmingly. Last year the com-

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

Mr. CORBETT. The gentleman in reply to the query of the gentleman from Michigan I believe inadvertently gave a wrong answer. The only persons who would be entitled to receive this retroactive pay would be those who have retired or are deceased. If they were involuntarily separated or separated by resignation they would not be covered by the terms of this bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If the gentleman will yield further, is the gentleman sure about that? This bill covers 10 percent to all of them who have been in since January.

Mr. CORBETT. But it deals with present employees of the Government.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It applies just to those who are on the payroll when the bill becomes law?

Mr. CORBETT. Certainly.

Mr. MURRAY. I thought it applied to all who were on the payroll since January 1.

Mr. CORBETT. And who were retained on the payroll and are presently covered.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the gentleman. I am herewith attaching a summary of the categories and number of employees and the estimated increased annual cost of S. 734 as amended by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

mittee recommended a bill providing an increase of 11 percent. It was passed overwhelmingly by this body, but was subsequently vetoed. Since that time there has been a steady increase in the cost of living and other wage adjustments for employees in other fields. In spite of this continued increase in the cost of living and in spite of the fact that we went along with the 11 percent last year, and in spite of the fact that many of us introduced legislation providing for a larger increase, the committee came out with a compromise of 10 percent, which is less than we approved overwhelmingly last year in spite of the increase in the cost of living.

I strongly feel, Mr. Speaker, this is a minimum compromise that the Congress should accept at this time. Why is it a minimum compromise? In the first place, better than 50 percent of the Federal employees earn less than \$60 a week take-home pay. It does not take an economist to realize that it is almost impossible to provide for one's family the basic necessities of life with such an in-

come. Furthermore, we have not over the period of years granted increases to the Federal employees consistent with the increased cost of living. I will take 1 grade for an example, and that is grade 7 which is the medium grade between 1 and 15 exclusive of the so-called supergrades. Grade 7 today is receiving \$4,525 per year. In 1939, that grade was receiving \$2,600 per year. All of us agree that in 1939 the cost of living had been somewhat stable for several years. The cost-of-living index, the Consumer Price Index shows that as of December 31, 1957, the cost of living had gone up to 104.7 percent. Yet, the total salary increase of that medium grade has amounted to 74 percent. In order for the grade 7, the medium grade, to receive the same gross income they received in 1939, we would have today to grant an increase of 17.6 percent. For that same employee to have the same purchasing power and the same net take-home pay after taxes and retirement payments are taken into consideration and to buy the same number of loaves of bread, and the same number of pairs of shoes, we would have to grant today an increase of 25 percent. Yet, this bill only provides for an increase of 10 percent. That is the reason I say it is a minimum compromise that we should accept. I think all of my colleagues will agree that we get what we pay for in every walk of life, and most certainly if we do not properly adjust these wages and these salaries, over a period of time the quality of our personnel is going to be lowered. The efficiency is going to be lowered and the cost to the Government as a consequence will naturally be higher. I think all of my colleagues will also agree that we should be fair with all of our employees and provide the same increase for the classified employees as was provided for the postal employees within the last few weeks, which is a little over 10 percent. In fact, the amendment offered by the chairman here today is equalizing that, so as to provide a minimum 10 percent for all postal employees. I hope this body today passes this bill by such an overwhelming vote that it will encourage the conferees to hold to the 10 percent figure in the conference. Recognizing that the other body did approve 7.5 percent before, and there would naturally be an inclination on the part of our conferees in the conference to compromise somewhere between that amount. I believe the overwhelming vote today should indicate the feeling of this body that we believe all of our employees should receive the same and equal treatment. The only way we can be fair to all the employees is to insist on this minimum bill of 10 percent at this time.

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

Mr. BROYHILL. I yield.

Mr. BOW. Does the gentleman believe that if this increase were granted, taking into consideration the great amount of income in the gentleman's district, that perhaps we could cut down on the amount that we contribute to the schools of his district?

Mr. BROYHILL. No, I do not agree with that. The Federal Government contributes to the schools on the basis of the fact that the Federal Government owns property in that area on which it does not pay taxes. I do not think you can penalize the employees of the Federal Government because of the cost of the Government operation on tax-free property in our districts. I do not believe there is any connection between the two.

The average Government employee makes less today than the average coal miner, steel worker, automobile worker, oil worker, or construction worker. It was not always this way. A Government position used to be sought after, not only because of the opportunity of service that it offered, but also because of the good pay and fine working conditions that Government employees used to enjoy compared with other groups in the population.

This is no longer so. We have allowed the status of Government employees to deteriorate. Let me illustrate the experience of one occupation in the Government with which we are all familiar—that of the letter carrier. The average letter carrier today makes \$4,383. In most American cities this is less than is required, for what I called before, an adequate but modest cost of living. It is no wonder, therefore, that most postal employees have to look for a secondary job to supplement the income that they receive for long hours of work in the post office. During the past 10 years, the average salary of a letter carrier has increased by 52 percent, but most of this increase was absorbed by the rise in cost of living so that during the whole decade since 1946, the real rise in the wages of letter carriers has been only 10 percent. Compare this with an increase of three times as high for workers in manufacturing, coal, and building construction. Even retail employees have gained relatively twice as great a wage boost in real wages during the past decade than those of the letter carrier.

The lot of the classified civil service employee is not much better. Their money wage over the decade between 1946 and 1956 has increased by 61 percent, but the average real wage has risen by only 16 percent, or half as much as that in manufacturing, coal, and building construction.

Over the past 2 years alone, since Federal Government employees have received their last and inadequate salary raise, wage rates of the major groups in American economy have risen between 10 and 20 percent.

Is it, therefore, any wonder that the position of Federal employees has corroded over the years and that the status of Federal employment has been seriously injured.

In private industry we take it for granted that the increases in cost of living and improvements in productivity are compensated so that the remuneration of employees improves with increases in productivity. Most Government jobs do not lend themselves to measurements of productivity, but such measurements do not appear necessary.

It is quite obvious that Government employees who perform essential services and who help create a climate which makes possible the overall growth of productivity should be entitled to share in the economic growth of this economy.

But in some areas where productivity of Government employees can be measured, like in the post office, we find that the rise in productivity has compared favorably with that in private industry. According to the Postmaster General and the Bureau of the Budget productivity of postal employees has increased at an annual rate of some 3 percent, and the best available data indicate that these increases are going to continue in the future.

Plain justice and fair play would therefore require that we grant a substantial wage increase to Federal employees in order to make it possible for them to catch up with the increases granted to employees in private industry doing comparable work. This in itself would be sufficient and good reason for granting the increase, but there are other compelling reasons which would require Congress to raise the wage and salary scales of Federal employees.

Evidence presented before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee shows that in many cases the Federal Government has difficulty in hiring suitable personnel to replace those who retire or who leave Government employment for more remunerative occupation outside of Government.

In addition, independent studies conducted by the Department of Defense, the Civil Service Commission, and a commission especially appointed by the President to study the problems of Federal pay practices have all concluded that in many areas, Federal wages and salaries are too low to attract the necessary caliber of men to perform the high level of responsibility that Government work requires.

Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of reducing the budget and in favor of reducing the heavy burden that taxation brings upon our population. But we cannot accomplish this at the expense of the already underpaid Federal employees. Failure to enact a fair wage increase to Federal employees will not constitute a saving but a loss. Failure to act now would impair essential Government services and would, therefore, constitute a damage to our total economy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

(Mr. FULTON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I strongly favor passage of this bill for a 10-percent pay raise for classified employees and other classes of employees of the Federal Government, and recommend this action heartily to my colleagues. The Congress should recognize the good and efficient work these employees have rendered to the American people, and should realize the urgent need for this increase in pay.

These classified employees have been given only one pay raise since the year 1951. This previous raise was 7½ per-

1958

8879

cent in the year 1955. Compared to employees in business and industry, this pay raise is long overdue. The cost of living has increased every year and this pay raise, which is a minimum, should be promptly passed.

As this legislation has been the subject of much controversy, which has delayed the passage of the bill, the pay raise should be made fully retroactive to January 1, 1958, in order to do full justice to our worthy Government employees.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, before I learned that this bill was coming to the floor of the House under suspension of rules which permits committee amendments only, I had intended to offer an amendment to the bill. My amendment would provide that only 50 percent of the vacancies among classified employees could be filled until a 5-percent reduction had been effected in personnel for the fiscal year 1959. I will read my proposed amendment:

Sec. 15. Effective July 1, 1958, or 30 days after the enactment of this act, whichever is later, positions, the grades and rates of compensation for which are specified in sections 2, 5, 6, and 7 of this act, becoming vacant shall not be filled: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to—

(1) not to exceed 50 percent of all vacancies;

(2) departments or independent agencies the total positions within which does not exceed 100;

Provided further, That when total employment, the compensation for which is prescribed in sections 2, 5, 6, and 7 of this act, shall have been reduced to a figure not exceeding 95 percent of the total number provided in the various appropriation acts for the fiscal year 1959, this section shall become operative: *Provided further*, That this section shall cease to be effective on June 30, 1959.

Since I learned only yesterday that this bill was to be considered under suspension of rules, I have just talked with the chairman of the committee, my good friend and able colleague from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] and also my good friend and able colleague from Kansas [Mr. REES], the ranking Republican member of the committee, and asked them if they would offer my amendment as a committee amendment. They feel that it would not be proper since the Post Office and Civil Service Committee has not had an opportunity to act on the amendment.

As most of my colleagues know, in 1952 and 1953, a similar amendment introduced by myself was adopted on five appropriation bills, and the effect of those amendments on those appropriation bills kept many thousands of people off the payroll, without a single Federal employee losing his or her job. My amendment, as you know, reduces Federal employees by the attrition method by not filling vacancies that occur through death, retirement, and resignation. Since the committee will not offer my amendment as a committee amendment, I can only wait until the supplemental appropriation bill is considered by the House, which of course will be necessary to support this legislation

with dollars, as in the case with most every legislative bill that comes before the Congress. Had this amendment been adopted to this bill and made law it would have saved in the fiscal year 1959 \$240 million, which is \$40 million more than is estimated that the retroactive section would cost.

Some of our liberal spenders of taxpayers' dollars will say \$240 million is hardly worth saving, but who knows what effect that last straw will have on the future of America. I say, Mr. Speaker, \$240 million is not hay in anybody's language, and we had best start saving wherever we can. At a later date when the appropriation bill comes here, I propose to find out whether or not this House is interested in making such a saving, and at that time I propose to demand a yea and nay rollcall in order that the people in each congressional district will know the attitude of their Representative in Congress on the all-important issue of Federal spending.

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

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MURRAY. The gentleman spoke to me about this amendment only this morning, and then it was too late to secure consideration by the committee and it could not be considered as a committee amendment.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes; I explained that.

Mr. MURRAY. The gentleman has put such a rider on bills in the past and I have always supported him.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I agree with the gentleman to this extent that a great amount of money could be saved if the agencies of the Government would, every time a person is separated from the payroll, not fill the position until it is shown that to do so is absolutely necessary to the proper functioning of the agency.

Mr. JENSEN. I am glad to see that the committee did include a provision in this bill directing the Bureau of the Budget to see to it that the agencies affected make every attempt to save money by this very method of not filling vacancies. But as the gentleman knows, it is always best to say to the fellow who is working for you alone or for all the people: "This is what you must do," and say it in such language that your orders are sure to be carried out, and in this instance to the letter of the law.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

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

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, the challenge of Soviet scientific achievements has reawakened America to the necessity of having the ablest and the best trained personnel in our Federal service, working for our national preservation. In recent years we have witnessed a marked deterioration in the prestige of

our civil service. Government personnel directors can testify to the serious difficulties they have faced in recruiting trained personnel for Government jobs. The Federal agencies have been unable to compete with the alluring offers from private industry.

In addition, the civil service has been losing valuable, skilled employees through the enticements of higher paid positions elsewhere. Turnover rates as high as 25 percent among highly trained employees have been cited. In the interests of our national welfare and the retention of a high caliber civil service, we must authorize immediate and substantial pay increases for our Federal classified employees so that they can regain lost ground in our expanding economy.

The continued and accelerated upward spiral in the cost of living have left Federal employees bearing the brunt of the inflation. The cost of living has far outdistanced the meager increases in the Federal pay rates. The pressure of the never-ending treadmill of trying to purchase the necessary goods and services for their families and themselves with dollars of declining relative value has led many Federal employees to take secondary jobs or to have their wives go back to work.

Recent surveys indicate that for a family of four to maintain a modest but adequate standard of living their annual income must be at least between \$4,700 and \$5,000. Yet the median wage for Federal classified employees is \$4,075. In other words, more than half of our Federal civil servants are receiving substandard wages. This is a disturbing situation which calls for immediate action.

Over the past decade, while workers in private industry, with the assistance of their unions, have considerably improved their conditions both in wages and in added fringe benefits, Government employees, precluded from the advantages of collective bargaining, have steadily lost ground. Federal workers have been given only one general wage increase of 7½ percent for classified employees in the last 6 years, while many workers in the business world have been getting annual wage boosts commensurate with their increased productivity and the rise in the cost of living.

In the 3 years since the Federal employees received their last pay raise, wages in manufacturing have gone up 14 percent; in wholesaling 13 percent; and in mining they are up 21 percent. One has only to compare the changes in real income of Government employees with various other occupational groups over a 17-year period from 1939 through 1956 to realize how poorly the civil service has fared in our growing economy. Bituminous-coal miners have enjoyed the largest increase in real income of 107 percent. But other groups have also prospered: Lumber workers, up 73 percent; textile workers, up 64 percent; chemical workers, up 58 percent; meat-packers, up 47 percent; even school-teachers are up 36 percent; and retail clerks, up 24 percent, to mention only a few. And where do we find the Federal Government workers? At the bottom

of the list, with a modest 14-percent increase in their real income. To raise Government salaries to the pre-World War II status would require a pay raise of at least 25 percent, a much greater figure than anyone is proposing.

The disparity in wage increases and real take-home pay is not confined to a comparison of Federal employees with other occupational groups. Even within the Government service this disparity extends to the relationship of classified employees' salaries and the earnings of nearly 700,000 Federal employees whose rates of compensation are not set by the Congress, but rather are based upon the prevailing wage rates in the communities where they are employed. These Federal wage-board workers have received repeated upward adjustments which have kept their wages in line with the cost of living, but which have also placed them far ahead of their fellow classified employees in terms of increased income. The Department of the Navy reports that it wage-board employees have received pay raises totaling 25.8 percent since 1951, while the Federal classified employees have had to settle for 7½ percent. Numerous situations have been created where classified supervisors are paid lower salaries than the wage-board workers they supervise. If this condition is allowed to continue, we will witness a further decline in the morale of our Federal service, which we cannot afford in these perilous times.

Today the median salary in the 927,-822-man classified service is \$4,075 compared with that of the wage-board employees of \$4,597. This is quite the reverse of the picture in 1950 when the classified service salary* median was \$3,225 as against the wage board's \$3,099. These figures clearly illustrate the unjustified inequities in our Federal pay system. We in Congress are now faced with the responsibility of removing these detrimental inequities before they endanger the whole quality of our civil service.

Our economy-minded friends in both Houses argued last year that we could not afford to grant Federal pay increases because the cost would add to the already huge Federal expenditures and precipitate an increase in the Federal debt limit. I favor Government economy wherever possible, but I say to these colleagues we cannot afford not to authorize some upward adjustments in our Federal pay scales. It would be faulty business logic and false economy to allow a slow deterioration of our Government service in the name of economy. The replacement costs of training new, skilled employees would far outweigh the savings gained from not giving a pay raise. The Hoover Commission reports that it costs \$3,000 to recruit and train a new Federal employee.

Another argument propounded by opponents to a Federal pay increase was that these raises would start an inflationary chain reaction. This appears to be a case of confusing cause and effect. Actually, the Federal employees have become the special victims of the inflation. Why should this one small segment of our economy be singled out to hold the line in the fight against infla-

tion, by foregoing justified salary increases, in the face of the complete failure of the administration's efforts to restrain price increases in other segments of the economy?

We are confronted here with the almost unbelievable spectacle of the richest country in the world today keeping a majority of its Federal employees on what is subsistence pay or less. To authorize a pay increase would only be remedying an inequality.

National self-interest requires us to improve the wages of our Federal employees and to return them to an equitable position in our economy. I know I need not belabor the importance of our civil service to the workings of our whole society. In recent years, the Federal Government has grown to have such a vital role in the economy and in the preservation of our way of life. It is essential that our Government be manned by the most capable and best trained of our citizens. We cannot hope to entice qualified personnel into Government Service with our present inadequate pay scales. It would be sheer folly to let this pressing problem go unsolved any longer.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that I favor suspension of the rules and passage of this legislation.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON].

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

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, like several members of our committee, I introduced legislation similar to this bill which is before the House today. Our committee went over this legislation very carefully in the hearings, and went into every possible detail. I believe it is the best compromise our committee could bring to the floor, the bill that is presently before you.

I therefore strongly favor same and urge you to support this bill.

Representatives of the administration and of every major Federal employee organization have agreed that salary increases are justified. During the hearings held in the first session of this Congress on pay increase legislation, which passed the Congress but was vetoed by the President, witnesses representing the Federal employees were unanimous in their testimony with respect to the need for immediate and substantial classified pay increases. The pay increases they urged were not only in fairness to employees, so that they could regain lost ground arising from increased costs of living, but, also, in the interest of the Government itself. Inadequate compensation was given as the primary reason for the high turnover of Federal employees—particularly in the scientific, engineering, and technical fields of Government activity which are essential to the maintenance of a strong national defense. Turnover rates of 25 percent a year and higher were cited, with instance after instance of trained and highly capable employees leaving Federal employment to accept higher paid positions in private industry.

The cost of recruiting and training new employees and bringing them up, through the necessary period of service, to the standard of production of those they replace is a tremendous item of expense which well could outweigh a large part of the direct payroll cost of the salary increase provided by this legislation.

I strongly supported the 11 percent pay increase which was passed by the House last year. Frankly, I felt that a larger increase than 11 percent was more than justified. I still feel that a larger increase should be considered; however, in the spirit of compromise, I am supporting this legislation which provides for an increase of 10 percent per annum.

I hope the House will pass the bill so that differences between the House and the Senate can be worked out and the employees will receive the benefits of this legislation, which is long overdue, in the form of larger pay checks at the earliest possible time.

I also urge your support for the committee amendment. This amendment is fair and equitable and gives a full 10 percent pay increase for all postal supervisors and postmasters. Since the postal employees have a bill now, a law providing for their 10 percent pay increase, it is only fair that this bill, as amended, be enacted into law to provide a 10 percent pay increase for all other Federal employees.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG].

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take the 4 minutes that have been allotted to me. I rise in support of the pending legislation. A pattern has already been set in the previous conference report which was adopted regarding postal rates and postal pay for our other workers. I certainly hope that this legislation will be adopted overwhelmingly and that no demand for a rollcall will be made because then it will be necessary to delay calling of the roll until Thursday. If this can be prevented, the bill may go to conference right away; the sooner the better.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Tennessee for putting this amendment in here which will erase an inequity as far as postal supervisors are concerned. It was not in the previous legislation.

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BROYHILL. In view of the fact that we do grant a minimum of 10 percent in this bill and around 10.3 for postal employees, if the Senate does not concur in this legislation does not the gentleman feel that our conferees should insist upon the House position; that is, grant a minimum of 10 percent for the classified employees?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I have no question but what that will happen in the other body, knowing that body as I do. I have every confidence it will come back with 10 percent and I hope the other body will do that.

1958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

8881

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

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

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 734. This bill, as amended by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, would provide for a 10 percent increase for Federal classified civil service employees. This increase is justly deserved and urgently needed. In fact, I believe we should have passed this bill months ago.

Our Federal classified civilian employees play an essential part in making it possible for our Government to function. We should certainly be fair with them and be prompt in enacting legislation which will give them a fair and just pay increase. In the San Francisco Bay area of California, the Federal wage board employees have received three pay increases in the last 3 years, as their wages are adjusted periodically to be competitive with those in private industry and business. On the contrary, the Federal classified civilian employees in the same area have received no pay increase for 3 years. This has been unjust to the Federal classified employees and has created serious inequities. In some cases Federal classified employees are receiving less pay than Federal wage board employees under their supervision. This is most detrimental on morale and should be corrected.

I hope that the House of Representatives will pass this bill today unanimously. I also hope that the conferees who will then be appointed to resolve the differences between the House bill and the bill passed by the other body will resolve these differences promptly so that we may then act to approve the conference report and send this legislation to the President for signature as soon as possible.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

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

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the pending legislation to increase the salary of Federal employees. I believe it is timely. I favor the House resolution for a 10-percent increase over the Senate resolution for 7.5 percent and I further favor that this increase be retroactive to January 1, 1958.

This raise in pay for Federal employees is long overdue and has not kept in pace with the rise in the cost of living.

The following statement from the committee report confirms this:

Since 1951 Federal classified employees have received only a 7.5-percent salary increase, granted in 1955. During the same period employees in private manufacturing industries have received an average of 31.4 percent in pay raises, and nearly three-quarters of a million Federal wage-board employees have received comparable increases.

The Consumer Price Index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics rose only 3.07 percent between the 1951 and 1955 salary adjustments for these Federal employees. Since the 1955

increase, the index has risen 7.9 percent—that is, 2½ times as much in the last 39 months as it rose in the preceding 42 months. Latest Bureau of Labor Statistics figures show it still on the rise.

Earlier allegations of an inflationary effect due to Federal salary increases, presented by opponents of such increases, now are purely academic in the present trend of our economy. The salary adjustments provided by this legislation should tend to have a valuable influence in the efforts to arrest the decline in the national economy.

I compliment the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee for the fine job they have done and on reporting this bill to the House for action.

I will support and vote for the bill and I urge all Members of the House to vote favorably for its passage.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DORN].

(Mr. DORN of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the pending legislation to increase the pay of our Federal employees. It is a measure long overdue. As you know Government employees have now gone since 1955 without receiving any cost-of-living or other salary adjustments, during which time the cost of living throughout the Nation has continually risen. This has had the effect of shrinking the salary of classified Government workers who are in a fixed salary bracket.

It is vital to the efficiency of Government operations to retain in Federal service its highly skilled and professional personnel who are now being attracted from Federal service by more attractive pay and fringe benefits offered by private enterprise.

The Federal Government has always lagged behind the pay in private industry, and it is now further behind than usual. Employees in private industry have their bargaining units which take care to see that pay is commensurate with the cost of living. The Congress is the only place to which the Federal employees may look for equitable treatment. It is high time we recognized our responsibility and pass this legislation.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBESON].

(Mr. ROBESON of Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROBESON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the effect and the coverage on this legislation has been most ably explained by our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee, [Mr. MURRAY], and I will not burden the Record with additional details regarding its many benefits.

I do believe it appropriate, however, to emphasize and reaffirm the great importance of early approval of this legislation to the interest of the classified and other employees who will benefit. These one million or more employees have placed their reliance in the Congress for fair and equitable salary adjustments. I might say that these employees, also, consistently have followed

this policy and by and large feel that their faith is fully justified. Approval of this legislation will be keeping faith with them.

I am fortunate in having thousands of these Federal employees engaged in the conduct of vital defense activities in my district. Therefore, I have the benefit of first-hand experience, through hundreds of personal discussions with friends and neighbors who certainly have brought home to me their urgent need for adjustments in their Federal salaries.

There is one feature of Federal salary consideration which, in my judgment, has not been brought out clearly enough up to this point. This is the factor which causes perhaps greatest concern to many of our outstanding and very capable Federal employees. There is no question but that Federal salaries are lagging far behind those in private enterprise. One immediate and undesirable result is that our Federal employees gradually have been moved farther and farther downward in the economic and social scale in relation to their friends and associates in private industry who have not had to wait so long for improvements in their incomes. Not only is this tied to a lack of ability to obtain material things—the necessities and a few comforts and luxuries of life—but, also, there is a natural tendency for widely varied income groups to move apart in their interests and pursuits. This works a real hardship on those who are not able to move with their old friends and neighbors.

Still another factor is the pride which every Federal employee should and does take in his work and the prestige which public service should bring to him. I think most of us will agree it is only human to suffer a loss of pride and prestige where one's employer fails or delays in giving deserved recognition—particularly when it comes to compensation for services rendered. I know from personal observation and long experience that these Federal employees are doing an outstanding and productive job for their Government and are the most vital link in maintaining a national defense capable of meeting the threat of any potential enemy.

I strongly support the motion to suspend the rules and pass S. 734 with the proposed amendments, and urge its approval so that the employees may obtain the recognition they have earned in the form of substantial increases in their take-home pay.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I strongly favor this legislation and only regret that the long deadlock over the postal pay and rate raise bill has prevented its being enacted into law long ago. The feature making the increase retroactive to January 1, 1958 helps some.

One possible partial consolation for the delay is that if the bill had been passed last year, it probably would have provided a somewhat smaller increase than the 10 percent in the present bill. In the end the employees effected may re-

ceive a total larger amount under this bill, especially if the other body will accept our bill and the 10 percent figure, as I hope and believe is likely to be the case.

There are some real advantages and satisfaction in Federal employment. Surely the greatest disadvantage and the cause of greatest wear and tear to the employee, is the difficulty in getting ponderous Government machinery to move without unconscionable delay in making adjustments in salaries and making conditions necessary to keep pace with the times and with rising costs of living. I am glad that at long last this overdue bill is on the way to final passage.

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

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, the provisions of this legislation have been explained in some detail by our chairman. Briefly, the bill grants salary increases to 1,021,072 employees, including 978,632 under the Classification Act; also, 19,485 doctors, dentists, and nurses in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, 12,636 in the Foreign Service, 6,200 in the legislative branch, and 4,119 in the judicial branch.

Our committee held complete hearings on salary legislation during the first session of this Congress. Representatives of every major Federal employee organization presented their views. Testimony was also submitted by representatives of the executive branch.

On the basis of information and evidence developed at the hearings, our committee approved House bill 2462, which provided for an increase of 11 percent for classified and other employees above-mentioned. Following that, Senate bill 734, which provides for a 7½ percent increase for these employees, was amended by striking all after the enacting clause and inserting the language of the House bill with a further amendment providing a 10 percent salary increase for classified employees, employees in the judicial and legislative branches, Foreign Service personnel, and doctors, dentists, and nurses in the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration.

The annual cost of this legislation is estimated at \$542 million—representing an average increase per employee of \$530 a year. Approval of this legislation will represent one of the most generous salary increases that has been enacted in many years. I hope that the House will approve the reported bill with the amendments offered by the chairman, so that the differences between the House and the Senate can be worked out in conference in order that the employees will receive the benefits of this legislation at an early date.

It is my opinion that if all the agencies of Government cooperate, as I hope they will, the cost of this legislation can be materially reduced through the process of attrition.

It is estimated that there is an annual turnover in Government employment of

approximately 20 or 25 percent. If each agency would follow a recommendation made by our committee sometime ago, by determining first whether it is necessary to fill a position made vacant rather than filling such position on a routine basis, then a considerable share of the extra cost of this measure can be saved.

In other words, let the head of each agency make sure it is necessary to hire a new employee to fill vacancies before such action is taken. There are many places in Government where vacancies need not be filled and where such procedure followed would not cause anyone to lose his job. More consideration of such policy will make considerable difference in the cost of Government.

(Mr. REES of Kansas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

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

[Mr. HOFFMAN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

(Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for allotting me this time. I was the author of the bill H. R. 9999 which was reported by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service during this session of the Congress. The committee-reported bill which is under consideration here today is also my substitute for the Senate bill S. 734, the bill which is before the House this afternoon.

Testimony received at the hearings on these bills and statistical information furnished by the Department of Labor gives every justification for an increase in the Federal employees' salary much larger than the 10 percent provided in this bill. I personally feel that an increase in the neighborhood of 15 percent would be more realistic. However, in a spirit of compromise and a desire to pass a bill which would be signed into law, I am supporting the 10 percent contained in this bill.

The bare figures in the Consumers' Price Index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics indicate that there has been an 8-percent increase since the last Federal salary increase in 1955. However, the actual cost-of-living increase has been approximately 18 percent. This is the amount of the increases in the wage rates being paid the employees of the General Motors Corp. under their cost-of-living escalator clause in their wage contract. Since 1955 wages at General Motors have risen 18.3 percent. Since 1951, they have risen 31.4 percent. During the same period the Federal employee's pay has risen only 7.5 percent. Thus, the Federal employee is now 23.9

percent behind the employees in private industry insofar as pay increases are concerned.

I again wish to state that it is my personal belief that the House should be acting on a bill with a 15-percent increase rather than a 10-percent increase if the Federal employee is to receive anywhere near the equal treatment that has been received by employees in private industry. However, I firmly believe that the 10 percent provided by this bill will become law and result in money in the pocket to the Federal employees. I, therefore, am supporting it.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I would like very much to associate myself with the gentleman in the very splendid statement that he is making.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky.

During the first session of this Congress, the President vetoed a bill which would have increased the salaries of Federal employees on the basis that it would have been inflationary. There has been some question raised at this time that due to the recession it is not the proper time to give raises to the Federal employee. I ask if the Federal employees cannot get raises during an inflationary period and cannot get raises during a recessionary period, when can they get a raise? I firmly believe that the Federal Government has owed its employees an increase in salary for a number of years, and that now is the time to give it to them regardless of the so-called inflationary-recessionary trends. I especially believe that it should be given at this time inasmuch as it will put additional money into circulation in the retail outlets throughout the country. Money in the retail outlets is what is needed to offset the present recessionary trends.

I urge unanimous support of this bill with the committee amendments so that the Federal employee can have money in his pocket at the earliest possible time.

The minimum amount granted under this legislation will be \$270, which is the increase in the first step in grade 1. The maximum increase will be \$1,500, which is the fifth step in grade 17. This bill also provides for 38 supergrades in the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

It provides for a number of increases in the 313 category. The total cost of it, according to the figures furnished us in the committee will be \$547,669,447. It includes increases for the legislative employees. It includes increases for doctors, dentists, and nurses in the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration, and for 12,636 employees in the Foreign Service; for 4,119 officers and employees in or under the judicial branch and, as the chairman of the committee has pointed out, in one of the amendments which he has offered, it carries a 2½ percent temporary increase for the Post Office supervisory employees to bring that category up to the employees in level 6 and below, in

the postal salary increase bill which was passed and signed by the President during the past week.

This is good legislation. It carries, as the chairman has said, a provision for absorption, as much as can be done during this fiscal year and succeeding fiscal years by departments, without interfering with and without injury to governmental services. I look for considerable absorption under that provision.

Now, I would like to address to my remarks to the comments just made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN]. I, too, in the past have been a supporter of proposals somewhat of the type indicated by Mr. JENSEN, namely, a controlled employment program and an overall lower total Federal employment.

In September 1955 the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service inaugurated its present program calling for more effective manpower utilization in the departments and agencies, and, with that, a reduced Federal employment. For the past 3 years this subcommittee has worked closely with the departments and agencies to eliminate duplication and overlapping of effort as well as unnecessary positions.

When our subcommittee began this program in September 1955 we had slightly more than 2,400,000 employees on the Federal payroll. Today this number has been reduced by over 76,000. This is a significant decrease but it is not enough. I am convinced the Federal Government can get done efficiently all of its essential tasks with considerably fewer employees.

Our subcommittee in the past 3 years has continued to emphasize to the Federal departments and agencies that a close, objective review of job vacancies will result in the elimination of unnecessary jobs. Planned attrition will produce economies without the harmful effects either of cutting top priority programs or firing people. In fact, this policy was adopted by the President in December 1956 when he requested the departments and agencies of the executive branch of the Government to thoroughly examine all job vacancies before making new hires.

From experience, agencies and departments in the Government have shown that they can reduce their employment by attrition. During the last 6 months of calendar year 1957, the Defense Department made a net civilian personnel decrease of 74,500. A large part of this reduction was through attrition. Each military activity critically reviewed its job vacancies as to essentiality and only 40 percent of the vacant jobs were filled.

In contrast to the suggestions proposed by my colleague, Mr. JENSEN, my feeling is that it is best to give the Federal departments and agencies some personnel administrative flexibility in making their employment reductions. Top management should know best the areas where the personnel reductions can and should be made. It is also recognized that an across-the-board reduction hurts the efficient operator. The meat-ax approach not only eliminates

management flexibility but it allows the inefficient to continue.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the most effective and lasting basis for reducing overall Federal employment is to continue to urge and to work with top management in agencies for planned personnel reductions through careful and objective analysis of all job vacancies.

(Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

(Mr. BOLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support this legislation providing for 10 percent pay increase for classified civil service Government employees. These Federal employees have been given only one increase in the last 7 years, while the cost of living has increased many percentage points during that time. Their pay checks have not kept pace with this rise in the cost of living, and their economic plight has worsened in the last several months. Thousands of these hard-working and loyal Federal employees are trying to support families on take-home salaries of just over \$60 a week. The seriousness of this problem is emphasized by the fact that many of these employees work in vital Government operations pertaining to defense, while others work in the varied services that Government performs for the American people. If these agencies are to retain their highly qualified employees in the many categories essential to the security and welfare of this Nation, the employees must be given the opportunity to earn a living wage.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote overwhelmingly in favor of this 10 percent pay increase. By so doing we will strengthen the position of the House conferees to convince the Senate conferees to adopt the 10 percent instead of the 7½ percent recommended by the other body.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to say a word concerning section 5 of S. 734.

In the 84th and 85th Congresses the Subcommittee on Hospitals of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, under its late chairman, the Honorable George S. Long, visited many hospitals throughout the United States to gather information on a first-hand basis concerning the operation and administration of those installations. The Hospitals Subcommittee came to a number of very definite conclusions, among them that if the high standard of medical care in Veterans' Administration hospitals was to be maintained, a sizeable increase in the salaries of professional personnel would have to be granted.

As a result of this decision, the late chairman of this subcommittee introduced early in the 85th Congress H. R. 6719, which has for its purpose the increasing of the rates of pay for employees of the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration. Three days of hearings were held on this bill in the first session of the 85th Congress

and it was later reported favorably by the full committee.

A most unusual thing occurred following the reporting of this bill. The action of the full committee and the study of the subcommittee apparently had so impressed the Veterans' Administration, and the Bureau of the Budget in particular, that these agencies took a second look at the legislation, recommended greater increases, and then also recommended favorable action. As all Members of the House know, this is indeed an unusual step.

Many Members have received much correspondence concerning the section in the bill which relates to recognition of the services of optometrists. I am glad to be able to say to the House that the language before you today is supported by the American Optometrical Association and does not have any objection from the American Medical Association or from the Veterans' Administration.

I want to stress, too, the importance of the language which begins on page 46, line 9, which places laymen on a par with doctors insofar as management of a hospital is concerned. The net result of this language will be that laymen who manage hospitals or Veterans' Administration medical centers will receive the same pay as doctors in the chief grade. This, too, was one of the provisions of the bill in which the late chairman of the subcommittee was most interested. He early came to realize the importance of utilizing to the fullest extent possible laymen in our Veterans' Administration medical system. In doing so, of course, we free doctors for doing the duties for which they were primarily trained.

The passage of this bill today would bring much pleasure and satisfaction to the gentleman from Louisiana, the late Dr. George S. Long, if he were alive. He had worked long and diligently for it, and whatever credit accrues as a result of the passage of this section is largely due to his efforts.

The chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in moving to suspend the rule and pass this bill has been good enough to include in his motion an amendment which is badly needed. Section 5 of the bill, among other things, would amend Public Law 85-56 to provide increases in the pay of professional personnel of the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration comparable to the increases which would be provided for classified employees in positions of similar responsibility. It also raises the maximum ceiling on base pay plus specialty allowances for doctors rated as medical, surgical, or dental specialists to \$16,000 per annum. Application of the bill's across-the-board 10-percent increase to the pay of Directors of Service in the Department of Medicine and Surgery results in a maximum salary of \$15,730 per annum for those officials. Accordingly, under the bill those top staff members of the Department would receive less pay than subordinate physicians who are in the top step of the chief grade and who are entitled to specialists'

pay. The amendment would correct this situation for the 28 employees concerned.

Mr. Chairman, I want, also, to express publicly my appreciation to the chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee and to that committee as a whole for the cooperation which has been extended to me and to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in connection with section 5 of S. 734. This section is largely H. R. 6719 as finally agreed upon and recommended by the Subcommittee on Hospitals. After the last action of the subcommittee it became evident that it would be desirable from all standpoints that the provisions of H. R. 6719 be included as a section in this bill. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] was most cooperative and patient in taking the necessary steps to accomplish this. The entire Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I am sure, joins me in expressing our appreciation to the gentleman for his consideration and help in this matter.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I want to comment primarily on section 5 of the pending bill.

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and its distinguished chairman were good enough to include, as section 5 of S. 734, most of the features of H. R. 6719, as reported by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs last July.

This bill, which was introduced and sponsored by the late Dr. George S. Long, who, at the time of his death, was chairman of the Subcommittee on Hospitals, was reported unanimously on July 11, 1957, by the committee after the subcommittee had held 3 days of hearings. The bill was designed primarily to make more likely the retention by Veterans' Administration of its medical and professional personnel. Since the bill was reported, certain changes have been proposed and embodied in section 5, which make it, in our opinion, a better bill than was the original reported version.

I will not discuss the increases provided for the various grades suffice to say that each of these provisions had careful consideration by our committee. We believe it is a merited increase and is a positive step forward.

Some Members have received considerable correspondence concerning the inclusion of optometrists in H. R. 6719, and the language which appears in section 5, I am glad to say, is supported by the American Optometry Association. So far as I know, the American Medical Association and the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration have no objection to this addition.

I also invite the House's attention to the subsection (b), beginning on line 9, page 46, of the reported version of S. 734, which seeks to provide that laymen who are managers of Veterans' Administration hospitals shall receive remuneration on the same basis as a doctor in the chief grade in the medical service. In this day of great shortages of medical personnel it seems to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs every encouragement should be given to the use of trained laymen in the management of hospitals. Most of the management functions of

Veterans' Administration hospitals are administrative in character and do not involve medical questions. It is hoped that this section will lead to an increase in the number of laymen who are managers in the Veterans' Administration medical system. At the present time there are over 40 such managers out of 173 hospitals and 16 domiciliaries.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I desire to express the appreciation of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and to its chairman for their courtesy and consideration in including section 5 in this general pay bill, so that any pay increase which is finally granted will be effective at the same time and available on the same basis.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee I have supported legislation to increase the standard of living of Government employees and I support the pay bill before us today.

I also support the committee amendment which proposes to correct the postal employees pay schedule so that postal supervisors receive the same benefits as have been given other postal employees. If we are to retain a high morale among our postal employees it is necessary that we treat each group fairly. The committee amendment recognizes this need and I urge that the amendment be adopted.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, it is most gratifying that Congress has had the wisdom to follow the postal workers pay increase with this legislation to increase the wages of classified Federal employees. In my own district in Los Angeles there is a larger than average number of Federal employees, and I am most aware of the vital need for this legislation—both from the standpoint of the problems which are clearly presented by the difficulties in maintaining living standards as living costs rise and from the increasing difficulties in retaining trained personnel who can earn more in private employment than under Civil Service.

It is eminently fair that the increase be retroactive to January 1st, in conformity with the postal pay bill.

I am happy that, even at this late stage, action has been secured. However, I cannot help but wish and hope that a better system could be devised to review the pay of Government workers. The retroactive provision of the bill will help only slightly to close the wide gap between the fixed wages of the classified schedules and the cost of living. In fairness to our civil servants and to the country as a whole, it is important that we bend our efforts toward determining ways in which it might be possible to keep the wages of postal and classified workers in line both with the cost of living and with the wages of non-governmental workers, and, in so doing, to prevent this gap from periodically recurring.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in support of this legislation which is designed to make vitally needed adjustments in

the pay of our classified employees. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee is to be commended for bringing this matter before the House of Representatives.

During my 10 years in the House of Representatives, I have consistently supported legislation to adequately reimburse our Federal employees. I have always felt that if we are to compete with private industry we must at least approach the prevailing wage scales being paid by these industries. I believe that if we are to have a strong Government we must have well qualified individuals serving in that Government. Obviously it is impossible to have these well-qualified individuals working for the Government unless they are adequately reimbursed for their services.

The 10-percent increase provided in this bill is a very modest increase indeed. It will, however, assist our workers in meeting some of the higher costs which have been caused by the increased cost of living in recent years. The increased will also aid and assist in combating the downward trend in our economy and supply an additional source of funds which is always spent in the consuming market by our Federal employees.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly happy that an amendment has been offered that will result in postal supervisory employees getting the same 10-percent postal employees in the lower grades and which we are approving today for the classified workers.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this bill and hope that this legislation will receive favorable consideration.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in commending the committee in bringing in a bill that gives recognition to the effect of inflationary conditions on our Federal workers and their need for relief. The sorry fact is that the men and women in Federal employment, in the classified and other positions as well as in the post office, if we take into account the wage boosts in private employment during these years of inflation, have actually been penalized for their willingness to work for the Government. This has had no justification on moral grounds and the continuance of a condition of underpayment of Federal workers, so much below comparable scales in private employment, is not in the public interest. The 10-percent increase is not as large as the facts and the figures justify, but at least it is an advance in the right direction, and some amends are made in the retroactive provision. Since I have been in the Congress, I have fought and voted on every occasion for fair wage and salary treatment for Federal workers and my especial interest has been in letting in a little more economic sunshine into the lives of those countless thousands who labor in humble places faithfully and loyally even though underpaid. I am happy to support the pending bill and to join with my colleagues in urging upon our conferees to stand firm against any wage readjustments below the figures in this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the rules be suspended

1958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

8885

and the bill S. 734 as amended be passed?

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its amendment to the bill just passed, S. 734, and request a conference with the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MURRAY, MORRISON, DAVIS of Georgia, REES of Kansas, and CORBETT.

There was no objection.

To hear
GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND
REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the Record on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 217 OF
THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 171) to amend section 217 of the National Housing Act.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 217 of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "\$3 billion" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$7 billion."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, Senate Joint Resolution 171 would authorize an increase of \$4 billion in the amount of mortgages the Federal Housing Administration is authorized to insure under section 217 of the National Housing Act. Section 217 contains the mortgage-insurance authorization for all FHA programs, except the home repair and improvement program—title I—and the armed services housing program—title VIII. These excepted programs have separate authorizations and at this time need no further increase in their respective authorizations.

Since the enactment of the Emergency Housing Act of 1958 early this spring, and because of a general improvement in the availability of mortgage funds, FHA mortgage-insurance activity has risen markedly over the past several months. In January the net use of authorization totaled \$157.8 million and in February

\$234.4 million. In March the use of insurance authorization rose to \$367 million, and in April to \$464 million. The activity in April was the highest in FHA history since 1950.

This increased use of FHA insurance is most gratifying to us all for everyone recognizes that the FHA programs are of vital importance to the improvement of the national economy. The leadership of the Congress was largely responsible for bringing this condition about for the Emergency Housing Act of 1958 was a Democratic measure. However, because of this desired increase use of FHA mortgage insurance we now have reached a point where FHA was required recently to stop issuing commitments except as approved, on a day-to-day basis by the central office of FHA.

This certainly must not be allowed to continue for the FHA programs, with their low downpayment and long-term loan features, are vital to a healthy home building and home financing industry which is of basic importance to our economy. For these reasons we must take this emergency type of action today. I personally regret that we could not have followed a more orderly legislative process in meeting this situation and I trust the agency will be more alert in the future to their needs and requirements in order for the committee to hold public hearings and thus be in a better position to pass upon the question of the precise amount of increase which should be authorized.

In this regard, Mr. Speaker, I believe the House is entitled to an explanation of the need for its legislating in this manner. Your committee had very little advance or definite notice of the emergency and the depletion of the fund. In fact, the first indication of this condition was contained in a letter dated May 10, 1958, from the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. The Administrator requested an increase of \$4 billion in FHA insurance authorization; he indicated in his letter that the remaining authorization would last through June 10. However, on May 20, the staff was advised informally that the FHA insurance authorization would be exhausted by the end of May.

Because of this sudden change in the Agency's estimate the committee met on May 22 and agreed to report out an emergency resolution for an increase of \$1 billion in FHA's insurance authorization. This was done with the understanding that this authorization would permit the FHA insurance programs to continue uninterrupted until the committee could consider this question more fully, after public hearings. A rule was granted on the committee's resolution on May 28.

Mr. Speaker, the committee is proud of the accomplishments of the FHA and would support any reasonable request that it should make. We certainly want nothing to interfere with its work. It should be mentioned that since the committee took its action on May 22 the Senate passed Senate Joint Resolution 171, which is now before us. This action was taken after the Senate Bank-

ing and Currency Committee had concluded its hearings on general housing legislation for this year. It appears that the Senate committee found the request of the agency for \$4 billion additional insurance authorizations to be necessary and reasonable. Because of this finding and our general knowledge of the existing conditions I believe the House is justified in passing the resolution and do so urge it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(Mr. TALLE asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to underwrite the comments made by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE]. I think it would be well at this point to give a brief history of the development of this legislation, especially from the point of view of clarifying the need for quick action.

On May 10 the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency addressed a letter to the Speaker of the House, and likewise to the presiding officer in the other body, pointing out that authorization for insurance by FHA was running out and that in all likelihood it would run out completely by the 10th of June. The authorization under current law is \$3 billion plus the amount of outstanding mortgages and commitments. Mr. Cole, the Administrator, asked for an increase of \$4 billion, with the expectation that that increase would carry the agency through the fiscal year 1959. In response to that letter the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency and I introduced identical resolutions for the purpose of making effective the request made by the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. However, on May 21 the chairman of the committee introduced a second resolution calling for only \$1 billion, and in executive session the following day that was approved. My amendment to provide a \$4 billion increase was defeated by a vote of 12 to 11. Thereupon I asked for an open rule before the Rules Committee, in order that I might offer my amendment to restore the \$3 billion cut.

Accordingly, on May 28, such a rule was granted and it was expected that this legislation would come before the House in the form of an open rule and 2 hours of general debate. It is significant that in the other body similar resolutions were introduced on a bipartisan basis just as was done in this Chamber on the 14th of May, and that the Banking and Currency Committee in the other body approved \$4 billion on the 20th of May. The other body passed the legislation on the 28th of May. It therefore appeared that employing the suspension procedure would be the better way to bring the legislation before this Chamber, inasmuch as the other body had approved it, and the dire need for quick action was apparent. The evening before the action was taken in the other body the FHA Agency sent word to all district offices throughout our land stating that from then on those of-

files would be on a day-to-day basis and that in all likelihood 2 out of every 3 applications would have to be turned down. The directive to the FHA district offices stated further that in any event the applications they received would have to be screened in Washington, in the Washington office, and what could actually be effectuated would depend on the status of the revolving fund—on money coming in, on cancellations, and so on.

This great activity in the housing industry is something in which we may take great pride. I believe that the Congress should take some pride in having enacted the Emergency Housing Act which became law on April 1, 1958, because that has had something to do with the progress that has been made.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TALLE. I yield gladly.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to express my deep appreciation to the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] and the other members of the committee for bringing this up instead of the other bill.

Mr. TALLE. I thank the gentle lady very much.

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

Mr. TALLE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. I would like to say that in the last 2 weeks I have received not less than 15 letters and telegrams urging speed because contractors are running out of funds. So in the interest of continued employment and the welfare of the veterans this bill should be passed without delay.

Mr. TALLE. I thank the gentleman. As an illustration of the tremendous increase in this activity may I point out that during the months of January, February, March, and April of this year as compared with the same months of last year there was an increase of 80 percent.

What does this mean? It means that the increase is running on the basis of approximately 20 percent a month.

On May 21 the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Mitchell, testified before the House Committee on Banking and Currency and pointed out that 85 percent of the slowdown in economic activity is in manufactures. He pointed out that 70 percent of the slowdown is in hard goods. This is our glorious opportunity, because when a house is built it must be supplied with plumbing, a heating plant, washing machine, refrigerator, stove, and other hard goods. So this would tend to promote further activity in the very field in which the slowdown is most apparent.

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

Mr. TALLE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. I think the gentleman is exactly right on this whole question not only of construction but also as to the need for the hard goods that will be used on the inside of houses; and that is where the effect will be felt. I

want to associate myself with what the gentleman has said with reference to this entire bill and ask unanimous consent that I may insert my own remarks at the end of the gentleman's.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TALLE. The contribution of the gentleman is appreciated.

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

Mr. TALLE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. I appreciate the necessity and urgency for this legislation, but I wish the gentleman would comment on the possibilities of an omnibus housing bill under which we can do something about urban renewal and other projects about which there is a great deal of concern. Can the gentleman tell me whether there will be any chance that that kind of legislation can be considered before this session is over if this legislation passes today?

Mr. TALLE. My personal opinion is all I can give to the gentleman, but my personal opinion is that the possibility is very good.

Mr. VANIK. I hope the gentleman will help make that a reality, that we can consider an omnibus bill so that we can reach into a great many other fields that will help stimulate employment and which will also result in the development of a sound housing program.

Mr. TALLE. As a humble worker in the vineyard of the minority, I assure the gentleman from Ohio that I will do my best.

Mr. VANIK. If the gentleman will yield further, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to extend my remarks at the conclusion of the gentleman's remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. Speaker, this is the very heart of our economy; it is the brightest star in our economic firmament, if I may use such a metaphor. Let us not forget that the building season is right upon us now, and any day that is lost is a great loss indeed. In large parts of our country building is practically suspended during the cold season, so this is the time when assistance in this field can do the greatest good.

This is not the authorizing of the appropriation of money; it has nothing to do with appropriation or taxation; it merely increases the right of a Government agency to insure money that is lent by local lenders. The borrowers pay the insurance premiums, and those premiums have been adequate to cover the losses that have been incurred, and the agency has accumulated a reserve of half a billion dollars.

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

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. I understood the gentleman to say it did not require the Government to become obligated. Does

not this bill fix upon the Federal Government a contingent liability?

Mr. TALLE. I may say to the gentleman that in the event we should encounter complete disaster so that the economy would collapse, then there would be a contingent liability.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There would be an actual liability under the situation the gentleman states.

Mr. TALLE. A contingent liability that would become an actual one.

Mr. HOFFMAN. So in the end the Government stands to lose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, Senate Joint Resolution 171 would authorize an emergency increase of \$1 billion in the amount of mortgages the Federal Housing Administration is authorized to insure under section 217 of the National Housing Act. National home building has been one of the greatest cushions we have had in the economy during all of the time I have been a Member of Congress. Each time we have had a falloff in the economy, house building has picked up the load and gone ahead. Home building has not only an employment effect, but also makes possible a substantial increase in the sale of building materials. One of the most important results of home building is to decrease the sale of refrigerators, stoves, home appliances, furniture, and general home furnishings. The impact from the latter in many respects is almost as great as the actual building of homes.

In April the Federal Housing Administration received applications for loan insurance on 1- to 4-person family homes covering approximately 80,000 units. Of this, 31,630 represented new construction and 47,900 represented existing construction. This is more than double the same month a year ago.

Because of this the rate of applications for mortgage insurance jumped from \$158 million in January to \$464 million in April. This represented the highest rate of utilization in FHA history since the boom year of 1950.

The rate of application and commitment has been so great that FHA will be forced to stop issuing commitments unless the insurance authority is passed today.

If this resolution is passed, FHA activity will continue uninterrupted for several months.

The FHA merely guarantees the loan. It means that the money will be repaid to agencies which provide money to the borrower. The United States Government has not lost a penny on FHA during all of the years it has operated. In fact it has returned a small dividend. This is the greatest antirecession legislation we could pass where no cash outlay is required by the Federal Government.

This is good legislation in the best interests of the entire country and it should be passed without further delay.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I fully appreciate the urgency for action on this legislation to increase the amount of mortgages the Federal Housing Admin-

EXHIBIT 3

WASHINGTON, May 28, 1958.

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Small but important U. N. technical assistance program deserves all support United States can give. Foreign Relations Committee decision not to accept two constructive House provisions is most disappointing. We urge Senate on floor or in conference to peg United States contributions at 40 percent. Creation of new special fund makes 40 percent essential. United States ability to pay estimated at 40 percent of world's income. Also urge revision of base to include local cost assessments received and audited by U. N., thus giving greater recognition to contribution of other governments. These amendments already accepted by House would greatly strengthen technical assistance through U. N. They have our wholehearted support.

Robert R. Nathan, Americans for Democratic Action; Andrew E. Rice, American Veterans Committee; Wallace J. Campbell, Cooperative League of the U. S. A.; E. Raymond Wilson, Friends Committee on National Legislation; Bernard Weitzer, Jewish War Veterans; Reuben Johnson, National Farmers Union; Rev. James L. Vizzard, S. J., National Catholic Rural Life Conference; Mrs. Samuel Brown, National Council of Jewish Women; John W. Edelman, Textile Workers Union of America; Victor G. Reuther, United Automobile Workers; Donald Harrington, United World Federalists; Annalee Stewart, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we shall shortly begin to vote on what is universally acknowledged to be one of the 3 or 4 most important pieces of legislation in this second session of the 85th Congress.

I should like to say, as I said on Monday of this week, that I am not only for the mutual security bill, H. R. 12181, as reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations, but I am for it more strongly than ever. The headlines on the front pages of this very afternoon's newspapers confirm the wisdom of the bill.

Furthermore, I should like to say that I am more strongly than ever in favor of keeping in the bill the Kennedy amendment. It rightly amends the overly restrictive Battle Act, and thereby permits, within the discretion of the President of the United States, possible aid to Iron Curtain countries, excluding, however Soviet Russia, Red China, and North Korea.

I shall vote, therefore, in opposition to the effort made by my distinguished friend, the able senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], who would attempt to eliminate the Kennedy amendment, and thereby keep the restrictive Battle Act, as it is at present.

CRITICS OF FOREIGN POLICY IGNORE GOOD NEWS
ABROAD

I should like to state, Mr. President, that with respect to this overall bill, the basic choice before us in whether we will:

(a) Strike another effective blow for human freedom, for liberty, for security; or

(b) Whether we will wring our hands in dismay, in defeatism, and in self-imposed limitation.

The fact of the matter is that in recent weeks the critics of our present foreign policy have tended to follow two standard lines of procedure which have been their pattern for years and years:

(a) They have ignored all the good news on the international scene.

(b) They have played up all the not-so-good news, and have magnified it as if it were "utter calamity."

Thus, in recent weeks, we have not heard from these critics any reference to the gratifying news which came from Italy and from Japan. In the recent balloting in both of those countries, pro-western leadership, while it did not win an overwhelming victory, nevertheless it not only maintained itself, but, in some instances, grew even stronger.

Meanwhile, the economic position of the Western World, while it is not all that we would like it to be, certainly has not deteriorated as some prophets of gloom foresaw once our own recession had set in.

NEWS FROM FRANCE DISPELS GLOOM-MONGERING

Now, what about the news from France?

I would be less than frank if I did not say that, for a good many days, all of us were indeed concerned about the future of our great ally.

I had personally expressed the hope that the then Premier Pflimlin might be successful in his efforts.

The fact, however, that the Pflimlin Government has now given way to the De Gaulle Government, and that the latter has been clothed with extraordinary legal powers, is certainly, in itself, no cause for gloom in the Western World.

On the contrary, there is a great deal of enheartening evidence to indicate that Gen. Charles De Gaulle may indeed prove to be exactly the man who is needed at this fateful hour in history to extricate France not only from the morass in Algeria, but to deliver it from its dire economic, social, and yes, psychological, straits.

Charles De Gaulle is obviously a patriot to the depths of his being. He is a man of honor. I have faith that he will honor the treaty obligations to which France has subscribed, as was indicated yesterday by Assistant Secretary of State Elbrick.

Meanwhile, General De Gaulle's choice of Cabinet members and other associates has indicated that he is wisely determined to mobilize many of the best talents of a nation which is rich with talent.

General De Gaulle's prompt messages to Tunisia and Morocco, and his visit at this very moment in Algiers, are evidence that here is a man of speed and decision who will not dillydally in meeting head on the challenges which confront his nation.

I am no prophet; I cannot attempt to foresee the future, in particular the future constitutional reforms which he proposes. But certainly De Gaulle's

efforts to repair France's parliamentary weaknesses, its chronic immobilism, its factionalism, and political splinterism, its weak office of chief executive—his efforts along these lines will strike a responsive chord in our hearts.

I do not mean to imply that the road ahead will be easy for De Gaulle, or that the western alliance, particularly NATO, may not be in for many serious problems. But I ask, what alternative do the domestic critics of our foreign policy constructively offer, with regard to France, or NATO, or anything else?

The answer is that the critics have no constructive alternative. They criticize; they lament; they wring their hands; they complain. But never once do they outline a specific and helpful program which would provide an alternative.

CONCLUSION

For that reason, I say, let the mutual security bill pass. Let it pass intact. And let H. R. 12181 be approved in Senate-House Conference Committee in its Senate form, so that we can make our fullest contribution to mankind in this decisive hour of history.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield for 10 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] without losing my right to the floor.

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

REVISION OF BASIC COMPENSATION
SCHEDULES OF CLASSIFICATION
ACT OF 1949

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 734, which has just been received from the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 734) to revise the basic compensation schedules of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this act may be cited as the "Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1958."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 603 (b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (69 Stat. 172, 70 Stat. 740; 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 | | | | | |
|-------|-----------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| | \$2,960 | \$3,055 | \$3,150 | \$3,245 | \$3,340 | \$3,435 |
| GS-1 | \$2,960 | \$3,055 | \$3,150 | \$3,245 | \$3,340 | \$3,435 |
| GS-2 | 3,255 | 3,350 | 3,445 | 3,540 | 3,635 | 3,730 |
| GS-3 | 3,495 | 3,590 | 3,685 | 3,780 | 3,875 | 3,970 |
| GS-4 | 3,755 | 3,850 | 3,945 | 4,040 | 4,135 | 4,230 |
| GS-5 | 4,040 | 4,140 | 4,240 | 4,340 | 4,440 | 4,540 |
| GS-6 | 4,430 | 4,540 | 4,650 | 4,760 | 4,870 | 4,980 |
| GS-7 | 4,980 | 5,100 | 5,220 | 5,340 | 5,460 | 5,580 |
| GS-8 | 5,470 | 5,600 | 5,730 | 5,860 | 5,990 | 6,120 |
| GS-9 | 5,985 | 6,125 | 6,265 | 6,405 | 6,545 | 6,685 |
| GS-10 | 6,505 | 6,655 | 6,805 | 6,955 | 7,105 | 7,255 |
| GS-11 | 7,030 | 7,180 | 7,330 | 7,480 | 7,630 | 7,780 |
| GS-12 | 7,560 | 7,710 | 7,860 | 8,010 | 8,160 | 8,310 |
| GS-13 | 8,090 | 8,240 | 8,390 | 8,540 | 8,690 | 8,840 |
| GS-14 | 8,620 | 8,770 | 8,920 | 9,070 | 9,220 | 9,370 |
| GS-15 | 9,150 | 9,300 | 9,450 | 9,600 | 9,750 | 9,900 |
| GS-16 | 9,680 | 9,830 | 9,980 | 10,130 | 10,280 | 10,430 |
| GS-17 | 10,210 | 10,360 | 10,510 | 10,660 | 10,810 | 10,960 |
| GS-18 | 10,740 | 10,890 | 11,040 | 11,190 | 11,340 | 11,490 |

(b) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees to whom this section applies shall be adjusted 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 scheduled or longevity 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 scheduled or longevity 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 2 scheduled or 2 longevity rates, or between a scheduled and a longevity rate, of a grade in the General Schedule, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the higher of the 2 corresponding rates in effect on and after such date.

(3) If the officer or employee (other than an officer or employee subject to paragraph (4) of this subsection), immediately prior to the effective date of this section, is receiving basic compensation at a rate in excess of the maximum longevity rate of his grade, or in excess of the maximum scheduled rate of his grade if there is no longevity rate for his grade, he shall receive basic compensation at a rate equal to the rate which he received immediately prior to such effective date, increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase made by this section in the maximum longevity rate, or the maximum scheduled rate, as the case may be, of his grade until (A) he leaves such position, or (B) he is entitled to receive basic compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; but, when his position becomes vacant, the rate of basic compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with such act, as amended.

(4) If the officer or employee, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, is receiving, pursuant to paragraph (4) of section 2 (b) 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; Public Law 763, 83d Cong.), plus the amount of the increase provided by section 2 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, he shall receive an aggregate rate of compensation equal to the sum of (A) his existing aggregate rate of compensation determined under such section 208 (b) of the act of September 1, 1954, and (B) the amount of the increase provided by section 2 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955 and (C) the amount of the increase made by this section in the maximum longevity rate of his grade, until (i) he leaves his position, or (ii) 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 (ii) 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 such act of September 1, 1954, to constitute a part of the existing aggregate rate of compensation of such employee.

(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.

(6) If the officer or employee on the rolls has had his rate of basic compensation established, under authority of section 803 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (68 Stat. 1106; 5 U. S. C. 1133), at any time during the period beginning on September 1, 1954, and ending on the date of enactment of this act, his rate of basic compensation shall be adjusted retroactively in accordance with one or more of the following provisions of this paragraph (6), as applicable:

(A) If his rate of basic compensation was established under authority of such section 803 after September 1, 1954, and prior to the effective date of this section such rate shall be adjusted retroactively, for the period of time served by him in a pay status under the Classification Act of 1949 in the position concerned on and after such effective date and prior to the date of enactment of this act, 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 which was in effect for such officer or employee, without regard to this act, as a result of such adjustment under such section 803;

(B) If his rate of basic compensation was established under authority of such section 803 on or after the effective date of this section and prior to the date of enactment of this act, such rate shall be adjusted retroactively for the period of time served by him in a pay status under the Classification Act of 1949 in the position concerned on and after such effective date and prior to such date of enactment, as follows:

(1) for the period of time prior to the effective date of the establishment of his rate of basic compensation under such section 803, on the basis of the rate of basic compensation which he was receiving during such period, and

(ii) for the period of time on and after the effective date of the establishment of his rate of basic compensation under such section 803, 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 which was in effect for such officer or employee, without regard to this act, as a result of such adjustment under such section 803,

and such basic compensation adjusted under subparagraphs (A) and (B) (ii) of this paragraph (6) shall be paid in accordance with such subparagraphs until—

(a) he leaves such position, or

(b) he is entitled to receive basic compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of any provision of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended;

(7) If the officer or employee became subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, at any time during the period beginning on September 1, 1954, and ending on the date of enactment of this act, at a rate of basic compensation which was established under authority of section 803 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (68 Stat. 1106; 5 U. S. C. 1133), his rate of basic compensation shall be adjusted retroactively, for the period of time served by him in a pay status under the Classification Act of 1949 in the position concerned on and after the effective date of this section and prior to the date of enactment of this act, 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 which was in effect for such officer or employee, without regard to this act, as a result of such adjustment under such section 803, and such basic compensation shall be paid in accordance with this paragraph (7) until—

(A) he leaves his position, or

(B) he is entitled to receive basic compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of any provision of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(8) 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, became subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, at a rate of basic compensation which you fixed on the basis of a higher previously earned rate and which is above the minimum rate of the grade of such officer or employee, his rate of basic compensation shall be adjusted retroactively to the date on which he became subject to such act, 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 he became subject to the Classification Act of 1949 as in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this section.

(9) Each officer or employee—

(A) (i) who with his position has been transferred under authority of the Classification Act of 1949, at any time during the period beginning on the effective date of this section and ending on the date of enactment of this act, from the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949 to a prevailing rate schedule, or (ii) who, at any time during such period, transferred from a position subject to the Classification Act of 1949 to a position subject to a prevailing rate schedule,

(B) who, at all times subsequent to such transfer, was in the service of the United States (including the Armed Forces of the United States) or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, without break in such service of more than 30

1958

9085

consecutive calendar days and, 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, without break in service in excess of 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.

(C) who, on such date of enactment, is being compensated under a prevailing rate schedule, and

(D) whose rate of basic compensation on such date of enactment is less than the rate to which he would have been entitled on such date if such transfer had not occurred (unless he is receiving such lesser rate by reason of an adverse personnel action resulting from his own fault),

shall be paid basic compensation at a rate equal to the rate which he would have been receiving on such date of enactment (including compensation for each within-grade and longevity step-increase which he would have earned) if such transfer had not occurred until the day immediately following such date of enactment, for all time in a pay status on and after the effective date of this section in a position subject to a prevailing rate schedule under the circumstances prescribed in this subsection, until—

(a) he leaves the position which he holds on such date of enactment, or

(b) he is entitled to receive basic compensation at a higher rate under a prevailing rate schedule;

but when such position becomes vacant, the rate of basic compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with prevailing rate schedules.

Sec. 3. (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 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 of the United States Code, the third sentence of section 603, section 604 (a) (5), or sections 672 to 675, inclusive, of title 28 of the United States Code are hereby increased by amounts equal to the increases provided by section 2 of this act in corresponding rates of compensation paid to officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) The limitations of \$13,485 and \$18,010 with respect to the aggregate salaries payable to secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges, contained in the paragraph designated "Salaries of supporting personnel" in the Judiciary Appropriation Act, 1958 (71 Stat. 65; Public Law 85-49), or any subsequent appropriation act, shall be increased by the amounts necessary to pay the additional basic compensation provided by this act.

(c) Section 753 (e) of title 28 of the United States Code (relating to the compensation of court reporters for district courts) is amended by striking out "\$6,450" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$7,095".

Sec. 4. (a) Each officer and 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 10 percent of his gross rate of compensation (basic compensation plus additional compensation authorized by law).

(b) 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 (1) the provisions of this subsection shall not apply in the case of any employee if on or before the 15th 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 this subsection to apply to such employee, and (2) no employee whose basic compensation is adjusted under this subsection shall receive any additional compensation or increase in compensation under this act for any period prior to the effective date of such adjustment.

(c) Notwithstanding the provision referred to in subsection (d), the rates of gross compensation of each of the elected officers of the Senate (except the presiding officer of the Senate), the Parliamentarian of the Senate, the Legislative Counsel of the Senate, the Senior Counsel in the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate, and the Chief Clerk of the Senate are hereby increased by 10 percent.

(d) 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 (69 Stat. 510; Public Law 242, 84th Cong.), is amended to read as follows:

"No officer or employee, whose compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate shall be paid basic compensation at a rate in excess of \$8,880 per annum, or gross compensation at a rate in excess of \$16,300 per annum, unless expressly authorized by law."

(e) The provisions of subsection (a) shall not apply to employees whose compensation is paid from the appropriation contained in the paragraph designated "Folding documents" under the heading "Contingent Expenses of the Senate" in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1958 (71 Stat. 246; Public Law 85-75), or in any subsequent appropriation act, but the limitation contained in such paragraph is hereby increased by the amount necessary to provide increases corresponding to those provided by subsection (a).

(f) The official reporters of proceedings and debates of the Senate and their employees shall be considered to be officers or employees in or under the legislative branch of the Government within the meaning of subsection (a).

(g) 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. 2251-2267).

(h) The paragraph relating to rates of compensation of employees of committees of the Senate, contained in the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956 (69 Stat. 505; Public Law 242, 84th Cong.), is amended by striking out so much of the second sentence thereof as follows the words "First Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1947," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "the basic compensation of any employee of a standing or select committee of the Senate (including the majority and minority policy committees and the majority conference of the Senate and minority conference of the Senate), or a joint committee of the two Houses the expenses of which are paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, whose basic compensation may be fixed under such provisions at a rate of \$8,000 per annum, may be fixed at a rate not in excess of \$8,040 per annum, except that the basic compensation of one such employee may be fixed at a rate not in excess of \$8,880 per annum and the basic compensation of two such employees may be fixed at a rate not in excess of \$8,460 per annum."

(i) No officer or employee shall be paid increased or additional compensation for any

period prior to the first day of the month following the date of enactment of this act at a rate in excess of 10 percent of his gross rate of compensation computed without regard to the amendment made by subsection (d) and without regard to subsections (m), (n), (o), and (p).

(j) The position of Chief Nurse in the Senate Office Building, under the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, shall be established and allocated to grade 9 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, so long as such position is held by the present incumbent.

(k) The rate of gross annual compensation of each of the elected officers of the House of Representatives (except the presiding officer of the House and the Chaplain of the House) is hereby increased by 10 percent.

(l) The aggregate rate of the rate of basic annual compensation and the rate of additional annual compensation authorized by law of the Chaplain of the House of Representatives and of the Coordinator of Information of the House of Representatives is hereby increased by 10 percent.

(m) The rate of gross annual compensation of the Legislative Counsel of the House of Representatives shall be an amount which is equal to the rate of gross annual compensation of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate on the day following the effective date of this subsection.

(n) The basic compensation of the Administrative Assistants to the Speaker, majority leader, minority leader, majority whip, and minority whip, shall be at the rate of \$8,880 per annum.

(o) Subsection (e) of section 202 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (2 U. S. C. 72a (e)), is amended (1) by striking out "\$8,820" where it first appears in such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof "\$8,880", and (2) by striking out "\$8,820" at the second place where it appears in such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof "\$8,880".

(p) (1) This subsection is enacted as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House of Representatives to change the rule amended by this subsection at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the House of Representatives.

(2) Clause 27 (c) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended (A) by striking out "\$8,820" where it first appears in such clause and inserting in lieu thereof "\$8,880", and (B) by striking out "\$8,820" at the second place where it appears in such clause and inserting in lieu thereof "\$8,880".

(q) The limitations in the paragraph designated "Folding documents" under the heading "Contingent Expenses of the House" in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1958 (71 Stat. 249; Public Law 85-75), or in any subsequent appropriation act, are hereby increased by 10 percent.

(r) Each employee in the legislative branch of the Government whose compensation—

(1) is disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives,

(2) is not increased by any other provision of this act, and

(3) is fixed at a gross aggregate rate per annum, shall receive additional compensation at the rate of 10 percent of the rate of his existing gross annual compensation.

(s) The increases in compensation provided by this section shall not be applicable with respect to the Office of the Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives and to any employee in such office.

(t) Subject to subsection (j) of this section, each position of nurse under the Architect of the Capitol shall be allocated by the Architect to that grade of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as

amended, which is recommended to the Architect by the Attending Physician of the Congress. Any such allocation shall not be subject to post audit, review, or change by any authority in the executive branch.

"Sec. 5, (a) Section 1403 (b) of the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 (71 Stat. 130; Public Law 85-56), relating to the annual salary of the Chief Medical Director of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended by striking out "\$17,800" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$19,580."

(b) Section 1403 (c) of such act, relating to the annual salary of the Deputy Chief Medical Director of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended by striking out "\$16,800" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$18,480."

(c) Section 1403 (d) of such act, relating to the annual salaries of the Assistant Chief Medical Directors and the directors of service or chiefs of division of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended—

(1) by striking out "\$15,800" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$17,380";

(2) by striking out the word "twenty" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "twenty-five"; and

(3) by striking out "\$13,225 minimum to \$14,300 maximum" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$14,545 minimum to \$16,500 maximum."

(d) Section 1403 (e) of such act, relating to the annual salaries of the Director of Nursing Service and the Deputy Director of Nursing Service of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended—

(1) by striking out "\$11,610" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$12,770 minimum to \$13,970 maximum"; and

(2) by striking out "\$10,320" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$11,355 minimum to \$12,555 maximum."

(e) Section 1403 (f) of such act, relating to the annual salaries of the chief pharmacist, the chief dietitian, the chief physical therapist, and the chief occupational therapist of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended to read as follows:

"(f) The Administrator may appoint a chief pharmacist, a chief dietitian, a chief physical therapist, and a chief occupational therapist. During the period of his service as such, the chief pharmacist and the chief dietitian shall be paid a salary of \$12,770 minimum to \$13,970 maximum a year and the chief physical therapist and the chief occupational therapist shall be paid a salary of \$11,355 minimum to \$12,555 maximum a year."

(f) Section 1407 (a) of such act, relating to maximum and minimum annual rates of salary of certain employees of the Medical Service, Dental Service, and Nursing Service of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The grades and per annum full-pay ranges for positions provided in paragraph (1) of section 1404 shall be as follows:

"MEDICAL SERVICE

"Chief grade, \$12,770 minimum to \$13,970 maximum.

"Senior grade, \$11,355 minimum to \$12,555 maximum.

"Intermediate grade, \$9,890 minimum to \$11,090 maximum.

"Full grade, \$8,330 minimum to \$9,530 maximum.

"Associate grade, \$7,030 minimum to \$8,230 maximum.

"Junior grade, \$6,505 minimum to \$7,405 maximum.

"DENTAL SERVICE

"Chief grade, \$12,770 minimum to \$13,970 maximum.

"Senior grade, \$11,355 minimum to \$12,555 maximum.

"Intermediate grade, \$9,890 minimum to \$11,090 maximum.

"Full grade, \$8,330 minimum to \$9,530 maximum.

"Associate grade, \$7,030 minimum to \$8,230 maximum.

"Junior grade, \$6,505 minimum to \$7,405 maximum.

"NURSING SERVICE

"Assistant Director, \$8,330 minimum to \$9,530 maximum.

"Senior grade, \$7,030 minimum to \$8,230 maximum.

"Full grade, \$5,985 minimum to \$6,885 maximum.

"Associate grade, \$5,205 minimum to \$6,165 maximum.

"Junior grade, \$4,425 minimum to \$5,385 maximum."

(g) Section 1408 (d) of such act, prescribing the maximum amount of pay and allowances of medical, surgical, and dental specialists of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Any person, rated as a medical, surgical, or dental specialist under the provisions of this section or prior corresponding provisions of law, shall receive, in addition to his basic pay, an allowance equal to 15 percent of such pay, but in no event shall the pay plus the allowance authorized by this subsection exceed \$16,000 per annum."

(h) Section 1411 of such act, relating to appointment of additional employees, is amended—

(1) by inserting "(a)" immediately following "Sec. 1411.," and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the per annum rate of salary of each individual serving as a manager of a hospital, domiciliary, or center who is not a physician in the medical service shall not be less than

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Class 1..... | \$16,000 | \$16,500 | \$16,940 | \$17,380 | \$17,820 | \$18,260 | \$18,700 |
| Class 2..... | 13,880 | 14,100 | 14,520 | 14,850 | 15,180 | 15,510 | 15,840 |
| Class 3..... | 11,980 | 11,980 | 12,320 | 12,650 | 12,980 | 13,310 | 13,640 |
| Class 4..... | 9,900 | 10,175 | 10,450 | 10,725 | 11,000 | 11,275 | 11,550 |
| Class 5..... | 8,140 | 8,415 | 8,690 | 8,965 | 9,240 | 9,515 | 9,790 |
| Class 6..... | 6,710 | 6,930 | 7,150 | 7,370 | 7,590 | 7,810 | 8,030 |
| Class 7..... | 5,610 | 5,775 | 5,940 | 6,105 | 6,270 | 6,435 | 6,600 |
| Class 8..... | 4,730 | 4,895 | 5,060 | 5,225 | 5,390 | 5,555 | 5,720 |

(3) The second sentence of section 415 of such act (22 U. S. C. 870) is amended to read as follows: "The per annum rates of staff

| | | | | | | | |
|---------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| "Class 1..... | \$11,770 | \$12,120 | \$12,480 | \$12,830 | \$13,180 | \$13,530 | \$13,880 |
| Class 2..... | 10,920 | 11,205 | 11,485 | 11,770 | 12,120 | 12,465 | 12,810 |
| Class 3..... | 10,030 | 10,320 | 10,600 | 10,885 | 11,165 | 11,445 | 11,725 |
| Class 4..... | 9,095 | 9,380 | 9,665 | 9,945 | 10,230 | 10,515 | 10,800 |
| Class 5..... | 8,395 | 8,610 | 8,815 | 9,030 | 9,315 | 9,600 | 9,885 |
| Class 6..... | 7,690 | 7,905 | 8,120 | 8,325 | 8,540 | 8,955 | 9,370 |
| Class 7..... | 6,990 | 7,200 | 7,415 | 7,630 | 7,840 | 8,050 | 8,260 |
| Class 8..... | 6,285 | 6,495 | 6,710 | 6,925 | 7,140 | 7,350 | 7,560 |
| Class 9..... | 5,585 | 5,795 | 6,005 | 6,220 | 6,435 | 6,650 | 6,865 |
| Class 10..... | 5,115 | 5,260 | 5,400 | 5,540 | 5,755 | 5,970 | 6,185 |
| Class 11..... | 4,650 | 4,790 | 4,930 | 5,070 | 5,215 | 5,355 | 5,500 |
| Class 12..... | 4,180 | 4,320 | 4,460 | 4,605 | 4,745 | 4,890 | 5,025 |
| Class 13..... | 3,730 | 3,870 | 4,010 | 4,155 | 4,295 | 4,440 | 4,580 |
| Class 14..... | 3,300 | 3,445 | 3,585 | 3,730 | 3,870 | 4,010 | 4,155 |
| Class 15..... | 3,090 | 3,165 | 3,230 | 3,300 | 3,445 | 3,585 | 3,730 |
| Class 16..... | 2,875 | 2,950 | 3,020 | 3,090 | 3,165 | 3,230 | 3,300 |
| Class 17..... | 2,690 | 2,735 | 2,805 | 2,875 | 2,950 | 3,020 | 3,090 |
| Class 18..... | 2,455 | 2,520 | 2,590 | 2,660 | 2,735 | 2,805 | 2,875 |
| Class 19..... | 2,240 | 2,310 | 2,380 | 2,455 | 2,520 | 2,590 | 2,660 |
| Class 20..... | 2,025 | 2,095 | 2,165 | 2,240 | 2,310 | 2,380 | 2,455 |
| Class 21..... | 1,810 | 1,880 | 1,955 | 2,025 | 2,095 | 2,165 | 2,240 |
| Class 22..... | 1,600 | 1,670 | 1,745 | 1,810 | 1,880 | 1,955 | 2,025" |

(b) 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 step rates provided by sections 412 or 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, shall receive basic compensation on or after the effective date of this section at the corresponding step rate as provided by such sections 412 or 415 as amended by this section.

Sec. 7. (a) Notwithstanding section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 665), the rates of compensation of officers

the rate of salary which he would receive under section 1407 if his service as a manager of a hospital, domiciliary, or center had been service as a physician in the medical service in the chief grade. This subsection shall not affect the allocation of any position of manager of a hospital, domiciliary, or center to any grade of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, except with respect to changes in rate of salary pursuant to the preceding sentence, and shall not affect the applicability of the Performance Rating Act of 1950 to any individual."

(1) Paragraph (2) of section 1404 of such act, relating to additional appointments, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) Managers, pharmacists, physical therapists, occupational therapists, dietitians, and other scientific and professional personnel, such as optometrists, pathologists, bacteriologists, chemists, biostatisticians, and medical and dental technologists."

(j) Paragraph (5) of section 1405 of such act, relating to qualifications of appointees, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (B) and (C) thereof as subparagraphs (C) and (D) thereof, respectively; and

(2) by inserting immediately below subparagraph (A) thereof the following:

"(B) optometrist—

"be licensed to practice optometry in one of the States, Territories, or Commonwealths of the United States, or in the District of Columbia;";

Sec. 6. (a) The Foreign Service Act of 1946 is amended as follows:

(1) The third sentence of section 412 of such act (22 U. S. C. 867) is amended by striking out "\$17,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$19,250."

(2) The fourth sentence of section 412 of such act 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..... | \$16,000 | \$16,500 | \$16,940 | \$17,380 | \$17,820 | \$18,260 | \$18,700 |
| Class 2..... | 13,880 | 14,100 | 14,520 | 14,850 | 15,180 | 15,510 | 15,840 |
| Class 3..... | 11,980 | 11,980 | 12,320 | 12,650 | 12,980 | 13,310 | 13,640 |
| Class 4..... | 9,900 | 10,175 | 10,450 | 10,725 | 11,000 | 11,275 | 11,550 |
| Class 5..... | 8,140 | 8,415 | 8,690 | 8,965 | 9,240 | 9,515 | 9,790 |
| Class 6..... | 6,710 | 6,930 | 7,150 | 7,370 | 7,590 | 7,810 | 8,030 |
| Class 7..... | 5,610 | 5,775 | 5,940 | 6,105 | 6,270 | 6,435 | 6,600 |
| Class 8..... | 4,730 | 4,895 | 5,060 | 5,225 | 5,390 | 5,555 | 5,720 |

officers and employees within each class shall be as follows:

| | | | | | | | |
|---------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| "Class 1..... | \$11,770 | \$12,120 | \$12,480 | \$12,830 | \$13,180 | \$13,530 | \$13,880 |
| Class 2..... | 10,920 | 11,205 | 11,485 | 11,770 | 12,120 | 12,465 | 12,810 |
| Class 3..... | 10,030 | 10,320 | 10,600 | 10,885 | 11,165 | 11,445 | 11,725 |
| Class 4..... | 9,095 | 9,380 | 9,665 | 9,945 | 10,230 | 10,515 | 10,800 |
| Class 5..... | 8,395 | 8,610 | 8,815 | 9,030 | 9,315 | 9,600 | 9,885 |
| Class 6..... | 7,690 | 7,905 | 8,120 | 8,325 | 8,540 | 8,955 | 9,370 |
| Class 7..... | 6,990 | 7,200 | 7,415 | 7,630 | 7,840 | 8,050 | 8,260 |
| Class 8..... | 6,285 | 6,495 | 6,710 | 6,925 | 7,140 | 7,350 | 7,560 |
| Class 9..... | 5,585 | 5,795 | 6,005 | 6,220 | 6,435 | 6,650 | 6,865 |
| Class 10..... | 5,115 | 5,260 | 5,400 | 5,540 | 5,755 | 5,970 | 6,185 |
| Class 11..... | 4,650 | 4,790 | 4,930 | 5,070 | 5,215 | 5,355 | 5,500 |
| Class 12..... | 4,180 | 4,320 | 4,460 | 4,605 | 4,745 | 4,890 | 5,025 |
| Class 13..... | 3,730 | 3,870 | 4,010 | 4,155 | 4,295 | 4,440 | 4,580 |
| Class 14..... | 3,300 | 3,445 | 3,585 | 3,730 | 3,870 | 4,010 | 4,155 |
| Class 15..... | 3,090 | 3,165 | 3,230 | 3,300 | 3,445 | 3,585 | 3,730 |
| Class 16..... | 2,875 | 2,950 | 3,020 | 3,090 | 3,165 | 3,230 | 3,300 |
| Class 17..... | 2,690 | 2,735 | 2,805 | 2,875 | 2,950 | 3,020 | 3,090 |
| Class 18..... | 2,455 | 2,520 | 2,590 | 2,660 | 2,735 | 2,805 | 2,875 |
| Class 19..... | 2,240 | 2,310 | 2,380 | 2,455 | 2,520 | 2,590 | 2,660 |
| Class 20..... | 2,025 | 2,095 | 2,165 | 2,240 | 2,310 | 2,380 | 2,455 |
| Class 21..... | 1,810 | 1,880 | 1,955 | 2,025 | 2,095 | 2,165 | 2,240 |
| Class 22..... | 1,600 | 1,670 | 1,745 | 1,810 | 1,880 | 1,955 | 2,025" |

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 began on or after January 1, 1958, by amounts not to exceed the increases provided by this act for corresponding rates of compensation in the appropriate schedule or scale of pay.

(b) 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.

(c) 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.

SEC. 8. (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 first day of the first pay period which began on or after January 1, 1958, 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 363, 81st Cong.), as amended (5 U. S. C. 61f-61k), for services rendered during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began on or after January 1, 1958, and ending on the date of enactment of this act by an officer or employee who dies during such period.

(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.

SEC. 9. (a) The Director of the Bureau of the Budget is authorized and directed to provide by regulation for the absorption from the respective applicable appropriations or funds available for the fiscal year in which this act is enacted and for the immediately succeeding fiscal years, by the respective departments, agencies, establishments, and corporations in the executive branch, to such extent as the Director deems practicable, of the costs of the increases in basic compensation provided by this act.

(b) Nothing contained in subsection (a) of this section shall be held or considered to require (1) the separation from the service of any individual by reduction in force or other personnel action or (2) the placing of any individual in a leave-without-pay status.

(c) Subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall not apply to the field service of the Post Office Department and to such other departments, agencies, establishments, and corporations in the executive branch as the Director, with the approval of the President, may designate.

SEC. 10. Section 505 (e) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U. S. C. 1105 (e)), is amended by striking out "37" and inserting in lieu thereof "75."

SEC. 11. Section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U. S. C. 1105), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) Appointments to positions in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the general schedule, except positions provided for in subsection (e) of this section, shall be made only upon approval by the Civil Service Commission of the qualifications of the proposed appointees."

SEC. 12. The annual rate of basic compensation of the position of Chief Postal Inspector in the Post Office Department shall be \$19,000.

SEC. 13. Section 604 (d) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended (5 U. S. C. 944), is amended to read as follows:

"(d) (1) Hereafter, for all pay computation purposes affecting officers or employees in or under the executive branch, the judicial branch, or the District of Columbia municipal government, basic per annum rates of compensation established by or pursuant to law shall be regarded as payment for employment during 52 basic administrative workweeks of 40 hours.

"(2) Whenever for any such purpose it is necessary to convert a basic annual rate to a basic biweekly, weekly, daily, or hourly rate, the following rules shall govern:

"(A) An hourly rate shall be derived by dividing the annual rate by 2,080;

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|----------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| 7 | Temporary rate | \$4,870 | \$5,035 | \$5,200 | \$5,365 | \$5,530 | \$5,695 | \$5,860 |
| 8 | Temporary rate | 4,990 | 5,160 | 5,330 | 5,500 | 5,670 | 5,840 | 6,010 |
| 9 | Temporary rate | 5,255 | 5,440 | 5,625 | 5,810 | 5,995 | 6,180 | 6,365 |
| 10 | Temporary rate | 5,385 | 5,575 | 5,765 | 5,955 | 6,145 | 6,335 | 6,525 |
| 11 | Temporary rate | 5,675 | 5,875 | 6,075 | 6,275 | 6,475 | 6,675 | 6,875 |
| 12 | Temporary rate | 5,815 | 6,020 | 6,225 | 6,430 | 6,635 | 6,840 | 7,045 |
| 13 | Temporary rate | 6,235 | 6,450 | 6,665 | 6,880 | 7,095 | 7,310 | 7,525 |
| 14 | Temporary rate | 6,390 | 6,610 | 6,830 | 7,050 | 7,270 | 7,490 | 7,710 |
| 15 | Temporary rate | 6,860 | 7,095 | 7,330 | 7,565 | 7,800 | 8,035 | 8,270 |
| 16 | Temporary rate | 7,030 | 7,270 | 7,510 | 7,750 | 7,990 | 8,230 | 8,470 |
| 17 | Temporary rate | 7,545 | 7,805 | 8,065 | 8,325 | 8,585 | 8,845 | 9,105 |
| 18 | Temporary rate | 7,735 | 8,000 | 8,265 | 8,530 | 8,795 | 9,060 | 9,325 |
| 19 | Temporary rate | 8,310 | 8,590 | 8,870 | 9,150 | 9,430 | 9,710 | 9,990 |
| 20 | Temporary rate | 8,520 | 8,805 | 9,090 | 9,375 | 9,660 | 9,945 | 10,230 |
| 21 | Temporary rate | 9,140 | 9,440 | 9,740 | 10,040 | 10,340 | 10,640 | 10,940 |
| 22 | Temporary rate | 9,370 | 9,680 | 9,990 | 10,300 | 10,610 | 10,920 | 11,230 |
| 23 | Temporary rate | 10,050 | 10,375 | 10,700 | 11,025 | 11,350 | 11,675 | 12,000 |
| 24 | Temporary rate | 10,300 | 10,635 | 10,970 | 11,305 | 11,640 | 11,975 | 12,310 |
| 25 | Temporary rate | 11,075 | 11,400 | 11,725 | 12,050 | 12,375 | 12,700 | 13,025 |
| 26 | Temporary rate | 11,350 | 11,685 | 12,020 | 12,355 | 12,690 | 13,025 | 13,360 |
| 27 | Temporary rate | 12,255 | 12,580 | 12,905 | 13,230 | 13,555 | 13,880 | 14,205 |
| 28 | Temporary rate | 12,560 | 12,895 | 13,230 | 13,565 | 13,900 | 14,235 | 14,570 |
| 29 | Temporary rate | 13,760 | 14,085 | 14,410 | 14,735 | 15,060 | 15,385 | 15,760 |
| 30 | Temporary rate | 14,105 | 14,440 | 14,775 | 15,110 | 15,445 | 15,780 | |
| 31 | Temporary rate | 15,050 | 15,375 | 15,700 | 16,025 | | | |
| 32 | Temporary rate | 15,425 | 15,760 | 16,095 | | | | |
| 33 | Temporary rate | 16,000 | | | | | | |

(b) (1) The provisions of sections 402, 403, 404, and 405 of the act of May 27, 1958 (72 Stat. 146; Public Law 85-426), shall be applicable and effective, as of the effective date of this section, with respect to the application and operation of the amendment made by subsection (a) of this section.

(2) For the purposes of paragraph (1) of this subsection—

(A) The terms "This title" and "this title," as used in such sections 402 (a), 403, and 404, mean the amendment made by subsection (a) of this section; and

(B) The term "This act," as used in such section 405, means the provisions of this section 14.

SEC. 15. (a) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c) of this section, this act shall take effect as of the first day of the first pay period which began on or after January 1, 1958.

(b) This section, the first section, and sections 4 (b), 4 (e), 4 (h), 4 (j), 4 (q), 4 (t), 5 (i), 5 (j), 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 shall take effect on the date of enactment of this act.

(c) Sections 5 (h), 12, and 13 shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of enactment of this act.

(d) 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 first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of such enactment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the House amendment to Senate bill 734 is proper and very desirable.

First, it extends the cost-of-living adjustment to employees of the postal service who were not included in the postal

"(B) A daily rate shall be derived by multiplying the hourly rate by the number of daily hours of service required; and

"(C) A weekly or biweekly rate shall be derived by multiplying the hourly rate by 40 or 80 as the case may be.

"(3) All rates shall be computed in full cents, counting a fraction of a cent as the next higher cent."

SEC. 14 (a) The Postal Field Service Schedule contained in section 301 (a) of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955, as amended by section 401 (a) of the act of May 27, 1958 (72 Stat. 145; Public Law 85-426), is amended by striking out levels 7 to 20, inclusive, and the respective per annum rates and steps for such levels and inserting in lieu of such levels and per annum rates and steps the following:

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|----------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| 7 | Temporary rate | \$4,870 | \$5,035 | \$5,200 | \$5,365 | \$5,530 | \$5,695 | \$5,860 |
| 8 | Temporary rate | 4,990 | 5,160 | 5,330 | 5,500 | 5,670 | 5,840 | 6,010 |
| 9 | Temporary rate | 5,255 | 5,440 | 5,625 | 5,810 | 5,995 | 6,180 | 6,365 |
| 10 | Temporary rate | 5,385 | 5,575 | 5,765 | 5,955 | 6,145 | 6,335 | 6,525 |
| 11 | Temporary rate | 5,675 | 5,875 | 6,075 | 6,275 | 6,475 | 6,675 | 6,875 |
| 12 | Temporary rate | 5,815 | 6,020 | 6,225 | 6,430 | 6,635 | 6,840 | 7,045 |
| 13 | Temporary rate | 6,235 | 6,450 | 6,665 | 6,880 | 7,095 | 7,310 | 7,525 |
| 14 | Temporary rate | 6,390 | 6,610 | 6,830 | 7,050 | 7,270 | 7,490 | 7,710 |
| 15 | Temporary rate | 6,860 | 7,095 | 7,330 | 7,565 | 7,800 | 8,035 | 8,270 |
| 16 | Temporary rate | 7,030 | 7,270 | 7,510 | 7,750 | 7,990 | 8,230 | 8,470 |
| 17 | Temporary rate | 7,545 | 7,805 | 8,065 | 8,325 | 8,585 | 8,845 | 9,105 |
| 18 | Temporary rate | 7,735 | 8,000 | 8,265 | 8,530 | 8,795 | 9,060 | 9,325 |
| 19 | Temporary rate | 8,310 | 8,590 | 8,870 | 9,150 | 9,430 | 9,710 | 9,990 |
| 20 | Temporary rate | 8,520 | 8,805 | 9,090 | 9,375 | 9,660 | 9,945 | 10,230 |
| 21 | Temporary rate | 9,140 | 9,440 | 9,740 | 10,040 | 10,340 | 10,640 | 10,940 |
| 22 | Temporary rate | 9,370 | 9,680 | 9,990 | 10,300 | 10,610 | 10,920 | 11,230 |
| 23 | Temporary rate | 10,050 | 10,375 | 10,700 | 11,025 | 11,350 | 11,675 | 12,000 |
| 24 | Temporary rate | 10,300 | 10,635 | 10,970 | 11,305 | 11,640 | 11,975 | 12,310 |
| 25 | Temporary rate | 11,075 | 11,400 | 11,725 | 12,050 | 12,375 | 12,700 | 13,025 |
| 26 | Temporary rate | 11,350 | 11,685 | 12,020 | 12,355 | 12,690 | 13,025 | 13,360 |
| 27 | Temporary rate | 12,255 | 12,580 | 12,905 | 13,230 | 13,555 | 13,880 | 14,205 |
| 28 | Temporary rate | 12,560 | 12,895 | 13,230 | 13,565 | 13,900 | 14,235 | 14,570 |
| 29 | Temporary rate | 13,760 | 14,085 | 14,410 | 14,735 | 15,060 | 15,385 | 15,760 |
| 30 | Temporary rate | 14,105 | 14,440 | 14,775 | 15,110 | 15,445 | 15,780 | |
| 31 | Temporary rate | 15,050 | 15,375 | 15,700 | 16,025 | | | |
| 32 | Temporary rate | 15,425 | 15,760 | 16,095 | | | | |
| 33 | Temporary rate | 16,000 | | | | | | |

pay bill recently enacted. That is done by giving an additional 1 percent to employees in level 7 who, under the postal bill, received only 1 1/2 percent, and by extending the 2 1/2 percent increase to employees in level 8 and above. The net result is to give the same percentage increase to all postal employees. I commend the House for its wise and proper action in this respect.

Second, The House amendment gives the other employees the same percentage increase which has been received, or will be received, by the postal employees. The House is to be commended for its wisdom and fairness in this respect.

I had hoped that the House amendment might be accepted by the Senate without sending it back to the House or without having a conference with the House. But, unfortunately, that will not be the case.

The House and the Senate are not far apart in the matter, and I see no difficulty in reaching quick agreement. As a matter of fact, most of the changes that need be made have already been agreed to. In these circumstances, the best course of action would seem to be to agree to the House amendment with an amendment. Accordingly, I sent to the desk an amendment, and ask that it be read, but first I wish to explain briefly the purpose of the amendment.

First, it makes a necessary technical correction to carry out the wish of this body in regard to the adjustment of salaries in the offices of Senators. It leaves it to Senators to make adjustments as they see fit, and gives them a lump sum allowance.

Second. It makes a necessary technical correction in the language relating to the fixing of salaries of employees in the House document room. This correction was requested by the other body, and I am happy to comply with their request.

Third. It puts into the bill language requested by the administration which permits the recruitment of certain scientific and professional college graduates at grade 7 rather than grade 5. This provision was previously approved by the Senate after full consideration when S. 734 was passed on February 28, so I am confident there will be no dissent here today to putting it back in the bill.

Fourth. The amendment restores to the bill previously approved Senate language relating to the establishment of necessary supergrades and scientific positions justified to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee by the administration at the time S. 734 was under consideration, and as it was passed by the Senate.

Fifth. The amendment restores previously approved Senate language prescribing a method for adjusting the pay of employees upgraded under section 803 of the Classification Act by action of the Civil Service Commission.

Finally, the amendment makes certain perfecting changes of a minor nature.

This bill authorizes a substantial increase in the number of grade GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 positions. When we approve these additional supergrade positions I should like to insure that the needs of the Bureau of Prisons are recognized. In the past this Bureau has not been authorized supergrade positions by the Civil Service Commission.

I am familiar with the work of this agency. In the position of warden at the United States penitentiary, Atlanta, Ga., there is a man whose responsibilities are exceeded by few in the Federal service. He is charged with the detention of some of the most difficult prisoners in the country, and at the same time with their modification of attitude and rehabilitative preparation for release. He administers and manages a large and complex Federal installation, and directs the operations of a large industrial factory which any place else would by itself justify a higher grade.

Similarly in the Federal prisons at Leavenworth, Kans.; Alcatraz, Calif.; Lewisburg, Pa.; Chillicothe, Ohio; McNeil Island, Wash.; El Reno, Okla.; and the Medical Center at Springfield, Mo., we have administrators performing as difficult and important work as one can find in the Federal Government. None of these wardens have been approved for supergrade positions. They are in fact paid considerably less than are the wardens in many of the State prisons. I want the attention of the Civil Service Commission called to this inequity.

The Federal Bureau of Prisons has a worldwide influence upon law enforcement, confinement, and programs concerned with the treatment and rehabilitation of prisoners. In the central office of the Bureau, at its Medical Center, and in the major institutions, administrators and professional personnel with broad backgrounds of experience and understanding are required. It is essen-

tial that this agency of Government be able to recruit and retain persons with understanding and skill in this specialized field of work.

In its relationships with the legal and medical professions, and in its participation at national and international conferences this Bureau is expected to take the initiative in improving standards and methods of handling and treating prisoners. The trends in age groups toward more youthful offenders and in types of offenses toward more violent crimes greatly increase the difficulties and responsibilities of this organization. There is a pressing need to meet the challenge of these responsibilities. Correctional leaders of the highest capability are needed to recognize and exploit every opportunity to find solutions to the problems which face this Nation and its people in our growing inmate population.

The Bureau of Prisons has worked tirelessly to make a career service for its personnel. A few supergrade positions in its eight major institutions will be of great assistance to the Attorney General and the Director, Bureau of Prisons, in their staffing key positions with individuals possessing the needed abilities and stature.

Mr. President, I now ask that my amendments to the House amendment be read, and I move that the Senate agree to the amendments, in the hope that the House will agree to them, which will avoid the necessity for a conference.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is my understanding that after the Senate had taken action on the bill, it went to the House, and the House struck out all after the enacting clause and substituted an entirely new bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In the bill as passed by the House, among other things the House included a proposal to require Civil Service Commission approval of all classifications of GS-16, 17, and 18, the supergrades, and also schedule C.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In the amendments the Senator offers it is proposed to strike that out, so that matter will be in conference. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In addition, only the increases in FBI supergrades were permitted to stand, and all other scientific and supergrades were stricken in the House bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That also will be cured by the amendments offered by the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. As to scientists and others who are given increases under section 803, an automatic ceiling has been provided by the House as against the Senator's proposal to carry them, so to

speak, as they go along. That will be cured?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Finally, there is a provision with reference to recruitment of scientific and professional college graduates, namely, the ceiling of GS-5, will be removed, and grade 7 substituted?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is also included in the amendments.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And in the motion?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That would put all the Senate bill and the House bill, and also the new proposals submitted by the Senator from South Carolina, in conference?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. No; it would put in conference only amendments as to which there was a difference, if the House failed to agree to them.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The whole latitude of the House bill and the Senate bill and the new proposals would be in conference. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I have talked to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] about the matter, and I have taken the House bill, with the amendments I am suggesting.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I want to be reasonably sure about the situation, in order to satisfy the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] who has raised some questions both with me and with the Senator from Kansas, so there can be no misunderstanding as to what is contemplated by the motion before the Senate. I ask the Senator from Delaware whether he has any questions with respect to the matter, so the record will be entirely clear.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, it was my understanding, from my conversation with the Senator from Illinois, that all the provisions which are being discussed would be in conference.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. What I have done is ask the Senate to accept the House bill with the amendments I have called to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The House bill may be all right, or it may not, but the language of the House bill has not been before the Senate or a Senate committee, nor has it been considered by any Member of the Senate, except perhaps the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I never saw the language until this morning, and even now it is not printed and available for distribution.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I suggest that there be a reading of the amendments and the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is waiting for an opportunity to have the clerk read the amendments.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Am I correct in my understanding that the language the Senator from South Carolina is proposing has not been before the Senate for consideration in printed form prior to today?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The language is the same, but the

amount is not the same. We agreed to that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the Senator mean the language of the House bill is the same as that passed by the Senate? If so, why not take the Senate language?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. There is some difference in the phraseology, but it means the same thing. It provides for an increase of 10 percent. That is what it amounts to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I object to the motion unless it is cleared up. Frankly, I am a little confused as to what is proposed. I hope other Senators know more about it than I do.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. All the amendments do is to put back in the bill what was in the Senate bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the proposed amendments.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Amendments to House amendment to S. 734: On page 5 of the House engrossed amendment, beginning with line 5, strike out through line 6 on page 8 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(6) Except as provided in paragraph (7) of this subsection, if the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the date of enactment of this act as a result of action taken under section 803 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (68 Stat. 1106; 5 U. S. C. 1133), he shall receive the higher of either (A) a rate of basic compensation at the scheduled rate in effect on the effective date of this section to which he would have been entitled under the provisions of section 701 of the Classification Act of 1949 (5 U. S. C. 1121) had such action under section 803 not been taken, or (B) a rate of basic compensation at the scheduled rate in effect on such effective date which is equal to his existing rate, or if there is no such scheduled rate equal to his existing rate, then at the next higher scheduled rate: *Provided*, That upon approval by the Civil Service Commission, based upon a determination that such action is equitable, any such employee may be paid at any scheduled rate not in excess of the rate which he was receiving on the date of enactment of this act, adjusted in accordance with paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of this subsection.

"(7) If the officer or employee has had his rate of basic compensation adjusted, under authority of section 803 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (68 Stat. 1106; 5 U. S. C. 1133), at any time during the period beginning on the effective date of this act and ending on the date of enactment of this act—

"(A) his rate of basic compensation shall be adjusted retroactively in accordance with the initial conversion rules prescribed in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of this subsection for the period beginning on the effective date of this section and ending on the effective date of such adjustment under such section 803, on the basis of the rate or rates which he was receiving during such period; and

"(B) on and after the effective date of such adjustment under such section 803, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation adjusted in accordance with paragraph (6) of this subsection."

On page 12 of the House engrossed amendment, strike out all of subsection (b) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) The basic compensation of each employee in the office of a Senator."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, if Senators will obtain copies of the bill which passed the Sen-

ate, they will observe the exact wording of the amendments I am offering is in the bill which the Senate passed.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Is the effect of the proposal essentially that the Senate is abdicating its responsibilities by accepting every amendment put in the bill by the House, with the exception that we are insisting upon retention of the one amendment concerning the number of higher grades which may be increased?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. With some other minor amendments which the clerk will read. Every item the clerk is reading was in the Senate bill.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I am not interested in hearing about what was in the Senate bill. What I should like to know is what we are accepting in the House amendment, without giving the membership an opportunity to discuss it or to know what we are acting upon.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senate is asked to accept a 10-percent pay raise bill instead of a 7½-percent pay raise bill.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Is that the only amendment?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is all that is involved. The proposal is the same as the language of the Senate bill, with the 10-percent pay raise provision.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina explain what the amendments the clerk has just read will do?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. There is one exception. There has been added an item requested by the administration, that in the Postal Department those above grade 6 be allowed to get a 10-percent pay raise also. That is the only difference. That provision is in the House bill. We do not object to that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAUSCHE in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, has the clerk finished reading the proposed amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No, he has not.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I did not know whether the Senator wanted to have them all read. If the Senator will pick up a copy of the bill, he will see we have covered the subject in the past.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let us forget what we have acted upon before. Does somebody know what the amendments now being proposed will do? If so, just explain them. First, it was claimed that the proposed amendments merely reinstated some Senate language. Now, we find that they include other proposals.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I have made that clear in my statement on the floor. I will read the statement again. I read it once.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I am merely asking for an explanation. If the Senator will read the statement that might help. The Senator says he read it before, but I did not hear him. I should like to have an explanation.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendments be suspended temporarily, because I believe I can explain the matter for the Senator.

First. The amendments proposed by me make a necessary technical correction to carry out the wish of this body in regard to the adjustment of salaries in the offices of Senators.

Second. They make a necessary technical correction in the language relating to the fixing of salaries of employees in the House document room. This correction was requested by the other body, and I am happy to comply with their request.

Third. They put into the bill language requested by the administration which permits the recruitment of certain scientific and professional college graduates at grade 7 rather than grade 5. This provision was previously approved by the Senate after full consideration when S. 734 was passed on February 28, so I am confident there will be no dissent here today to putting it back in the bill.

Fourth. The amendments restore to the bill previously approved Senate language relating to the establishment of necessary supergrades and scientific positions justified to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee by the administration at the time S. 734 was under consideration.

Fifth. The amendments restore previously approved Senate language prescribing a method for adjusting the pay of employees upgraded under section 803 of the Classification Act by action of the Civil Service Commission.

Finally, the amendments make certain perfecting changes of a minor nature.

We found that mistakes had been made, which were brought to our attention. The sections are to be renumbered in accordance with the amendments. Certain changes had to be made to make the provisions clear.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the Senator for his explanation, but what has he said? I am very frank to say I am not sure I understand it fully. In simple language, tell us what the proposed amendment does.

Then one other question. As to the retroactive feature of the bill, would a retroactive payment be subject to retirement deductions?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. For the information of the Senator, that matter will not be considered in the conference. The bills passed by both Houses fixed the same date, so we cannot consider that matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am simply asking a question. In connection with the retroactive-payment feature of the bill, I understand there is a date for payment retroactive to January 1, 1958.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will retirement deductions be taken from such back payments?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. They will be. Certainly they will. The retirement percentage will be deducted, the same as would be true with respect to any salary.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If there is such a deductible provision—and it is my understanding from a hurried examination of the bill that there is—would not that necessitate a recomputation of payments for all retirees who have retired since January 1, 1958?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. No; it would not.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is that matter provided for in the bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is covered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What section of the bill provides for that?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The bill contains language consistent with that in the Postal Pay Act, so that is taken care of.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not question the Senator's statement, but could the Senator bring to my attention the paragraph in the bill which covers that item?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I will provide that information for the Senator in a moment. I shall have to look it up. It is a long bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, has the Senator found the information?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I have the information. It reads as follows:

On page 25 of the House engrossed amendment, after the period in line 20, insert a new sentence as follows: "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."

That language takes care of the matter, and is provided in the amendments on the desk.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is that provided in the amendments on the desk, or in the bill which was passed by the House?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is in the amendments at the desk.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is the Senator from South Carolina sure that that is in the amendments on the desk or in the bill which was passed by the House? No mention of this point was made in his explanation of the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is at the desk, in the amendments we were going to have read.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then we are now being assured that it is one provision of the amendments which was not explained. I did not understand the Senator to explain that as being in the amendments.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. These are merely clarifying amendments.

Mr. WILLIAMS. May I ask what other clarifying provisions are in the amendments which have not been fully read? Is that the only one?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator will find there are approxi-

mately 7 amendments changing section numbers and things like that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am speaking of those corrections in the form of amendments which are of major substance, such as the one we have just mentioned.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I would answer the question "No."

Mr. WILLIAMS. May I ask the Senator another question? The retroactive feature of the measure, as I understand it, will necessitate the payment of between \$250 million and \$275 million. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is approximately correct, but there is nothing we can do in regard to that matter. The House has adopted such a provision in its amendment to the Senate bill, which contained the same provision.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not debating that point now. I am merely speaking of the fact that that is the amount involved.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is about correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Presumably that will be paid as of a given date, assuming the bill is enacted. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should say on the first payday thereafter. It may require longer to compute the amount in some cases. It may be the second payday.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It will be paid at some projected future date.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Do the agencies have funds with which to pay the increase? Have funds been appropriated to pay it, or how will they get the \$250 million? Does the bill make any provision for it? Also, where will the agencies get the extra \$250 million to pay salaries for the remainder of the year? Is that provided for in this measure?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Money is appropriated for the various departments. If any department runs short in the last 2 weeks or the last month, we always pass a supplemental bill to take care of the shortage.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That may be true, but—

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. This is only an authorization act, and not an appropriation bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. This is more than an authorization, as I understand it. It is a commitment to pay.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Therefore there would be a direct obligation to pay. The question is how the agencies are to pay it. We have already acted on the appropriation bills for 4 or 5 departments, and we are now passing on to those departments their proportionate share of this \$500 million increase.

Where will they get this money? Will this action necessitate an immediate reconsideration of the appropriations for the various departments in order to provide the additional money?

Certainly it is not out of order to ask from where the money to make these payments is coming. This bill calls for an extra expenditure of \$500 million,

and the entire pay structure increase will be in excess of \$1¼ billion in calendar year 1958.

We already are operating at a deficit, and our national debt is bumping the ceiling. What suggestions does the Senator have for raising this extra \$1¼ billion.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The employees affected by this bill will be placed in the same position as the postal workers and the military personnel.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That may be true; but what position are they all in? I am not debating the point. I am merely asking for information. There is no need of saying that we are going to pay the money if there is not some projected plan for doing so. I am asking if any plans have been made or any consideration given by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee as to where the money will come from. The agencies must be given the cash to pay the increase if the bill passes. Or is that to be considered later?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Each department will pay out of the general fund, as the departments always do. That is a matter for the Appropriations Committee to pass upon. All we can do is pass an enabling act.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What general fund? The reason I asked the question is that there is a law, as I understand—and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who is a member of the Appropriations Committee, can correct me if I am in error—which provides that no agency of the Government may spend in any month more than one-twelfth of its allotted appropriations. The Government agencies are supposed to stay reasonably close to that figure. They are not permitted to spend the entire annual appropriation in the first 6 months and go broke. That would be a violation of the law.

Yet, now it is proposed that we place an extra obligation on these departments for an immediate payment of \$250 million in retroactive payments and another quarter billion for increases during the latter half of this year.

But apparently no consideration has been given as to from where this money is to come. Let us face this issue.

If we impose a commitment on the agencies of another \$500 million for the next 6 or 7 months, either they will have to violate the intent of the law or we shall have to appropriate an additional \$400 million or \$500 million. Is not that true?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. We shall have to pay the money out of the Treasury over a term of years—not at one time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator says we would be paying it out of the Treasury over a period of years. That is not true. This \$575 million will be paid out this calendar year. Is it not a fact that instead of paying it out of the Treasury's ready cash we would have to borrow the money in order to pay for this increase?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true. We appropriate money for everything. We are about to appropriate

about \$3,900,000,000 and give it to people outside the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Some of us are hoping that that will not be done.

The point I am making is that, whatever the cost, to a large extent it will have to be met with borrowed money. We might as well agree on that.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. We all realize that we shall have to pay the money. I am glad the Senator is telling us about it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then before we borrow it, we shall have to increase the debt ceiling so that we can borrow the money to pay what we are now authorizing, appropriations for which will be made later. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I do not know. I will have to leave that up to the financial experts.

Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. President, I appreciate the answer from the Senator from South Carolina. It is a clear indication of the complete lack of concern on the part of so many Members of the Senate as to how we are to pay for these expenditures after they are authorized. It is easy to pass a bill and say, "At some later date we will find the money somewhere." As a result of such irresponsible actions we are now confronted with a \$10 billion deficit for next year. I think it is well to recognize in the Congress, aside from the question of the merits of the proposal, that what is being proposed is to authorize salary increases—salary increases amounting to a billion or a billion and a quarter dollars, proposed to be paid for with borrowed money, by a Government which is already expected to be in the red to the extent of \$10 billion for the next 12 months. I am not proposing that salary consideration for Federal employees should be altogether based on the condition of the budget. The fairness or need of the increase in comparison to industry salary scales and the cost-of-living factor are also involved. But likewise we cannot ignore the condition of the budget.

A cost-of-living adjustment in my opinion would be in order, but the House bill goes far beyond that factor, and I will not support the measure as it is now before us. Let us not forget that we shall have to borrow the extra money to make these payments, and before we borrow it we must raise the debt ceiling.

There may be some merit in this proposal, but I do not think the full implication of what is proposed is understood. It was laid before the Senate only a few hours ago. I frankly admit, as one Member of the Senate—that I have very little knowledge as to what is in the measure now before us and I will not support any measure with respect to which I know so little.

Our Government must be kept solvent and it is long past time when some consideration should be given as to the financial crisis which is rapidly developing. Inflation is still one of the major threats in America.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In order to make certain that a record is made, I wish to make a few observations.

First of all, we passed the bill substantially in this form on February 28 this year, to cover, roughly, 1,021,000 employees in the classified service.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There were some technical difficulties which were corrected when the bill was considered by the House committee, and also by the House.

I should observe that I am not a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. As I understand from the House report, among other things the House had to clarify provisions with respect to wage board employees, so-called salary-saving cases, and so-called section 803 cases.

The House had to make some provision for computation of compensation in the case of retirement since the first of January or the first pay period, to the effective date of the act.

In addition, the House also provided for Civil Service Commission clearance with respect to those employees who are in the general classification schedule—the so-called C-grade employees, and some others.

Moreover, the House inserted a provision which eliminated all the supergrades, with the exception of those allocated to the FBI. I think the House also inserted a provision to increase the salary of the Chief Postal Inspector to \$19,000.

Then there was a new formula for computing hourly, daily, weekly, or bi-weekly rates of compensation in certain cases.

My understanding is that finally, in effect, the House eliminated 564 supergrades, and also 313 jobs under Public Law 525.

Furthermore, the House struck out the Senate provision with respect to the recruitment of those who had a college degree or college education.

Finally, the House inserted a provision with respect to an automatic ceiling on scientists and engineers.

The proposal of the Senator from South Carolina—

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. By the way, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is a cosponsor, with me, of the amendments.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct. I merely wished to make sure that the record was clear, in view of the questions raised by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Substantially, then, we have the Senate bill, with some clerical changes, and some clarifying and technical amendments, and certain substantial provisions, which the Senator now proposes to strike, so that the House may again work its will on the bill, which will bring it back substantially in the form in which it passed the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. With the exception that the House has provided for an increase of 10 percent instead of 7½ percent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was coming to that. The Senate passed a bill providing for a 7½-percent increase. The House provided a 10-percent increase for the one-million-odd employees in the classified service.

One further observation. This increase would normally cost, I suppose, about \$540 million. So the question arises, Where are we to get the money? That question is inevitable. Of course, the Budget Bureau will have to send a supplemental estimate to the Congress. That estimate will be referred to the Appropriations Committee, and it will receive consideration before the present session is over.

Obviously provision will have to be made for every agency and department involved. We must give them whatever is necessary, because this is a mandate in the law.

This is a modification. It is an amendment of existing law which changes the classification schedule. Congress is obligated to provide the money regardless of what the situation may be. Perhaps I ought to add, if my affable friend will permit me to do so, that there must have come to the desk of every Senator a preliminary estimate from the Bureau of the Budget as to what the fiscal situation will be in 1958 and in 1959. The Budget Director indicates, as does the Secretary of the Treasury, what the anticipated revenues will be and what the anticipated expenditures will be. The deficit for fiscal 1958, which will end on the 30th day of June, will be in the neighborhood of \$3 billion, and the deficit for fiscal 1959 will be between eight billion and ten billion dollars, as I understand the figures.

Of course we have had similar conditions to deal with heretofore; indeed I was a Member of one body of Congress or the other, in the days when we had, I believe, 17 continuous deficits, some larger and some smaller. However, the Senate ought to be aware of the fact that, notwithstanding the deficits during this and the next fiscal year, this bill provides for five-hundred-and-forty-odd million dollars in salary increases which will have to be paid. Obviously the administration will certainly honor the obligation.

I should say, with respect to the position taken by the administration, that it wanted the supergrades to apply not only to the FBI, but also to other agencies of the Government. The administration was not happy about the Civil Service Commission qualifications of certain of the 16, 17, and 18 GS grades and the so-called C-schedule, and also with respect to the action taken by the House in regard to scientists and in connection with college recruitment, as well as in the case of engineers. Those four items are being cured by the amendments which are now before the Senate. I believe I am in position to say, and I think I am free to say, that that is in accordance with the desires of the administration.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to say that, as I understand, the only question before the Senate is, "Do we wish to treat the classified employees in

the same way we treated the postal employees?"

When we passed the postal employee pay increase bill, I said I would be in favor of doing for the classified workers what we did for the postal workers. That is what our committee chairman is trying to accomplish this afternoon. I sincerely hope that the Senate will concur in the House amendments, with the amendments which the chairman is offering. The amendments restore provisions which we placed in the Senate bill. We are not doing anything new. We are not dealing with any new language.

As the distinguished acting minority leader has said, what is suggested is very badly needed language. I hope the Senate will adopt the amendments, and I also hope that the House will not hesitate to accept them. If the House wishes to get quick action on behalf of the classified workers, I hope it will accept the amendments. In that connection, I call attention to the language in the House report:

Under these circumstances, the consideration by the House of S. 734, rather than H. R. 9999, will expedite final legislative action on needed adjustments in the compensation of the Federal employees concerned.

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

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Kansas is the ranking minority Member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Have we any assurance that the President will accept the bill, or is there a possibility of a veto?

Mr. CARLSON. All I can say to the distinguished Senator from Idaho is that the President signed the postal pay bill, which contained the same percentage increases. I sincerely hope that there will be no question about the classified bill on that ground. The postal bill set the pattern. The pattern was also set by the bill covering the retired annuitants, which we passed yesterday. The bill now before the Senate would take care of the classified employees on the same basis. It seems to me to be only fair that such action be taken.

Mr. DWORSHAK. As I recall, when this bill was first considered by the Senate, the President said he would not accept more than a 7 or 8 percent increase in the pay schedules of classified civil servants. Is that correct?

Mr. CARLSON. As a matter of fact, last year the President submitted in his budget a recommendation for a 6 percent increase. He suggested a 6 percent increase for postal and classified employees and military personnel. The cost of that increase would have been about \$1,052,000,000. Since that time Congress has passed a postal pay bill and a retired annuitants bill, and I hope that it will approve the bill for the classified employees with the 10 percent feature in it.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Does the Senator have any estimate of the total cost of the increases for the civilian employees of the Government? I am not thinking of the military personnel now.

Mr. CARLSON. The bill for the classified worker will cost \$542 million in pay increases. I forget what the other figure is. It represents a substantial increase also.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Does the Senator from Kansas believe, then, that the President has changed his position—probably in equity to all categories of Federal employees—and that he will accept the bill if it is finally approved by both Houses of Congress?

Mr. CARLSON. When we had the postal pay increase bill before the Senate, I said I hoped the President would sign it after we had approved it. He did sign it. That is about all I can say.

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

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is there not, in fact, a bit of difference between the principle which was applicable to the postal employees' pay increase and that which we are now discussing with respect to the civil-service employees? I have in mind that, in a measure, we provided funds with which to meet the increases for postal employees by raising the rates charged for the delivery of mail. Here we are doing nothing in that regard. We are saying to the administration: "You have a \$3 billion deficit in 1958. There will definitely be an 8 to 10 billion dollar deficit in 1959. However, we want you also to take on this additional burden of \$500 million in expenditures on a deficit basis."

Mr. CARLSON. I merely wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Ohio that while we did increase the postage rates on first-, second-, and third-class mail, that is not applied, so to speak, to the salaries of the postal workers. The collections from postal receipts go into the Treasury of the United States. The postal employees are paid out of the United States Treasury, just as the classified employees are.

Therefore, I do not believe we can say—and I have always contended that we should not say—that the postal workers' salaries are based on the postal rates obtained from first-, second-, and third-class mail. Many persons seem to think that a postal employee gets his salary from postal receipts. That is not correct. A postal employee gets his salary from the United States Treasury, as does also a classified employee. The increased receipts from postal rates go into the Treasury of the United States. This is a separate matter altogether. While we did pass a postal workers' pay bill, I do not believe it can be tied to the postal rate bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What I have in mind is that it is a good policy in Government first to provide the money, and then to spend it. It is a bad policy to do the spending first and then become indifferent about providing the funds. The Senator from Kansas, I am sure, to a substantial degree subscribes to that philosophy.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Kansas both served as Governors of their States. We have had some experience with financing. I believe the Senator from Illinois

[Mr. DIRKSEN] made a very appropriate statement when he said that, after all, those of us who are voting for this increase must keep in mind that we are responsible to see to it that there are funds in the Treasury of the United States with which to take care of these items. I feel very deeply on this subject, and I know the Senator from Ohio does also.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The President of the United States has asked industry and labor to hold the line against inflationary processes. I subscribe to that suggestion of the President. I do not want to go along with a program, to which ordinarily I subscribe, and at the same time state to the labor leaders and the industrialists of the Nation that Congress is the first one to contribute to the inflationary process. I went along with the 7½ percent increase. The Senator from Kansas also was of that belief originally. I will not be a part of a program which contemplates the cheapening of the dollar of the American citizen any further. Even though I am the only one to vote against the bill, I will do so, because I do not believe it is in the interest of the security of the Nation.

Mr. CARLSON. I share the concern of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Ohio will not leave the floor for a moment. This is an excellent opportunity to commend to the Senate a reading of a very notable portion of the rules of the Senate, which deals with the legislative budget. It is to be found on page 63 of the rules.

In 1947 I was a member of the joint committee of the Senate and House which wrote this rule. It provides that the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, the Senate Committee on Finance, and the Appropriations Committees of both Houses shall become one great committee and shall meet at the beginning of a session in order to propose a legislative budget.

Remember, Mr. President, this rule has been enacted into law. It provides that the joint committee must estimate the receipts and the expenditures for the fiscal year with which it is dealing. It provides that a recommendation shall be made as to how much shall be expended.

But this is the gimmick; this is the "kicker." The Senate has ignored that rule, and the House has ignored it, and they have not even bothered to do so formally by a resolution. The rule provides:

If the estimated expenditures exceed the estimated receipts, the concurrent resolution shall include a section substantially as follows: "That it is the sense of the Congress that the public debt shall be increased in an amount equal to the amount by which the estimated expenditures for the ensuing fiscal year exceed the estimated receipts, such amount being \$—."

That is what we wrote into the rule in 1947.

The rule also provides:

Such report shall be made by February 15.

Then it continues:

The report shall be accompanied by a concurrent resolution adopting such budget, and

fixing the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year. If the estimated expenditures exceed the estimated receipts, the concurrent resolution shall include a section substantially as follows: "That it is the sense of the Congress that the public debt shall be increased in an amount equal to the amount by which the estimated expenditures for the ensuing fiscal year exceed the estimated receipts."

I have no recollection that any such concurrent resolution ever was introduced. I have no recollection that the two Houses ever paid any attention to the legislative budget estimate except for the first year. Then that unwieldy committee of 107 Senators and Representatives was cut down to frying size, so to speak, so that it could work, and we labored over the problem for quite a while. But then the whole business went out the window.

If we are looking for someone at whom to cast a stone, let us cast it right in this Chamber; and let the Members of the House cast it in their Chamber; because the legislative budget procedure is still a part of the rules of the Senate and the House of Representatives, but has been blithely and beautifully ignored. Once in a while it is well to become familiar with some of the provisions in our own rule book.

Mr. CARLSON. I think the Senator from Illinois has brought into the discussion a very timely topic. The Senator from Delaware is entitled to credit for remaining the Senate that some of these days—and I predict it will be before the end of this session—we shall have to vote for an increase in the debt limit. I hope we will keep that in mind when we make the appropriations.

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

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I was chairman of the subcommittee which held hearings for 3 weeks on the postal pay and classified pay bills. We were not dealing there with the Senate rules, with theories, or with anything of that kind. We were dealing with the fact that the paychecks of Government employees have been held in legal shackles at a time when the cost of their groceries, their rent, their clothing, their medical care, their children's education, and everything else has been rising steadily.

During the past several years there has been the sharpest increase in the cost of living in the peacetime history of the United States. The able Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] stated that when we ask industry and labor to hold the line on pay increases, there should not be substantial increases in the pay of Federal employees. But the answer is that industry and labor as a whole have not held the line. While employees in some segments of private industry have received pay increases through the efforts of their labor unions, the people who work for the Government have had their pay held in legal shackles. To say now that their pay should be frozen or held to a very minimum increase, after some of labor and many segments of industry have had a picnic, does not seem to me to be fair.

I wish the junior Senator from Ohio, who is a very thorough student, would read the hearings before our subcommittee to see what the people who work for the Government—such as letter carriers, postal clerks, stenographers, forest rangers, and all the others who are employed by the Government—have encountered in increased costs of living. The basic fact remains that no one in authority or power in the United States Government is willing to inflict upon his own group the discipline which is necessary to control inflation.

The people who live in farm States make speeches about why unemployment compensation should be reduced. The people from States which do not have a large farm population urge reductions in farm-commodity price supports. But I have not heard many speeches which urge a reduction in expenditures in their own States.

I gathered together the other day a number of quotations made in the Senate about 12 years ago when the OPA was still in existence. They are very interesting. Many able Senators made speeches then to the effect that if only the then prevailing price controls were removed, the law of supply and demand would go into effect, and the American people really would get low prices for the things which they had to buy. They said prices would rapidly come down. Some of the most eminent Members of the Senate made that prediction at that time. I do not condemn them for it, because they were under terrific pressure from their constituents to get rid of price controls so there could be "lower prices."

I regret that I do not have with me that compilation of quotations about what would happen to the cost of living if price controls were removed. Needless to say, though, prices have not come down. The cost of living has risen approximately 101 percent with respect to cereals and bakery products since price controls were removed in 1946, so that the cost of living could allegedly come down. This is a sample.

It seems to me, speaking as Chairman of the Subcommittee on Federal Pay, that unless we are willing to impose price, wage, and profit controls on every segment of the population, then we have no right to impose legal restrictions on the pay of the people who work for the Government. This was brought out in our hearings. I want the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from South Carolina to correct me if I am wrong.

The so-called Wage-Board employees of the Government, those who work in blue shirts, the members of the various craft unions, have had far greater increases than have the classified employees who work in white shirts, because they have been subject to the general lack of economic discipline which has been imposed on most of the population.

If we expect to stop inflation, I do not see how we can continue to make speeches on economy only to the people who work for the Government who are sincere people who want to support their families adequately. If they are not afforded relief in the form of a pay in-

crease, they will leave the Government service; and it will cost the Government more than the cost of the increases to train new personnel.

There was placed in the record of our hearings a table published in the U. S. News & World Report, which certainly cannot be said to be a leftwing or a radical magazine. That table will show that in recent years—the past 3 or 4 years—the persons whose salaries had risen the least, in comparison with the cost of living, were retired Federal employees and the present Federal employees.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I shall yield to the Senator from Ohio. However, I told the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] that I would speak only 1 minute. Since then, nevertheless, I have taken probably 20 minutes. However, I shall yield to the Senator from Ohio; and then I wish to yield the floor.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kansas for yielding to me.

Let me say that I subscribe to the proposition that a reasonable pay raise should be granted.

There has been a difference of opinion about what constitutes a reasonable pay raise. I think the President first suggested 6 percent. Then it was conceded that a 7½-percent pay increase would be reasonable. On the other hand, the pending amendment, as I understand it, provides for a 10-percent increase.

Mr. President, with regard to the issue of shackling the salaries of the Federal employees, let me say that, as Governor of Ohio, I was constantly confronted with the anomalous situation that the State employees who were paid with Federal funds were paid substantially more than the State employees who were paid with State funds. All my employees in the State government wanted to work in the Unemployment Compensation Bureau or the Employment Service Bureau because of the liberality of the wages granted by the United States Government, allegedly, in comparison with those granted by the State government.

Mr. President, everything to the contrary that has been said does not refute the statements which have been made by the Senator from Illinois. The Congress is responsible for inflation. The Congress has been creating the deficits. If in 1959 there is to be a \$15 billion deficit, the dollar, which today is worth 48 cents, probably will fall eventually to a value of only 40 cents. Deficits are paid by cheapened dollars. The Congress is promoting every spending program, is urging tax reductions, is indifferent to the deficit, and is unmindful of the ultimate impact on the safety of the country.

If the dollar falls to a value of 35 or 40 cents, then we shall really have to begin to worry about what is happening to the country.

Mr. President, what is wrong with a 7½-percent increase in the wages of these employees? If the budget is in-

creased by 10 percent, next year the total budget will be \$80 billion, instead of \$72 billion or \$73 billion.

Mr. President, I have watched the chief executives and the legislatures of the States operate. The President is worried about the deficit. He must answer for it. On the other hand, there are 96 Members of the Senate, and they get lost in the shuffle, and do not have to make any direct answer.

Legislatures by nature are indifferent to whether the budgets are balanced or are not balanced. But the Chief Executive finally has to find the necessary money. He has to do the budget-balancing and he has to do the answering.

So, Mr. President, the Congress should give some heed to what the President says about this proposition, rather than continue the policy of spend more, become indifferent to the consequences, and believe that everything will turn out all right.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio permit a question?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Will the Senator from Ohio join me in the introduction of a bill, in the comparatively near future, to reinstate wage, price, and profit controls?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, earlier today I read a statement directed to my colleagues. The Congress passed the bill providing for a \$2 billion housing-construction program, and the Congress passed the bill providing for a \$1,900 million accelerated highway-construction program. When those bills were passed, I asked whether labor leaders had asked for the passage of the bills, so that the members of their unions would be provided with work. They did so testify; they said, "Our men are out of work. Make this money available."

But last month, in Ohio, labor leaders called out on strike 10,000 craftsmen. The very men for whom the Congress provided approximately \$4 billion, in order that they might have work to do, said, "We will not work unless we receive wage increases." Mr. President, how can the Congress consistently defend conduct of that type?

In the statement I made earlier today, I said that Congress had better begin to give consideration to price and wage controls.

Mr. President, many of those who are listening to my remarks have savings deposits and are drawing annuities and pensions and own bonds of the United States Government. Every year those deposits, annuities, and bonds are falling in value 3 cents on the dollar. The banks may be paying them interest at the rate of 2 percent a year, but the dollars thus invested are shrinking in value at the rate of 3 cents a year on each dollar. I, for one, am not going to be drawn into the tide of the thinking that deficits can be carried. I will not do so, because it is not consistent with my thinking and it is not in the interest of the Government.

I am thinking of the proposal the Senator from Oregon has just made to me.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I would be very happy to join with so eminent a Member of the Senate as the Senator from Ohio in sponsoring it.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I yield now to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. I am trying to yield the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kansas for yielding again.

Let me say that one of my major objections to the pending measure is not so much in regard to providing for a cost-of-living increase, but that as the Senator from Ohio has pointed out the pending measure goes far beyond providing for a pay increase commensurate with the increase in the cost of living. At this time we have before us a bill which has been adopted by the House of Representatives. The bill is approximately 25 pages in length. It strikes out all of the Senate version and provides an entirely new formula. Frankly, I am not sufficiently informed about the House amendment to be able to vote intelligently on it, but I do know that it goes far beyond what the Senate had originally approved.

On page 5 of the House committee's report it is pointed out that between 1951 and 1955 the consumer price index—in other words, the index for the cost of living—rose only 3.07 percent; that the increase in the consumer price index has risen 7.9 percent since 1955; and that since 1951, the Federal classified employees have received a 7.5-percent salary increase, which was granted in 1955. Some industrial wages in this same period have increased as much or more, but some industry wages have not been increased as much. We should take note of the fact that in 1955 there was a 7.5-percent increase in the salary of these Federal employees, whereas since 1955 there has been a 7.9-percent increase in the cost of living; but does that justify a 10-percent increase in all wages financed by borrowed money?

The pending measure provides for a pay increase of 10 percent.

Mr. President, I cannot avoid the fear—as the Senator from Ohio has stated—that by such action we shall be contributing to inflation. Inflation is recognized by all as the No. 1 danger which faces the country. Now, if the Government of the United States sets a pattern for a 10-percent wage increase—an increase far in excess of the increase in the cost of living—I wonder what will be the effect on the employees in the automobile industry, the steel industry, and other industries, and, ultimately, on the value of the United States dollar.

I believe we should consider especially the fact that today the various executive departments of the Government not only do not have sufficient funds to pay the proposed wage increase, but also our executive branch has recently publicly called upon labor and industry to join in holding the present wage and price level in an effort to check inflation further and to get the unemployed back to work. The projected deficit for next year is approximately \$10 billion, according to the

most conservative estimates as of the present time.

When we realize that the pay increase now proposed will add to the deficit another \$1 billion, which can be financed only by means of borrowed money and by having the Congress raise the debt ceiling above what it is at the present time, I believe it is clear that we should give more careful consideration to this proposal.

While I would support a cost-of-living adjustment for Federal salaries, I shall vote against these proposals, which go far beyond what, in my opinion, can be justified and what the American taxpayers can afford.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YARBOROUGH in the chair). Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield. However, I should like very much to yield the floor.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kansas for yielding to me.

Let me say that I am as much concerned as is any other Member of the Senate about deficits, and, in particular, about the deficits in 1958 and in 1959. But I believe we must dissociate the pending question from the question of deficits.

If there is validity to the argument that the proposed pay raise should be predicated upon the deficit, then we would have a valid reason for decreasing the salaries of the Federal employees sufficiently to wipe out the deficit.

I think the question before us is, Are these increases warranted? I do not think we should consider at all the matter of deficits. What we should consider is, Are the increases warranted? In my opinion, I would say to my colleague from Kansas, I believe they are. I shall vote for them. Certainly, if we think the pay increases should be denied because the deficit will be increased, then, it seems to me, using the same reasoning, we should reduce salaries because there is a deficit.

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

Mr. CARLSON. I would like to yield the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I try to be a little cautious about what goes in the RECORD. So much of what we say is quoted in the press. High-school youngsters who are studying contemporary problems refer to this great compendium of information as wholly authoritative, and we should use care that what goes into the RECORD is authoritative.

With respect to what the Senator from Delaware has said, I think the rest of the story should go into the RECORD. There was an increase in pay from 1951 to 1955 of 7½ percent for the Federal workers; but in that comparable period of time, according to the report, there was an increase in the pay of workers in industry and in private enterprise of 31.4 percent.

We must have the whole story in order to come to an honest and a fair conclusion. There have been increases in the

cost of living. The Consumer Price Index—assuming the House report to be correct—increased from 1951 to 1955 by a little more than 3 percent; but since 1955 it increased by 7.9 percent, and is in a rising trend at the present time. That is not a happy situation, but that is the whole story.

So what we are considering is an endeavor to provide an equitable pay increase, which does not move ahead with salaries enjoyed in private industry, but does attempt reasonably to keep up with the industrial increase and put employees on the same pay level.

I think the record ought to show those facts, so the story will be there for anyone who wants to examine it and argue the question from that premise.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield, or will the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service yield?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I would like to yield the floor.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question.

Mr. DWORSHAK. When the Senator from South Carolina and the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service recommended increases in the postal wage scales, the increases were made contingent upon increases in postal rates, so that there might be increases in the revenues of the Post Office Department to partially offset the increased cost of its operations.

I should like to ask the chairman of the committee whether, in the extensive deliberations which I am sure the committee has had about all aspects of this problem relating to the payroll of the classified civilian employees of our Government, any consideration was given to the possibility of recommending an increase in taxes to partially offset the increased cost of the wage increases and minimize the budget deficit which is inevitable not only this year, but next year and in subsequent years, at a time when we are giving urgent consideration to the essential needs of national defense and expenditures for various programs of preparedness?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I shall answer the question of the Senator from Idaho by saying that in the passage of the postal bill I hope no Senator voted for an increase in pay based on an increase in postal rates. Postal rates have absolutely nothing to do with the pay postal workers should receive. They should be paid reasonable wages for the services rendered.

If that argument were carried to its logical conclusion, if income taxes were increased 50 percent, then the pay of the Federal employees should be increased that much.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Is the Senator from South Carolina interested in increasing income taxes 50 percent?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. No.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Who is proposing that?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Neither am I tying taxes to the salaries which Government employees should receive for their services. We should look at what private corporations are paying

their employees, and then keep Government employees on the same basis.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I agree substantially with what the chairman of the committee has said, that Federal employees in the civilian departments are entitled to equitable pay; but at the same time I am sure the chairman will agree with me and other Members of this body who profess to have great apprehension over increasing inflationary trends, which will probably make it necessary, a year or two hence, to increase again the salary schedules of Federal employees. With the recurring cycle of increasing wages and prices, there will be greater inflation, with a constant weakening of our economic structure.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Let me say to the Senator from Idaho that if the rest of the Senate had voted to withhold the \$70 billion which has been given to other countries, considering the interest which will have to be paid on that money, and also the \$10 billion proposal now before the Senate—when the \$3,900,000,000 is appropriated, it will amount approximately to \$10 billion—and if that money were now in our hands, there would not be a deficit.

I am glad the Senator from Idaho voted with me all the way through on such expenditures.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I am glad the Senator from South Carolina has clarified that statement, because the Senator from Idaho, throughout an entire decade, has consistently voted against the wasteful expenditures of \$70 billion for economic and military aid abroad, which likewise have contributed materially to the large deficits. Therefore, instead of fortifying our defenses and strength against potential aggression by countries behind the Iron Curtain, in reality we are destroying the very fabric and weakening the defense and preparedness of our country by deficit spending.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question.

Mr. JAVITS. There are a great many Federal employees in my State, I think at least as many as any other place except Washington, D. C.

I shall support the motion made by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, which has been advocated by my colleagues, the Senators from Kansas and Illinois, based to a great extent upon personal experience, and for this reason: The test of what persons should be paid in times of recession are not what people get absolutely, but what they get as compared with productivity and the general rate of compensation as compared with the standard of living. Applying that test to Federal Government employees, who, themselves, have no machinery for bargaining for their wages, but must depend upon our conscience, our sense of justice, our analysis of the facts, the employees, by this measure, are being placed at least within shooting distance of parity as

compared with what is going on in the rest of the country.

I do not think it is quite fair to tax the people with whatever misapprehensions we may have by way of the cost of such wages, if there is a disproportion and a lack of parity in the salaries which they receive as compared with the pay of those doing the same kind of work in the communities. In short, I do not think the Federal employees should be penalized because they work for the United States Government. All the considerations which have been voiced, and they are important, should not be imposed on the workers because of our shortcomings in failing to measure up to our responsibilities as legislators or the shortcomings in the pay scale of the Federal Government which we have allowed to exist.

For those reasons I shall vote as indicated by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendments be suspended. I think the reading of the amendments is the item of business before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be printed in the RECORD in full.

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

AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE AMENDMENT TO
S. 734

On page 5 of the House engrossed amendment, beginning with line 5, strike out over through line 6 on page 8 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

“(6) Except as provided in paragraph (7) of this subsection, if the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the date of enactment of this act as a result of action taken under section 803 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (68 Stat. 1106; 5 U. S. C. 1133), he shall receive the higher of either (A) a rate of basic compensation at the scheduled rate in effect on the effective date of this section to which he would have been entitled under the provisions of section 701 of the Classification Act of 1949 (5 U. S. C. 1121) had such action under section 803 not been taken, or (B) a rate of basic compensation at the scheduled rate in effect on such effective date which is equal to his existing rate, or if there is no such scheduled rate equal to his existing rate, then at the next higher scheduled rate: *Provided*, That upon approval by the Civil Service Commission, based upon a determination that such action is equitable, any such employee may be paid at any scheduled rate not in excess of the rate which he was receiving on the date of enactment of this act, adjusted in accordance with paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of this subsection.

“(7) If the officer or employee has had his rate of basic compensation adjusted, under authority of section 803 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (68 Stat. 1106; 5 U. S. C. 1133), at any time during the period beginning on the effective date of this act and ending on the date of enactment of this act—

“(A) his rate of basic compensation shall be adjusted retroactively in accordance with

the initial conversion rules prescribed in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of this subsection for the period beginning on the effective date of this section and ending on the effective date of such adjustment under such section 803, on the basis of the rate or rates which he was receiving during such period, and

"(B) on and after the effective date of such adjustment under such section 803, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation adjusted in accordance with paragraph (6) of this subsection."

On page 12 of the House engrossed amendment, strike out all of subsection (b) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) 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 15th 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 15th 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."

In the last line on page 16 and the first line on page 17 of the House engrossed amendment, strike out " or in any subsequent appropriation act."

On page 25 of the House engrossed amendment, after the period in line 20, insert a new sentence as follows: "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."

On page 27 of the House engrossed amendment, strike out all of sections 10, 11, and 12 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 10. Section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U. S. C. 1105), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(f) The Administrator of the United States Courts is authorized to place a total of 4 positions in grade 17 of the General Schedule. Such positions shall be in addition to the number of positions authorized to be placed in such grade by subsection (b).

"(g) The Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization is authorized to place a total of 11 positions in grade 17 of the General Schedule. Such positions shall be in addition to the number of positions authorized to be placed in such grade by subsection (b).

"(h) In any case in which, subsequent to February 1, 1958, provisions are included in a general appropriation act authorizing an agency of the Government to place additional positions in grade 16, 17, or 18, the total number of positions authorized by this section to be placed in such grades shall, unless otherwise expressly provided, be deemed to have been reduced by the number of positions authorized by such provisions to be placed in such grades."

"Sec. 11. (a) Section 505 (b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by striking out 'twelve hundred and twenty-six' and inserting 'seventeen hundred and seventy-nine', by striking out 'three hundred and twenty-nine' and inserting 'four hundred and seventy-two', and by striking out 'one hundred and thirty' and inserting 'one hundred and eighty-eight.'

"(b) Such section is further amended by striking out 'thirty-seven' in subsection (e) and inserting in lieu thereof 'seventy-five'."

"Sec. 12. (a) The first section of the act of August 1, 1947 (Public Law 313, 85th Cong.), as amended, is amended by striking out 'one hundred and twenty' and 'twenty-five' in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof 'four hundred and thirty-five' and 'fifty', respectively.

"(b) Such section is further amended by striking out 'thirty' in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof 'one hundred and fifty'."

"(c) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(d) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for not more than 10 scientific or professional positions in the Department of the Interior, each such position being established to effectuate those research and development functions of such Department which require the services of specially qualified personnel.

"(e) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for not more than five scientific or professional positions in the Department of Agriculture, each such position being established to effectuate those research and development functions of such Department which require the services of specially qualified personnel.

"(f) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for not more than five scientific or professional positions in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, each such position being established to effectuate those research and development functions of such Department which require the services of specially qualified personnel.

"(g) The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for not more than 50 scientific or professional positions in the Department of Commerce, of which not less than 10 shall be for the United States Patent Office, each such position being established to effectuate those research and development functions of such Department which require the services of specially qualified personnel.

"(h) In any case in which, subsequent to February 1, 1958, provisions are included in a general appropriation act authorizing an agency of the Government referred to in this act to establish and fix the compensation of scientific or professional positions similar to those authorized by this act, the number of such positions authorized by this act shall, unless otherwise expressly provided, be deemed to have been reduced by the number of positions authorized by the provisions of such appropriation act."

"(d) Section 3 of such act is amended by inserting after 'Secretary of Defense' a comma and the following: 'the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture,

the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare,' and by inserting after 'Military Establishment' a comma and the following: 'the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.'

"(e) Section 208 (g) of the Public Health Service Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 210 g)), is amended by striking out 'sixty positions' and inserting in lieu thereof 'eighty-five positions, of which not less than seventy-three shall be for the National Institutes of Health.'

"Sec. 13. (a) (1) Clause (2) of that paragraph of section 602 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U. S. C. 1112), which defines the level of difficulty and responsibility of work in grade 5 of the General Schedule (GS-5) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) to perform, under immediate supervision, and with little opportunity for the exercise of independent judgment, simple and elementary work requiring professional, scientific, or technical training; or'

"(2) Clause (2) of that paragraph of the same section which defines the level of difficulty and responsibility of work in grade 7 of the General Schedule (GS-7) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) under immediate or general supervision, to perform somewhat difficult work requiring (A) professional, scientific, or technical training, and (B) to a limited extent, the exercise of independent technical judgment; or'

"(b) The Civil Service Commission shall exercise its authority to issue such standards or regulations as may be necessary for the administration of subsection (a) of this section.

"Sec. 14. It is the sense of the Congress that appropriations for cooperative agricultural extension work and appropriations for payments to State agricultural experiment stations for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1958, should include additional amounts sufficient to provide increases in the portion of the compensation of persons employed in such work or by such stations, which is paid from such appropriations, corresponding to the increases provided for employees under this act."

On page 27, line 18, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out "Sec. 13." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 15."

On page 28, line 19, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out "Sec. 14." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 16."

On page 29, in the next to the last line, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out "14" and insert in lieu thereof "16."

On page 29 of the House engrossed amendment, in the salary schedule on such page, in lieu of the blank space at the end of the line providing temporary rates for level 18 insert "15,780."

On page 29, in the last line, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out "Sec. 15." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 17."

On page 30, line 6, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out "and 11" and insert in lieu thereof "11, 12, 13, and 14."

On page 30, line 7, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out "5 (h) 12, and 13" and insert in lieu thereof "5 (h) and 15."

On page 30, lines 15 and 16 of the House engrossed amendment, strike out the words "the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] for himself and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], to the House amendment.

The amendments to the amendment were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on concurring in the House amendment, as amended.

The House amendment, as amended, was concurred in.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the House amendment, as amended, was concurred in.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from South Carolina to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

HEARINGS ON RENOMINATION OF EDWARD N. GADSBY AS CHAIRMAN OF SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Committee on Banking and Currency has had some difficulty in polling the members of the committee on the question of the reappointment of Mr. Edward N. Gadsby as Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Under the rule, the nomination is required to lie over 1 day. But I have conferred with the majority leader, and the first thing tomorrow the nomination will be taken up. I am confident that it will be acted upon favorably. In any event, if any Senator wishes to express his views about Mr. Gadsby, he will be heard. I simply give notice now that the nomination will be taken up the first thing tomorrow.

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR GORE

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, our two-party system has served the Nation well. It is through the workings of the two-party system that the people have a meaningful choice as to broad policies and direction of government.

If in our country, now grown so large and great, most people merely voted for the man, or chose between a myriad of fly-by-night, irresponsible political parties, the people would have but little meaningful choice except between nostrums and personalities. In that connection, we have but to consider the sad plight of our friend and ally, France, to realize the unfortunate predicament into which such could lead.

I hold it fortuitous, then, that we have two strong, vigorous political parties which biennially offer national programs and candidates to the public. This is not to praise unreasoning partisan rigidity in either the exercise of the franchise or in official action. Such would rob our system of the necessary flexibility and facility for change, and would promote extremism in governmental operation.

During the course of my political career, I have enjoyed the friendship of many members of the Republican Party. Indeed, the people of several Tennessee

communities which normally are Republican in political leanings have repeatedly voted for me, and this I appreciate. I, in turn, have undertaken to represent the whole people.

Upon occasion I have strongly supported legislative proposals submitted by President Eisenhower, such as the Cordell Hull reciprocal trade program.

On the other hand, I have opposed with equal vigor unsound programs, such as the Dixon-Yates contract. By and large, I have tried to measure issues on merit, supporting on principle, and opposing on principle.

Even so, I have recognized the benefits of our two-party system; and consequently I have in the main undertaken to work within the Democratic Party. Especially, and specifically, I have refrained from undertaking to intrude into matters that are particularly the prerogatives of the members of the Republican Party. I believe this can be said of all other Democratic Senators and in reverse of all Senators who are members of the Republican Party. This is part of the workings of our two-party system, and I endorse it.

Mr. President, it seems to me a little strange, then, that certain Republican leaders, both from within and from without Tennessee, together with a few special interests with which they are allied, are undertaking to intervene in a Democratic Party primary election in Tennessee. I refer particularly to Mr. Guy Smith, of Knoxville, Tenn., chairman of the Tennessee Republican Executive Committee; and to Mr. Meade Alcorn, chairman of the National Republican Executive Committee, who has invaded Tennessee for personal attacks upon me, and who has sent agents there to serve a similar purpose.

Their fury at me seems to have stemmed from the fact that I said frankly, early this year, that our country was in a recession, and proposed an acceleration of highway improvement and other permanent public works as a means of stimulating our economy and relieving the distress of unemployment.

Mr. President, the partisan voices which now seek to interfere with what should be a matter for Tennesseans, and primarily for the Democrats of Tennessee, immediately denounced me as a prophet of gloom and doom, and in other uncomplimentary and untrue terms.

The fact that the whole country and President Eisenhower later recognized and acknowledged the recessionary condition of our economy seems not to have dulled in any respect those personal attacks upon me.

Mr. President, I shall not be deterred in the least, by those or other tactics, from speaking the truth as I see it, nor will the people of Tennessee be misled by such tactics.

UNKNOWN SOLDIER OF WORLD WAR I

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, one of the most famous news stories in the history of American journalism was written by Mr. Kirke L. Simp-

son on the burial of the Unknown Soldier of World War I.

Mr. Simpson was then a member of the Washington staff of the Associated Press, and for his famous story he was awarded the Pulitzer Prize, the highest honor that can come to a reporter.

I have already placed in the RECORD the program of the 1921 ceremonies and the 1958 ceremonies. I feel that Mr. Simpson's article will be of great interest, not only to the Members of the Senate but to the general public, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that a major portion of the story be inserted at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

A STORY RETOLD: UNKNOWN SOLDIER RESTS AT LAST

WASHINGTON, November 11, 1921.—Under the wide and starry skies of his own homeland, America's unknown dead from France sleeps tonight, a soldier home from the wars. Alone, he lies in the narrow cell of stone that guards his body; but his soul has entered into the spirit that is America. Wherever liberty is held close in men's hearts, the honor and the glory and the pledge of high endeavor poured out over this nameless one of fame will be told and sung by Americans for all time.

Scrolled across the marble arch of the memorial raised to American soldier and sailor dead, everywhere, which stands like a monument behind his tomb, runs this legend: "We here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain."

The words were spoken by the martyred Lincoln over the dead at Gettysburg. And today with voice strong with determination and ringing with deep emotion, another President echoed that high resolve over the coffin of the soldier who died for the flag in France.

Great men in the world's affairs heard that high purpose reiterated by the man who stands at the head of the American people. Tomorrow they will gather in the city that stands almost in the shadow of the new American shrine of liberty dedicated today. They will talk of peace; and of the curbing of the havoc of war.

They will speak of the war in France, that robbed this soldier of life and name and brought death to comrades of all nations by the hundreds of thousands. And in their ears when they meet must ring President Harding's declaration today beside that flag-wrapped, honor-laden bier:

"There must be, there shall be, the commanding voice of a conscious civilization against armed warfare."

All day long the Nation poured out its heart in pride and glory for the nameless American. Before the first crash of the minute guns roared its knell for the dead from the shadow of the Washington Monument, the people who claim him as their own were trooping out to do him honor. They lined the long road from the Capitol to the hillside where he sleeps tonight; they flowed like a tide over the slopes about his burial place. They choked the bridges that lead across the river to the fields of the brave, in which he is the last comer.

Soldiers, sailors, and marines—all played their part in the thrilling spectacle as the cortege rolled along. And just behind the casket, with its faded French flowers on the draped flag, walked the President, the chosen leader of a hundred million, in whose name he was chief mourner at his bier. Beside him strode the man under whom the fallen hero had lived and died in France, General Pershing, wearing only the single medal of

victory that every American soldier might wear as his only decoration.

Behind came the carriage in which rode Woodrow Wilson, also stricken down by infirmities as he served in the highest place of the Nation, just as the humble private riding in such state ahead had gone down before a shell or bullet. For that dead man's sake, the former President had put aside his dread of seeming to parade his physical weakness and risked health, perhaps life, to appear among the mourners for the fallen.

After President Harding and most of the high dignitaries of the Government had turned aside at the White House, the procession, headed by its solid blocks of soldiery and the battalions of sailor comrades, moved on with Pershing, now flanked by Secretaries Weeks and Denby, for the long road to the tomb.

Ahead, the white marble of the amphitheater gleamed through the trees. People in thousands were moving about the great circle. Down below the platform placed for the casket, in a stone vault, lay wreaths and garlands. Above the platform gathered men whose names ring through history—Briand, Foch, Beatty, Balfour, Jacques, Diaz, and others—in a brilliant array of place and power. They were followed by notables from all countries gathered here for tomorrow's conference, and by some of the older figures in American life too old to walk beside the approaching funeral train.

At the arch where the choir waited the heroic dead, comrades lifted his casket down and, followed by the generals and the admirals, who had walked beside him from the Capitol, he was carried to the place of honor. Ahead moved the white robed singers, chanting solemnly. Carefully the casket was placed above the banked flowers and the Marine Band played sacred melodies until the moment the President and Mrs. Harding stepped to their places beside the casket.

Mr. Harding showed strong emotion as his lips formed the last words of the address. He paused, then with raised hand and head bowed, went on in the measured, rolling periods of the Lord's Prayer. The response that came back to him from the thousands he faced, from the other thousands out over the slopes beyond, arose like a chant. The marble arches hummed with the solemn sound.

Then the foreign officers who stand highest among the soldiers or sailors of their flags came one by one to the bier to place gold and jeweled emblems for the brave above the breast of the sleeper. Already, as the great prayer ended, the President had set the American seal of admiration for the valiant, the Nation's love for brave deeds and the courage that defies death, upon the casket. Side by side he laid the Medal of Honor and the Distinguished Service Cross.

The casket, with its weight of honors, was lowered into the crypt. A rocking blast of gunfire rang from the woods. The glittering circle of bayonets stiffened to a salute to the dead. Again the guns shouted their message of honor and farewell. Again they boomed out: A loyal comrade was being laid to his last, long rest.

High and clear and true in the echoes of the guns, a bugle lifted the old, old notes of taps, the lullaby for the living soldier, in death his requiem. Long ago some forgotten soldier poet caught its meaning clear and set it down that soldiers everywhere might know its message as they sing to rest:

"Fades the light;
And afar
Goeth day, cometh night,
And a star
Leadeth all, speedeth all,
To their rest."

The guns roared out again in the national salute. He was home, the unknown, to sleep forever among his own.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1958

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12181) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I shall not make a lengthy statement on the Mutual Security bill. My views on this matter are well known. I have consistently supported policies looking to the economic advance of free nations throughout the world. I have also supported, perhaps with less enthusiasm, those involving military aid to other nations.

My endorsement of these measures, Mr. President, is not a perfunctory one. I have listened intently for years to the justifications of these programs as they have been made by the executive branch under two administrations before the Committee on Foreign Relations. I have been persuaded that these aid programs are essential in terms of the defense of the Nation, in terms of the contribution which they make to the strengthening of freedom throughout the world, in terms of the requirements of common decency of those who are fortunate, to help others in distress, and in terms of the long-range benefits which they might bring to this country in greater international trade and other economic benefits.

These justifications have always seemed to me to be more than ample to validate the aid program. The justifications promised a contribution to the national interest of dimensions far greater than the cost of the aid programs. They represented the program as a form of enlightened self-interest, of broad national interest, which I, for one, was most anxious to advance.

This year, however, a new model of justification has emerged for the mutual security program, like the new models of automobiles. And like the latter, I do not find the new justification very persuasive. To be sure, the defense, the broad-range economic advantages, and the humanitarian appeals are retained as selling points. But new tail fins have been added, and double headlights.

The program this year is being justified by what it contributes to keeping the American economy going. It is being justified as an anti-recession measure. We are presented with detailed analyses of how much good aid given abroad does for the airplane industry, the farmer, the farm equipment manufacturer, the shipping industry, the electronics industry, and what not. Discreetly omitted is how much good it does for the armaments industry.

I can assure Senators, Mr. President, that I have a great concern for the condition of the American economy. It is not, as the Senate well knows, in very good condition at this moment. To suggest, however, that the way to maintain the economy in a tolerable condition is by continuing an aid program abroad is to drain this program of its meaning.

I recall that Marxist propaganda against this program has frequently reverted to the theme that American aid is a device to alleviate economic crisis within the United States by conjuring up

crises abroad. Those who have seen fit to justify the aid program this year in terms of its salutary impact on the American economy are underscoring this propaganda. They are leaving the impression—and I have no doubt that the Soviet Union will make the most of it in the months ahead—that we are pouring our wealth abroad because we do not know what to do with it at home. And to that end we are keeping the world in a state of crisis.

Let me say that there are many things which could be done at home with these billions we are using in the foreign-aid program. There are other ways—far more effective ways—to deal with an economic recession within the United States, and I hope that this administration will soon begin to follow them. If we are going to continue the aid program as I assume and hope that we are, however, let us not, ourselves, so narrow its concept as to make the Nation the legitimate butt of Soviet propaganda and an object of derision throughout the world. Let us drop this nonsense that we must continue the program because it keeps a factory going or dumps some wheat or corn abroad. Who pays for the products of the factory or the wheat or corn, if it is not the people of the Nation, through their taxes to support the program?

Let us continue the program, not for an imaginary advantage which is no advantage at all. Let us continue it because military aid, as it is necessary, is a legitimate interest of the Nation; because economic and technical progress throughout the world is an essential of the survival of freedom; and because assistance to a people elsewhere in acute distress is a human responsibility on any Nation more favorably situated. In short, Mr. President, let us support this program as an expression of bold leadership for peace and not as a fearful, inward-looking enterprise gutted of all of its enlightened significance. As an expression of positive leadership for peace aid programs make sense. Otherwise they do not.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I congratulate the Senator for the statement he has made. I did not hear all the Senator's address, but I rejoice especially in his pointing out what is the real significance of the program. We are not operating the program to try to give people in this country jobs, even though our people may benefit from the program. We have the program, as I think the Senator will agree, for the security of the United States of America. Is that a true statement?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I appreciate the significance of the Senator's remarks.

The Senator from New Jersey made a very thorough, extremely competent, and interesting speech on the program the other day. I felt it was not necessary at all to attempt to reiterate all the many points which the Senator from New Jersey made. I merely sought in my very brief statement to pick out one