

want to make more than 2½ million trips a day—every day—into, out of, around, and through Salt Lake City in 1975 is an engineering challenge. But it is also a challenge to mayors and councilmen, downtown businessmen, and community planners. In the final reckoning, the outcome of the Salt Lake metropolitan area transportation study rests in their hands. If they do their job well a milkman may be able to finish his rounds before sundown, a carpenter's helper may get to work, an insurance company executive may make that bus, and a housewife may get four children to school—safely as well as on time.

Here is one problem the engineers are smart to share—from start to finish—with the citizens of the community they serve.

#### WHAT'S BEING ATTEMPTED IN THE SALT LAKE SURVEY

Highway and street engineers in America's cities have long been aware of the fact that construction of the much-publicized National System of Interstate and Defense Highways is not going to solve the total transportation problem in most of America's cities—large or small.

However, not many people have actually known how a city could go about starting the comprehensive study necessary to develop a long-range improvement program based on facts.

A few months ago, an organization called the National Committee on Urban Transportation completed a self-appointed task which it has been working on for 2 years—namely, to produce the tools with which an average city can inventory its local street and highway needs and determine where to go from there.

The traffic experts—State, county and city—involved in the Salt Lake City metropolitan area study are following these procedures. In the course of the comprehensive \$500,000 study they will:

Determine the traffic load on every block of city street and every mile of suburban road in the multi-square-mile area and classify them as expressways, major arterials, collector streets, or local streets.

Observe and record the physical condition of every block and mile of these facilities to determine where improvements are necessary, such as widening of roadbeds, addition of drainage, repair of curbs and gutters, rehabilitation of sidewalks, and installation of traffic signals.

Measure existing traffic service to determine traffic volumes, travel time between strategic points, location of accident "hot-spots," and parking needs.

Determine the number of trips into, within, and through Salt Lake City, and its suburbs from all directions.

Study present and anticipated use of every block or square mile of land so future traffic patterns may be predicted.

Measure the role of the local bus company in providing transportation service. (In some cities this would include rapid transit and commuter railroads.)

Collect fiscal information necessary for legislative bodies to consider in allocating future funds for transportation improvement projects.

In some respects, Salt Lake City is more fortunate than other large cities. Its settlers, looking far ahead in laying out the original city, allowed plenty of room for expansion. Streets were given 132 feet of right-of-way (wide enough for a team of six oxen to make a U-turn on downtown streets, old-timers report with obvious pride). Most of the arterial street system is in good to excellent condition. A highly professional traffic engineering staff has steadily boosted the city's safety rating.

However, there have been no bond issues for major improvement jobs within the last

20 years and the capacity of much of the 500-mile street and highway plant has been rendered inadequate under the growing traffic load. As everywhere, suburban development is springing up around the city, feeding a heavy commuter traffic flow onto the narrower streets, outside the city, overtaxing their capacity. Traffic volume has tripled since 1946 and will double again within the next 15 years.

Businessmen are feeling the problem in two ways: Customers are drifting away to fringe shopping centers and delivery costs are going up. A local pickup and delivery truck is moving little more than 50 percent of the time on city streets.

Because so much of the total traffic in the State of Utah is generated in the Salt Lake City area, State engineers are playing a heavy role in the study. But traffic experts, engineers, and officials from Salt Lake City and the several surrounding suburban towns and counties are participating directly in the undertaking.

They are agreed that only such a comprehensive approach can solve what is a mutual problem. The adequacy of transportation media throughout the entire area, regardless of city, county, or State jurisdiction, cannot be evaluated independently or improved by piecemeal projects.

Although the study is being conducted under the guidance of two State highway staff engineers (J. Edward Johnston, deputy director for planning, and Gerald Matthews, chief research engineer), its course is guided by an executive committee made up of top officials of all the cities and counties involved.

All of these jurisdictions are represented on subcommittees set up to study administrative, legal, engineering, and fiscal aspects. The objective here is twofold—to safeguard the interests of all the communities involved and to familiarize their engineers with the areawide situation.

Governor Clyde made a point of this purpose in first calling the group together:

"The thing I want to emphasize is that this is your, transportation study," he said. "It is not solely designed to locate State highways. It will serve an even more important purpose for locating your city streets and county roads and developing a transportation system that will insure the best land use and the best location of public improvements. It is an opportunity, as I see it, for the various governmental agencies throughout the metropolitan area to obtain the factual data they have needed for a long time to develop a sound transportation plan, and to have available to them the technical assistance needed to translate the plan into an improvement program. Such a plan would be difficult to obtain by their own resources."

Federal funds will pay for most of the Salt Lake City study. Although the traditional matching basis for Federal highway grants is 50-50, the predominance of public lands in Utah reduces the State's matching requirements to only 13 percent. This portion is being met jointly by the State, city, and county.

#### INVESTIGATIONS BY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON ASSIGNED POWER AND LAND PROBLEMS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, some 10 days ago on the floor of the Senate I commented in some detail on the need for revision of our public-land laws. In particular, I attempted to bring to the attention of the Senate the series of investigations which has been conducted throughout the West by the House Spe-

cial Subcommittee on Assigned Power and Land Problems.

I was, and still am, concerned about the methods employed by this subcommittee in reviewing practices of the Bureau of Land Management in my own State. I questioned the necessity of these hearings into land transactions in Arizona at the taxpayers' expense, while we in Congress have failed to act upon a resolution which would enable a qualified commission to examine the inadequacy of our public land laws and recommend changes.

Mr. President, I review my previous statement, so that I may be able to comment now on developments since my remarks of June 3.

At the time when I brought to the attention of my colleagues these subcommittee probes into Arizona land transactions, the Department of Justice already was conducting its own investigation into charges that were made during the subcommittee's hearings in Phoenix. Under review by the Justice Department was the so-called Stegall-Lawrence exchange, one of three transactions which received a great deal of publicity during the Phoenix hearings.

In view of the accusations that were bantered about as a result of the subcommittee's investigation, I believe that the finding of the Justice Department in this particular case is deserving of special note.

In reporting to the Department of the Interior, the Department of Justice said:

The inquiry conducted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation into alleged irregularities in the filing and processing of this land exchange application has now been completed. That investigation has developed no evidence of the use of "tainted" appraisals in the negotiation of the Lawrence-Stegall land exchange or otherwise disclosed evidence of possible violation of the Federal criminal statutes. Accordingly, the Department is closing its file on this case.

Mr. President, I want to make it perfectly clear that I do not question in any way the right of congressional inquiry. Having served on select committees, I know very well the importance of such investigations to elicit information in the public interest. However, I believe it was no coincidence that investigations and vague charges about the operation of the Bureau of Land Management should reach their height during an important election year. If such investigations are to be made, I feel it is necessary to bring all the facts before the public; and that is my purpose in commenting on the Department of Justice report today.

I want to reiterate that I recognize the problems faced by the Department of the Interior in carrying out its operation under outdated public land laws. I suggest that Congress move to correct this, not through the airing of charges and countercharges by investigative subcommittees, but by sound legislative processes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, has morning business been concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

12062

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

June 17

ADJUSTMENT OF COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9883) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I do not know who has amendments to this bill, but we are hopeful we can get action on it today, and I suggest that the attachés on both sides of the aisle notify all members of the committee and all absent Senators who may have an interest in the bill that we are going to proceed to the consideration of the Federal and postal employees pay bill. It affects a good many people, a good many little people, a good many people who need the assistance provided by this bill, and I hope all Senators will give their careful attention to it, because, if they remain in the Chamber, we can act much more expeditiously.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, so that all interested Senators may be present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas request from what time it shall be taken?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I request that it be taken off time on the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum and that the time be taken from the time allotted to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. When was the legislative branch appropriation bill reported to the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill was reported yesterday.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Are the reports available to Members?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill and the committee report are at the desk.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask the clerks to see that copies are distributed to Members, so that they will be available.

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

ADJUSTMENT OF COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9883) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina obtained the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the majority leader yield time to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. JOHNSTON of Texas. Yes, Mr. President. The Senator from South Carolina, as chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, will control the time on the bill in my absence, and may yield time as he desires.

I commend the Senator from South Carolina for the fine job he has done. He has been one of the most fearless friends of the public servants of America. He is one of the most distinguished and able Members of this body. I congratulate the Senator for the excellent work he has done on behalf of the public servants of this country.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I thank the majority leader for those kind remarks. Of course, I have done nothing other than what I thought was right and just for the majority of our Federal employees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I doubt that anyone in this Chamber is unfamiliar with what is at stake in this matter. The question of a pay raise for our Federal employees has been the subject of discussion both here and in the House for many, many weeks. It has been discussed in the newspapers and on the air. The time for discussion is almost past. The hour for action has arrived in the Senate.

Mr. President, early in the present session more than 80 pay bills were introduced in the House calling for increases ranging up to 26 percent. As hearings were held in the House and in the Senate, adjustments were made first in one area and then in another. Finally, there evolved agreement among the majority, at least, that the rate of increase should be somewhere between 7 and 10 percent. Many felt that a larger increase was justified, but in their desire to see Federal employees receive an increase, they adopted a realistic approach to the matter.

Early this week, the House was prepared to act under a discharge petition which had been signed by 219 Members on a 9 percent bill. In an effort to reduce the area of difference, the House committee the day before yesterday morning adopted an amendment scaling down the increase to 7½ percent. Almost simultaneously the Senate Com-

mittee on Post Office and Civil Service approved and favorably reported to the Senate S. 3672, providing a similar increase.

Thus, we have before us H.R. 9883 and S. 3672, identical bills providing a 7½ percent across-the-board increase to: (a) Some 535,000 postal employees; (b) 980,000 employees subject to the Classification Act; (c) 8,100 employees under the Foreign Service Act; (d) 19,300 in the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration; (e) 15,000 employees in the agricultural stabilization and conservation service; (f) 5,000 employees in the judicial branch; and (g) 7,500 legislative employees.

Mr. President, as I indicated, this is a 7½ percent across-the-board bill with two minor exceptions as follows:

First, a 7½-percent increase in grade 18 of the general schedule of the Classification Act would have raised the rate to \$18,815. The bill holds the salary of these positions to \$18,500. This was done in order to prevent overlapping with positions subject to the Executive Pay Act.

Second, in addition to the 7½-percent increase, an additional \$5 has been added to the base rate and the annual increments in the lower six levels of the postal field schedule with a similar adjustment in the rural schedule so that rural carriers will continue to receive the same rate of pay as city carriers with whom their pay has been aligned in the past.

In addition to the pay features of the bill already mentioned, the measure has three additional provisions as follows:

First, it amends the Federal Executive Pay Act of 1956 so as to give the legal adviser, solicitor, or general counsel of an executive department (excluding the Department of Justice) the same standing and pay as an assistant secretary.

Second, it creates in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the position of Administrative Assistant Secretary. Such a position now exists in the other executive departments.

Third, it adds 5 supergrade positions to the 20 such positions now established in the Interstate Commerce Commission for a total of 25 supergrade positions in this agency. The number of supergrade positions given to the Civil Service Commission for allocation to the various agencies is reduced by 20 because of the direct allocation to the Interstate Commerce Commission made by this bill.

World events of recent days give this measure added importance. The employees whose pay would be adjusted consist not only of our postal workers but include the scientific, professional, technical, and administrative personnel engaged in the execution of our defense program. These employees are engaged in the performance of over 15,000 different occupational skills in almost every area on the face of the globe. Less than 20 percent of the total who would benefit by the bill are located in the Washington area. The other 80 percent are stationed in every hamlet in the Nation and in the most remote outposts of the world. These employees are dedicated workers. The jobs they are performing are neces-

sary to our national welfare. The Congress would be derelict in its duty if it failed at this time to see that they receive their just rewards.

In conclusion, it is my hope that the Senate will accept this measure by an overwhelming vote as it was passed in the House yesterday, and that vote, may I remind you, was 378 to 40. Incidentally, on a motion to scale down the increase from 7½ to 5 percent, the vote was 324 to 90. In light of this, let there be no one proclaim that every avenue has not been explored and considered.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks brief excerpts from the report of the committee which appear on pages 1 and 2 thereof under "Purpose," "Salary adjustments," "Executive positions," and down to "Summary of major provisions."

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

#### PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is twofold:

1. Title 1 provides a 7½-percent salary increase for employees in the executive, judicial, and legislative branches of the Government.

2. Title 2 authorizes the establishment of certain additional supergrade positions and adjusts the relative relationship of a limited number of existing positions in order to maintain a proper balance in the areas concerned.

#### SALARY ADJUSTMENTS

Title 1 provides a general increase of 7½ percent in the pay of approximately 1½ million employees in the executive, judicial, and legislative branches of the Government. The bill carries out the traditional practice of treating these employees alike in matters of pay.

The employees whose pay would be adjusted by the bill consist of our postal workers and the scientific, professional, technical, administrative, and clerical personnel required to perform over 15,000 different occupational skills essential to the performance of the varied and far-flung functions of the Government. Less than 20 percent of the total are employed in the Washington area. The other 80 percent plus are employed in every State and county of the Nation and in many faraway outposts of the world.

The hearings held on this portion of the bill established conclusively that the compensation of the Government's white-collar employees has not kept pace with that of comparable employees in private industry.

Competent testimony was presented during public hearings on this portion of the bill to the effect that—

1. The Government is losing an alarming number of career engineers, scientists, and professional personnel to private industry because of an unfavorable competitive position with respect to compensation.

2. The most highly skilled are leaving the service and replacements are below the quality needed to maintain the standard of service desired.

3. More than a desirable number of employees—particularly postal workers—find it necessary to hold a second and even a third job in order to make ends meet.

4. Currently, one out of every six electronic, mechanical, and aeronautical engineering positions is vacant and similar shortages exist in other occupations.

5. Postal workers in our major cities (where most of such workers are concentrated) have fallen behind workers of comparable skills in private industry.

In light of these and other facts of an equally shocking nature, some members of the committee believe a higher increase than that provided by the bill is fully justified. However, in the interest of harmony and in the belief that an increase of modest proportions would stand a better chance of quick enactment, the 7½-percent, across-the-board amount was agreed to.

#### EXECUTIVE POSITIONS

Title 2 makes three changes in the alignment of executive positions of the Government as follows:

1. The chief legal officers of the executive departments are given the same standing as assistant secretaries. As a result of this change, the salary of these officers would be increased from \$19,000 to \$20,000 a year.

2. The position of Administrative Assistant Secretary is established in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on the same basis as it exists in the other departments.

3. Five additional supergrade positions are authorized to be established in the Interstate Commerce Commission, which together with the 20 they now have will make a total of 25 such positions.

#### GIRLS' HIGHLAND BAGPIPE BAND OF IOWA

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will someone yield to me about a minute and a half? Are we under a limitation of time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEATING in the chair). The Senate is proceeding under a limitation of time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I am fully aware of the rules of the Senate, which I do not wish to transgress, and I shall not transgress them this morning. I know it is against the rules of the Senate to introduce anyone in the gallery, so I shall not attempt to do so. I merely inform the Senate that sitting in the gallery today at this time is a group of young folks of whom we in Iowa are justly proud.

We have a famous Girls' Highland Bagpipe Band, which has a history of 20 or 30 years of activity. These young people have made two tours of Europe, and they are now on their way to make a third tour of Europe. I personally am very proud to have them in the gallery today. While I may not formally introduce them under the rule, I call attention to the fact that if Senators will look, they will identify the costumes of these very fine young ladies who make up this band.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair informs the Senator from Iowa that he has complied strictly with the rules of the Senate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I assure the Chair I would not for the world transgress the rules of the Senate, and I shall bend over backward to keep within the rules. However, this is a matter of national importance, and I think the Senate should be informed of the presence of this distinguished group of youngsters who are here from my home State.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, is it a violation of the rule to applaud in the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair informs the Senator that regretfully he is required to rule that it is a violation of the rule to applaud in the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I could ask unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair assumes that unanimous consent would be forthcoming.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these young ladies be given a round of applause.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection. The Chair hears none. [Applause.]

#### ADJUSTMENT OF COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9883) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask if the minority leader will yield me some time on the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, it is with considerable dismay that I enter into a discussion of the pay legislation that is now before the Senate.

During my many years of service in both the House and Senate, I have had an opportunity to propose, support, and assist in securing approval of pay legislation. My record in behalf of the interests of our Federal employees speaks for itself.

It is my sincere hope that the action we take today can consummate in legislation that will give our Federal employees a well-deserved pay increase.

It is my firm conviction that should the Senate approve H.R. 9883 without amendment, it will not become law and our Federal workers, whom I firmly believe are entitled to additional compensation at this time, will suffer as a result.

There are four points about the pending salary legislation which I believe should be made clear.

First, its cost.

The legislation before the Senate has an overall cost of approximately \$750 million. In fact, the most precise estimate that can be made after the hasty action of the two committees in recommending this legislation is \$746 million.

It should be made clear as to how this amount of money is distributed among the employees.

The cost for employees paid under the Classification Act is \$452 million. The cost attributable to the Postal Pay Act is \$252 million. The cost for the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration is \$12,400,000. The cost for the Foreign Service is \$8,600,000. The cost for the legislative and judicial branches is \$5½ million. The final element to be brought into the cost picture results from a provision in the bill which establishes new pay scales for some 15,000 individuals who perform cer-

tain duties in connection with the agricultural conservation and stabilization program. The cost of this action is \$15,500,000.

I think it should be mentioned that the inclusion of the agricultural stabilization and conservation county committees employees will bring all of them under the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act, and the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959.

These employees are hired by farmer-elected, farmer-composed committees, the members of which are not under Federal appointment. These employees are not supervised by a Federal officer. Their tenure, hours of work, salaries, and so forth are wholly controlled by the farmer-elected committees of farmers.

Second, I want to call the Senate's attention to the fact that this is not, in reality, a 7½-percent bill.

H.R. 9883, as passed by the House, gives an average increase for the postal workers at 8.35 percent, or nearly 8.4 percent.

While this is an overall 8.35-percent increase measure for postal workers, it should be noted that the increases are applied unevenly and inequitably, generally to give the least percentage of increase to employees in the most responsible jobs.

Salary levels 7 and above will receive 7½-percent increase, whereas employees in the top steps of the lower level, levels 1 through 6, receive as much as 8.8 percent.

The first step of these lower levels, employing over 60,000 workers, receives a 7½-percent increase, whereas employees in the top step, whose base salaries are already considerably higher than the employees in the lower steps, and who are performing the same duties, will receive increases of 8.7 percent in level 1, 8.6 percent in level 2, 8.4 percent in level 3, 8.3 percent in level 4, 8.3 percent in level 5, and 8.6 percent in level 6.

The application of higher percentage increases in the lower salary levels obviously serves to decrease the percentage differentials as you get into the first line of supervision, differentials which are already precariously narrow in terms of providing incentive for advancement.

The present difference between the top step of level 6 and the top step of level 7 is 8.29 percent. H.R. 9883 would compress the spread to a 7.55 percent differential. From the standpoint of sensible personnel administration in any competent business enterprise this would be immediately recognized as a drastic step in the wrong direction.

I believe that it is most unwise to enact any kind of pay legislation which does not contain adequate provisions for further adjustment of the Federal pay structure.

In 1945, 1946, 1948, 1949, 1951, 1955, and 1958 the Congress took action to increase Federal salaries. Each time it became more apparent that the Congress is not adequately equipped to keep compensation legislation up to date by the unsatisfactory device of biennial hearings. At best these produce much replowing of old ground and the creation of an infinite number of distractions

and distortion of fact and proper relationships.

I have already indicated that the present legislation completely fails to provide for necessary reform in Federal pay statutes. Further, it does not take into account facts already known about numerous kinds of jobs in which Federal compensation is not out of line. It makes no provision at all for correction of the errors which will be compounded by its own provisions.

Third, I would like to call to the attention of the Senate the minority views reported to the House of Representatives in House Report No. 1636 on H.R. 9883. These views were written before the bill was reduced to the so-called 7½-percent legislation before us but they are equally applicable to the present legislation except for certain of the dollar figures therein contained. I would like to quote from that report.

The Congress last year provided \$500,000 for the executive branch to institute a survey of the salary rates being paid by private enterprise for work similar to that performed by Federal employees. We have been advised by the White House that this information will be ready for use by the end of September of this year. This means that the Congress can adopt a principle for compensating Federal employees that can be reasonably compared with those paid by private industry for work of similar skill and responsibility. Never before has the Federal Government had the data upon which to set such pay. It would appear to us that the fairness and objectivity of this principle should appeal to both the Federal employees and the taxpaying public.

We deny that this is a delaying tactic. We maintain that this is the accomplishment of a new and improved principle in personnel administration which in the long run will be more advantageous to the Government and to the public as well. The executive branch representatives have indicated to our committee that they will be able to present to the Congress early in January 1961 pay scales based on these Bureau of Labor Statistics survey findings.

Mr. President, I regret that this report was not available for study by the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, in order that we might have brought to this body statistics and facts that are badly needed if we are to write just and proper pay legislation.

Fourth, I want to state that I believe a pay increase is justified on the basis of information we have regarding the cost-of-living index and the general inflationary trends.

While I cannot support the present bill, I do not believe—based on the cost-of-living index and the inflationary trends—that we should state that the Federal workers are not entitled to some pay increase before the next session of Congress.

It is my intention to offer an amendment to the pending bill which would provide for a 6-percent across-the-board pay increase. When I do this, I realize fully that this does not correct some of the inequalities and injustices that are prevalent in this bill, but if approved by the Senate it would send the bill to conference between the House and Senate, where I believe it could be greatly improved.

I would not want to mislead anyone into believing that I have any assurance that the 6-percent proposal which I am submitting would be acceptable to the President, but I do make this pledge that if this amendment is approved I will do everything in my power to assure it becoming law.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I regret deeply that I must disagree with my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Kansas. The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service did go above, slightly, 7½ percent. We went above 7½ percent in the extremely low grades. We felt that a letter carrier who spends his life in his work, and who after 7 years finally comes up with a gross salary of less than \$400 a month, on which to raise a family and educate his family, is entitled to an increase.

The place where the 7½ percent is exceeded is in the case of the lowest pay grades. Obviously, 7½ percent on a low salary is less of an increase than 7½ percent on a high salary.

If we are to limit the 7½ percent on the \$15,000 and \$17,000 a year positions, then certainly on the \$3,000, \$3,400, and \$4,000 jobs, which are submarginal with today's cost of living, we should go above that limit.

What we mean when we say the bill breaks the 7½ percent rule is that we have added \$5 a year in the low stages, so as to give them a little more meaningful raise. The raise for the bulk of the letter carriers, who form the big portion of postal employees in the first grade, will be \$310. For the second grade, \$330. For the third grade, \$350. For the fourth grade, \$370.

Mr. President, it seems to me that by putting the extra \$5 on the lowest part of the scale, we are only trying to do justice. We do not believe the bill should be criticized because attention has been paid to the substandard incomes of the lower-paid postal employees.

The basis and the genesis of the bill has been the long-time, severe suffering which some of the employees' families have endured.

I do not believe the Post Office has advanced a legitimate argument by saying that we should hold everything at the 7½-percent level, and charging that this is an 8.6 percent or an 8.4-percent increase. That percentage applies only to those who are in the lowest paid scales, and not to the highest paid scales.

I believe the bill has been carefully prepared after long hearings. There is a slight difference, of course, in the percentage of pay increase which the distinguished ranking Republican member of the committee proposes—a 6 percent increase—and the proposal before the Senate providing for a 7½-percent increase.

I call attention to the fact that all these increases will be reduced by the 20 percent income tax which will be deducted from the take-home pay of the employees. They will be further reduced by the 6½ percent retirement contribution; and also by the deduction for the

health program, which amounts to \$12 a month.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In each section where "seven and one-half per centum" is listed, it is proposed to reduce the amount to "six and one-half per centum."

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the majority leader, would he object to a quorum call without the time for the quorum call being charged to either side?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Let the time be charged to both sides on the bill. We have plenty of time on the bill. I shall be happy to accede to the request of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. The distinguished majority leader says we have plenty of time. I am not so sure. The bill provides for more than \$50 million. That is an amount of quite some size.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If there is any question, we will get additional time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be a quorum call, the time for the quorum call to be charged against the time on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. Does the Senator from Texas suggest the absence of a quorum?

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

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

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Kansas yield to himself?

Mr. CARLSON. Ten minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, after sending the amendment to the desk, I find it was improperly drawn. Therefore, I ask that my amendment be modified, so as to read in the way I now submit it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment as modified will be read.

The amendment as modified was read, as follows:

Wherever 7½ per centum appears, it be reduced to 6 per centum and a corresponding reduction made in all schedules.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I offer this amendment because I have a very deep and personal feeling that the employees of the Federal Government are entitled to an increase in pay.

This bill, even with my amendment, will not correct some of the inequalities I have mentioned in my previous remarks. But I believe a 3-percent across-the-board, cost-of-living pay increase can be justified.

That is more than the Bureau of Labor Statistics advised us in the committee the increase in the cost of living has been; the Bureau stated it was 1.6 percent. But after hearing testimony from many of these people, I believe we can well justify a 3-percent increase above the last pay act, that of 1958.

I also feel—based on past history—that in a presidential election year there is an inflationary trend. Present indications are that that trend will develop this year; and I think it might be between 1 percent and 2 percent.

Therefore, I am willing to add 2 percent more to the 3-percent pay increase which I think should be paid, beyond any question, to these Government employees. And to provide good measure, I am willing to throw in 1 more percentage point, thus making a total increase of 6 percent. I am willing to defend that at any time, and that is the reason why I have offered this amendment.

I state frankly, as I have said previously, that I have no assurance from the President that he will sign a 6-percent pay increase bill. But if the Senate adopts this 6-percent amendment, I shall make every effort to see to it that the bill is enacted into law.

I know there are some problems in connection with this pay bill, and I know \$580 million is not a small sum of money for us to vote this afternoon.

On the other hand, when we approach this problem from the point of view of the proposed 7½-percent pay increase, such an increase would involve an added cost of \$750 million, whereas the 6-percent pay raise which I propose by means of my modified amendment would amount to an additional cost of between \$580 million and \$600 million.

I realize that the cost of the amendment I propose will not be small. But, as I have said, my feelings and my sympathies are with these Government employees, who are entitled to a pay increase.

Frankly, I do not believe that House bill 9883, which now calls for a 7½-percent pay increase, will ever give our Federal employees \$1 of pay, although they need a pay increase and are entitled to it. That is why I have offered this amendment.

No great amount of debate on the amendment is needed, for I believe everyone knows the facts.

As I have stated, the bill is an overall bill. I would not have written the bill in the way it now stands. But the bill has been passed by the House of Representatives and is now before us for our consideration.

As we go over the various proposals for the various groups, I believe it important that we keep in mind that these items are rather substantial ones. For instance, the cost for the employees under the Federal Classification Act is \$452 million. The cost attributable to the Postal Pay Act is \$252 million. The cost for the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration is \$12,400,000. The cost for the Foreign Service Act employees is \$8,600,000. The

cost for the legislative and judicial branches is \$5,500,000.

In addition, we added 15,000 new ASC employees, for the first time in our Nation's history, at a cost of \$15,500,000.

Mr. President, it is for that reason that I offer this amendment to reduce the proposed 7½-percent pay increase by 1½ percent, to 6 percent.

If this amendment or a similar amendment is adopted, so we can get the bill into conference, I believe we can iron out, in the conference, some of the difficulties which I believe every fair-minded person will admit should be handled by rewriting some of these provisions.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. Do I correctly understand that the Senator's amendment would effect a reduction in the proposed wage increase from 7½ percent, in the overall, to 6 percent?

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct.

Mr. CHURCH. I should like to have the RECORD show that it has been my own feeling that, as regards the postal workers, the case made out before the congressional committees fully justifies the proposed 7½-percent pay increase.

However, as the Senator from Kansas knows, I have strong misgivings about the justification for a comparable pay increase for all the classified civil service. I feel that the evidence brought before the congressional committees fails to bear out a justification for so large an increase for all Government employees.

The arguments which the Senator from Kansas has made in support of his amendment—to the effect that the bill in its present form does not tend to solve, but, rather, tends to compound, many inequities within the present wage structure of the Government—is one which appeals very strongly to me.

I believe that if the amendment of the Senator from Kansas were adopted, we then would have an opportunity in conference to revise the bill, to the end that some of these inequities could be dealt with.

Therefore, despite the fact that I believe the proposed pay increase for the postal workers, as provided in the bill, is justified, the argument made by the Senator from Kansas is persuasive as to the benefits which would be derived from a conference which could deal with many of the inequities which this bill overlooks in the present wage structure.

So I commend the Senator from Kansas for submitting his amendment; and I state to him that, for these reasons, I shall support his amendment.

Mr. CARLSON. I thank the Senator from Idaho. I know of his interest in the Federal Government employees, because we have discussed this matter together. I call his attention to the fact that even with the proposed reduction from 7½ percent to 6 percent in the postal-pay section of the bill, the postal workers will still have 7 percent or better.

Mr. CHURCH. I recognize that to be the case.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield to me?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I share the views which have been expressed by the distinguished Senator from Idaho. I am rather familiar with the situation of the postal workers. A number of them live in my hometown and work in my home county. I know they are on the borderline of subsistence. I feel satisfied that even though they have had a number of pay raises, their pay is, in many instances, well below the industrial rates. But they have to compete for a standard of living with the industrial workers in their communities.

Therefore, I was very eager to support a bill which would do justice primarily to the low-income groups in the postal service with whom I am familiar, and also a bill which would be enacted into law.

In checking, however, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I found that every type of worker had been put in this bill. For instance, is it not true that there were included consular workers overseas who are getting \$19,200 a year, whose salaries would be raised \$700?

Mr. CARLSON. It was a substantial increase. I do not have the exact figure before me, but that is a correct statement; there was a substantial increase.

Mr. ROBERTSON. As to the average provided in the bill, for the postal worker is it something over 8 percent?

Mr. CARLSON. The bill, H.R. 9983, carries an average increase for postal employees of 8.35 percent.

Mr. ROBERTSON. As I understand the Senator's amendment, while it is an across-the-board increase for those who make the top salaries as well as those who can best prove the need for a salary increase, it will have a better chance, in the opinion of the Senator from Kansas, to be enacted into law. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. It will have a better chance to be enacted into law than the bill as passed on the House side, on which apparently there have been no hearings held either on the House side or the Senate side. Is that correct?

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from Kansas would hope that the amendment would be more acceptable than the 7½-percent increase.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia, desiring to have a reasonable increase for the postal workers, in view of the fact that they are all lumped together in this bill, agrees with the Senator from Idaho that the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas is our best plan to accomplish that purpose.

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

Mr. CARLSON. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wonder if the Senator from Virginia will give heed for a moment? I notice the hearings were on Senate bill 3141, which actually related only to the 2½-percent pay increase and

the feasibility of making that increase permanent. Is that correct?

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I want to correct that statement. While that was the bill introduced, it was a vehicle for considering pay increase for classified and postal workers alike. The hearings and the testimony bear out that fact. Very little was said about the 2½ percent, for everybody realized they are getting that now and that automatically it should go on.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My statement is governed entirely by what I see on the title page of the hearings, because it reads, "S. 3141, a bill to make permanent the temporary increases in rates of basic salary provided for employees in the postal field service, and for other purposes."

That raises this question: Were there any hearings actually held on the House bill that is now before the Senate, which bears the number H.R. 9883?

Mr. CARLSON. There were no hearings on the bill that is before the Senate this morning, H.R. 9883. We did hold hearings on Senate bill 3141, which related to a 2½-percent increase for postal workers, and we had hearings and testimony on pay increases generally. So, while I would not say there were no hearings on pay increases generally, there were no hearings on H.R. 9883 by the Senate committee.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, let us keep the record straight. We reported from the committee a 7½-percent bill, and we also held hearings and reached the conclusion that that was a justifiable pay increase.

Mr. CARLSON. I do not want to have any quarrel with the distinguished chairman of the committee, but the record shows that there were no hearings on the House-passed bill which is on the Senate Calendar. Hearings were held on the 2½-percent increase and pay legislation generally, which is a true statement.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, with respect to the amendment which the distinguished Senator from Kansas has offered, he proposes, as I understand, to substitute his amendment for the 7½ percent increase in every section of the pending bill?

Mr. CARLSON. That is the pending amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And keep in the bill pay increases for the so-called community and county committee men under the ACP agricultural program. Is that correct?

Mr. CARLSON. It would do that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. They are included?

Mr. CARLSON. They are included.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield the distinguished Senator 5 minutes on the bill.

Does it include all members of the legislative branch, meaning, of course, the employees?

Mr. CARLSON. It does.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does it include all employees of the judicial branch?

Mr. CARLSON. It does.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In addition, the amendment of the Senator from Kansas would also include all employees of the executive branch, including, of course, the postal service. Is that correct?

Mr. CARLSON. It does. To keep the RECORD absolutely clear, my amendment would cover classified employees of the Federal Government, postal employees, the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration, the Foreign Service, the legislative and judicial branches of this Government, and 15,000 employees in the ASC who are not now included. It covers every phase of the bill which passed the House.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Did the Senator give an estimate of the cost of his proposal?

Mr. CARLSON. It will cost between \$580 million and \$600 million. Each percentage point is equal, roughly, to \$100 million. The cost of the bill before the Senate is, roughly, \$750 million.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President—  
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator in charge of the time yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the chairman of the committee yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield me 1 minute?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, having visited my senior colleague from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPEL], who was unavoidably detained, he asked me to express his support of my amendment and to state that he is very much interested in securing pay increases for the Federal employees of the United States. He has asked me to make this statement for him and I quote:

Delegation after delegation representing postal employees have conferred with me about this legislation. They have satisfied me that they are entitled to a reasonable increase. In my opinion, an increase in the amount of 6 percent is reasonable. I have advised them that in my judgment any effort to exceed that amount would be opposed by the executive branch and would probably cause the legislation to fail.

Frankly, I think we do a disservice to the Federal employees when we seek to pass legislation that invites a Presidential veto. It may be "smart politics" to support such legislation and then "pass the buck" to the President but that doesn't help those who are finding it more and more difficult to pay their living expenses.

I support the amendment offered by my colleague, Senator CARLSON. The 6 percent it would provide is only 1½ percent less than the increase provided in the legislation now before us. This may seem like an insignificant amount over which to quibble. But from the standpoint of the American taxpayer this amounts to approximately \$200 million per annum. To the Federal employee it may mean the difference between the success or failure of this legislation.

This concludes Senator SCHOEPEL's statement.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, to put at rest the contention that there

have been no hearings held on the bill before the Senate, let us face the fact that the bill which is before us was passed less than 2 days ago. So it would have been impossible for the Senate to have held hearings on the House numbered bill.

I am sure those in the administration who vigorously oppose the bill would not say there had not been any hearings held on the subject, because fully half of the record of the hearings is composed of material and exhibits put in the hearings by the administration, including all kinds of charts, graphs, and dictagrams, and everything else, to try to prove that an increase was unnecessary.

The remainder of the hearings were the pathetic story of postal and Government employees who are trying to live in a 1960 cost-of-living era on less than \$300 a month.

Further to put at rest the question whether these hearings were on postal and classified salary increases, I point out that on the first page of the opening statement of the chairman of the committee, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], in the third paragraph he said:

The committee also desires to receive advice and pertinent information on whether additional adjustments in the salaries of the Postal and Classification Act employees are justified and, if so, to what extent, and in what areas.

The hearings followed that purpose. Let us not have a misleading assumption that there were no hearings held on the bill. I have participated in many pay-raise hearings, and I think the distinguished Senator from Kansas, always a great friend of the Government employees, will admit there were adequate hearings held by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee as to the adequacy of Federal pay.

Mr. President, it is easy to say that a 1-percent pay increase equals \$100 million. Let us face it; that is what the situation is. A 1-percent pay increase equals \$100 million for 1.7 million employees.

The reason why the bill is before us, Mr. President, is that we are dealing with people. We are dealing with human beings, whose employer is Uncle Sam. These people do not have the right to strike, to collectively bargain. They must rest their case in the only court of appeals they have, to keep them from going into debt, to keep them from breaking up their homes, to maintain adequate family standards of living, housing, and education, and so on. The court of appeals for them is the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives.

Let us admit, to begin with, that a 1-percent pay increase equals \$100 million cost in a budget which runs in the neighborhood of \$65 billion to \$70 billion a year. Let us face it. That is what it will cost to provide a pay increase.

Now let us consider the people. People are what make up the United States. People make up the Government service. People make this Government run.

People make the post offices run. People make the Government run in the farflung outposts where we grapple with the threat of Communist countries. The dedicated public servants repair and maintain our missiles, our aircraft, and our trucks. They clean the floors and do the necessary repair work in our public buildings, and so on.

There are 1.7 million of those people involved.

What will the two amendments do? We are talking about people. There are 1.7 million people we are talking about; and, of those, 1 million are people who have salaries below \$5,000 a year, gross. One million of these people are paid less than \$5,000 a year, and many of those have salary ranges from \$3,600 to \$4,200 or \$4,400 a year.

Let us consider a typical case, because it is typical. Let us consider the level 4 of the letter carriers. There are 400,000 of these men. So that we will not be accused of being misleading, by considering the pitifully poor ones, who are beginning work, let us consider the highest wage a letter carrier can earn, after 20 years of service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 5 more minutes?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. After 7 years of service this man attains the top grade, and receives \$4,875 a year. Mr. President, he has no chance for an in-grade promotion. He has no chance to move up, as is true in the classified service or in the congressional offices. This is the top of life for 400,000 employees in the letter carriers' group.

Mr. President, I point out there are almost a million people in a somewhat similar position. I believe this is a typical case.

The bill the committee supports, Mr. President, would give a 7½-percent pay raise, plus \$5 per in-grade step to these men. The reference there is to the fact that for every year the man worked, for the first 7 years, he would get \$5 above the 7½ percent. I do not think that is a bad provision.

Our bill would provide that the man, after working more than 7 years—and for the rest of his life this would be the top he could get—would be paid a grand total of \$430 increase in his gross salary. Mr. President, this equals \$35 a month, according to my arithmetic, which we are talking about under the so-called exorbitant increase, which, I admit, runs a little above 7½ percent for these men. As a matter of fact, for the top of this grade, for these particular people, the increase would be 8.8 percent.

Mr. President, let us consider what the take-home pay of this man will be. We have a 20-percent income tax for people in this grade. The man, of course, has used up his deductible, unless he should have more children—and I am sure such

a man will be trying not to have more children, at this salary. Therefore, from the \$35 a month increase we would give him, he would pay back to Uncle Sam \$7 in income taxes.

Mr. President, we also have a 6½-percent retirement provision. I grant that the retirement payment builds up the man's retirement benefit when he gets too old to work, and is of benefit to him. When his feet break down, when he reaches the age of 65, or when he gets arthritis and cannot carry the mail, there is no nice spot in the Cabinet for him to fill. There is no nice spot keeping track of filing papers or something for this man. When a man is a letter-carrier, and his feet give out, he goes on the retirement roll.

Mr. President, I ask Senators to bear in mind that this is a 6½ percent deduction from the monthly \$35 increase we would provide. Therefore, the man would have to give back to Uncle Sam, to the retirement fund, \$2.28.

Then, with a great stroke, I think—I do not believe a Member of the Senate voted against it—we passed the great Dick Neuberger bill. That was the Neuberger-Johnson bill for health protection. That is the health insurance bill for these employees. The employees are signing up this week and next week. The employees must decide whether they will try to have a health program for their families or not. If they have families—and most letter carriers have families, as most other people do—it will cost these men approximately \$12 a month to pay for the health insurance program.

I think that is a good program. I think the employees should enter it. However, we must bear in mind the fact that the money must come from the take-home pay. From the \$35 a month increase we want to provide, under the 7½-percent provision there would be a total of approximately \$21.28 deducted.

Actually, Mr. President, these men would get very little money which they could spend from the pay increase. Approximately \$21.28 would be deducted from the \$35 pay raise they would get. The rest is all the money they could take home, to say to their wives, "Honey, I brought home a raise."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has again expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 3 more minutes?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, these men would say, "Honey, I brought home this big raise which Congress voted. I have brought home nearly \$14 for additional groceries or clothes for the children this month."

That is approximately \$3.50 a week, or 50 cents a day, Mr. President. These pay deductions are for benefits which are of help to the employees, I am sure, but, Mr. President, when we talk about a steel settlement, when we talk about a

settlement with the auto workers, when we talk about any other settlement in a labor dispute, practically all of these fringe benefits I have mentioned have been given in totality as a part of the bargaining, as fringe benefits. The figures we get, with respect to a 3½ percent increase or a 5 percent increase for the steel workers, do not include these other benefits for which we charge our Federal employees. Our employees have to take pay deductions for them. Our employees pay for those benefits.

Let us consider the take-home pay. The take-home pay will be 50 cents a day.

Under the 6-percent increase provision, we would have the magnificent increase, in this same grade, for the old-time letter carrier, who has worked all his life, of \$268.50 a year. That is \$22.37 a month.

After we deduct approximately \$19.17, which this employees would have to pay back to the Federal Government in income taxes, retirement, and for the health program, what would the employee receive? He would receive \$4.70 per month net take-home pay, to take to his wife, so that she could buy a new dress, perhaps. Perhaps she could buy the baby a pair of shoes. That is \$4.70 per month, \$1.20 per week, or less than 20 cents per day.

Mr. President, I am concerned about the cost of Government, but I do not believe that a government which can spend money for outer space exploration, which can spend money for research and development, and which can spend money to build great new buildings—we are going to build downtown some four or five buildings, in the General Services Administration program—ought to wring the money out of the lowest salaried people who work, who can look only to the Congress for a pay wage adjustment.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me? Does the Senator have additional time?

Mr. MONRONEY. If the Senator from South Carolina will yield me 2 minutes, I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, is it not the view of the Senator from Oklahoma that the cost of Government would increase very substantially if the ability and efficiency of Government employees were to decline?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am certain that would be true. If these people are held submerged beneath a decent standard of living, if their families are broken up, if there are foreclosures and garnishments and the loss of homes, because of an inability to meet repair bills and other costs, I would say that we would see a general collapse of the great cadre of people who keep Government afloat. On the floor of the Senate we say this is the greatest Government and the best

administered Government under a civil service system on the face of the globe.

Mr. CLARK. Is it not clear to my friend from Oklahoma that private industry is in constant competition with Government employees for the brains and ability of America as they come from our schools and universities?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. CLARK. Is it not clear to my friend from Oklahoma that, unless we keep the salary and wage standard of our Government employees at least reasonably competitive with that of private industry, it is a certainty that the Government service will lose a very large proportion of its capable and able employees?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is absolutely correct. We are losing an alarming number of people, as is pointed out in the report of the committee which is before us.

1. The Government is losing an alarming number of career engineers, scientists, and professional personnel to private industry because of an unfavorable competitive position with respect to compensation.

2. The most highly skilled are leaving the service and replacements are below the quality needed to maintain the standard of service desired.

The situation is worse in the skilled fields. It now amounts to almost a continual revolving personnel in the lower grades of the Post Office Department. Postmasters whom I know tell me they cannot possibly fill those jobs with competent people at present wages because every other employer in town can outbid them in salary.

Mr. CLARK. Does not my friend feel that the bill now before us makes only a modest effort to achieve that kind of parity for Government employees which the Senator has agreed is essential to the future welfare and well-being of employees in the Government service?

Mr. MONRONEY. I would say not quite parity. As in the farm program, I would say it is somewhere between 65 and 80 percent of parity as compared with other wages.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend for his answers.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President I yield to myself 5 minutes.

Something has been said in regard to the hearings on the bill. The fact is that during the hearings on the bill most of the witnesses who testified were officers and employees of the Government. Over half of the testimony presented at the time was given by officers and employees of the Government. A good many of them were from the Post Office Department.

The committee reached the conclusion from all the facts presented that a 7½-percent increase was the lowest we could give to Government workers and do justice to them at all. We found it to be true that the 800,000 blue-collar workers who worked for the Government at the time received a far greater increase in pay from the Government of the United States than did workers covered under the bill. Those facts

were brought out before the committee at our hearings.

I call the attention of the Senate to another fact that we sometimes forget. The revenue of the Government will be increased if the bill is passed. If we give increases in pay to Government workers which will approximate \$700 million, we will find that at least \$150 million of that amount will never leave the Treasury of the Government, but will be retained from the pay of the workers as a withholding tax.

Therefore the Government workers themselves in reality will receive only about 6 percent increase in pay from the Government after income taxes alone are deducted. That does not take into account increases in deductions for retirement and other funds which would be made. I ask the Senate not to forget that fact. Employees would receive only 6 percent net, which is what the Senator from Kansas proposes.

I noticed that the Senator from Kansas said in his speech that we propose to give the Government employees 7½ percent, and then we give them 1 percent here and there. I do not know why he stopped there. I do not know why he did not propose to give them the other 1½ percent, which I think is what they are really entitled to in equity. That is what the committee did, and as I remember, the committee report was unanimously agreed to.

The Senator from Kansas reserved the right to offer amendments in the Senate at the time the bill was reported. The members of the committee, having conducted hearings and discussed the subject, believe that Government workers are entitled to a 7½-percent increase and the three other small increases which are contained in the bill, and to which I have already called attention.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. CARLSON. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I share with the distinguished occupant of the Chair [Mr. KEATING] representation of a State which in the Post Office service has an enormous representation of the number of employees affected. We have in the New York Post Office alone 35,000 employees. Everyone knows that there has been a great amount of interest expressed by postal employees in the proposed increase in their compensation.

I think there is one point that must be emphasized as we consider the amendment and as we consider the bill, and that is that I believe postal employees will feel that they have by no means attained the result which they have been seeking. I think we will be fortunate if we give them the 7½ percent if they feel that this is even a small measure of justice.

I have attended a great many meetings of postal employees, and I have



talked not only with the bread winners of the families, but with their wives, who have to make ends meet, and I have talked with many postal employees who must hold down two jobs in order to make a living, or have their wives work, notwithstanding that they do a full day's work, for which they ought to earn enough to support a family. It is a matter of disgrace for an official of the United States to have to face this kind of justifiable criticism on the part of employees.

Let us never forget that if the postal employee is to receive any kind of economic justice, we must give it to him. He has no other remedy. He does not have the privilege of economic bargaining. He cannot get another job unless he wishes to leave the service and relinquish years of investment in his own future security. He has no opportunity to go into business for himself. Only we can give him justice.

The ultimate verity in respect of whether a 7½-percent increase is the very minimum that we possibly can give is found in a comparison of the rates of compensation between the employees who are included in the bill and those engaged in similar endeavors in the private economic system, and also between the employees included in the bill and those engaged in public work, such as policemen, firemen, and other employees in municipalities and in States.

When we make such comparisons we find that even after we give Government employees the proposed increase, they will still be under par.

For some reason or other it is disadvantageous to work for the Federal Government in terms of compensation. For that reason the argument that in order to retain an effective work force we must meet economic competition is an extremely sound one.

Finally, all of us are deeply concerned about international tensions, and we realize the tremendous responsibility which is vested in our Government employees to maintain at the highest peak of efficiency our Government machinery today in the face of international tensions.

There is great dissatisfaction especially in the postal service, a dissatisfaction which we will not satisfy completely by what we propose to do here, but which will make considerable progress toward meeting that dissatisfaction.

Finally, we are urged to keep within the budget in terms of the surplus which we expect to attain. I feel as keenly about that as any other Senator. What we have to remember, though, is the great American tradition which we enforce on corporations, just as we should enforce it on government itself, and that is, that we do not take it out of the backs of our employees. I would like to repeat that, because this is an important point. We do not take that kind of economy out of the backs of our employees.

Every legitimate survey which we have had made shows that the United States is able to pay its bills and is able

to carry out its responsibilities. Where we must deal with this question of the budget and the savings, we must make certain that we do not take it out of the backs of our employees. If we can find no other way, we will have to consider the continuation of certain taxes. It seems to me we must face that issue squarely and honestly. If we must do everything we are doing and must spend all that we are spending in every way which is now encompassed in the budget, rather than taking the necessary savings out of the back of our employees, who are solely dependent upon us for economic justice, we must deal with it in our tax bill and continue taxes which we might otherwise not wish to continue, in order to see that the United States does this measure of justice to the people who make it what it is.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I suggest that we let it run sufficiently long so that all Senators may be notified, and that the time be charged to both sides.

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

#### THE BOMBARDMENT OF THE CHINESE OFFSHORE ISLANDS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the news ticker brings us the information that the Chinese Communists have opened fire on Nationalist-held offshore islands to protest against President Eisenhower's visit to Formosa tomorrow.

According to the report, the Communist news agency boasted that the gunners shouted anti-American slogans as they opened fire. The bombardment was described as a "furious rain of shells" on the Quemoy Islands.

Mr. President, this is another step in the massive effort by the Communists to humiliate the United States and to seal off as many people as possible from contact with freedom. There is not even the slightest effort to conceal Communist aims.

This demonstrates the wisdom of the Senate in strengthening the defense bill that was before us yesterday. It is evident that the Communists will use force in any area where they believe there is not sufficient counterforce to block their aggression. The free world can exist only to the extent that it can defend itself or has a capacity for retaliation.

I think we must demonstrate similar foresightedness in our efforts to reach the uncommitted people of the world. Where the Communists ask them to respond to brute strength, we must appeal to the desire for dignity, freedom, and a degree of security.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record

as a part of my remarks the item from the United Press ticker concerning the bombardment of the offshore islands.

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

Tokyo.—Red China announced that "thousands of guns" on its Fukien Province coast began shelling the Nationalist-held offshore islands tonight in an angry demonstration against President Eisenhower's visit to Formosa tomorrow.

"Thousands of guns roared the instant the order was issued and innumerable flashes cut through the dark sky over the Taiwan (Formosa) straits," the official Communist New China News Agency said in a broadcast heard in Tokyo.

The Communist news agency said the gunners shouted anti-American slogans as they opened fire. They shouted such things, it said, as "Eisenhower go back—fire"; "U.S. aggressors get out of Japan—fire"; and "Get out of Asia—fire."

The broadcast said that a "furious rain of shells poured down on the Quemoy Islands."

Radio Peiping and NCA said the bombardment began at 8 p.m. mainland China time (8 a.m. edt). The news agency said "the powerful shelling in demonstration against the United States" was "still continuing," but did not give any indication at that time the bombardment would stop.

The agency said the soldiers who manned the guns and "civilians at the Fukien front" held "meetings and forums" earlier in the day to protest the "plotting of new wars in Asia and (the) hostile attitude of the United States to the Chinese people."

"The Chinese people opposed the coming to Taiwan of warmonger Eisenhower and \* \* \* would resolutely persist in the struggle as long as the U.S. aggressors remain in Taiwan."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I plead with my colleagues in Congress and with freedom-loving people everywhere to keep their powder dry and to close ranks.

#### ADJUSTMENT OF COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9883) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Kansas would like to have a yea-and-nay vote on his amendment. I therefore ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes. Then I shall be ready to vote.

I offered my amendment to the bill (H.R. 9883), reducing the amount from 7½ percent to 6 percent, across the board. I do not for this reason. I do not know of any Senator who can sincerely state that he believes a 7½-percent pay increase bill will become law. I would be less than frank if I did not state also that I am not sure that a 6-percent bill will become law. However, I feel it has a much better chance of becoming law than has a 7½-percent bill. Not only that, but it shows that I am sincerely trying to do something for the Federal workers. I want them to get a pay raise. I do not want to try to get

something for them that I know cannot become law. It is for that reason that I offered my amendment calling for a 6-percent increase. The bill is not in the form in which I would have drawn it, but it is the best we can do at this moment. I urge the Senate to adopt my amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes. I am opposed to the amendment. I believe that even a 7½-percent increase is not a sufficient amount to balance the workers who are included in the bill with other employees of the United States subject to the wage board system. I feel that if the amendment shall be adopted it will mean the death of any such legislation at this session of Congress. My reason for making that statement is that we have tried to work and get together with the House in connection with a bill calling for a 7½-percent increase. The House reduced its amount from 9 percent to 7½ percent after it had reported the bill from committee. Therefore we have a bill before us that we can get to the President's desk in time for him either to sign or not while Congress is still in session. If we add amendments to the bill, and if we adjourn on the day when I think we will adjourn, no pay raise bill will be passed by the House and Senate in time to put it on the President's desk in time to keep him from pocket-vetoing it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We have been talking here since January about a 10-percent raise, a 9-percent raise, and finally a 7½-percent increase. Leaders of our Government participated in and contributed toward working out a settlement involving the steelworkers. I do not begrudge anyone an increase to which he is entitled.

However, I think we should bear in mind that 75 percent of the postal workers make less than \$3,800 a year. After 25 percent of their pay has been deducted for income tax and insurance, most of the families of the postal workers are trying to exist on less than \$300 a month.

I am convinced, after observing the action in the House, where a bill providing for a 9-percent increase was reported, but as to which the employees' groups willingly accepted 7½ percent, that if the Senate begins to amend and change the bill now so as to make the amount 8 percent or 6 percent, or any other figure, all we will do will be to kill the bill. I think a vote for the 6-percent amendment is a vote to kill the bill. It is a vote against any pay-increase legislation. So far as I am concerned, I do not want that blood on my hands. I shall support the committee bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I agree with the majority leader. If it is desired to kill the bill, then the amendment of the Senator from Kansas should be agreed to.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield 1 minute.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the bill apply to the members of my staff?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It applies on a permissive basis to the members of the Senator's staff. The Senator can increase the salaries of the members of his staff or not as he desires.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. There is nothing mandatory about that, as I understand it. We proceed on the assumption that the members of our own staffs are as patriotic and competent and are as much entitled to consideration as the members of any other Senator's staff. However, there is no provision in the bill which requires any Senator who believes his staff is not entitled to an increase to give it to them.

Each year, I turn back funds allotted to the various committees over which I preside and allotted to my own office, when I feel that the money is not needed. Each Senator can be his own judge. The bill merely provides for an increase for all employees.

Someone raised a question with me a while ago about administrative assistants. I inquired into the matter and found that in the Senate there are 100 administrative assistants. Fifty-four of them are not paid what is authorized to be paid now, because the judgment of the Senators is that they should not be paid more than they now receive. Only 46 are paid the amount which is authorized.

There is nothing in the bill which requires that those 46 be paid the 7½-percent increase. But if they were so paid, it would mean for 46 persons an amount of less than \$50,000 out of the \$7 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, may I have 1 more minute, to clarify my position?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I do not want my question to imply that I feel the pay increase should be mandatorily applicable to the members of my staff. On the basis of the salaries which are paid to employees in private industry in Ohio, the salaries which I pay are grossly disproportionate. They are so high that I frequently feel I am not fair to the taxpayers. The salaries which I pay are paid on the basis of comparison with those which other Senators pay.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not want to have the responsibility for the salaries which the Senator from Ohio pays the members of his staff. If he is paying too much, he should reduce the salaries. He is the sole judge of the salaries he pays to the members of his own staff. He may pay them what he wishes to pay. There is nothing in the law which requires him to pay anyone anything.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I do not want the Senator from Texas to escape the reality that the salaries I pay must inevitably

be fixed on the basis of the salaries which other Senators pay.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kansas. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPEL] are absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPEL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay," and the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 54, as follows:

[No. 223]

YEAS—28

Allott	Curtis	Morton
Bennett	Dworshak	Prouty
Bridges	Ervin	Robertson
Brunsdale	Goldwater	Saltonstall
Bush	Hayden	Talmadge
Byrd, Va.	Hickenlooper	Thurmond
Carlson	Holland	Wiley
Case, S. Dak.	Lausche	Williams, Del.
Church	McClellan	
Cooper	Martin	

NAYS—54

Aiken	Gore	McGee
Anderson	Green	Magnuson
Bartlett	Gruening	Mansfield
Beall	Hart	Monroney
Bible	Hartke	Moss
Byrd, W. Va.	Hill	Murray
Cannon	Humphrey	Muskie
Case, N.J.	Jackson	Pastore
Chavez	Javits	Proxmire
Clark	Johnson, Tex.	Randolph
Dirksen	Johnston, S.C.	Scott
Dodd	Jordan	Smathers
Douglas	Keating	Smith
Eastland	Kerr	Sparkman
Ellender	Kuchel	Symington
Engle	Long, La.	Williams, N.J.
Fong	Lusk	Young, N. Dak.
Frear	McCarthy	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—18

Butler	Hruska	Mundt
Capehart	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Carroll	Kennedy	Russell
Cotton	Long, Hawaii	Schoeppel
Fulbright	McNamara	Stennis
Hennings	Morse	Yarborough

So Mr. CARLSON's amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I submit an amendment which I send to the desk, and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Beginning on page 17, in line 11, it is proposed to strike out all through line 6, on page 20.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may the amendment be read again?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be read again.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Beginning on page 17, in line 11, it is proposed to strike out all through line 6, on page 20, being the section entitled "Employees in the Legislative Branch."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Louisiana yield to himself?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana will state it.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much time is available to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield myself 10 minutes, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am taken by surprise, by having this bill come up so suddenly. I was very busy yesterday afternoon, as well as today, in hearings on the mutual security program.

Mr. President, I wish to say I am all for a fair wage increase for Federal employees. In the last vote, I voted to

sustain the committee in maintaining a 7½-percent increase.

The purpose of my amendment is to strike from the bill the provision authorizing pay increases for all employees connected with the legislative branch of our Government. It has been our custom in the past to fix salaries for our employees, independently of any hard and fast wage scale; we have a method of our own for handling salaries of legislative employees.

I wish to point out that when the House first considered pay legislation, the original House committee bill contained a provision which would have increased the salaries of Senate administrative assistants from \$16,300 to almost \$19,000 per year. That provision, of course, was deleted, so that those employees are in about the same category as employees in the Civil Service and the Postal Department, that is, they would receive an across-the-board 7.5-percent raise.

It is my belief that, since we have a method of our own for fixing salaries in the Senate we should not burden this bill with raises for legislative employees. That matter should be handled separately.

As I have already stated, the purpose of this amendment is to delete from the bill those sections extending the 7.5-percent pay raise to employees of the legislative branch. In this connection, Mr. President, I believe a little background might be in order.

Under existing law, Senators can pay one employee up to \$16,300 per year, a second up to \$15,731 per year, and a third employee up to \$15,044 per year, with a maximum limitation as to all other employees of \$10,221 per year, with the actual number of such employees being so compensated subject only to the overall limitation of salary funds available to individual Senators.

The total clerk hire figure available to Senators is dependent, of course, upon the populations of the respective States.

Now, it goes without saying, Mr. President, that these are far from starvation-level salaries. As a matter of fact, the salaries I have indicated are, as I believe Senators will agree, relatively handsome amounts of money.

Yet, as I pointed out earlier, in the original version of H.R. 9883, the so-called 9-percent pay increase bill, quite a few little gadgets were inserted to further increase the salaries of legislative employees. The bill, at first reading, would have apparently only accorded a flat 9 percent increase to employees in Senator's offices, and employees of Senate committees. The top bracket limitation was raised from \$16,300 per year to \$17,525 per year. However, in a subsequent subsection of the same section of the bill, the basic salary limitation for the top three employees in Senator's offices and committee staffs would have been geared to the three highest brackets of the classified schedule. In other words, by so doing, an increase in compensation for the three top brackets of the classified figure would have, of and by itself, raised the maximum amount which Senators could pay to their three

top office staff employees, and other top employees of committees. In effect, the limitation, would have increased from \$16,300 per year for the administrative assistant, to \$18,964 per year; for the second ranking employee, the maximum would have been fixed at \$17,788 per year, compared with \$15,731 per year under existing law. A third employee could have been paid up to \$16,505 per year, compared with \$15,044 per year under existing law. The maximum pay level for employees in Senators' offices, other than the top three, salary would have been raised to \$11,141 per year, as opposed to \$10,221, under existing law.

Furthermore, as indicated earlier, any increase in the upper limits of the three highest existing civil service classifications would have been automatically fixed as the maximums for employees of Senators and employees of Senate committees. In addition, should any new grades have been added to the Classification Act, these new limitations would have become the maximum, since the bill states that the maximum salaries of Senate employees in these categories would have been equal to the maximum established for the third highest grades under the classification figure.

I hasten to add, of course, that no Senator would have been required to pass these increases on to his staff members, but the fact is, that for all practical purposes, the original bill would have considerably lessened the Senators' control over maximum salaries which Senators could pay to their office employees, and employees of Senate committees.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, for the information of the Senator, I agree thoroughly with what he has been saying. The House bill has been amended, and the bill before the Senate at the present time gives each Senator the right to regulate all salaries within his office.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am pleased to note that these sections have been removed from the pending bill, and that the measure as it is now written merely extends a flat 7.5-percent increase in the maximum compensation which could be paid to employees in Senators' offices and employees of Senate committees, but the fact still remains that the new limitations so provided, are amazingly high. Administrative assistants, for example, could receive up to \$17,525 per year, compared with \$16,300 per year, the present maximum. One other employee could be compensated up to \$16,911, as compared with \$15,731 per year under existing law. A third employee could receive as much as \$16,733 per year, as compared with the maximum presently available for such third employee of \$15,044 per year.

It is now proposed to so legislate that every Senator will almost be compelled to increase by 7½ percent the salary of an administrative assistant who is now getting \$16,300, as well as salaries of other employees in his office.

Let me be perfectly frank. I believe the amount that is now being paid to employees in the legislative branch is ample for their needs.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina.  
Mr. President—

Mr. ELLENDER. I am on limited time.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I will take it out of my time if necessary.

Mr. ELLENDER. Very well.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to point out that at the present time only 46 percent of the Senators pay the maximum. In the future, if the Senator wanted to keep down the payments, he could do so. Any Senator could do so. However, 54 percent of the Senators are paying the maximum. Some of them may want to increase it; some may not. That is exactly what the bill provides a Senator can do.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is my belief that if we follow that policy and provide a 7½-percent increase, it ought to be made obligatory.

The point I wish to make is that we have a method for fixing salaries of our employees which is peculiar to the Senate and to the House of Representatives. We can give increases in such manner as we determine, within broad limits, of course.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point a document headed "Salary Tables, U.S. Senate." This document illustrates the broad flexibility available to Senators in fixing salaries of their employees, utilizing the basic salary amounts available to each. This table shows, for instance, that by designating a basic salary of \$4,500, a Senator can give to an employee in his office a gross salary of \$9,134.05. The difference is paid by the Government. In any event, this schedule demonstrates the latitude available to Senators in fixing salaries of their employees, and fortifies my position to the effect that legislative employees' salaries should not be dealt with in general Federal pay legislation.

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

Salary tables, U.S. Senate, effective July 1, 1958

(Retroactive to Jan. 1, 1958)

Basic per annum:	Gross per annum
\$60	\$87.40
\$120	1,010.32
\$180	1,133.24
\$240	1,256.16
\$300	1,379.08
\$360	1,502.00
\$420	1,624.93
\$480	1,747.84
\$540	1,870.77
\$600	1,993.69
\$660	2,116.60
\$720	2,239.53
\$780	2,362.44
\$840	2,485.36
\$900	2,608.27
\$960	2,731.19
\$1,020	2,854.10
\$1,080	2,977.02
\$1,140	3,100.93
\$1,200	3,224.85
\$1,260	3,348.76
\$1,320	3,472.68
\$1,380	3,596.59
\$1,440	3,720.51
\$1,500	3,844.42
\$1,560	3,968.34
\$1,620	4,092.25

Salary tables, U.S. Senate, effective July 1, 1958—Continued

Basic per annum:	Gross per annum
\$1,680	\$3,216.16
\$1,740	3,339.31
\$1,800	3,462.46
\$1,860	3,585.60
\$1,920	3,708.75
\$1,980	3,831.89
\$2,040	3,955.04
\$2,100	4,078.18
\$2,160	4,201.33
\$2,220	4,324.47
\$2,280	4,447.61
\$2,340	4,570.76
\$2,400	4,693.90
\$2,460	4,817.04
\$2,520	4,940.19
\$2,580	5,063.33
\$2,640	5,186.48
\$2,700	5,309.62
\$2,760	5,432.76
\$2,820	5,555.91
\$2,880	5,679.05
\$2,940	5,802.19
\$3,000	5,925.34
\$3,060	6,048.48
\$3,120	6,171.62
\$3,180	6,294.77
\$3,240	6,417.91
\$3,300	6,541.05
\$3,360	6,664.19
\$3,420	6,787.34
\$3,480	6,910.48
\$3,540	7,033.62
\$3,600	7,156.77
\$3,660	7,279.91
\$3,720	7,403.05
\$3,780	7,526.19
\$3,840	7,649.34
\$3,900	7,772.48
\$3,960	7,895.62
\$4,020	8,018.77
\$4,080	8,141.91
\$4,140	8,265.05
\$4,200	8,388.19
\$4,260	8,511.34
\$4,320	8,634.48
\$4,380	8,757.62
\$4,440	8,880.77
\$4,500	9,003.91
\$4,560	9,127.05
\$4,620	9,250.19
\$4,680	9,373.34
\$4,740	9,496.48
\$4,800	9,619.62
\$4,860	9,742.77
\$4,920	9,865.91
\$4,980	9,989.05
\$5,040	10,112.19
\$5,100	10,235.34
\$5,160	10,358.48
\$5,220	10,481.62
\$5,280	10,604.77
\$5,340	10,727.91
\$5,400	10,851.05
\$5,460	10,974.19
\$5,520	11,097.34
\$5,580	11,220.48
\$5,640	11,343.62
\$5,700	11,466.77
\$5,760	11,589.91
\$5,820	11,713.05
\$5,880	11,836.19
\$5,940	11,959.34
\$6,000	12,082.48
\$6,060	12,205.62
\$6,120	12,328.77
\$6,180	12,451.91
\$6,240	12,575.05
\$6,300	12,698.19
\$6,360	12,821.34
\$6,420	12,944.48
\$6,480	13,067.62
\$6,540	13,190.77
\$6,600	13,313.91
\$6,660	13,437.05
\$6,720	13,560.19
\$6,780	13,683.34
\$6,840	13,806.48

Salary tables, U.S. Senate, effective July 1, 1958—Continued

Basic per annum:	Gross per annum
\$6,900	\$13,929.62
\$6,960	14,052.77
\$7,020	14,175.91
\$7,080	14,299.05
\$7,140	14,422.19
\$7,200	14,545.34
\$7,260	14,668.48
\$7,320	14,791.62
\$7,380	14,914.77
\$7,440	15,037.91
\$7,500	15,161.05
\$7,560	15,284.19
\$7,620	15,407.34
\$7,680	15,530.48
\$7,740	15,653.62
\$7,800	15,776.77
\$7,860	15,899.91
\$7,920	16,023.05
\$7,980	16,146.19
\$8,000 <sup>1</sup>	16,269.34
\$8,040	16,392.48
\$8,100	16,515.62
\$8,160	16,638.77
\$8,220	16,761.91
\$8,280	16,885.05
\$8,340	17,008.19
\$8,400	17,131.34
\$8,460	17,254.48
\$8,520	17,377.62
\$8,580	17,500.77
\$8,640	17,623.91
\$8,700	17,747.05
\$8,760	17,870.19
\$8,820	17,993.34
\$8,880	18,116.48

<sup>1</sup> Committee use only.

Mr. ELLENDER. What is proposed would make it possible for an employee of the Senate to get a salary increase of 7½ percent when most are already getting ample salaries. That is why I am opposed to it.

Since the primary purpose of this bill is to help postal and civil service employees in the low pay brackets, it is my belief we should confine the provisions of the bill to them.

I know, of my own knowledge, that many postal employees are paid just about what a janitor gets around here, and that is very small remuneration. I am for a bill that will give to the lower paid employees fair additional compensation.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. Personally, I have doubts as to whether anyone will get a pay raise if all these additional emoluments are made available.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I point out that the same argument which the Senator has used with relation to pay increases in the higher pay brackets in the legislative branch would be multiplied a thousand times when related to classified employees and postal employees, because a great many of those employees are in those high classifications. To be consistent, the Senator ought to apply his proposal to the lower grades of all Federal employees.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am glad to inform the Senator that I shall offer an amendment to make the pay increase applicable only to employees

whose salaries are not over \$10,000 per year.

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

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

Mr. President, I yield myself such time as is required.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The statement has been made that the increase for the \$16,300-a-year employee will not apply unless the Senator determines it shall be applied. I wonder if the Senator from Louisiana understands that under the provisions of the bill, affirmative action on the part of the Senator is required, and that the Senator must notify the disbursing officer he does not want the increase applied to a particular employee.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. No; that is a mistake.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator must take some action.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let us get this clear. Does the Senator have to take some action?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator must, yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the Senator must take some action, this language is intended to "put him on the spot."

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How can I tell my employee, "I refuse to give you the 7½-percent increase"? It is blackmail, defying me to deny the increase. With the condition the country is in peculiarly today, I do not believe we ought to increase the salaries of these \$16,300-a-year employees by 7½ percent. There must be motives other than a desire to deal fairly with these employees.

If I increase the salary of my assistant by \$1,050 a year and the Senator's assistant finds out about it, and the Senator tells him, "You cannot have it," what position will the Senator from Louisiana then be in?

Mr. ELLENDER. I would not like to describe it. [Laughter.]

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. This is nothing more than "putting the bee" on us.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator pay his administrative assistant the maximum salary now?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand that 56 assistants are not paid the maximum salary now, and 44 are. That is a matter within the discretion of each Senator. Who is better able to determine what a Senator's employee is worth than the Senator himself?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, it is not a question of worth at all. My administrative assistant is seated next to me. He is second to none in the Senate. He worked for me for quite a few years before I assigned him the position of administrative assistant. Only a few years ago I elevated him to that position.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am not questioning that statement.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand. The point is that there should be some kind of uniformity imposed here. We have

a method under which we can proceed, which is peculiar to the Senate and to the House of Representatives.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is not changed in the slightest.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, it is.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It is not.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is, as the Senator from Ohio pointed out.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. How did the Senator from Ohio point it out?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let us find out.

Mr. ELLENDER. We are asked to make it possible to change.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is an automatic increase, unless the Senator goes to the disbursing officer.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. No.

Mr. ELLENDER. Action must be taken by the Senator.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Action must be taken?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Where does it so provide in the bill? Let us find out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I suggest that the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] clear up the matter. He is chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. In the meantime, Mr. President, I repeat that we have our own method of dealing with our employees. If a Senator is desirous of increasing the salary of any of his employees, he can do so under the rules and regulations set out for the Senate, up to \$16,300 per year, for one employee. Certainly, this is ample salary. Why make it possible to add another 7½ percent to each employee's salary?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. The pay of the legislative employees is sufficient that we should not at this time increase their salaries.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am sorry I voted against the general franking privilege, which would have permitted a Senator to send unaddressed letters, so that to each citizen of the United States could go a letter that our staff employees are paid \$16,300 a year now and, under the pretense of helping the underpaid postal workers, we are giving these employees a 7½ percent pay increase.

Very few of the Senators on the floor, under those conditions, would vote for this proposal. They would then support the proposal of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have conferred with Mr. Brenkworth, who handles legislative matters for the Senate, and who has done so for some time. I think

he is a dependable and competent employee.

To those who are having some difficulty understanding the bill, I may say, I am informed this is language identical to that carried in other acts.

I ask Senators to turn to section 117(a) of the bill.

Section 117(a) provides, in effect, that every employee in the Senate shall receive a 7½-percent pay increase. That is clear. It refers to the Parliamentarian. It refers to the reading clerk. It refers to the Sergeant at Arms.

The next paragraph, paragraph (b), takes care of any individual Senator who does not feel his employees should have the 7½-percent pay increases. A good many Senators so feel.

It is provided that the increase is taken away from the employees in the Senator's office. That is provided in paragraph (b). We do not provide for a raise for the Senator's office unless the Senator "in the case of any employee on or before the 15th day following the date of enactment of this Act notifies the Disbursing Office of the Senate" that he wishes the employee to have the pay increase.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, that confirms exactly what I said. The Senator must take this action.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am not talking about what the Senator said. I am trying to explain what is in the bill. The Senator can interpret the provision as he wishes. That is the language we have had in other bills.

It seems to me reasonable, if we are going to raise the salaries of all the employees in the Government service by 7½ percent, that we should have such a provision. There is no reason why a Senator should not have individual authority to extend the pay increase to some employee in his office. This is simply the same right which is being extended to the postal employees and the other Federal employees.

If we do not have such a provision, we will find that our employees will leave us to take the other jobs.

The only explanation I can think of is that perhaps the Senator is willing to admit the employees are overpaid now. I am not going to say what is the Senator's opinion.

Mr. President, the only point I make is that this is the same as the language which was in the 1955 act and in the 1958 act. That is point No. 1.

Point No. 2 is that we are raising the salaries of postal employees and of all Federal employees. We are raising salaries of some 2.4 million people. We are saying, "We are going to give you a 7½-percent pay increase."

The steelworkers got a pay increase. Other people got pay increases.

In the next paragraph we have provided that no Senate employee in a Senator's office will receive the pay increase unless the Senator wants the employee to receive it. We leave it up to the Senator's judgment. We leave it up to the management of the individual Senator and the judgment of the individual Sen-

ator, even though sometimes I do not agree with them.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. If we do not approve an increase for legislative employees now, we will have to pass at another time in this session, a special act to do so, anyway. So what difference does it make how we do it?

Mr. ELLENDER. I say to the Senator from Rhode Island that we do not have to do either.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator from Louisiana mean that he proposes to raise the pay of all Federal employees and not raise the pay of legislative employees? Why does he seek to discriminate?

Mr. ELLENDER. If the salaries of postal employees were equal to the present salaries of legislative employees, this bill would not be before us.

Mr. PASTORE. I consider my assistants as well qualified as are the assistants of the President of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have a great admiration for the postal employees. I think they are wonderful people. I have respect for postal employees. But I do not yield to anyone with respect to the devotion and service of my own employees, and I am not willing to say that I will approve increases in pay for the employees of everyone else except those in my own office.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I could not agree more with the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has control of time.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I sought to point out a while ago, I do not know who put the proposals before the House, but an effort was made to increase the salaries of administrative assistants from \$16,300 to \$18,964; even if this bill should pass, those salaries will be increased from \$16,300 to \$17,525.

I wonder how many Senators would vote for an increase of their own salaries at this time? It is my belief that the employees of the legislative branch are well paid. We have a method of our own to increase their salaries if we see that it is necessary. I do not wish to do something today that may result in a denial of an increase to those who are entitled to it, because I feel confident that if provisions for increases for legislative employees remain in the bill, and if we otherwise make the increase apply to many employees of the Government who are now receiving sufficiently large salaries, we may deny pay increases to those who are really entitled to them.

Mr. President, how much time have I left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall listen to what my friend from South Carolina has to say.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

To clarify the discussion concerning the particular provision of the bill before the Senate, I should like to say that it is not a new provision. It has been contained in every such pay increase bill upon which the Senate has acted. The bill provides for a 7½ percent increase for legislative employees, which is exactly the same increase the bill gives other employees of the Government. However, in the case of employees in the office of a Senator, the increase is not automatic. The bill follows a practice established in previous pay increase bills of leaving it up to each individual Senator to determine whether the increase, in whole or in part, is to be given to the various employees in his office.

I say to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] that the increase authorized by the bill is not mandatory. A Senator is not compelled by its terms to give a penny increase to the employees of his office if he does not wish to do so.

The same is true with respect to committee employees. The salaries of such employees are completely within the control of the chairman of the committee. If for any reason he does not wish the committee employee to receive the increase provided in the bill, all he needs to do is rearrange the base pay of the employee so that he will receive the same amount in the future as he is currently receiving.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Has it not been the practice of both the Senate and the House, every time a pay raise is granted to Post Office employees and to civil service employees, to grant an increase in salary to legislative employees as well? It is done at the same time, although possibly not in the same bill, but at the same session of Congress.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. The Senator is entirely correct. We have always provided for such an increase in every pay bill, giving legislative employees the same amount, though in a lump sum, and leaving it up to the Senator to act according to his wishes.

Mr. PASTORE. Is there any reason that the Senator knows why we should discriminate against faithful, qualified, and talented legislative employees?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. There is no reason why we should discriminate against them and in favor of some employee downtown whom we do not know at all.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if there is to be any discrimination, it ought to be the other way. The Senate remained in session until 12 o'clock last night. I left the Capitol after midnight. I left men at the desk, I left men at the office, and I left men at the room in the basement. They are back this morning. Never in 30 years

of public service have I seen a more dedicated group of public servants than those who serve the legislative branch of the Government. I cannot say, "I recommend an increase in salary for everyone except the folks I have hired. I am ready to give 2,400,000 employees \$700 million, but not \$50,000 for increases in pay to our own employees."

Mr. President, we have in this country some equity and some justice. The people who work in the Senate, in the House, in the Secretary's office, in the office of the Sergeant at Arms, and in the paymaster's office are not hangers-on. They do not have an 8-hour shift. Sometimes they work as many as 16, 18, and 20 hours. I do not know why we should discriminate against them. We might discriminate for them and give them a little overtime. We might give them some of the time-and-a-half which is talked about, and some of the wage-and-hour benefits. We might make such provisions apply to legislative employees. If we did so, they might get what they are entitled to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Texas has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield myself 3 minutes. Merely because we have people that we can control, hire and fire, working for us, and we think we might be criticized a little because we had extended to them the same privilege we had given to everybody else, is no reason for us to say, "I will give an increase to postal employees. I will give an increase to the people in the Pentagon. I will raise the salary of everybody else except the people who work in the Senate—the little page boys, the telephone employees, the secretary, the librarian, and the rest of the employees."

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I agree with the Senator from Texas, and that is the reason I cannot follow the logic of our distinguished colleague from Louisiana in the position he has taken today. He has indicated that he intends to vote not to cut the proposed 7½-percent increase to 6 percent, for he wants certain people to get the 7½ percent—a position with which I agree. He wants this increase extended to the Post Office employees, with which I agree. He wants it extended to civil service employees, and we agree on that. But when legislative employees are considered, he has said they are not entitled to the increase. I cannot follow that logic.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No Senator is required to permit his assistants to have the increase if he does not want them to have it. He may walk back to his office and say, "I do not think you are entitled to an increase."

Mr. PASTORE. And that Senator would not give it to them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. He might say, "I voted for an increase for everybody else, but I voted in the Senate today that you are not entitled to one. I will not give it to you." Senators have

1960

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

12075

that authority. I do not want any other Senator to tell me how to handle my office and what people I shall hire. Therefore we leave it up to the judgment of the Senators, and I think every Senator could trust his own judgment.

Mr. MONRONEY. As the Senator knows, practically every employee covered in the bill, excepting senatorial and other legislative employees, are on a 40-hour workweek.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. Does the Senator from Texas know of any office in the Capitol, or the House or in the Senate, which is not virtually on a 50-hour workweek?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No; and I think 50 is the minimum. Here we are talking about 2¼ million people, and except for 5 percent of them, they all get less than \$10,000 a year. Yet we would extend the benefits to 435,000 postal employees, 980,000 classified employees, 8,100 Foreign Service employees, 19,000 medical and surgical employees, 15,000 stabilization and conservation agricultural employees, and 5,000 judicial employees, but we would say to legislative employees, "No, no, we will not extend this to you. We are not going to permit any Senator to extend the increase to you. We are not going to give the authority to Senators to extend this increase to salaries of their employees, if they think it is necessary and if they certify it is necessary."

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not correct to say that the only position of validity that can be established for raising every comparable worker in the Federal Government by 7½ percent, without permitting a Senator to do likewise, to raise his employees to that level, is by presuming or admitting that they are being overpaid by 7½ percent?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is exactly correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. PASTORE. Another fact that we must not forget is that not everyone working for a Senator is an administrative assistant. We have a great many people below that level.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If we take all the increases that could be given according to the bill before us and apply them to all the administrative assistants, all 100 of them, out of the 2,400,000 employees, less than \$120,000 out of a total of \$700 million would be paid out. This is a red herring. It is nothing more than an attempt calculated to beat the bill. If we load the bill down with amendments, we will say, "I am in favor of giving a raise to the postal employees and to the classified employees, but not to the legislative employees." If we add such an amendment and it goes to the House and it gets to conference, we will wind up without any bill.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Perhaps it is not popular to raise the pay of someone

who is making more than \$10,000. I can testify to the fact that I have had two administrative assistants leave me. I believe that they are now making at least twice as much as they could make working for me. It has been my impression that if we have a good administrative assistant he is very much underpaid. My guess is that even a Senator could get more pay, that it would be impossible to hire a Senator for \$22,500. At the same time an administrative assistant does not get the recognition that he deserves in his State. Many times an administrative assistant works just as hard and just as long as a Senator, and in some cases I should imagine he performs greater service for his constituents back in his State.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield myself an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The argument made by the Senators from Oklahoma, Rhode Island, and Texas completely overlook the fact that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has already stated that the increase of 7½ percent, in his opinion, should not be applied to the high salaried officials in the Pentagon or in the offices of Senators.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand his viewpoint.

Mr. LAUSCHE. He stated that he proposed to offer an amendment on that subject. I contemplate supporting him on that subsequent amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is one of the reasons I believe we are second in space to the Soviet Union, and in many other technological fields, because people come up and say, "I won't vote for higher salaries."

Mr. President, we have scientists working for the Government who could get three times their salary in private industry. Does anyone think that Wernher von Braun is not worth more than the salary he works for. He must subsist. He must get along. He does not have a high salary, but his salary is high in terms of \$10,000.

The other day we had a request from a department to give them an additional authorization so that the Government will not lose some of the best men it has in the scientific fields.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. In view of the explanation made by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], I want the position of the junior Senator from Rhode Island to be made quite clear on the record. I still disagree in all aspects with the reasoning and logic of the Senator from Ohio and the senior Senator from Louisiana.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield myself an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. There is not a State in the Union that is not concerned about the pirating by the Federal Government of State employees. Ohio employees are in an exodus from the payrolls of Ohio to the payrolls of the Federal Government. May I say—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President—

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I say—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yielded to the Senator for a question.

Mr. ELLENDER. I will be happy to yield some time to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have the floor.

Mr. LAUSCHE. On the matter of casting a vote in the Senate, to gain a few popular votes, the Senator from Texas made an implication that those who are supporting the Senator from Louisiana are doing it to gain votes. I say to the Senator from Texas that the easy course to follow is to dig deep into the Treasury of the Federal Government and hand out the money. There are many persons in the galleries who have frowns on their faces because some of us oppose this proposal.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not know who is in the gallery. I know that some of them who are there sometimes have an appeal and sometimes their interest is calculated to influence. I do not know what the situation is in the Senator's State. I am much more concerned with the pirating that industry is doing of scientific employees of the Federal Government—and of some legislative employees, too—than I am of any pirating that the Federal Government does on the State level. I live in the capital of my State. We are still functioning there. The people are satisfied, so far as I know. We have had no complaints from the Governor or the Attorney General about being called to Washington. We have a good relationship down there. I was down there last week. We get along very well together. As far as I know, there is no problem. I do hear complaints about industry coming in and taking some of our best scientists and our best administrative employees out of the Government.

We are talking about \$700 million. Some Senators say, "Let us not do it for the few people who work for the Senate as administrative assistants." That amounts to \$100,000 out of \$700 million. If we add this amendment to the bill, we will endanger the whole bill. Besides that, I believe we would do an extreme disservice to the country and an extreme injustice to the people.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back the balance of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield back the balance of his time?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I have a perfecting amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Let us see if we cannot get the yeas and nays. Mr. President, I again request the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I have a perfecting amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On pages 17 and 18, in subsection (b) wherever the word "Senator" appears, insert the words "or Representative."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators who have been working with the bill to what I am here proposing. I invite comment as to whether it is applicable or not. As I examine the bill, it seems to me that subsection (b), which begins at line 19, page 17, provides that the increase shall not apply if the Senator notifies the disbursing office, in writing, that he does not wish it to apply to a particular employee. But I have not been able to find anywhere in the bill indicating that a Representative has a similar privilege. It seems to me that in that sense the bill is uneven and discriminatory.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The bill came from the House. The language is similar to that which is in every bill which the House passes with respect to pay. The House likes to handle its affairs in its own way; and the Senate acts on its affairs in its own way. That is according to past history. So the language of this bill has been prepared according to that policy. It leaves the matter to the discretion of each Senator. In the House the practice is different.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I recognize that it is customary for each House to operate for itself. I have offered the amendment to point out that the language of this paragraph would establish a mandatory increase for the staff employees of the House of Representatives, as I see it; but with the Senate, the increase would not be a mandatory.

I accept the interpretation which has been placed upon paragraph (b) that the basic compensation of senatorial employees—that is, employees in the offices of the Senate—would be automatically adjusted downward, to keep them where they are, unless a Senator notifies the disbursing office, in writing, that he wants his employees to have the benefit of the bill. That is the point I think the Senator from Texas was debating a while ago. It takes a rather close reading of paragraph (b), but I think it is correct to say that the bill automatically adjusts downward the basic compensation of employees in the offices of the Senate, so that they will not get the benefit of this increase un-

less the Senator indicates to the disbursing office, in writing, that he wants them to get the increase.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator is correct. Mr. Brenkworth confirmed that interpretation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That understanding is confirmed both by the chairman of the committee which reported the bill and by the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But I have not found any provision in the bill which permits that to be done in the House of Representatives.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. There is none. The House handles these matters in its own way.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In the House, therefore, the increase would be mandatory for every employee. I suggest that that establishes some discrimination. The bill then provides that employees in the offices of Representatives will get a 7½-percent increase. The employees in the offices of Senators will not get the increase unless Senators individually, as to their employees, indicate that they want them to get the increase. Certainly that is discriminatory. I think we should treat our employees evenhandedly. I think Senators' employees should not be treated differently from employees of the Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I agree with the Senator. The Senator is correct in his understanding; that there is a difference. The House chooses to operate in that way. There are many differences in the operating arrangements of the two bodies.

As the Senator knows, the House refused to employ administrative assistants, following the passage of the Reorganization Act, which was introduced by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] and the late Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. La Follette, authored. The House did not choose to have the high-level personnel which the Senators have. Theirs is a different situation.

In this instance, the House has chosen to pass the bill as the Senator has it before him. Although I would much prefer to have the same provision apply to both Houses, I think the comity which exists between the two bodies, and the understanding we have always had, is desirable. Accordingly, the Senate does not touch the provisions relating to the House of Representatives. If the Senate does not have enough to do without handling the affairs of the House of Representatives, then the Senate is underworked.

The situation throughout the years has been that the House of Representatives handles its own business, and the Senate handles its own.

The pay of the Senate Parliamentarians is different from the pay of the House Parliamentarians. Some of the employees of the House get more than the

comparable employees of the Senate. Some are given increases by statute, while ours are not.

In each instance, the leadership has felt that it was better to leave such matters up to the membership of the other body. The vote in the other body on this bill was, as I recall, something like 8 or 9 or 10 to 1.

I dislike in the concluding days of this session to have the Senate adopt an amendment affecting the House. It would be something we have never done before. If we did, I think perhaps the House simply would not receive it and would send it back to us.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am fully aware of the logic and historical traditions by which each body legislates for itself. However, I am glad to have the confirmation of the Senator from Texas of the fact that there is a difference in the treatment which is accorded the employees of Senators and Representatives.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. There always has been.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. There are two ways to handle the matter: Either to include the words "or Representative" after "Senator," or to strike subparagraph (b) from the bill.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has proposed to strike the entire section from the bill. I offered my amendment as a perfecting amendment so that it could be considered before the Senate votes upon the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana. If it is not desired to act in that way, and if the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana should not be accepted, then the other way to proceed would be to strike subparagraph (b) from the bill, so that Senators will not be in the onerous position of having individually to determine whether the blanket pay increase which would be given to the employees in a Representative's office shall not extend to the employees in a Senator's office.

I have thought that the logical thing to do, under the motivations which produced paragraph (b) of the bill, is to give the Senate an opportunity to avoid discriminatory action by including the words "or Representative." If that is not desired, then the entire paragraph should be stricken from the bill, so that Senators will not be called upon to pick and choose, if Representatives are not going to pick and choose.

I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Would it also be considered a perfecting amendment if I were to move to strike paragraph (b) from section 117?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator could move to strike that section.



Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I move that subparagraph (b) of section 117, beginning on line 19, page 17, and continuing through line 7, on page 18, be stricken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I should like to discuss the amendment for a moment. I invite the attention of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to the situation which now exists.

If the entire section 117, relating to employees in the legislative branch, remains in the bill undisturbed, then we will have a situation in which the employees in the office of a Representative will get an automatic pay increase of 7½ percent. The employees in the office of a Senator will not get such an increase unless the Senator notifies the disbursing office, in writing, that he wishes his employees to get the increase—and, presumably, which employees in his office he wishes to receive the increase.

If the employees in a Representative's office are to get the increase automatically, as the employees in the other branches of the Government will get it, why should we not strike paragraph (b) of section 117, so that the employees in senatorial offices will be treated just as fairly as and on all fours with the employees in the offices of Representatives? If the employees in the offices of Representatives are to get the increase automatically and uniformly, why should not the employees in the offices of Senators get the increase automatically and uniformly?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I will tell the Senator why. It is because the House of Representatives, which regulates its own business, does not choose to have its employees dealt with in this way.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But I am not proposing that the Senate legislate for the House of Representatives employees. I am proposing that the Senate legislate for the Senate employees.

If the House decides that the employees of the House of Representatives are to receive an automatic pay increase, are we to say to the employees in the senatorial offices, "You will not get an automatic pay increase. Your Senator must go to the disbursing office and must notify it in writing which of his employees is to receive an increase, and how much."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield further to me?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I say we should vote to proceed in the way recommended by our committee, because I think a considerable number of Sena-

tors do not want their employees to receive an automatic pay increase of 5 percent or 6 percent or 7 percent; instead, those Senators want to be the judge of what their employees shall receive.

In the House of Representatives the situation is different. I propose that each body make the decision for itself.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Very well; and I am proposing that the Senate make the decision as to whether it wants the Senate employees not to receive an increase which the House of Representatives employees will automatically receive.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The House has decided this question for itself; but I do not want any Senator to be forced to increase the pay of his employees 6 percent or 7 percent, if, in his judgment, he does not want that done.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But the employees of the House of Representatives should not automatically receive benefits which the employees of the Senate will not automatically receive.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield, to permit me to propound a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado will state it.

Mr. ALLOTT. I wish to ask whether an amendment which I have in mind will properly lie to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Colorado state the nature of the amendment he has in mind?

Mr. ALLOTT. I shall discuss the amendment in just a moment. On page 18, in line 3, I propose to strike out the word "not."

The effect of the amendment—and I hope the amendment will solve part of the difficulties which are bothering the Senator from South Dakota—will be simply that the pay raises will not be applicable until the individual Senator notifies the disbursing office, in writing, that he does wish such provisions to apply to such employees. In other words, the amendment takes off the burden, and reverses the situation.

I hope that my friend, the Senator from South Dakota, will see fit to accept this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from South Dakota must first be acted upon, before the amendment of the Senator from Colorado can be acted upon.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I think the issue is clearly before the Senate; so I have nothing further to say. This issue is merely whether Senators want the bill, as passed, to discriminate in favor of employees in the offices of Members of the House of Representatives, and against employees in the offices of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement:

2,400,000 persons are affected by this bill; and at the moment we are talking about a relatively small number of these Government employees.

I have checked with the House of Representatives office, and it makes this statement:

The Senate has traditionally followed the practice of requiring affirmative action in order to give the increase to its employees. The House has always done it the other way; the House employees get it unless action is taken to take it away from them.

That has been true of every increase that has been made through the years. The House has traditionally proceeded in the other way—making the increase automatic. The House employees receive the increase automatically, unless action is taken to prevent them from receiving it.

I hope that in dealing with an item which affects so few people relatively we shall not take action which will necessitate sending the bill to conference.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time available to me.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I wish to say a further word.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then, Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of the time available to me. I had thought the Senator from South Dakota had yielded back the remainder of the time available to him.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas has been making the point that each House should legislate for itself. But now he has taken the position that not one amendment should be written into the bill by the Senate, but that the bill should be passed by the Senate in exactly the same form as that in which the bill came to us from the House of Representatives, so that the bill will not have to go to conference. That is a denial of the right of the Senate to have any part in this legislation. If no amendment is to be made by the Senate to the bill, then we let the House of Representatives write the legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senate committee reported the bill in this form.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes, but under the same strictures which the majority leader now wishes to lay down for the Senate—namely, that we take the bill just as it is, and do not amend the bill and have it go to conference. If that is permitting the Senate to write its own ticket, I do not so understand it.

Mr. President, I ask for a vote on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPP] are absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPP] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 19, nays 63, as follows:

[No. 224]

YEAS—19

Anderson	Hayden	Saltonstall
Bennett	Lausche	Talmadge
Bush	Lusk	Thurmond
Byrd, Va.	McClellan	Williams, Del.
Curtis	Mansfield	Young, Ohio
Ellender	Prouty	
Gore	Robertson	

NAYS—63

Aiken	Ervin	Long, La.
Allott	Fong	McCarthy
Bartlett	Frear	McGee
Beall	Goldwater	Magnuson
Bible	Green	Martin
Bridges	Gruening	Monroney
Brunsdale	Hart	Morton
Byrd, W. Va.	Hartke	Moss
Cannon	Hickenlooper	Murray
Carlson	Hill	Muskie
Case, N. J.	Holland	Pastore
Case, S. Dak.	Humphrey	Proxmire
Chavez	Jackson	Randolph
Church	Javits	Scott
Clark	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Dirksen	Jordan	Sparkman
Dodd	Keating	Symington
Douglas	Kerr	Wiley
Dworshak	Kuchel	Williams, N. J.
Eastland	Long, Hawaii	Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—18

Butler	Hennings	Mundt
Capehart	Hruska	O'Mahoney
Carroll	Kefauver	Russell
Cotton	Kennedy	Schoeppel
Engle	McNamara	Stennis
Fulbright	Morse	Yarborough

So Mr. ELLENDER'S amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask to have it stated, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will first state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 20, between lines 16 and 17, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

LIMITATION ON INCREASES

SEC. 123. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or of any amendment made by this Act, no such provision shall—

(1) provide or authorize an increase in any rate of basic compensation or gross compensation (basic compensation plus additional compensation authorized by law) if such rate, computed without regard to such provision, is \$10,000 or more per annum, or

(2) provide or authorize an increase in any rate of basic or gross compensation to an amount in excess of \$10,000 per annum if such rate, computed without regard to such provision, is less than \$10,000 per annum.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I renew my request for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. What time will be used for the call of the roll?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana request that the time not be changed to either side?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for the call of the roll not be changed to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. 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. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I renew my request. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this is a very simple amendment. All it seeks to do is to confine the 7.5 percent across the board pay increase provided in the pending bill to persons making less than \$10,000 per year. Under my amendment, an employee receiving \$10,-

000 per annum or more would receive no pay increase, and, as to persons presently receiving less than \$10,000 per year, in no case could their compensation be increased under the authority of the pending bill, to more than \$10,000 per year.

I do not enjoy offering amendments of this kind to proposed pay legislation, but I feel compelled to do so because I am firmly convinced that if the inflationary spiral is to be stopped, if burgeoning Federal expenditures are to be reduced, it is up to the Federal Government to set the example.

There is doubtless a strong case to be made for a pay increase for persons in the lower income brackets, but I do not believe that persons presently earning \$10,000 per year or more, which is a substantial amount of money, need a pay increase to the extent that the lower paid Federal workers do.

Actually, Mr. President, it could perhaps be argued that a pay raise of the magnitude provided in the pending bill might be somewhat excessive, even as to the lower income brackets. According to my information, the cost of living, as measured by the Consumer Price Index, has increased by only 2 percent, since the last Federal pay raise in 1958.

A more limited study of the Consumer Price Index, embracing only housing, apparel, transportation, medical care, personal care, reading, and recreation, indicates that there has been an average net increase in prices for these items of only 3 percent during the same period of time.

Now I am not unaware of the fact that individuals employed in the private sector of our economy have received substantial wage increases since 1958, but I return to the basic premise, that despite such increases it is up to the Federal Government to lead the way in holding down the cost of living, in holding down Government expenditures.

We cannot afford to follow blindly in the footsteps of other segments of our economy, and, in effect, participate in an effort which is bound to further increase the cost of living. I am also compelled to inform Senators that despite the fact that average hourly earnings in manufacturing and similar industries have increased only an average amount of 6.4 percent since 1958, the pending bill would provide a 7.5-percent increase for Federal employees. Thus, Mr. President, even assuming that the Federal Government should go forward and "follow the leader" in raising wages, the average hourly earnings in other segments of our economy has increased by only some 6.4 percent, compared with the 7.5-percent increase provided under the pending bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the tables showing the Consumer Price Index for all articles, the Consumer Price Index for selected items, and the average hourly earnings, excluding overtime, for selected industries, be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

1960

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

12079

## Consumer Price Index, all items

	[1947-49=100]
March 1958.....	123.3
March 1960.....	126.7
Net change.....	+2.4
Change, +2 percent (rounded).	

## Consumer Price Index, selected items

	1958 average	March 1960	Percent change
Housing.....	127.7	131.3	+2.8
Apparel.....	107.0	108.8	+1.7
Transportation.....	140.5	146.5	+4.3
Medical care.....	144.6	155.0	+7.8
Personal care.....	128.6	132.7	+3.2
Reading and recreation.....	116.7	120.9	+3.6
Food.....	120.3	117.7	-2.2
Average increase.....			+3.0

## Average hourly earnings (excluding overtime)

[Selected industries]

	1958 average	February 1960	Percent change
Manufacturing (all)....	\$2.08	\$2.22	+6.7
Banks.....	1.78	1.87	+5.0
Hotels.....	1.13	1.20	+6.2
Telephone.....	2.05	2.22	+8.3
Telegraph.....	2.17	2.27	+4.6
Gas and electric utilities.....	2.46	2.65	+7.6
Chemical industry.....	2.31	2.46	+6.4
Textiles.....	1.51	1.60	+5.9
Primary metals (including steel).....	2.65	2.86	+7.9
Average increase.....			+6.4

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I also tell Senators that, according to the best information I have been able to obtain, the adoption of my amendment, which, as I have said, would limit the pay raise provided in the bill to the lower paid employees of the Federal Government, would result in savings aggregating at least some \$48 million. The latest available figures on Federal employment which I have obtained from the Civil Service Commission, show that there are 55,971 civil service employees earning more than \$10,000, out of a total 962,264,000 employees. These \$10,000 per year and over employees—and I am referring to civil service employees only—were receiving as of June 30, 1958, aggregate pay totaling \$639,101,065. Applying a 7.5 percent to this amount, it is easy to see that the saving as to civil service employees alone, would be \$47,932,579 per year.

I also have before me a table headed "Employees by pay group, all areas, June 30, 1959," indicating that of all Federal employees—classified, wage board, postal field service, and others—only 71,993 receive salaries in excess of \$10,000 per year. Thus, it becomes obvious that the amount I propose will not affect the rank and file of our Federal workers, but will apply only to a little more than 3 percent of our total Federal payroll, in terms of number of employees, while at the same time, saving an amount in excess of \$48 million per year.

I do hope, Mr. President, that my amendment will be adopted. I do not mean to say that persons presently earning \$10,000 per year are overpaid. That is not the point at all. The fact is, as I have already tried to point out, the Federal Government owes to our peo-

ple a major responsibility in curbing inflation, and in halting the ever rising cost of Government.

It strikes me that this is a particularly appropriate time for the Congress to fulfill its responsibilities in this area. Under my amendment, a step forward in this regard would be taken, without as I have indicated, working any injury upon the great majority of our Federal employees.

As I previously stated, I wish to be in a position to vote for a pay increase for those who need it. As I pointed out previously, the bill is dubbed a bill to increase the pay of postal employees. Every telegram I have received in the past 24 hours refers to the bill as a postal pay raise bill, when, as a matter of fact, it affects practically every classified employee, many of whom, as I have said, are today receiving salaries that are fair and just. My fear is that by overloading this pay increase bill, by increasing the salaries of people who are now receiving sufficient salary, we may prevent the bill from becoming law.

Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to my distinguished friend from Georgia.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I thank the able and distinguished Senator from Louisiana for yielding to me. I commend him for the amendment he has offered. As a matter of fact, I had prepared an identical amendment which I had planned to offer myself.

I have great sympathy for the hundreds of thousands of employees of the Government who live on nominal and sometimes little more than subsistence salaries. I am ready and willing to lend my voice and my vote to improve their lot. But, in considering raising the pay of Government employees, I also have equal sympathy for the millions of Americans outside the employment of the Federal Government who are burdened with oppressive taxation.

During the past 31 years we have succeeded in balancing our budget only five times. During that same period of time the value of our dollar has eroded to slightly less than 47 cents. Although I have had the privilege of serving in the Senate for less than 4 years, during that time we have acted or soon will act on four different bills to raise the ceiling on the national debt.

We have been guilty of nothing less than complete and abject fiscal irresponsibility.

At a time when the Nation is having difficulty selling its bonds we in the Senate find ourselves considering a bill which would raise the pay of virtually every civil employee in the United States, regardless of his present level of income.

How can we justify raising the salaries of employees who are receiving \$10,000 to \$19,000 a year when we have not balanced our budget and the value of our dollar is steadily declining. We seem to have gotten caught in a vicious cycle of having to raise the salaries of employees whose incomes have not kept pace with the inflation created by irresponsible Federal spending.

As has the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, I, too, have tried to get some facts on this matter. My time was

limited as I prepared my amendment only this morning. But I found that of the 535,000 postal employees, only 1,141 earn in excess of \$10,000 a year. Thus the proposed amendment would affect them virtually not at all.

This bill is intended to aid the people who work for the Government of the United States to meet their obligations, a purpose in which I concur. However, I do not think that we should haphazardly pass legislation affecting virtually every employee of our Government, regardless of his salary, when we cannot even balance our budget.

The figures I obtained on the saving which would be accomplished under the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana vary somewhat from the figures given by the Senator from Louisiana, but they are along the same line.

The staff of the committee informs me that if the amendment is adopted, it will save \$35 million a year. I arrived at a little different result on the basis of the information I received from the Bureau of the Budget. That agency reported the savings as \$56 million a year. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] received figures from the Civil Service Commission which put the amount in the vicinity of \$48 million a year.

I do not think this Senate ought to raise the salaries of the people in the highest pay brackets in the Government at the expense of placing an even greater burden on our children and on our grandchildren yet unborn.

I hope that the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana will be adopted.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate what the Cordiner report had to say in regard to some of the salaries that would be affected by the amendment:

In the top-level civilian employee field, the Department of Defense is in direct competition with industry for scarce skills. Industry is free to offer greater economic incentives. As a result, the Department is suffering alarming losses of established career civilians—engineers, scientists, and managers.

We hear a good many people talking about our inability to retain skilled workers, but if the amendment passes, it will only serve to keep more people from remaining with us in the different scientific fields. The Cordiner report says further:

To be precise turnover is increasing. The ratio of losses of top scientists and engineers in 1956 was four times that of 1951.

Quality is decreasing. Supervisors indicate that their best people are leaving and that the replacements don't measure up to those who have left.

Many positions remain unfilled. In June 1956, one out of every five electronic, mechanical and aeronautical engineering positions was vacant. Similar shortages exist in other occupations. The situation grows steadily worse.

The excerpts I have read are from what is known as the Cordiner report.

I hope the Senate will not agree to the amendment. I call to the attention of the Senate again the fact that Senators might just as well vote against the bill as to amend it and send it to conference.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I rise to explain briefly the reasons why I support the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana. I must say at the outset that normally I would oppose the amendment, because it is not my feeling that those who occupy high policy-making positions in the Government are overpaid. If I felt that a case had been made out by which I could, in good conscience, justify the 7½-percent increase proposed in the bill for all Civil Service employees, then I would wish to see the same increase given to the employees in the highest brackets as well as those in the middle or lower brackets.

Because I feel that no case has been made to warrant a 7½-percent increase for civil service employees generally, I must support any amendment which will tend to temper the cost which is encompassed in the proposed legislation. The cost, as the Senate well knows, is three-quarters of a billion dollars, permanently added to the Federal budget, and to the burden of the taxpayers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. How much is involved in the pending amendment?

Mr. CHURCH. The pending amendment would effect a saving of anywhere from \$35 million to \$55 million a year, depending upon the source of the figures. There seems to be some divergence with regard to the estimates made by the Civil Service Commission, by the Bureau of the Budget, and by the staff of our own committee. However, whichever figure is taken, be it \$35 million or \$55 million, it is a significant figure. I feel that it justifies support of the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. How many people are affected?

Mr. CHURCH. I am sorry I do not know the answer. Perhaps the Senator from Louisiana knows the answer.

Mr. ELLENDER. Fifty-five thousand.

Mr. CHURCH. Fifty-five thousand people would be affected. That would be the total number of people on the Federal payroll whose salaries are now above \$10,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator realize that most of our technological and scientific people are in that group?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes. If I felt that a 7½-percent increase were warranted, I would want it to go to those in the higher brackets, as well as to the middle and lower brackets.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Coming from the State that the Senator does, with the great interest he has in the problem, he knows of the difficulty we have of holding technological people in our employ, the people who fall into this group, particularly because industry is hiring them away from government all the time.

Mr. CHURCH. I am trying to keep this matter in perspective. The total cost of the bill is very large indeed. To justify favorable action on the bill as a whole, upon the ground of what it might do for these highly trained peo-

ple and specialists, seems to me not to be sound. After all, we have a big package. We have to consider the impact of all of it on the cost of government.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I could appreciate the Senator's position on an amendment separating the postal employees from the other employees, if he wished to raise only the postal employees. However, that is not this amendment. This amendment says, "We will give everybody a raise except to the people we need the most, the people who are being grabbed away from the Government." It seems to me that the Senator would do that to save \$35 million in the hectic period when bombs are raining on Quemoy. It is a poor way to try to take \$35 million from people we are looking for to help maintain freedom in the world.

Mr. CHURCH. I do not believe that the committee reports contain data upon which we can draw, with any degree of assurance, what the Government's difficulties are, with respect to procuring these highly skilled people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. We do not know what the difficulties are with respect to procuring these specialists, or what adjustments should be made in their wages. I do feel that if this 7½-percent increase is not warranted generally for the Civil Service employees, then let us take such steps to modify the bill as the majority will support. It seems to me that the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana at least has this force to it. It will confine the increase to those who are most likely to be in need of it, because their salaries are in the lower brackets. It will effect an overall saving of between \$35 million and \$55 million.

Until a better case is documented, showing, to my satisfaction, that adjustments in the higher brackets are necessary in order to maintain, attract, and hold, scientists and technicians, who now receive anywhere from \$16,000 to \$19,700 a year, I believe that I am justified in supporting the amendment.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I am on limited time, but I am glad to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Why does the Senator assume that a single girl earning \$4,000 a year is in more need than a married man with five children earning \$11,000?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Are we not concerned with families as well as individuals?

Mr. CHURCH. We can choose convenient examples, of course. I am concerned about those who work for the Government with families, whether they are earning \$11,000 or \$7,000 or \$5,000.

Mr. PASTORE. Precisely.

Mr. CHURCH. Those in the lower brackets who have families are faced

with the rising cost of living. They are the ones who are most in need of such increases as we may choose to give. I therefore feel, that if we are going to have a 7½-percent increase, let us at least confine that increase to those who are most in need of it. It seems to me that those who are making less than \$10,000 are the ones most in need.

Mr. PASTORE. Is not the Senator arguing and is not his logic taking this form, that we can afford to give this pay increase, provided it costs \$35 million, but not if it costs \$800 million?

Mr. CHURCH. No, indeed I am not. This amendment would save \$35 million. I am about to offer an amendment to the bill which will confine the increase to postal workers, because I believe a legitimate case has been made to warrant an increase for these workers. That will exclude the \$500 million in the bill that would go to the classified civil service employees, because I think no case has been made out to warrant an increase of this size for these employees. This would save money which could better be spent for the critical needs of the country. I am therefore supporting the Senator from Louisiana, and I will later offer an amendment which will not effect a savings of only \$35 million or \$55 million, but will effect a saving of a half a billion dollars.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. I wish to observe that I can understand the logic of the Senator's position on his overall amendment, but I submit that it is not so much a question of the individual need of the scientist as it is the need of the Government itself. These people are going into private industry. They are going into private plants. I believe that what the Senator is saying to these people is, "We are going to raise everybody up to this level, but we are going to ignore you." That will aggravate the problem, rather than help to solve it. Perhaps the steel workers were not entitled to get an increase. However, if we are to give an increase to anyone, we should certainly give it to those we need the most in the critical period we are facing.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I dislike very much to disagree with those who argue in favor of the amendment. I should like to say a word about it. When the junior Senator from Louisiana came to the Senate the Hoover Commission had worked out recommendations for job economy in Government. One of their leading recommendations was that we should try to give an increase in pay to people who had the responsibility of management in the Government. The argument for that was that the Government was losing a great amount of money for lack of first-class managers in Government.

The junior Senator from Louisiana handled the bill on the floor, and had great difficulty in getting an increase for the top management officials in Government, although in his opinion an almost irrefutable case had been made that by spending money we could make tremendous improvements in efficiency and better management. I have seen bills go through Congress raising the salary of low grade employees but not of the higher grade employees. Incidentally, that is popular with the postal people. Raise all the low-grade people, who squabble over their supervisors, but do not raise the supervisors because they are not too popular with the letter carriers or the clerks.

If we are to have good management, we shall have to pay something for it. It is my impression that the best people in the Government today in the managerial end are staying there solely to obtain their retirement benefits, because the Government has a good retirement program. But they are being paid much less than persons having comparable ability who are employed in other areas of endeavor.

It is my judgment that if we want to keep the best people, the postmasters and persons in managerial positions in Government, we will do well to give them an increase.

We talk about people who are getting better-paid work elsewhere. They are the very people who would get no increase at all, while everyone else would get the 7½-percent increase.

My guess is that the pending amendment affects the people who have the most ability and who deserve a pay raise, while those who would be paid less would be those who would not get a pay raise, because we pile up the pay increases or incentives, in my judgment, and a better case would be made for the people who are paid on the basis of ability.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Louisiana is making a good case for what I believe is the basic trouble with the pay raise approach which confronts us every election year. I know a little something about management and something about hiring people.

We will not retain people in desirable positions in the Government with a 7½-percent increase. Suppose a man is making \$20,000 a year. If an aircraft company wants that man, it will offer him \$30,000, which will mean a net increase of about \$8,500 more than if he got a 7½-percent increase in the Government.

Every election year, for votes only, we come into this Chamber and argue about the underpaid postal workers and the underpaid civil service workers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield the distinguished Senator 5 additional minutes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Would it not be better for the committee to devote itself to a real study of the pay bases and pay

scales of the Federal employees? Would not that be better than to come here every election year, knowing it is very difficult to vote against pay increases? It is like voting against mother love or against the flag. I think we are wasting the taxpayers' money. I do not think we are getting the best out of our workers.

If the postal employees are underpaid, then let them be paid what they are worth. But let us not increase their pay in a political year merely by voting for a 7½-percent increase.

I guarantee that any private business that wants to pirate or hire any Government worker will not be stopped by a 7½-percent pay increase. It may be that we shall have to increase some of the pay bases by 20, 30, 40, or 50 percent. But I suggest that we do it, and not come here every election year with a purely political bill which does not do the worker any good. Let us not say that we have helped the underpaid employees of the Government. We have done them no good. We simply add to the inflationary spiral, and we add to the economic problems of the workers.

If we would stop irresponsible spending, we would do more good for the country than by providing wage increases.

I got away from the question I had intended to ask. Does not the Senator agree that the basic problem is one of studying the whole wage structure of the Federal employees?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is a problem connected with it, but the bill is before the Senate. My general feeling about it is that if we are to give a pay raise to everyone, the people who would be denied a pay raise by the amendment are those who could fill any position. They certainly are worth more than they are getting and are worthy of a pay raise. That being the case, I hope they will share in a pay raise, if a pay raise is to be granted.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I shall sum up the reasons why I oppose the amendment. It has been argued by the distinguished majority leader and other Senators that the Government has a great need for technicians and other highly educated and expert persons who are not now working for the Government because of the higher wages they receive in private industry, or who are leaving the Government because they can receive higher wages elsewhere. I suggest that this is an assertion which is not backed up by the committee hearings. We have no data or studies upon which to rest a competent judgment that that is so. We have no proof, upon which we can act, that this is so. We have merely surmises and the contention.

Furthermore, we have no proof whatever that a 7½-percent increase will cause those persons to stay with the Government, as was well pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Arizona. The kind of salary competition which may be attracting them away from Government service is not a differential of 7½ percent; it is a differential which may run as high as 20 or 30 percent.

Therefore, I believe we cannot assume, upon the evidence now before us, that the passage of the bill providing for a 7½-percent increase would rectify the problem which has been alluded to on the floor.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I will yield as soon as I have finished my statement.

Second, it seems to me that if the 7½-percent increase were justified overall, then it ought to apply to persons in the higher categories as well as to those in the lower or middle categories. That is why I said at the outset that normally I would not support an amendment of this kind.

But where there is no justification, in my opinion, for a 7½-percent increase overall, then I would prefer any amendment which would tend to limit the size of the increase to those who are clearly most in need of it. Those persons, obviously, are the ones in the lower and middle brackets. They are persons who are faced with the high cost of living but are having a difficult time making their budgets meet their living costs.

So I support the amendment. I believe it will effect a saving of at least \$35 million to \$55 million a year. Of those who are earning \$10,000 or more a year, the great majority are not the technicians or the scientists to whom reference has been made; they are those in the regular civil service positions of the Government. They are the persons who are most in need of a raise.

So let us effect a saving by the increase, if there is to be one, by granting the raise to persons in the lower income brackets, who certainly are most in need of an increase.

For these reasons, I believe it is in the public interest to support the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator has heard of Parkinson's law, has he not?

Mr. CHURCH. I have, indeed. I would only add to that statement that the existence of Parkinson's law makes it all the more mandatory for the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, on which I formerly served, and for which I have the highest regard, not to come before the Senate with a package which requires us to vote for a 7½-percent pay increase for everyone in the Government simply in order that the postal workers can get their share, or in order that scientists and technicians will stay with the Government, but rather come to the Senate with tailored legislation and a well-documented case to support the kind of reformation which should take place on the Federal payroll, if we are properly to serve the public interest. I submit that we have failed to do that in the pending bill.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, has the Senator from Alaska been yielded time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. The amount to be saved by the amendment will be something in the neighborhood of one two-hundredths of 1 percent. By adopting such a provision, we will impair the value of the persons who are most valuable, most skilled, and most important to the Government.

Only a few hours ago, I was at lunch with one of our colleagues who said that he had lost his three top employees to private industry because he could not afford to keep them at the maximum salaries which the Senate permits.

If we make this distinction, we will pile up a large number of persons at the \$10,000 level, and will be grouping persons having different values in one group. That would be most unfortunate. We should proceed to vote on the bill as it now is.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING] is paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea" and the Senator from Michigan would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and the Senator from Kansas

[Mr. SCHOEPP] are absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPP]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 58, as follows:

[No. 225]

YEAS—23

Allott	Dworshak	McClellan
Anderson	Ellender	Mansfield
Bridges	Ervil	Robertson
Byrd, Va.	Goldwater	Talmadge
Case, S. Dak.	Hayden	Thurmond
Church	Holland	Williams, Del.
Cooper	Lausche	Young, Ohio
Curtis	Lusk	

NAYS—58

Alken	Green	Monroney
Bartlett	Gruening	Morton
Beall	Hartke	Moss
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Murray
Bible	Hill	Muskie
Brunsdale	Humphrey	Pastore
Bush	Jackson	Prouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Proxmire
Cannon	Johnson, Tex.	Randolph
Carlson	Johnston, S.C.	Saltonstall
Case, N.J.	Jordan	Scott
Chavez	Keating	Smathers
Clark	Kerr	Smith
Dirksen	Kuchel	Sparkman
Dodd	Long, Hawaii	Symington
Douglas	Long, La.	Wiley
Eastland	McCarthy	Williams, N.J.
Fong	McGee	Young, N. Dak.
Frear	Magnuson	
Gore	Martin	

NOT VOTING—19

Butler	Hennings	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Hruska	Russell
Carroll	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Cotton	Kerney	Stennis
Engle	McNamara	Yarborough
Fulbright	Morse	
Hart	Mundt	

So Mr. ELLENDER'S amendment was rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARTKE in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk, and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Idaho will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed, beginning on page 4, at line 21, to strike all through page 13, line 6; and beginning on page 13, line 12, to strike all through page 20, line 6.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the effect of the amendment is to strike Part B of Title I of the pending bill. If adopted, it would mean a saving of about half a billion dollars. I therefore think it is a matter of sufficient importance to warrant the yeas and nays. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

If we were to confine this bill to the postal workers and adopt the increases in the proposed legislation for them, it would tend to bring them abreast of other workers in the Government, and to equate their pay with that being

received by the majority of workers in the classified civil service.

Secondly, the great bulk of the postal workers, as the Senate well knows, are concentrated in the lower grades, and they are faced with an increasingly serious problem in trying to meet rising living costs. I think they are the most entitled to a pay raise. They have more need for the higher pay, and there is greater justification for giving it to them.

I think this is borne out by the particular fact that data before the committees show that 31 percent of the postal employees have to have a second job in order to make a living, and 43 percent of the postal employees have wives who work, in order that their joint pay may be sufficient to meet the family bills. Therefore, I think a convincing case is made for the need to increase the general level of salaries of the postal workers.

Thirdly, there is evidence that many postal workers still receive far less for the work that they do, than those engaged in comparable work in private industry. During my 4 years in the Senate I have tried to be fair with Federal employees. I believe they are entitled to comparable pay for comparable work. The fact that this is still not true with respect to many in the postal service is still another reason why we should pass their pay increase, as embodied in this bill.

Since 1951 average industrial wages have gone up 45 percent, while postal salaries have gone up 19 percent.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I would like to complete my statement. Then I shall be happy to yield.

The question I want to raise, in all seriousness, before the Senate is: Apart from the postal workers, what justification does the record show for increasing the salaries of the classified civil service employees by 7½ percent? I have studied the committee hearings, I have studied the reports very carefully, to see if I could find, to my satisfaction, a case which would justify the increase entailed in this proposed legislation.

I have asked myself, Is it because the salaries we pay to the Federal employees generally are substandard? That is not so. Unlike the case of the postal workers, we have no convincing evidence before us which would lead us to believe that Federal employees in general are not being paid wages comparable to the kind of wages that prevail for the same kind of work in private industry. On the contrary, the evidence I have seen shows that present wage levels are fair, and that the fringe benefits we now give to Federal employees are even more generous than those that generally obtain in private industry. Benefits in life insurance, health insurance, retirement, hospitalization and medical expenses—all these have been estimated to have a value of 30 percent, over and above the actual wages paid to Federal employees.

So then, Mr. President, I suggest that no case has been made that prevailing wage levels of Federal employees are so substandard as to warrant a 7½-per-

cent increase, as provided in the pending legislation.

Therefore I have asked myself this second question: Are we granting this 7½-percent increase to enable Federal employees to keep abreast of the rising cost of living? Is that the justification for this bill? If so, I would support it, because I want to do equity by the Federal employees, and I think they are entitled to have wage adjustments as the rising cost of living may require. But since the last pay raise took effect a little more than 2 years ago, the cost of living index has gone up but 1.6 percent.

We are here proposing an increase of 7.5 percent. I wish to make it perfectly clear on the record that I favor any such adjustment as may be required to keep up with rising living costs. I would support such a bill here and now. I would support such a bill if it came from a conference committee, as it might relate to cost-of-living pay increases for classified civil service employees.

If the amendment I offer is adopted, the effect will be to send the bill to conference. There the conferees will have an opportunity to review what may be justified for the civil service employees in the light of all the data they can assemble with respect to rising living costs. Then the conferees can come back and recommend an increase in line with the needs of Federal employees, and I shall be happy to support such a measure.

However, the proposed pay raise contained in the bill before us cannot possibly be justified on the basis of the evidence presented to the committees, on account of increased living costs. What, then, is the justification?

**Mr. KEATING.** Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

**Mr. CHURCH.** I will yield to the Senator after I finish my argument, if I may.

If it is not that present wages are substandard, if it is not that inflationary rises in the cost of living require the adjustment to be made, what, then, is the justification for the bill? Is it that we have neglected for too long our Federal employees? That cannot be.

Mr. President, since the war Federal employees in the classified civil service have received regular increases in pay amounting, in the overall, to some 80 percent. If Members of the Senate who are interested will look at the minority views in the House report they will see a detailed listing of the increases granted by the Congress in the Federal wage level since the war.

In 1945, we granted an average increase of 15.9 percent.

In 1946, we granted an average increase of 14.2 percent.

In 1948, we granted an average increase of 11 percent.

In 1949, we granted an average increase of 4 percent.

In 1951, we granted an average increase of 10 percent.

In 1955, we granted an average increase of 7.5 percent.

In 1958, we granted an average increase of 10 percent.

Now we are asked to grant an increase of 7.5 percent.

The sum, all told, represents approved pay increases by the Congress of 83.6

percent in the last 15 years, and the employees have received seven of these increases, representing an in-pocket average increase of 72.6 percent.

I say, Mr. President, in all reasonableness, the record simply does not support the theory that Federal employees as a whole have been forgotten or neglected in any way. Rather, the record shows that Federal pay boosts come up like spring grass, every election year, as has been well pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Having found no other basis to warrant the salary increase proposal contained in the bill, I have concluded it is a familiar malady which furnishes the impetus for the proposed legislation, and that malady is election fever. Respectfully, I implore the Senate to consider the cost of the passage of this measure.

As the bill now stands, it would add approximately three-fourths of a billion dollars to the cost of Government from now on. That is not simply for 1 year, but for next year and the next year and the next year, for so long as anyone can foresee. It will permanently affix 1 percent to the tax burden of this country. It represents an added 1 percent permanently engrafted upon the Federal budget.

I say to you: Come chaos, calamity, war, pestilence, or economic collapse, one thing is as certain as death and taxes. The country may come down, but the Federal wage scale will not come down, once it has been approved by the Congress.

The cost of this proposed legislation cannot be accepted cavalierly, or dismissed simply because it may be politically expedient for us not to consider it.

Is it prudent, Mr. President, at this time to engraft an additional three-fourths of a billion dollars a year on the Federal budget, to increase Federal pay? Oh, we talk a lot, Mr. President, about our critical needs, and many indeed are the grave problems we are leaving unattended and unsolved.

I support—generously, I think—appropriations of public money for causes which I think require our attention, and many have been the times on this floor when I have said, "We are not doing enough to meet the critical needs of the country."

However, Mr. President, I cannot, in good conscience, support a three-quarter billion dollar bill to fatten Federal pay, when the proof is not before us to justify it.

This bill, Mr. President, represents a cost seven times as great as the \$90 million the Congress authorized to be appropriated for the elimination of water pollution. That bill, as the Senate well knows, was vetoed by the President. The veto was not overridden by the Congress.

This bill represents a cost three times the amount of money the Senate was going to provide to rehabilitate depressed areas. The depressed area bill was also vetoed by the President, and the veto was not overridden by the Congress.

I am told that this time we are going to override the veto. I am told that this time we are going to appropriate three-quarters of a billion dollars and then

override the veto. It will be the second time since Mr. Eisenhower became President of the United States that his veto has been overridden. Well, that is a fine record. We will vote to override the President's veto to fatten the Federal payroll, but not to meet the critical needs of this country.

Mr. President, there is so much crying to be done. Public money is needed to help rehabilitate depressed areas; to provide urban renewal in the rotting cores of our big cities; to upgrade public transportation in congested areas, now 20 years behind our needs; to clean up our polluted rivers; to do something about the thickening contamination in the urban air; to end the classroom shortage in our public schools; to increase teachers' pay; to close the dangerous gaps we know exist in our military defenses; to deal with the inadequate care and medical attention which is now extended to the old, the handicapped, and the feeble of this land.

Mr. President, the Congress may have difficulty in pointing to a record in these fields—and assuredly we cannot show with respect to any one of them that we have overridden a Presidential veto—but the plan is to override the veto of the President to fatten the Federal payroll.

I could go on, Mr. President, but the point is clear. Public money is desperately needed for urgent problems. Let us not spend it for a pay increase without cause, without justification, without any proven need.

But if we pass the bill as proposed, then, for goodness' sake, let us at least have the grace afterward to stop talking about this being a time for self-sacrifice for the country. This bill is self-indulgence. Let us stop talking about bravely standing up and tightening our belts, and doing something strong about the challenge which faces us. This bill is weakness.

I have always stood for fair treatment of Federal employees, and I always shall. I am for the postal pay raise because I think it is justified on the record. I am for such adjustments as rising costs of living may require, for Federal employees—all of them. But I am not in favor of squandering public money where the need is unproved, in the face of the desperately important and critically unattended to needs which face our country today, both at home and abroad.

I have sent to all Senators a telegram which summarizes my case for the amendment. I ask unanimous consent that it be incorporated in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

I urge your support of my amendment limiting pay raises to postal workers. Its adoption would effect an annual saving of nearly half a billion dollars. No case has been made to warrant 7½-percent increase in salaries of classified civil service employees. Their present wage scale compares favorably with comparable work in private industry, while their fringe benefits are even more generous. Since last pay raise was granted 2 years ago, cost of living has increased only 1.6 percent. The pending bill will permanently add three-quarters of a billion dollars to the cost of Government at

a time when public money is urgently required to meet critical needs on many fronts which we are leaving unattended.

Mr. CHURCH. For these reasons, I urge the adoption of the amendment. If it is adopted, I think we shall have rendered a signal public service.

If the amendment is not agreed to, I shall have to support the bill on final passage, in order to do justice to the postal workers. But in that event, we shall be paying a very high price to do right by one segment of our Federal employees.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield. Mr. McCLELLAN. In his remarks earlier I understood the Senator to make a statement with respect to the amount of money that his amendment would save annually. What was the amount stated by the Senator?

Mr. CHURCH. The best estimate that I have is that the amendment would effect an annual saving of about a half billion dollars.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is that not approximately two-thirds of the amount involved in the bill?

Mr. CHURCH. That is right; it is approximately two-thirds of the amount involved in the bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to compliment the Senator on the very able address that he has made in support of his amendment. I subscribe to the views that he has expressed, except that I have difficulty in agreeing with him in that we should vote for two-thirds of the bill that is bad in order to get the one-third which is needed enacted into law. That is not a sound or safe guide or policy to pursue.

Can we therefore, in the light of our fiscal situation, in view of the heavy burdens upon us, go further into debt by spending money we do not have, to raise salaries to the tune of a half billion dollars for employees where no adequate justification is shown to exist at the present time for such increase. I can't in good conscience do that. A case is made here for the postal employees, and I want to vote to increase their salaries.

I believe that we should raise the salaries of the postal workers. I agree that there is justification for doing so, and I want to do that. However, as the able Senator from Idaho has pointed out, there is no need to raise Federal salaries across the board. There is urgent need for this half billion dollars—a half billion dollars that we actually do not have—to be spent for things that are critical to the security of our country.

Mr. CHURCH. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to compliment the Senator highly. I hope that his message has reached home in the hearts of enough Senators so that we can rise to the occasion and meet our responsibilities as Senators, and protect the interest of the taxpayers, while doing justice to those Federal employees in the postal service who deserve the increase that this bill provides.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President—

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President—

Mr. CHURCH. I promised to yield to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina; when he finishes, I shall be happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. ERVIN. I wish to join the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] in commending the magnificent and courageous presentation which has been made to the Senate by the able and distinguished Senator from Idaho. The bill before the Senate has troubled me. I have made a study of the matter and have reached the identical conclusions which the Senator from Idaho has reached with respect to the proposal to raise the pay of Federal employees as set forth in the bill.

The postal workers have made out a case which in my judgment justifies the pay increase proposed for postal workers. I think there has been a total failure to make out a case for the increase of pay for Government employees generally.

I sometimes feel as though we ought to hang our heads in shame for the conduct of Congress in fiscal affairs. I make that statement because 28 years ago the people of the United States had a national debt of \$30 billion. Today they have a national debt of \$290 billion. They have that national debt because Congress has failed to exercise the moral and political courage to raise, by taxes upon the living, sufficient moneys to pay the appropriations it has made. Instead of doing so, Congress year after year, in 25 years out of 28, has appropriated more money than it has had the moral and political courage to raise by revenue measures bearing upon those living Americans who have a chance to walk up to the ballot box and say whether they approve of the way Congress is managing affairs.

It is time for Congress to quit appropriating the unearned income of unborn Americans, and that is precisely what this bill proposes insofar as it undertakes to raise the pay of Federal employees generally. I think it is time for somebody to represent these unborn Americans who, when they come into the world find themselves already in debt to an extent in excess of \$1,600 apiece as their pro rata part of the national debt.

During 25 of the last 28 years, Congress has not had the moral and political courage to raise enough revenue to take care of the expenditures which it has been authorizing. I wish to commend the Senator for his courageous and intelligent presentation.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator from North Carolina. I appreciate his remarks. I can only add that yesterday the Senate passed a defense appropriation bill, which relates to the Military Establishment. When that bill comes out of conference, it is entirely likely, and I venture to predict, that the total amount of increase the Congress will make to strengthen the national defense, over and above the budget re-

quests of the President, will be less than the amount of money that we provide in this bill to fatten the Federal payroll.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I realize the Senator from Idaho is a member of the committee, and therefore has been able to make a study of the problem in a way which we have not. As I understand the Senator's position, he favors a raise for postal workers because they have made out a case. As I have been able to review the testimony and the ample evidence presented to me, that is so. They have made out a good case.

The Senator from Idaho, however, does not favor the proposed raise for other employees of the Government because they have not made out a sufficient case. I ask this question of the Senator from Idaho, because I am somewhat impressed with his argument. There may well be an answer to it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the Senator from New York has referred to the Senator from Idaho as being a member of the committee.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I wish to correct that statement. It was my privilege to serve on the committee for a period of 2 years, but I am not longer a member of the committee and have not been for some time.

My allusion to the committee had reference to the time I had previously served on it. I did not attend the actual hearings on this bill, but I have tried to review the reports made by the committee, and the evidence presented to justify the reports.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the clarification. I intended to say that the Senator has had an opportunity to study the problem in a way which has not been given to those of us who have never been members of the committee.

I ask the Senator to refer to page 220 of the transcript of testimony, on which appears the testimony of Mr. James A. Campbell, the president of the American Federation of Government Employees.

I also call attention to the statement on page 223, of the testimony of Mr. Campbell. As I say, there may well be an answer to these assertions, but it is said at page 220:

During the 10-year period ended in February 1960, Federal classified employees received three raises which amounted to an average increase of 30 percent on a cumulated basis. During the same period, hourly rates of employees of seven of the largest corporations were raised through collective bargaining to a degree far exceeding that of Federal workers.

The total increase ranged from 53.7 percent for the Sinclair Refining Cos. to 87 percent for the Aluminum Co. of America, as indicated in appendix table 1. During the 2-year period from January 1, 1958, the hourly rates of employees of these seven companies were raised as much as 10 percent in contrast to no raise for Federal classified employees.

Then on page 223, below the middle of the page, there is this statement:

It would require an average increase of approximately 12.5 percent to return classified salaries to their 1939 purchasing power.



1960.

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

12085

I would appreciate it if the Senator from Idaho or, for that matter, any member of the committee, could enlighten us on whether those are accurate statements or inaccurate statements, or whether there is some other answer to them, because they do seem to me to present an argument on the other side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. CHURCH. As the Senator knows, it is always possible to present an argument to support any proposition. Arguments have been presented here which are confined to certain wage scales prevailing in certain industries at certain times. I have referred the Senate to the increases that Congress has granted since 1945. The increases referred to by the Senator from New York relate to a more limited period, beginning in 1950. I believe that when we go back to the end of the war and take into account all the increases which have been granted by Congress until the present time, and compare them with the rising cost of living which has occurred during the same period of time, no case is made for the proposition that we have not acted fairly toward our Federal employees.

The evidence I have seen has led me to the judgment that no sufficient case has been made to justify a 7½-percent increase across-the-board. I would approve of an increase which was commensurate with the rise in the living costs since we last made a salary adjustment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have listened to the Senator from Idaho, and I was very much struck by some of his statements. I notice that the Senator has said that we increased the salaries since the war by 83.6 percent. I should like to call his attention to the fact that if that is true we ought to have a higher increase than we are proposing in the bill, for this reason. We did not increase the salaries during the war. They were frozen. When we go back to the time before the war we find that the dollar was worth 100 cents. Today it is worth 47 cents to the dollar. It would take a 106-percent increase to equal the salaries the employees were getting at that time.

Then, too, we must consider the income tax. They had salaries of \$5,000 in the Federal Government prior to that time, and the man got whatever his salary was. Today the Government reaches out and takes, when the salary is over a certain amount, 20 percent, 25 percent, or 30 percent of the man's salary. Therefore, according to the Senator's own statement and according to his own figures, we are not giving the employees enough. The committee thought so too. We have always dropped back every time that we gave an increase. Some Senators who have served on the committee, like the minority leader, know from their experience with bills of this kind that we have dropped back 1 or 2 percent practically every time we passed a salary increase bill.

We have found too that the work has been increased. The employees are turning out more work.

If we should increase the salaries of the postal workers and not the classified

workers, I should like to point out some of the inequities that would result. The Post Office Department pays the salaries of the workers who clean the post offices if the post office occupies more than 50 percent of the space. If they do not occupy more than 50 percent of the space, that work is done by employees under the Classified Act. We must treat them all alike. We must be equitable in dealing with all of them. Postal workers and classified workers should receive the same treatment. They both have to pay the same amount for the cost of living.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. The Senator perhaps heard what I read from the testimony of Mr. Campbell. I would appreciate any enlightenment he can give us on this statement by Mr. Campbell, as to whether it is accurate or not accurate. I particularly wish to ask the Senator about this statement on page 8 of the report, near the top of the page:

This survey discloses that the salaries of classified employees in the middle ranges—grades 5, 7, 9, 11, and 13, which include 419,734 employees—declined 20.3 percent from 1950 to 1960, notwithstanding salary adjustments approved by the Congress.

I assume that that statement is inaccurately phrased. I assume it means to say that their standard of living has declined 20 percent. Is not that what it means? The following sentence in the report is:

This independent and unbiased conclusion means that in one short decade hundreds of thousands of Federal employees have been pushed 20 percent lower in their standards of living, in comparison to their friends and neighbors in private enterprise.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. From what report is the Senator reading?

Mr. KEATING. I am reading from the top of page 8 of the report.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is that the House report?

Mr. KEATING. It is the House committee report. I am reading from the top of page 8. I wonder if the Senator could clarify that statement. It seems to me that if that is a fact it is a rather persuasive argument for a raise for other Federal employees.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Well, I have no answer, but according to what is stated here, the salaries declined 20.3 percent.

Mr. KEATING. I suppose that the actual salary of any Federal employee has not declined. I believe that means to say that the standard of living has declined because the cost of living has gone up more than the salaries have gone up. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The purchasing power of the salary had decreased. I believe that is what was intended to be conveyed by that language.

Mr. KEATING. I believe that is true. In the statement of Mr. Campbell, he said that during the 10-year period ended in February 1960 Federal classified employees received a 30-percent raise as compared with 1953, and 87 percent of

the hourly rates paid by the seven large corporations.

I wish to ask the Senator from Idaho a question, because I recognize, having tried lawsuits, as has the Senator, that we can pick out peculiar situations, and make any case.

I ask the Senator from South Carolina whether he feels that this statement by Mr. Campbell is a fair and accurate statement, as picturing the fact that the increases for Federal employees generally have been well below the increases for workers in private industry.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. From all the facts brought out in the committee, the Federal Government is behind the large corporations in the United States in increasing the pay of its employees.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I can give a list of figures for different periods of time. All the information has been placed in the RECORD. It shows that the Federal Government is behind private industry in every big city in the United States in which we could gather the information. For example, blue-colored workers or laborers in Boston are 28 percent below; helpers are 27 percent below.

We went into this question from city to city and place to place in the United States, and we found that that is correct.

I myself believe that the proposed increase is but half of what it would be if we were to raise the pay to what is paid by the big corporations in the United States. However, we cannot afford to do that at this particular time, so we want to pass a bill which will be within the limits of the Government's ability to pay. I hope it will be signed by the President.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I appreciated the statement made by the Senator from Idaho today. I shall address myself to this question.

There are several features about the bill which I do not like, but it is the pending bill. It is the only bill before the Senate. I think I would be less than frank if I did not say I do not believe we can pass legislation, personally, I could not favor passing legislation, which would, in my opinion, treat unfairly one group of Federal employees as compared with another group.

Mr. Campbell's statement on page 218 of the hearings calls attention to some of the problems of the classified workers.

While I am talking about Mr. Campbell, I wish to say in his behalf, and in behalf of those whom he represents, that he is, in my opinion, one of the ablest of the various representatives of the labor group who come before us. He has rendered outstanding service on behalf of the classified employees of the Nation. I call attention to this statement by Mr. Campbell:

Eighty-seven percent of the 2,200,000 Federal employees have their salaries or wages fixed under three separate pay systems—

I repeat—three separate pay systems. These three systems are:

1. Classification Act, covering 970,000 employees.

They are the employees whom we are talking about at the present time in discussing the amendment.

2. The Postal Pay Act, covering 470,000 employees.

3. Army-Air Force and Navy wage systems, 480,000.

There are those three different groups.

I shall read from the statement what has happened as between the classified employees, whose pay is fixed by Congress, and the Wage Board employees. I read from page 222 of the hearings:

A comparison of how Wage Board and classified rates have differed in one 4-year period—1952-55—will illustrate the advantage of an annual review.

The discussion was as to whether there should be an annual review.

During those 4 years classified salaries were increased once by 7.5 percent. In the same period wage board rates advanced 20.7 percent. An increase of that size probably would have been challenged if proposed as a single raise, but divided into four separate raises it was assimilated without question.

The year-to-year wage board raises were as follows: 1952, 5.5 percent; 1953, 7.8 percent; 1954, 4.3 percent; 1955, 1.7 percent.

I desired to stress that fact because classified employees during that 4-year period received a 7½ percent pay increase, while wage board employees, whose salaries and wages are fixed by boards of the Federal Government, received a 20-percent increase. Therefore, I do not believe that we could, with any justice at all, adopt an amendment which would unfairly, in my opinion, treat classified Federal workers as compared with other workers.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I am grateful for the explanation made by the Senator from Kansas. It is very difficult for us in the Chamber to reach a correct conclusion without having heard the testimony and studied it at great length. The testimony of Mr. Campbell impresses me as being very persuasive on the point that the rates of pay of Federal employees generally, including the postal workers, have not kept pace with the rates in other industries.

If I may have permission, I should like to ask the Senator from Kansas whether he believes that the testimony of Mr. Campbell, which appears to be so persuasive, is much to be relied upon, or whether Mr. Campbell has picked out certain isolated cases which make a better case than really it should.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the figures in the wage board decisions are based on comparable wages in the communities. Therefore, I think they are figures which really and truly reflect the wage increases which have been paid em-

ployees who come under that system, as compared with the classified and postal workers who come under the regular Federal pay system.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The rates fixed by the wage boards are based on the prevailing wages in the respective areas.

Mr. CARLSON. They reflect the wages out in the communities.

Mr. KEATING. Do the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from South Carolina believe that the years which have been selected make an especially good case for the employees? If another series of years, or a 10-year period, or any other period, had been selected, would substantially the same effect have been shown?

Mr. CARLSON. It is my opinion that they would show substantially the same effect.

Mr. KEATING subsequently said:

Mr. President, will the Senator yield me a half a minute?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, earlier in the day I made some remarks in connection with an amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to include at the conclusion of my remarks copies of several letters which I have received with reference to this subject.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEATING

This measure, viewed in its overall impact, is designed to bring the salaries paid Federal employees more nearly in line with those paid to workers in private industry. As such, it should command wide support.

We now learn that in the last 10 years, literally thousands of fine Federal employees have dropped some 20 percent lower in their standards of living, in comparison to their neighbors who happen to work in private industry.

Here are some more statistics which have been furnished to me and which I believe to be accurate: The average overall private industry wage is \$15 a week or \$780 a year higher than that of Federal employees doing the same type of work. Even the proposed increase will not bring the level of Federal salaries up to that of salaries outside the Government, but it will be a step in the right direction.

As against the 30-percent increase in Federal employees' salaries in the last 10-year period, here are some more comparisons with private industry. Hourly wages have increased at the following rate since 1950 in these specific companies: General Motors Corp.—a 62-percent advance, compared to 30 percent for Federal employees. United States Steel 66 percent—of this increase 9.5 percent has been since January 1, 1958. There has been no increase in Federal salaries during the past 2 years. The Aluminum Corp. of America has raised its wages 87 percent in the last 10 years.

Other pertinent figures include: Goodrich Rubber—56 percent, Lockheed Aircraft, 63 percent. These percentages were supplied by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and therefore must be viewed as reliable. These figures make the Federal salary increase of 30 percent in the last 10 years look small indeed.

I have received literally thousands of letters from postal workers and other Federal employees, as well as their families and friends, pointing out the need for an adequate pay raise measure. These communica-

tions demonstrate the very real, the very personal manner in which the present inadequate wage scales are affecting these people.

A postal worker's wife in Tonawanda wrote me in part as follows:

"As the wife of a post office employee, I am writing to you in the hope that you may act in getting a pay raise bill passed.

"We have our home and three children to support. We live in a modest community but we can't associate with any of our neighbors because their incomes are far above ours. I have a part-time job, driving for a school but with our combined income, we have quite a problem just getting by. It doesn't seem fair to—just get by, not ever being able to afford anything but food and clothing, while most everyone around us has new cars and can take vacations. We have vacation time but where can you go on nothing. We can't even charge anything extra because there just is not enough money left over after paying mortgage payments, light, heat, and food."

Here is one from a constituent of mine in Rochester:

"Both my wife and myself are career distribution clerks at the Rochester Post Office. I have 11½ years of service and my wife has a little over 1 year. We have four children going to school; a mortgaged home; and one car, which is a necessity. Our living expenses are such that even though we are both working we can only just manage to live from one payday to the next. We would like to be able to help further the education of our children and live as others do."

A lady from Staten Island recently wrote me the following letter on this subject:

"I am the wife of a Federal employee who works in New York City, and the mother of six children. We live in a housing project.

"I write with much experience about the continuous rising of living expenses that make the bare necessities of an existence on this earth: food, rent, and clothing, a constant, impossible struggle.

"With an outside job there is no leisure time to divide between family and community and only a slight chance that anyone can match expenses. Yet, without an outside job, my family and I would be hard put to survive.

"Please make possible a worthwhile, liveable raise for those of us who must depend on Federal salaries. Let us get in step with the rest of America on our pay."

Here is one from a housewife in Floral Park:

"Have you ever missed a night's sleep worrying how you were going to pay your bills? Does your wife ever hesitate to call the doctor when your children are sick?

"Well, if you were a postal worker you would know these problems. My husband has a second job as most postal workers do, and we are still just getting by. The cost of everything has gone up but not the post office salary. When the bill for the post office raise comes up please vote yes, as we do need more money just to live on."

I also have a letter from a Federal worker in New York City. He writes:

"For the past years it's been very hard for us to meet expenses and I have had to take other work in order to meet my obligations.

"I am away from my home too long and the children do not see enough of me. It seems like the only time I am home is Sunday, but then I'm so tired I find it hard to bother with them.

"You can easily see the problem. I'm a career man and I don't want to give up my job with the Government. I've been on 20 years, so you can easily see why.

"We Government workers need a pay raise—now; not in some future day. Help us please."

Finally, here is a letter from the wife of a post office worker in Elmira, N.Y.:

"As the wife of a postal clerk, I would appreciate your affirmative vote on the pay raise bill.

"This increase is definitely needed—the few that we have received in recent years have been very minor in the lower grade levels, in which the majority of Federal workers are employed. The compensation paid to postal employees is not commensurate with salaries paid in private industry; are not high enough to permit the same standard of living enjoyed by these same employees in 1939. Even a 9-percent increase will not bring the salary level up to these standards.

"We would not be causing inflation, as has been indicated—we need the increase because of inflation.

"You are familiar with the unemployment in the Elmira area. Usually a situation like this has the effect of downgrading the cost of living in an area. But the reverse is true. The new sales tax, an increase in the school tax and the reappraisal, which will increase our other real estate taxes, are but a few of the items that will take what increase we may receive.

"A regular postal clerk's salary is \$4,875 annually. These are the five largest items in our budget:

Taxes—Income (Federal and State), real estate, sales, other.....	\$1,000
Food.....	1,800
Mortgage payments.....	840
Insurance and utilities.....	800
Total.....	4,440

"You can readily see why the increase is needed."

These letters are typical of the flood of communications I have received from all over New York State testifying to the great need for a pay raise for postal and other Federal employees. They point up graphically—in a way no set of cold figures could—the urgent need for salary increases to bring the pay for these Government workers more in line with those now offered to employees in private industry. The additional fact is, however, that the cold figures support the need for this legislation.

We must eliminate this inequity in our laws. We can do it by rejecting amendments to this measure which will unduly water it down and prevent its benefits from fully helping these people out.

I hope this measure, so important in human terms to so many of our people, will gain the overwhelming approval of the Senate.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I associate myself with the Senator from South Carolina and the Senator from Kansas in opposing the amendment. I think the Senators have shown that the adoption of this amendment would be very definitely discriminatory against the classified civil service employees.

I must oppose any amendment which would exclude the civil service employees from the well-earned and well-deserved pay raise. The persons who would be excluded by such an amendment are dedicated public servants. They are men and women who, at a sacrifice to themselves, are devoting their entire time and talent to a better civil service. That is my personal observation.

I know many persons in the civil service who could earn much more in private industry. They are making a career of their service in the Government, and we should not turn our backs on them.

The 7½ percent salary raise has been fully justified, I believe, by the Senator from South Carolina and the Senator from Kansas. Taking that for granted, who could be more deserving of the raise than the employees in the classified civil service?

The prices of commodities, rents, and everything else in Washington and the surrounding suburbs, as elsewhere, have risen substantially. The civil service employees need this pay raise in order to meet the rising costs of living.

In my opinion, it would be cruel for Congress to exclude the civil service employees from the pay increase. In fact, it would make a mockery of the entire move for the much deserved increase.

I hope the Senate will not agree to the amendment. As has been so ably explained by the Senator from South Carolina and the Senator from Kansas, to adopt the amendment would result in discrimination against a dedicated group of Federal employees.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CHURCH. My time has been exhausted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I hope the amendment will not be adopted. I do not believe we should say, "Brothers, we will give you a pay raise; sisters, we will not give you one."

I do not think we should say to the postal workers, "We recognize your faithful, dedicated service to the Government"; but to a civil service clerk on duty at some remote post, "We are going to reduce your pay." I believe we ought to deal with all these people equitably and fairly.

The committees have carefully considered this measure. They began with a 10 percent provision, and then reduced it to 9 percent, and now have reduced it to 7½ percent. I believe they have dealt equitably and fairly with these employees.

I do not think we wish to say we will give a postal carrier a pay increase, but will not give a civilian employee in Guam an increase in pay. I do not believe it fair to provide a pay increase to one group, but to ignore another in that connection.

Mr. President, admittedly, savings could be made. For instance, we could have cut in half the Defense Department appropriations we considered and passed, yesterday; but I do not think such procedure would be wise.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be decisively rejected.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President—

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the committee on the work it has done.

I am glad the bill it has reported provides for a pay increase for the postal

employees and for all the other employees, equitably.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). All time on the amendment has either been used or been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH]. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Carroll], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPP] are absent on official business.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPP] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 58, as follows:

[Roll No. 226]

YEAS—22

Brunsdale	Ervin	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Frear	Talmadge
Chavez	Goldwater	Thurmond
Church	Hickenlooper	Wiley
Cooper	Holland	Williams, Del.
Curtis	Lausche	Young, Ohio
Dworshak	Lusk	
Ellender	McClellan	

## NAYS—58

Aiken	Gore	Mansfield
Allott	Green	Martin
Anderson	Gruening	Monroney
Bartlett	Hart	Morton
Beall	Hartke	Moss
Bennett	Hill	Murray
Bible	Humphrey	Muskie
Bridges	Jackson	Pastore
Bush	Javits	Prouty
Byrd, Va.	Johnston, Tex.	Proxmire
Byrd, W. Va.	Johnston, S.C.	Randolph
Cannon	Jordan	Robertson
Carlson	Keating	Scott
Case, N.J.	Kerr	Smathers
Clark	Kuchel	Smith
Dirksen	Long, Hawaii	Sparkman
Dodd	Long, La.	Symington
Douglas	McCarthy	Williams, N.J.
Eastland	McGee	
Fong	Magnuson	

## NOT VOTING—20

Butler	Hennings	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Hruska	Russell
Carroll	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Cotton	Kennedy	Stennis
Engle	McNamara	Yarborough
Fulbright	Morse	Young, N. Dak.
Hayden	Mundt	

So Mr. CHURCH's amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof:

The rates of pay of Federal employees should be generally comparable to rates paid by private enterprise for similar work, should adequately recognize differences in difficulty and responsibility of work and provide material incentive to advance in the service, and should be governed by rules of administration which make pay a useful tool of management.

In accordance with this policy the President is authorized and directed.

1. To adjust the rates of pay in the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, the Postal Field Service Pay Act, the Veterans Benefit Act as amended, and the Foreign Service Act as amended, to levels generally comparable with those reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics as a result of its current survey of pay rates in private enterprise.

2. To revise the pay structures in the said acts in order to insure internal equity and to provide adequate incentives for advancement.

3. To establish rules for administration and use of the pay rates thus established.

The President is authorized and directed to make these adjustments and revisions effective as of the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after January 1, 1961.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, this pay bill has indeed done a grand shuffle. When it first began it started at a level of 23 percent. The second approach was at the level of 15 percent. The third ap-

proach was at the level of 9 percent. The bill that is presently before us calls for an increase of 7½ percent.

If it is applied generally across the board to 1,700,000 workers, it is very easy to calculate the budget impact of the bill. Just figure \$100 million for every 1 percent of pay increase, and that makes an easy rule-of-thumb calculation.

It seems amazing to me to make this proposal in view of the fact that in the Labor appropriation bill for fiscal 1960 we provided a sum of \$1 million, of which \$500,000 was earmarked for a study of so-called comparability of remuneration in government, as distinguished from industry. That job was assigned to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Our present information is that they have completed this work in some 30 metropolitan centers. It is intended to do the job in something over 80 centers. It will not be completed until September of this year.

The whole purpose of this study, in the hands of people in an agency created by Congress, was to determine what the disparity was between the pay in business and industry and the pay in government. It raises this interesting question: Do we not want to wait for this survey to be completed? Are we afraid that results of the survey will cause us to confess that this afternoon we have wasted \$500,000 of the people's money? Why have the survey? We are the ones who indicated it in the first instance, and I think it is long overdue. That kind of survey should have been made some years ago, because the question of what the pay is in industry as compared with what it is in government, or vice versa, continues to arise like some annual specter whenever we deal with the pay structure.

The amendment now at the desk operates from that stance, and it is very simple. It strikes out everything in the bill except the enacting clause, and it not only authorizes, but directs, the President of the United States to readjust the pay, and also the pay structures and the inequities that have become almost rigid in the pay structure, and do it by the next pay period after January 1, 1961.

It has to be done, as the amendment provides, at levels that will be generally comparable with those reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, as a result of its current survey, of pay rates in private enterprise.

I am ready to see this problem resolved. I should like to see it resolved. We continue to rush up hill and then we rush down hill again. If one examined the testimony on the 23 percent increase bill, he would find it was just as intense, just as passionate, just as persuasive as the testimony on the 15-percent bill.

If Senators will examine the testimony with respect to the 9-percent pay raise bill, they will observe that the same arguments were made as were made for the larger percentages. It was said the employees could not get along without the increase. This "bogey" continues to haunt us from time to time.

What is proposed is a sensible approach, unless we want to confess we

have no confidence in the Bureau of Labor Statistics and that we are afraid of the results, which will not be known until sometime close to election. Are we afraid the issue will not be resolved until after the Congress adjourns? I am content to abide the issue. I am content to do so now.

If this agency in the Department of Labor, on which we lavish large sums of money every year, has any value at all, then of course we could well wait until the study has been completed. The free enterprise system of this country uses the agency figures. The business structure of this country uses those figures. The other agencies of the Government use those figures. Are the Senate and the House to say, "That is perfectly all right, but we do not want to bother about those figures." That would be an amazing confession, to say the least.

We can say, "Well, we 'kissed' \$500,000 goodbye. The devil with this study. The devil with the Bureau of Labor Statistics. We will ignore them. We will not wait."

We could say that, notwithstanding the fact that it takes a given amount of time, always, to assemble the data and to do the job. Once the job is done, the amendment provides that upon the basis of the levels which are ascertained, to get comparability with remuneration in industry, the President "is authorized and directed to make these adjustments and revisions effective as of the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after January 1, 1961."

I listened with interest to the argument of the distinguished Senator from Idaho. Much of the burden of his argument was that there are no real, factual data, except in the case of the postal workers. That is the point the Bureau of the Budget makes. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget appeared before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Incidentally, this is a good time to come to grips with the question of how the President may feel. The President of the United States supports the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. The Budget Director does not take a position unless he confers with the President.

On the 28th of April the Budget Director appeared before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I read one sentence from what he said. It needs no further argument:

The administration finds no justification at this time for enactment of any legislation which would provide general increases in salary rates under the Classification Act, the Postal Field Service Pay Act, and other statutory pay systems.

The Budget Director elaborated. The whole statement can be compressed, I think, in a minute of time.

The reason for the position is that the enactment of the general salary increases would ignore the only sound principle of Federal pay fixing, which is reasonable comparability. That is the reason we set up the survey group. We are waiting for the study to be completed. We are waiting for the results.

The second reason the Director of the Bureau of the Budget assigned was that,

based on information presently available, enactment of any flat percentage or dollar increase would result in excessive salary rates in some grades and possibly inadequate salary rates in other grades.

We can compress this in a few words—rigidities and inequities which have persisted in the salary structure.

The third reason put forth is that any salary increase would be without sound factual justification. We are waiting for the data.

Realizing, of course, the rather intense circumstances under which the bill was rushed along, and the desire that no amendment be agreed to, so as to avoid a conference, in order to send the bill to the President of the United States, to make sure there will be no pocket veto, it seems to me in that kind of haste we are playing with the fiscal responsibility of the country, because three-quarters of a billion dollars are involved in the bill.

I am not insensible to all of the arguments which have been made, but I do not wish to be pushed into this thing when the Budget Director tells us there is no factual foundation, the comparability study has not been completed, and the inequities still persist. Certainly they do.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the Senator will permit, I should like to finish a thought or two first.

I know how easy it is to assail the Budget Director. That seems to be a common indoor sport in Congress today.

I simply remind Senators that in 1921 we passed the Budget and Accounting Act. In that act, among other things, we set up a Bureau of the Budget and named a Director of the Budget. The Director has been carrying on since that time. If Senators want to know what are his responsibilities, they can examine the 1921 law. His business is to help the President determine how to most efficiently and economically operate this Government. His business is to give aid to the committees of the Congress. That is what the law provides. His business is to have the departmental budget officers get their material together and come in to pool their information, so that there can be some responsible fiscal operation in Government.

There was a time when at the end of a session of Congress nobody knew what were the fiscal circumstances. Every committee, prior to 1921, not only took action upon its own proposed legislation, but also took action upon proposed appropriations. There was a wilderness until the act was passed to correct it.

That is the responsibility of the Budget Director. I will say, with respect to Maurice Stans, the present Director, he is in my judgment not one of the most, but—I think—the most capable Budget Director who has occupied that office since the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 was passed, and I make absolutely no exception.

The job of the Director of the Budget is to move into this matter, to advise the President, and to advise the com-

mittees of Congress. That he has done. The only way we are going to properly resolve the issue now, as I see it, is to strike out everything after the enacting clause and to authorize and direct the President to readjust the pay schedules, the pay rates, and the structure, after this survey has been completed in September, after he has the factual foundation to determine pay comparability and to do the job properly. In my book, it is that simple. I have nothing more to say. I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time, and I am ready to vote.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota and Mr. BUSH addressed the Chair.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator has referred to the bill as involving three-quarter billion dollars, and the same reference has been made at other times during the debate. I wish to point out to the Senator that this is an annual recurring cost.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. This bill does not involve merely three-quarter billion dollars. Yesterday we were talking about appropriations for the Department of Defense. The price tag for an item might be three-quarter billion dollars, or so many hundred million dollars, or something else, but it represented a one-time purchase. In this instance, if we pass the bill, without having the benefit of the study the Senator has suggested, we shall be committing the country to an annual expenditure of an additional three-quarter billion dollars.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Exactly. I am reminded of the story of the fellow in jail back home. When I walked across the courthouse yard I said, "What are you in for?"

He replied, "Larceny."

I said, "For how long?"

He said, "From now on."

Mr. President, this is going to be from now on.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield 10 minutes to me in order to enable me to speak in support of the amendment at the proper time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall be delighted to do so.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I ask the Senator from Illinois the difference between raising the wages of employees of the U.S. Government and the proposed appropriation of \$4 billion for foreign aid, which we considered this morning in committee?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I see that argument advanced in letters, and it is easy and appealing. I will explain the difference. The Constitution provides that provision shall be made for the common defense. Foreign aid, misnamed "mutual security," is a collective security arrangement and a program enacted by Congress in pursuant of a constitutional principle. By that law the Commander in Chief and the Congress, in its capacity as the exclusive legislative and law-making body of the Govern-

ment, undertakes in partnership to subserve the interest of common defense, which involves all of the 179,200,000 people in this country, and not just a group. That is the difference.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Where are we to get the help about which the Senator is talking?

Mr. DIRKSEN. What help?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Help for foreign aid to enable Uncle Sam to get along in the world. I ask the Senator where we are getting with respect to Japan, Korea, the Philippines, and Turkey.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I did not know that we were going to debate the mutual security bill this afternoon. If we are, I had better ask for an extension of time for 2 or 3 hours to enable me to get my notes. We may as well consider the bill now as later. I thought we were debating a pay bill and attempting to find a factual, equitable, and reasonable basis on which to act, since we are dealing with 1,570,000 people, which is quite different from the interests of 179 million men, women, and children, and probably quite different from the interests of 67 million people who file income tax returns in this country and who have some stake in the matter.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not run easily. I do not care what is said. I prefer to take care of the American girl in Washington and in New Mexico and in Illinois than to help elsewhere. That is the only difference between the attitude of the Senator from Illinois and myself. I wish to take care of our girls.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not quite get the point of my distinguished colleague from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Probably the Senator does not want to get the idea.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have some interest in all the people of this country, including even the taxpayers, who must make up the money which we appropriate, since it comes from the general revenue.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does the Senator worry about the \$4 billion that is appropriated for foreign aid?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I answered my friend a moment ago and tried to debate the subject on the high ground of constitutional responsibility for the defense and survival of this country, which takes it out of the narrow course in which sometimes we move.

I yield now to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] 10 minutes, if I still have 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, the basic issue of our times is whether the United States, a republic with a representative form of government based upon free elections, can compete successfully with the totalitarian dictatorship which rule the Soviet Union and her Far Eastern ally, Communist China.

I believe we can, once the American people, and their representatives in Congress, awaken to the realities we face. But I must confess, Mr. President, that there are grounds for pessimism when one considers the record of this Con-

gress to date, and especially the political cynicism which has brought this pay increase bill for Government employees before us today.

World tensions have been heightened by Khrushchev's torpedoing of the summit conference, and by renewed Communist pressure to drive us from our oversea bases, as evidenced by the rioting in Japan.

In recognition of the increased danger created by these and other events on the international stage, the Senate on yesterday increased the defense budget by more than \$1 billion.

But, Mr. President, our national security, our military strength, is based upon the financial stability, and the credit of the United States. While appropriating billions for defense, we seem determined to undermine those foundations upon which our defense rests by refusing to exercise fiscal responsibility.

President Eisenhower submitted a budget with an estimated surplus of \$4.2 billion, which is needed to retire some of our huge national debt and thus strengthen the credit of the National Government.

The committees in charge of taxation have refused to approve his recommendations for raising the revenues required to achieve that surplus. Nondefense spending has been proposed far in excess of the President's budget.

Unless we exercise restraint and insist upon fiscal responsibility, not only will we wipe out the projected surplus but also run the danger of incurring an inflationary deficit in the coming fiscal year.

In the Washington Daily News of today is an editorial entitled "Rush to a Deficit," which says, in part:

In the rush toward adjournment, our convention-minded Congress is showing a reckless tendency to play fast and loose with our hard-earned dollars.

As the outlook now adds up, extra spending of nearly \$5 billion is in the works—more than the surplus President Eisenhower had estimated for next year. And an optimistic estimate it was, too.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

#### RUSH TO A DEFICIT

In the rush toward adjournment, our convention-minded Congress is showing a reckless tendency to play fast and loose with our hard-earned dollars.

The trend is to more spending and less income—a sure route to inflation.

While the Senate Finance Committee, over the objections of its wisest heads, was voting to cripple the Government's revenue by cutting some obnoxious but productive taxes, other committees were trying to outdo each other in new ways to spend.

The House voted to raise Government salaries, and a Senate committee promptly approved the plan. Increases in spending for housing, welfare and defense were being eagerly pushed.

As the outlook now adds up, extra spending of nearly \$5 billion is in the works—more than the surplus President Eisenhower had estimated for next year. And an optimistic estimate it was, too.

The transportation, telephone and telegram taxes the Senate committee has voted

to repeal were imposed on a temporary basis because of the Korean war. They have been reimposed year after year, simply because the Government needed the money. The Government needs the money no less now.

Repeal of these taxes would be desirable in normal times. So would the repeal of any taxes. But there is only one practical way to reduce taxes—and that is by first reducing spending. The waste and overspending in the Government is sinful. But a worse crime against the people would be inflation—robbing the dollar of its integrity by running up the Government's debt.

The same finance committee which voted to take away \$752 million of the Government's income by reducing the transportation and communication taxes also found it necessary to raise—again—the Government's legal debt limit to \$293 billion, \$4 billion more than what the Government now owes. The spending, tax-cutting schemes Congress is cooking up may put temporary icing in our cake—but deficit-made inflation will take away the cake.

Mr. BUSH. The pending pay increase bill would unwisely add \$750 million to Government spending, not only in the coming fiscal year, but in all the years to come.

I say unwisely, because we do not have the facts before us upon which to base a judgment concerning what amounts of salary increases, and for what positions, are needed to compensate Government workers fairly, and to attract the skills the Federal service requires.

Only last year, we appropriated \$500,000 to enable the Bureau of Labor Statistics to conduct a study to determine those facts. The Bureau is scheduled to submit a report in September of this year, so that carefully considered legislation may be drafted for submission to the next Congress to provide pay adjustments for all employees to compensate for cost-of-living increases, and to correct inequities which exist in the salary schedules.

As the Senator from Illinois has said, we would waste or throw out the window \$500,000 of the taxpayers' money by passing a bill which takes the shotgun approach of increasing all salaries across the board by 7½ percent for most Government employees, and by more than 8 percent for the postal workers.

The bill has been brought before us for one reason and one reason only: politics in a presidential election year. We might as well face it. That is why we are facing the bill.

Organizations of postal workers, and of other Government employees, have brought heavy pressures to bear upon Members of the Senate and of the other body. There have been threats, sometimes veiled and sometimes bluntly stated, that Members who vote against the pay bill will suffer at the polls. It is surrender to these pressures that has brought the bill to the Senate floor today.

The political cynicism behind the bill lies in the fact that it is well known that it is entirely unacceptable to the President of the United States.

Testimony has been submitted to that effect by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and by Senators on the floor today.

Some feel secure in voting for it, with the knowledge that the President will rescue them from what they know is folly by a veto. Others feel confident

that there will be sufficient votes to override the veto. In either case, it is hoped to gain some political advantage by voting "for" the Government employees, and picturing the administration as being "against" them.

This kind of political maneuvering may be acceptable in normal times. In the days in which we live, when the United States and the entire free world are in increased danger from Communist aggression, I, for one, will have no part of it.

Mr. President, I have voted in the past for salary increases for postal and other Government workers. I expect I shall do so again. But I shall not so vote until I have a solid base of facts upon which to form a judgment.

I have consulted with postal workers from my own State during all my 8 years of service in the Senate, and especially in the past few months. I enjoy friendships among them, and have a sympathetic understanding of their problems.

I have carefully considered all the information they have presented to me, and all the information I could obtain from other sources.

The levels of postal salaries have been compared with those of State government employees in Connecticut, and with wages in industrial and nonindustrial employment in my State and elsewhere.

Although it is difficult to draw comparisons, a general conclusion can be reached. It has not been demonstrated that the salaries of postal workers and other Federal workers lag behind those prevailing in the Connecticut State government service, or in private employment in my own State. On the contrary, the evidence at hand indicates that these Federal employees are keeping pace, and, in some instances, enjoy advantages over those in private employment or the State service.

Mr. President, the attempt has been made to picture this administration as being unconcerned with the welfare of the postal employees. The record over the past 7½ years refutes that unfounded charge. In pay and fringe benefits, totaling \$544,323,000 in the first year and increasing in succeeding years, these actions have been taken:

First. Direct pay increases totaling approximately 20 percent, for a first-year cost of \$436,831,000.

Second. Greatly liberalized retirement benefits, with an added first-year cost of \$10,538,000.

Third. Group life insurance, at a first-year cost of \$7,103,000.

Fourth. Group health insurance, with an estimated first-year cost of \$37,963,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BUSH. I yield myself 10 minutes on the bill.

Fifth. Executive order holiday benefits for rural carriers, and Saturday holiday benefits which guarantee each employee eight paid holidays per year, with first-year costs of \$4,433,000.

Sixth. Additional equipment allowance for rural carriers, with first-year costs of \$6,800,000.

Seventh. Increased travel allowances, with first-year costs of \$4,100,000.

Eighth. Tax-free uniform allowances of up to \$100 per uniformed employee each year, with first-year costs of \$13,600,000.

Ninth. Biweekly pay periods, providing one extra day's pay per year, with a first-year cost of \$6,700,000.

Tenth. Military leave for substitute employees, at a first-year cost of \$2,800,000.

Eleventh. Longevity pay for substitute employees, at a first-year cost of \$765,000.

Twelfth. Unemployment compensation, with an estimated first-year cost to the Federal Government, attributable to postal employment, of \$7,200,000.

Thirteenth. Free fidelity bonds at an estimated annual savings to postal employees of \$776,280 and a cost to the Department of \$190,000.

Fourteenth. Social security coverage extended to temporary employees, at a first-year cost of \$5,300,000.

I do not think that is the picture of an administration which is not interested in postal employees; on the contrary, it is evidence of the very deep interest the administration has for people who are working for the Government.

I am confident that the administration will continue to give fair treatment to its employees in the postal service, as well as to those in the classified service. I am confident that when the study ordered by Congress at a cost of \$500,000 is completed in September, legislation to provide fair and equitable adjustments in compensation for all Government employees will be drafted and submitted to the next Congress. I am confident that it will be legislation that Members of the Senate can support.

If the Dirksen amendment shall be agreed to, and I hope it will be, the President will have before Congress in January of next year a schedule of pay adjustments and increases which will be made in the light of the study for which we are paying \$500,000 of the taxpayers' money.

To enact the bill now before the Senate would be an act of fiscal irresponsibility, and demonstrate a failure to recognize the dangers we face. For the reasons I have stated, Mr. President, I shall support the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

I have given a great deal of study to this issue. I have spent more time on it than on anything I have been involved in during this year. I have talked to people in my own State and I have talked to the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, as well as to members of the committee. I have also read volumes about it. I am satisfied that the jobs in the Post Office Department and in the classified service are in demand. Certainly that does not indicate that the Government is not offering comparable compensation with the State government or with private firms in commerce and industry, at least within the State of Connecticut. On the contrary, it indicates we need more information, and certain knowledge concerning inequities which may exist, before we can legislate fairly in the interests of all Federal employees.

Furthermore, the record shows that the "quit rate," as it is called, of people leaving the service, is lower than in private industry, which indicates that people are reluctant to leave Government service.

I hope that the Senate will adopt the Dirksen amendment. I believe that the report which we are about to receive in September will be a competent one, that it will be a report which will have been painstakingly and carefully prepared by people who are competent to make such an objective study. With this guidance, the President will, I hope, make what adjustments may be necessary, to treat fairly our Government employees.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

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

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. KERR. I am much interested in the statement the Senator made concerning the number of applicants for postal or other Government jobs because those jobs would be better than the jobs which the persons are now in. Would the Senator know if those persons are persons whose economic condition is worse as a result of their trying to make a living under Benson's farm program?

Mr. BUSH. Not many persons in Connecticut are displaced by the Benson farm program. Most of the people in Connecticut have been strongly behind Mr. Benson, and approve his farm policies.

Mr. KERR. Most of the people in Oklahoma are behind him, too, but for different purposes. [Laughter.]

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

THREE HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF NEW MEXICO

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am against the amendment and for the committee bill. That is certain. But before continuing with the debate on the bill, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to another matter. First, I am so glad that the Senators from Indiana are present.

It seems to me quite fitting that we should take a few moments to divert our attention from the turmoil and tumult of these riotous times and give heed to a significant event in my glorious State of New Mexico. Beginning June 17 and for 1 crowded week, the good people of my State, and especially those of Santa Fe, will celebrate the 350th anniversary of the founding of New Mexico. Everybody in the State, from Gov. John Burroughs and Mayor Leo T. Murphy, of Santa Fe, will join in this observance, basking in the past glories and looking forward to greater progress.

An event of the opening day of these festivities is worthy of note. Through the cooperation of its producers, Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, there will be a special performance of the new motion picture, "Ben-Hur," and the Governor and mayor have proclaimed June 17 as Ben-Hur Day in the anniversary celebration. Why

"Ben-Hur"? There is an interesting story behind that question; perhaps, my good colleagues the Senators from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. HARTKE] would prefer I did not tell the story. But the folks back home think I should.

"Ben-Hur" is a New Mexico product, and its author is being honored as one of the picturesque and courageous citizens of Santa Fe. Indiana and Crawfordsville, Ind., like to make similar claims to the origin of "Ben-Hur" and the citizenship of its author. But the record indicates that, at least, the honors must be shared. Gen. Lew Wallace, Civil War hero, Minister to Turkey, politician, and author, wrote the inspiring novel, "Ben-Hur." He began the book while living in Crawfordsville, Ind., but he finished it while he served as Governor of the Territory of New Mexico from 1878 to 1881. Wallace was a fantastic character; he was sent to New Mexico by President Hayes to try to clean up the territory which then was ridden by all of the lawlessness and problems of the early pioneer days. Among Wallace's problems was a young fellow known as Billy the Kid, who had the territory terrorized. Wallace contrived to have Billy give himself up, eventually. Prior to that the Kid swore to get Wallace. The fearless war hero refused to let the Kid or anybody else deter him from finishing the final chapters of "Ben-Hur." Wallace, stubbornly ignoring his wife's fears and protests, refused to draw the shades of his window as he sat writing at night. He made a perfect target for Billy the Kid. It was in that spirit that Wallace went about improving conditions in the old New Mexico. Now, 80 years later, Wallace and his immortal "Ben-Hur" are being honored in Santa Fe and throughout New Mexico.

I hope our Indiana friends will not mind.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HARTKE. I thank the Senator from New Mexico for acknowledging the fact that Lew Wallace came from Indiana. The generosity of Indiana is well known. We are glad to share such a distinguished leader with New Mexico.

I observed that Lew Wallace went to New Mexico to clean things up and did a pretty good job of cleaning them up. He went further and helped to develop the State of New Mexico.

One of the finest persons ever to come out of that State is the Senator who made the statement. He is one in a long line of the heritage of New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I acknowledge that fact that if it had not been for Lew Wallace, I might not be here.

Indiana has contributed much to New Mexico throughout the years. So have Vermont and New Hampshire. New Mexico would not have a railroad if it had not been for Vermont and New Hampshire brains and Boston money.

That is true also of the State of the distinguished junior Senator from Kan-

sas [Mr. CARLSON]. The Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe Railroad was built from Kansas into New Mexico. That railroad would not have been built to the Pacific Coast if it had not been for Vermont brains and Boston money.

#### ADJUSTMENT OF COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9883) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on the amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has 54 minutes remaining on the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in my own time, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I withdraw my suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

#### TRANSFER OF CERTAIN LANDS AND IMPROVEMENTS TO MASSACHUSETTS PORT AUTHORITY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to take time from both sides on the amendment to ask, on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], that the Chair appoint a committee of conference.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask that the Senator from Massachusetts be permitted to do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. With objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5888) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer to the Massachusetts Port Authority, an instrumentality of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, certain lands and improvements thereon comprising a portion of the so-called E Street Annex, South Boston Annex, Boston Naval Shipyard, in South Boston, Mass., in exchange for certain other lands, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, 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. RUSSELL, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. CASE of South Dakota conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### ADJUSTMENT OF COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9883) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I renew my request for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield time to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I support the amendment of the Senator from Illinois and shall explain why I do so.

Since I have been in this body, we have approached all the problems concerning salary increases in the Government from the wrong angle. Instead of determining what the probable salary should be vis-a-vis Government and private employment, we have merely jumped at some figure, sometimes a round number, sometimes not so round, to determine what the Federal employees should receive as a pay increase.

Mr. President, the greatest danger to the payrolls of America is the Federal Government itself, as we go along in our irresponsible way, spending billions of dollars that we do not have. Only 2 years ago we went through the process of increasing the pay of the postal workers and the Federal employees; and at that time I told my friends in the employ of the Federal Government that if we did not stop this reckless spending, we would negate, within 2 years, the increases we gave them. That seems to have come true, Mr. President.

The real problem is inflation, and one of the greatest contributing causes to inflation is continued deficit spending.

Recently, I was privileged to read a speech which Mr. Maurice Stans made not so long ago. I wish to read part of that speech into the RECORD, so that Senators will understand what we are doing and so that when Federal employees and other employees come to us and say to us that the dollar is not buying as much as it used to, we can take credit for that development.

Mr. Stans said

Where is the Federal budget headed in the coming decade? I can tell you this, as a statistical fact and not a prediction: If we continue the trend of the past several decades for just another 10 years we will have budget expenditures of \$160 billion by 1970. Impossible? So it seems. Yet it is not a bit more fantastic than the increases we have already scored, from \$3 billion in 1930 to \$9 billion in 1940, to \$40 billion in 1950, to almost \$80 billion in 1960.

The Mr. Stans made what I believe is a very sobering statement, as it relates

to the fiscal situation in this country. He said:

Fact No. 1 is that our present national debt of \$290 billion is far from all we owe for the past. This is just the interest-bearing current debt. To really understand what we owe, you have to add in some other things. For example, benefits which we have promised to veterans and their dependents will cost \$300 billion in the years ahead. On top of that, unfinanced Government liabilities for military and civil service retirement plans already come to nearly \$60 billion more.

Mr. President, the \$290 billion in public debt, plus more than \$350 billion of obligations for past services, plus \$90 billion of c.o.d.'s, come to the almost unbelievable total of nearly \$750 billion.

We in the Senate should be fully aware of what we are doing. Every time we endanger our fiscal responsibility, by considering measures such as the one before us today, we are not helping the wage earner of the United States. Instead, by enacting such a measure we would be destroying the wages he earns. What advantage does he gain if we increase his salary by 10 percent, but then decrease the purchasing power of the dollar by 12 percent or 15 percent? To me, the answer to this issue can be found by means of such simple arithmetic.

I believe it is high time that we in this body stop thinking about votes, and begin to think about our responsibilities to the people of the Nation, regardless of whether they work for the Government or whether they work for private industry. We in the Congress must take the responsibility for the position the dollar is in today.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I have been interested in the possible impact of the pending measure on the employees of the State of Utah who more nearly parallel Federal employees than private employees.

Today, I have received some very interesting figures: Using the present pay scales, before the proposed increase, employees of the State of Utah who correspond to Federal GS-2 and GS-3 clerks, are now earning from \$50 to \$60 a month less than their Federal counterparts. If the pending bill goes into effect, it will increase that difference by another \$20 to \$24 a month.

Employees in the State of Utah who correspond to Federal GS-4's in grade are earning approximately \$60 a month less than their Federal counterparts.

Employees in the State of Utah who correspond to Federal GS-7's in grade are earning \$75 a month less, for comparable employment.

The State of Utah employees in the professional group are earning from \$80 to \$90 a month less than the pay received by professional employees of the Federal Government who are engaged in similar work.

The Utah social case workers, who are a semiprofessional group, are earning between \$60 and \$100 a month less



1960

than the pay received by Federal Government employees who perform similar work.

The journeyman mechanics in Utah are being paid \$100 a month less than Federal journeyman mechanics are paid.

I wonder whether we stop to realize the damage we are going to do to the State governments and their employees, particularly in the case of the smaller States far removed from the large metropolitan centers, when we widen this variation. Not only shall we increase the burden on the taxpayers, by reason of the added cost of the Federal payroll; but, in addition, we shall put the taxpayers in many States in a situation in which, by using the Federal Government's example as a lever, attempts will be made to force up the State, county, and municipal payrolls.

So the real burden on the taxpayer may be very much heavier than that represented by the proposed legislation now before us. This is one reason why I am persuaded that under present circumstances I cannot support this measure.

I was also greatly impressed by the statements made by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] with respect to the classified service employees.

Mr. President, when we consider the total impact of all these factors and developments, we realize that rather sobering considerations face us as we prepare to vote on the question of passage of the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President—  
Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina.  
Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is, of course, an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the entire text of the pending pay bill.

First of all, I desire to commend the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and the other members of that committee for the prompt consideration they have given the Federal workers pay raise bill, following its passage on Wednesday of this week by the House of Representatives, by the overwhelming vote of 378 to 40.

The vote in the House of Representatives, especially in view of the opposition of the administration to pay raise legislation, is very significant and encouraging.

It indicates that the vast majority of the Members of Congress are convinced that the case for Federal pay raise legislation is sound and that the time to act is at hand. It also gives those of us who have been advocating a fair pay raise for Federal employees reason to believe that even if the President should veto this measure there are sufficient votes in the Congress to override the veto.

I intend to support the bill as reported from the committee. I earnestly hope that the bill is not further amended here in the Senate, because if it is, the

chances of obtaining its enactment this session will be seriously dampened. We may be sure that if the bill is amended and returned to the House, the opponents of pay raise legislation—and the administration in particular—will do all in their power to kill it through delaying tactics, in these few remaining days of the session.

I am confident that the Senate will approve the bill as reported from committee and that it will be sent to the President by such a large vote in its favor that the President will realize that his veto will not prevent its enactment.

In June of 1959 there were 2,380,000 civilian employees on the Federal payroll. It has been 30 years since there has been a thoroughgoing review of the compensation scales. There have been dozens of plans put together in a piecemeal fashion. The three major pay systems in use now include: first, the Classification Act, and under this fall 970,000 employees; second, the Postal Pay Act with 470,000 employees; and third, Army, Air Force, and Navy with 480,000 employees.

To delay the pay raise now being considered, the argument has been offered that there are those who do not deserve this pay raise and that we must wait for the results of a Bureau of Labor Statistics survey to be completed in September 1960. I am confident that this survey will show that the wages of Federal employees are not comparable—by and large—with wages for similar work in private industry. I do not believe that such a delay is either necessary or warranted.

This is certainly true in the case of the postal employees. There is no reason to delay. The temporary increase of 2½ percent of 2 years ago must be approved. As the result of a survey by the National Association of Letter Carriers, 24,878 budgets of members were studied; 74.9 percent—almost 75 percent—had to seek other income sources or have their wives work. Ninety-six percent reported that they were unable to live on their present salaries.

It is more than interesting to note that the Federal Housing Administration has determined that a letter carrier with 25 years service, earning \$5,170 per year, does not have a sufficient income to purchase a \$15,000 home under an FHA 30-year mortgage. An income of \$5,384 is necessary. The average salary of a letter carrier is only \$89.23 per week.

Every individual needs sufficient funds to keep abreast of the times. Federal salaries must be commensurate with salaries paid in private industry. There is a time element involved here. We are dealing with human beings, faced with an increase in the cost of living. Classified workers and post office employees have received only two pay raises under the present administration. Three pay raises passed by Congress have been vetoed. Salaries fixed by statute have not been adjusted in any timely or adequate manner in response to general changes and rises in non-Federal salaries.

Pay raises have become an annual occurrence in most industries, but not for

Federal employees. While other workers have received 14 or 15 pay increases since 1945, total increases in Federal employees' wages number 7. Postal employees have received four. Salaries of the greater number of employees continues to lag far behind the rising price level. It is not just to require the classified and postal employees to wait for the possibility of the coordination of the other minor pay systems at some future date.

From July 1951 to November 1959, postal clerks' wage increases averaged 38½ cents an hour, or approximately 20 percent, while workers in all industries received average increases of 70 cents an hour, or in excess of 45 percent. This marks a lag of 25 percent between July 1951 and November 1959 for postal clerks.

The postal clerks are not alone. Millions of Government employees face the same situation. They cannot wait to eat and to live. They must go on with their own family lives.

If, just for a moment, one assumes that classified employees were paid in 100-cent dollars in early 1939, it becomes apparent that the employee has lost much more than appears on the surface. A GS-5 salary would have to be increased 5.2 percent to make it equal in purchasing power to 1939. A GS-7 salary is worth \$263 less, and in the higher brackets the gap is much wider. To restore 1939 purchasing power today, between 3- and 61-percent raises are needed at different levels.

It is obvious that wages of comparable situations in private industry are far ahead of wages in Government employment. There are perhaps one or two grades at which they are equal, but from these lowest grades on up, pay in private industry far exceeds Government pay in managerial, scientific, and technical fields. The higher the level, the greater the gap. At GS-18, non-Federal pay is approximately \$22,500 per year, while Federal employees receive \$15,500. This low wage scale creates a great deal of difficulty in recruiting and maintaining workers.

It now costs the Federal Government \$900 to train a new employee in the postal service. At the same time, a trained man is utilized to instruct the new man. One thousand eight hundred dollars is now tied up in these two men. The turnover rate in the postal service is by no means small. Each time a man leaves, the Federal Government loses \$900. A satisfactory salary, which would keep these men in service would, in the long run, be less expensive than the wage increase. These men can rarely earn more than \$5,175 per year, and then only after 25 years' service. Frequently, they must learn difficult postal schemes on their own time and at their own expense. Is it any wonder that they leave this service?

Recently, United States Steel granted an increase to its office clerical workers, an increase in wages already higher than those of classified Federal employees in comparable positions. A file clerk in Federal service receives \$3,825 per year. A United States Steel file clerk now re-

ceives \$4,430, and by October 1961 will receive \$4,722. Government tabulating machine operators receive \$4,325, while those with United States Steel receive \$5,299 and will receive \$5,753 by October 1961.

Sperry Gyroscope Co., International Harvester Co., and Chrysler Corp. pay between \$4,320 and \$5,186 per year for stenographers, typists, and key punch operators. In the Federal service, these positions are classified in GS-2 to GS-4, for which the maximum pay is \$4,325. Only one of the private industry rates is in this category, most are comparable to GS-5.

Guards in private industry in the St. Paul-Minneapolis area receive \$2.17 an hour. Guards, rated GS-2, receive a highest pay of \$1.84. In 1939, postal letter carriers wages were generally greater than policemen. Today it is the opposite.

The whole body of Federal employees is working for the benefit of industry and for the well-being of the entire Nation. Industry could not efficiently function without the post office or the many services provided by the departments. Government engineers, scientists, and medical men benefit all the people. A fair salary is one that is compatible with business and justifiable in cost. To wait for the current survey is an unnecessary delay ignoring all previous studies and surveys. It is important that the Senate take favorable action on this bill now.

I wish to comment briefly on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois. Last evening, when the housing bill was discussed in the Senate, there was considerable debate on concentration of power in the Executive and the fact that the Congress was directing the President to put something in a message. The ghost of constitutionality was raised. We were told it would violate the Constitution. We were told by one Senator that we were pioneering on new ground. I realize that for the Republican leadership that is a rather dangerous adventure, but we were reminded this was something we should not do.

The housing bill called upon the President to make recommendations in his message to the Congress, and it was stated that, in furtherance of the realization of this goal, the President shall transmit to the Senate and the House of Representatives, after the beginning of each session of the Congress, but not later than January 20th, a report which shall include certain specified items.

Mr. President, this was not going to cost anybody anything. It was not said that the President was going to legislate by edict. All we were suggesting was that the President take cognizance of certain developments in the housing picture, certain housing needs of the American people, and that he make known those observations through a message to the Congress.

The minority leader led the fight against that proposal, which he called extreme legislation. He said the President would veto a bill which directed him to do such a thing as that. Yet the minority leader today brings in a substitute that provides that the President

shall be authorized and directed to adjust the pay scales in the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, the Postal Field Service Pay Act, the Veterans' Benefit Act, as amended, and the Foreign Service Act, as amended, to levels generally comparable with those reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics as a result of its current survey of pay rates in private enterprise.

Then the substitute proposal of the Senator from Illinois directs the President to do two more things: to revise the pay structures in the several acts in order to insure internal equity and to provide adequate incentives for administration, and to establish rules for administration.

Is not this interesting? Last night, less than 24 hours from this hour, the minority leader admonished us not to direct the President to put anything in a message, that it would be dangerous, that the President would veto it. There were speeches on the floor of the Senate to the effect that to direct him to lay down a blueprint in terms of planning in the field of housing would give the President too much power. I was reminded last night that this was almost socialism. But today the same spokesmen—and I put that word in the plural—say now the President should act like a little dictator. He shall set the pay rates for Federal employees who work for the Government of the United States, a Government that consists of the Congress as well as the executive branch, and the President shall not only set the pay rates, but he is authorized and directed to make such adjustments as his own Bureau of Labor Statistics advises him to make.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator makes a very powerful argument, but, to be very candid, is the Senator not of the opinion that the minority leader was wrong both times?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is not only my opinion, but I think it can be demonstrated to be a fact.

This is a delaying tactic. That is another reason why this is being done. We can be sure that there will be men in the other body of equal capability and ingenuity who will be able to use some kind of delaying tactics, and the Federal worker will get no help or no justice from his Government.

I have heard speeches made today about what the proposed pay raises would do to the Federal budget. I heard what the pay increase would do to inflation. I wonder where the words are, I say most respectfully, in behalf of the wage earners, when prices go up? I have not heard many speeches from the other side of the aisle when steel prices have gone up time after time. I have not heard many complaints from the other side of the aisle about interest rates going up. I say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that the average wage earner will pay more in increased interest than he will receive from the pay increase as provided in this bill.

I have not heard any Senator on the other side of the aisle condemn anyone

for the inflation in the cost of money, which takes its toll out of everyone who buys anything on time. This is a credit economy, in which the largest single item in the cost of living is the cost of money.

Furthermore, I heard one Senator say that we shall pay more to Federal employees than is paid in Utah. There is an answer to that: Raise the wages in Utah. That is the answer.

I would like to have some of our colleagues demonstrate as much concern over the worker's interest as they seem to demonstrate over what they call this item of inflation.

What would be the cost of the proposal of the Senator from Illinois? We have no figures that indicate the cost. On the one hand, it is being paraded before us as though it is of benefit to the workers. If it is beneficial, it is going to cost something. On the other hand, some speakers say it is beneficial because it will not cost anything. Mr. President, we cannot play both sides of the street. The proposal of the Senator from Illinois will result either in increased salaries or decreased salaries, and it seems to me we have a right to know which before we vote on his proposal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield 5 minutes more to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Finally, let us face the fact that Federal workers have only one place to go. There is no use of their talking about going to see the President. They will not find him in. Let us face it, the Federal workers will not get an audience at the White House. First of all, the President of the United States, when he applies himself to his work, will be a busy man, and the Federal workers will not have an opportunity to make their case if this matter is turned over to the executive branch. If this is turned over to the executive branch, we may as well turn over everything else, because this touches the heart of government.

I am surprised that the advocates of less executive power, the advocates of States rights, come before the Senate with a proposal which would put in the hands of the Executive—the President of the United States—control over the pay scales of workers for the Federal Government, without any regard to the Congress of the United States.

The Constitution says that we shall establish the rate of compensation. The Constitution does not say that the President shall do so. I suggest that we should hold the limited authority and power we have to ourselves.

The point is that Federal workers do not have the right to strike. Federal workers do not have the right of some workers to collective bargaining. Federal workers have only one right. That is the right to appeal to their representatives in Congress for justice.

These workers have never been able to keep up with the wage scales throughout the country. Surely, we can locate a Federal worker here or there who may earn more than is earned by someone in a small country town, but we do not

generalize from those limited statistics. We must consider the total picture.

The facts are that testimony before the committees of Congress has shown that many Federal workers need two jobs in order to maintain a home of modest means.

I have not seen many Federal postal workers or Federal employees spending 2 months on a yacht in the Caribbean. They have a tough time getting enough money together to be able to spend 2 days on a rowboat on a lake in Minnesota.

Those who are always admonishing the workers of this country as to the things they should or should not do are usually in Bermuda, in the Bahamas, at Nassau, or at Miami Beach at \$100 a day, in a swank hotel.

Mr. President, these workers are not overpaid. The tragedy is that the administration always wants to study the pay of the workers. This administration really is guilty of being a slow learner. It studies and studies, and never seems to catch on.

I suggest that the Congress of the United States, after having reviewed these matters in the committees month after month and year after year, is in a better position to know what is the situation than some study commission which has been appointed, which is somewhat removed from the realities of the economic life of the workingman or workingwoman.

There is one thing wrong with the Congress, above all. Too many times it has lost its sensitivity to the needs of the average man, to the needs of the man who does not have a chance to be in the social columns of the local newspaper.

Some of us in the Congress need to stand up to speak for the person who earns \$5,000 a year or \$4,000 a year.

A woman who testified before the committee, who lived in Fort Lauderdale, Fla., said that her husband had a take-home pay of \$89 a week, after 21 years of service with the Federal Government. My friends in the Senate, who have salaries of \$22,500 a year, should try to live on \$89 a week. I have lived with the people long enough to know that it costs a great deal to rear a family.

The Federal Government has an obligation to establish standards, not to be trailing behind. The people who carry the mail, the people who work in our Federal agencies, by and large are fine, good, dedicated people.

One of the reasons there is trouble in America today is that too often it takes two breadwinners in a family to pay for the cost of living. This causes delinquency. This causes problems.

I suggest that the Government of the United States should set a standard under which one breadwinner in a family can earn enough for the mother, the children, the father, and perhaps a relative or so, if need be.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, who has said in terms only he seems capable of commanding the things which need to be said at a moment like this. The Senator has moved me to bring into the focus of the picture today once again a reference I have made on other occasions to an individual whom I have described as a "one-eyed bookkeeper."

The "one-eyed bookkeeper" is the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. "One-eyed bookkeeping" goes on in the Bureau of the Budget.

Let us visualize what this could mean. The Bureau of the Budget opposes this legislation. In a statement before the Civil Service Committee, Budget Director Stans said:

The administration finds no justification at this time for the enactment of any legislation which would provide general increases in salary rates under the Classification Act, the Postal Field Service Pay Act, and other statutory pay systems.

The Bureau of the Budget is the arm, if not the brain—I sometimes think it is the brain—of this administration.

These, indeed, are the words of the oracle, the words of the "one-eyed bookkeeper."

Mr. President, I make my remarks after examining the Bureau of the Budget's own pay policies, in its own bailiwick, since 1953. What I expected, really, was to find that the Bureau of the Budget, finding no justification for pay raises, was practicing what it preached. I was amazed to discover that since 1953 the average grade level of Bureau of Budget employees has climbed from GS-10.2 to GS-11.1. Despite administration objections, in the last several years the Congress has enacted legislation to increase the pay of the Federal employees.

The pay has continued to go up for the workers at the Bureau of the Budget. Because the Bureau of the Budget has the highest grade level for its employees of any Federal agency, they have on the average received the greatest raises. Since 1953 the average Budget Bureau employee has received an \$1,100 salary increase as a result of pay legislation. These increases are the legitimate increases resulting from action by the Congress despite Presidential vetoes. These are the efforts that the Congress has made to keep the salaries of Federal employees reasonably consistent with those paid in private industry. I emphasize again that this increase for Bureau of the Budget employees occurred despite administration objections.

However, on top of this legitimate increase, the Bureau of the Budget, through raising the average grade of its employees from 10.2 to 11.1, has added approximately another \$1,100 to the salary of each of its employees.

No wonder the Director of the Budget Bureau can find no justification for a general salary increase. When he inquires into his own Bureau he finds that salaries are up and that his employees are "doing very nicely, thank you."

This earns for the Director of the Bureau of the Budget the designation as the "one-eyed bookkeeper." He looks at his own records through one eye, and through the other eye he cannot see and does not see the plight of his brethren.

Mr. President, I have compared what has happened in the Bureau of the Budget with the salaries in the offices of the secretaries of four of our major departments of Government. I ask unanimous consent at this point in my remarks that this table be printed in the Record.

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

	General schedule				
	1953	Amount below Bureau of the Budget	1961	Amount below Bureau of the Budget	Change since 1953
Bureau of the Budget.....	10.2		11.1		+0.9
Office of Secretary of the Treasury.....	8.1	-2.1	8.4	-2.7	+ .3
Office of Secretary of the Interior.....	9.0	-1.2	9.3	-1.8	+ .3
Office of Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.....	7.7	-2.5	8.2	-2.9	+ .5
Office of Secretary of Agriculture.....	8.6	-1.6	8.7	-2.4	+ .1

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, two things stand out in this table.

First, the staffs in the Secretaries' offices of these four departments receive salaries which are substantially below those in the Bureau of the Budget.

Second, the Bureau of the Budget has granted its employees, through improved grade levels, far greater increases than have the offices of the four Secretaries enumerated above.

I have not made a detailed analysis of the other agencies in these departments, nor of other departments, but I am certain that such an analysis would support the contention that the Bureau

of the Budget has taken good care of its own and has chosen to neglect the rest.

Mr. President, I do not contend that Federal employees should be denied a pay raise. On the contrary, I believe that they are entitled to a raise and I believe especially that the postal employees are entitled to a raise.

My petition is that the "one-eyed bookkeeper" has his principles mixed up and is looking in the wrong direction at what he considers to be the right time. He ought to give the same consideration to other employees of the Federal Government as he gives to his own people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 2 additional minutes?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, how the Bureau can justify the extremely large increases in the Bureau at the same time it asks Congress to hold down salaries of other categories of Federal employees is difficult to comprehend, unless it is rationalized in the "one-eyed bookkeeper" vernacular.

Mr. President, I also believe that the Bureau of the Budget has itself violated all of the arguments it has given in opposition to a general salary increase. If this is not the case, then apparently there is already available sound factual justification for the salary increases proposed in the legislation that the Congress is now considering.

Budget Director Stans in his presentation to the Congress claims that he is not quibbling over insignificant amounts. He said:

If we raise Federal white collar pay levels now on the basis of inadequate information which can make the results merely guesses, and if the September BLS report shows that such increases result in unnecessary or improper expenditures, then we will all have much to regret.

But this is not the situation in the temple of the savers where the high priests of economy are gathered. There has been no difficulty there in justifying a pay raise averaging \$1,100 per employee in addition to the \$1,100 pay raise effective in the Bureau of the Budget as a result of past legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the relationship between the average salaries paid the Federal employees in five important conservation agencies in 1953 to those to be paid in 1961, in comparison with the pay scales in the Bureau of the Budget, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

	Average salaries		
	1953	1961	Increase since 1953
Bureau of the Budget.....	\$6,979	\$9,320	\$2,341
Bureau of Reclamation.....	4,575	6,260	1,684
Geological Survey.....	4,553	6,428	1,875
Soil Conservation Service..	4,391	5,556	1,165
Forest Service.....	4,655	5,614	959
Agricultural Research Service.....	14,869	6,083	1,214
Bureau of the Budget differential.....	2,110	2,892	-----

<sup>1</sup> Best paid for fiscal year.

Mr. MCGEE. These are comparative to the pay scales of the Bureau of the Budget.

Some reference has been made in the Senate to the fact that the proposed legislation will cost us a little more money, and that is dishonest of Government

to spend this additional money without preparing a tax measure to balance the expenditure. I certainly can agree that it is dishonest now to face up to what this country must do. I am not impressed, however, with the suggestion that generations yet unborn will have to pay these costs. While I, too, am concerned about the future generations, I am likewise concerned about the generations who are still living. They, too, have a right to continue to live in an area where costs continue to rise.

The overhauling and revamping of the Federal pay schedules has long been overdue, and yet this opportunity has been frittered away during the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration.

One serious accomplishment of the administration has been the apparent ability of the Bureau of the Budget to award itself salary increases while holding down the salaries of other Federal employes. This is the spectacle of the "one-eyed bookkeeper."

I conclude by suggesting that not only is the pay legislation before the Congress necessary, but also, I believe the Congress might well give consideration to reducing the salaries in the Bureau of the Budget to the relationship that they had with other Federal salaries in 1953. I would predict that were this suggestion adopted, we would have to appropriate money for the construction of a walling wall on the White House side of the temple of the savers.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The proposed amendment of the Senator from Illinois makes a great deal of sense. References have been made during the debate to what is being paid to workers in industry and to people in State governments as compared with what is proposed to be paid to employees of the Federal Government. The amendment of the Senator from Illinois will merely give authority to the President of the United States to adjust the rates of pay. The amendment states in part:

To adjust the rates of pay in the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, the Postal Field Service Pay Act, the Veterans Benefit Act as amended, and the Foreign Service Act as amended, to the levels generally comparable with those reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics as a result of its current survey of pay rates in private enterprise.

Congress provided half a million dollars for the survey, the results of which are expected to come in September, and it is expected to use the survey as the basis for pay adjustment.

The dislocation of relative pay scales is a problem in a discussion of the cost of living. Established pay scales are thrown out of kilter. Then we try to adjust them, and sometimes there is no good relationship. The final result is relatively little better than the situation that existed at the outset. A cycle is started.

What disturbs me is that we talk about a percentage increase which ranges from 7½ to as much as 8 percent

and even 8½ percent for some employees, thus throwing them farther out of a fair relationship.

In some sections of the Post Office Department the discrepancy between supervisory positions and the rank and file postal workers could be again jeopardized. Only a year or so ago we passed a bill to correct an inequity in the relative pay scales of the general workers and the supervisors.

One of the most glaring inequities that exist today is the fact that the average net income of farm families is only \$2,380. Yet under the proposed legislation we have increases proposed, which affect all Government employees, in which the starting salary for an individual in the civil service rank is \$2,960. The starting pay for the civil service employee of \$2,960 is already \$500 more than the average net income of an entire farm family.

One of the tests of the relative equity of pay scales is the turnover. The Civil Service Commission during 1959 determined that the average quits per month per 100 employees are as follows: 1.25 percent in private industry; 0.70 percent in the Federal Government as a whole; and 0.57 percent in the U.S. postal service. The turnover in private industry is twice as much as the turnover in the postal service, which would certainly indicate that the postal service and the Federal Government as a whole are more attractive places of employment than is private industry.

In my experience I have noted that there seems to be no lack of applicants for postal positions, and I am obliged to believe that at least in South Dakota employment in the postal service is more attractive than vacancies in industry generally.

I asked the Post Office Department about the following figures and I was told that the figures represent their experience over the country:

During the first 3 months of this year 238,000 persons applied for postal positions. That number of applicants is enough to fill more than 40 percent of all the positions which the Post Office Department has. In the New York area there were 37,000 applicants. In the Chicago area there were 14,000; in the Los Angeles area, 12,000; in the San Francisco area, 11,000; in the Philadelphia area, 7,000 plus; in the St. Louis area, over 4,000. Therefore it seems to me that the proper approach is on the basis of the study which the Bureau of Labor Statistics is making to give the President the authority and the responsibility to adjust pay scales to the levels determined by a factual study.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the minority leader has been compelled to leave the Senate for a moment. I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum without having the time charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

1960

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I have not said anything on the amendment, but I want every Senator to know that I do not approve of the amendment. I am not ready to turn over to any one man, whether he be a Democrat or a Republican, the power to regulate the salaries of 2,300,000 employees of the Government. To do so would be setting up a dictatorship in the United States. We hear a great deal of talk about dictatorships. I believe that in Congress we have yielded entirely too much to the administration in regulating various and sundry things. This is one time that I am not in favor of going this far.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I concur with my distinguished chairman that Congress should not abrogate its powers in this way. Furthermore, I ask the chairman, if we were to grant this power to the President to fix wages, how would we know who in the 9th or 10th or 11th echelon would exercise the powers which Congress would supposedly be granting to the President.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes, while he is off somewhere trying to get into some country or other. Perhaps we ought to make him work at least a 40-hour week, if we are going to adopt this kind of amendment.

I yield back the remainder of my time. I believe the other side has used up all its time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Cali-

fornia [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPEL] are absent on official business.

On this vote the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPEL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPEL], would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 11, nays 70, as follows:

[No. 227]

YEAS—11

Bennett  
Brunsdale  
Bush  
Case, S. Dak.Cooper  
Curtis  
Dirksen  
GoldwaterMorton  
Wiley  
Williams, Del.

NAYS—70

Alken  
Allott  
Anderson  
Bartlett  
Beall  
Bible  
Bridges  
Byrd, Va.  
Byrd, W. Va.  
Cannon  
Carlson  
Case, N.J.  
Chavez  
Church  
Clark  
Dodd  
Douglas  
Dworshak  
Eastland  
Ellender  
Ervin  
Fong  
Frear  
GoreGreen  
Gruening  
Hart  
Hartke  
Hayden  
Hill  
Holland  
Humphrey  
Jackson  
Javits  
Johnson, Tex.  
Johnston, S.C.  
Jordan  
Keating  
Kerr  
Kuchel  
Lausche  
Long, Hawaii  
Long, La.  
Lusk  
McCarthy  
McClellan  
McGee  
MagnusonMansfield  
Martin  
Monroney  
Moss  
Murray  
Muskie  
Pastore  
Prouty  
Proxmire  
Randolph  
Robertson  
Saltonstall  
Scott  
Smathers  
Smith  
Sparkman  
Symington  
Talmadge  
Thurmond  
Williams, N.J.  
Young, N. Dak.  
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—19

Butler  
Capehart  
Carroll  
Cotton  
Engle  
Fulbright  
HenningHickenlooper  
Hruska  
Kefauver  
Kennedy  
McNamara  
Morse  
MundtO'Mahoney  
Russell  
Schoepel  
Stennis  
Yarborough

So Mr. DIRKSEN's amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senate for a minute, I can save the trouble of reading the amendment, although I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

On page 22, at the end of line 24 insert a new title numbered three.

"TITLE III—TO READJUST POSTAL RATES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

"First class mail

"SEC. 2. (a) That part of the first section of the joint resolution of June 30, 1947, as amended (61 Stat. 213, 72 Stat. 138, 39 U.S.C. 280), which precedes the proviso, is amended by striking out '4 cents' and inserting in lieu thereof '5 cents'.

"(b) Section 1 of the Act of October 30, 1951 (65 Stat. 672; 39 U.S.C. 280), as amended, is further amended—

"(1) by striking out '3 cents' wherever appearing in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof '4 cents'; and

"(2) by striking out '3 cents' in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof '4 cents'.

"Domestic air mail

"SEC. 3. Section 201 of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employee Salary Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1261; 39 U.S.C. 463a), as amended, is further amended—

"(1) by striking out '7 cents' in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof '8 cents'; and

"(2) by striking out '5 cents' in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof '6 cents'.

"Air parcel post

"SEC. 4. Section 1 of the Act of June 29, 1948 (62 Stat. 1097; 39 U.S.C. 475), is amended—

"(1) by striking out the words 'for the period of two years' appearing in paragraph (1); and

"(2) by adding the following sentence to paragraph (1): 'In no event shall the rate of postage on air mail of the first class weighing in excess of eight ounces be less than the rate prescribed in section 2(a) of this Act.'

"Second-class mail

"SEC. 5. (a) The postage rates for publications entered as second-class mail when mailed for delivery at the office of original entry is one-half cent per copy mailed when delivery is made through post office boxes, general delivery or by rural or star route carriers.

"(b) The postage rate for publications entered as second-class mail when mailed for delivery at the office of mailing by city or village letter carrier or when mailed at the office where it is entered for delivery by city or village letter carriers at a different office within the delivery limits of which the headquarters or general business office of the publisher is located is 1 cent for each copy weighing two ounces or less or 2 cents for each copy weighing more than two ounces or the zone-pound rates provided in subsection (c) of this section, whichever is higher.

"(c) The postage rates on publications entered as second-class mail not entitled to be mailed at the rates in subsections (a) and (b) of this section (including sample copies to the extent of 10 per centum of the weight of copies mailed to subscribers during the calendar year), when mailed by the pub-

lishers thereof from the post office of publication and entry or other post office where entry is authorized, or when mailed by news agents registered as such under regulations prescribed by the Postmaster General to actual subscribers or to other news agents for the purpose of sale are one-half cent for each individually addressed copy or package of unaddressed copies and in addition the pound rates set forth in the following table:

Advertising portion	Mailed during calendar year 1960	Mailed after Dec. 31, 1960
	Cents	Cents
Zones 1 and 2.....	2.6	3.0
Zone 3.....	3.5	4.0
Zone 4.....	5.2	6.0
Zone 5.....	7.0	8.0
Zone 6.....	8.7	10.0
Zone 7.....	11.0	12.0
Zone 8.....	12.5	14.0
Nonadvertising portion.....	2.3	2.5

Publications having over 75 per centum advertising in more than one-half of their issues during any twelve months' period shall not be accepted for mailing as second-class matter and their entry shall be revoked, except that for the purpose of this proviso only, a charge made solely for the publication of transportation schedules, fares, and related information shall not be construed as constituting a charge for advertising.

"(d) The rate of postage on copies of publications having second-class entry mailed by others than the publishers or authorized news agents, sample copies mailed by the publishers in excess of the 10 per centum allowance entitled to be sent at the pound rates, and copies mailed by the publishers to persons who may not be included in the required legitimate list of subscribers, shall be 2 cents for the first two ounces and 1 cent for each additional ounce or fraction thereof, except when the postage at the rate prescribed for fourth-class matter is lower, in which case the latter rates shall apply, computed on each individually addressed copy or package of unaddressed copies, and not on the bulk rate of the copies and packages.

"(e) For the purpose of this section, the portion of a publication devoted to advertisements shall include all advertisements inserted in and attached permanently to the publication.

"(f) The Postmaster General may require publishers to separate or make up to zones, in such a manner as he may direct, all mail matter of the second class when offered for mailing.

"(g) With the first mailing of each issue of each publication entered as second-class mail, the publisher shall file with the postmaster a copy of such issue together with a statement containing such information as the Postmaster General may prescribe for determining the postage chargeable thereon.

#### "Controlled circulation publications"

"Sec. 6. Section 203 of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1262; 39 U.S.C. 291b), as amended, is further amended—

"(1) by striking out '12 cents' and inserting in lieu thereof '14 cents'; and

"(2) by striking out '1 cent' and inserting in lieu thereof '3 cents'.

#### "Third-class mail"

"Sec. 7. Section 3 of the Act of October 30, 1951 (65 Stat. 673; 39 U.S.C. 290a-1), as amended, is further amended—

"(1) by striking out '3 cents' from that part of the section which precedes the first proviso and inserting in lieu thereof '4 cents'; and

"(2) by striking out '1½ cents' from that part of the section which precedes the pro-

viso and inserting in lieu thereof '2 cents'; and

"(3) by striking out 'twenty pounds' from the first proviso of said section and inserting in lieu thereof 'forty pounds'; and

"(4) by striking out '16 cents' from the second proviso of said section and inserting in lieu thereof '18 cents'; and

"(5) by striking out from the second proviso of said section, whenever they appear therein the words '2½ cents when mailed on or after such date' and inserting in lieu thereof '2½ cents when mailed on or after July 1, 1960, and prior to January 1, 1961, and 3 cents when mailed on or after January 1, 1961'.

"(6) by striking out '10 cents' from the second proviso of said section and inserting in lieu thereof '14 cents'.

"(7) by striking out '3½ cents' from the third proviso of said section and inserting in lieu thereof '4½ cents'.

#### "Fourth-class mail"

"Sec. 8. (a) Section 204(d) of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948 (39 U.S.C. 292a(d)), as amended, is further amended—

"(1) by striking out '9 cents' and inserting in lieu thereof '10 cents'; and

"(2) by striking out '5 cents' and inserting in lieu thereof '6 cents'.

"(b) Section 204(e) of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948 (39 U.S.C. 292(e)), as amended, is further amended—

"(1) by striking out '4 cents' and inserting in lieu thereof '5 cents'; and

"(2) by striking out '1 cent' and inserting in lieu thereof '3 cents'.

#### "Repeals"

"Sec. 9. The following provisions of law are hereby repealed:

"(1) Section 5 of the Act of June 23, 1874 (18 Stat. 232; 39 U.S.C. 283); and

"(2) Sections 1101, 1102, 1103, and 1106 of the Act of October 3, 1917 (40 Stat. 327; 39 U.S.C. 283, 287); and

"(3) Sections 202 and 203 of the Act of February 28, 1925, as amended (43 Stat. 1066, 1067; 39 U.S.C. 283, 287); and

"(4) Subsections (a), (b), (c), and (e) of section 204 of the Act of May 27, 1958 (39 U.S.C. 283); and

"(5) Section 25 of the Act of March 3, 1879, as amended (20 Stat. 361; 39 U.S.C. 286); and

"(6) Section 2 of the Act of October 30, 1951 (65 Stat. 672; 39 U.S.C. 289a).

"Sec. 10. (a) The provisions of this section and sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, (1), (2), (5), and (7), 8, and 9 of this Act shall become effective on July 1, 1960.

"(b) The provisions of section 7 (3), (4), and (6) of this Act shall become effective on January 1, 1961."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the amendment is in the form of a bill I introduced in March of this year. It provides for an increase in postal rates in first-, second-, and third-class postage. I know that the amendment is not germane under the germaneness clause in the unanimous-consent agreement. I confess that in my momentary ineptitude in the hurly-burly of things, I was not looking down the road far enough at the time I looked at the division of time and the allowance of hours on the amendments when the unanimous-consent agreement was adopted. I shall not quarrel about that. I shall not ask for any violation of the rules. I freely admit that the amendment is subject to a point of order, if any Senator cares to make a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois may proceed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in conformity with an informal understanding I have with the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] I shall take only a few minutes for an explanation and will be very brief.

This is a measure I introduced in March. It was sent to me by the Postmaster General. It had the approval of the President. What it is designed to do is this: On first-class letters or first-class mail, it would raise an estimated \$409 million. On airmail it would raise \$18 million. On second-class mail it would raise \$46 million. On other items it would raise \$85 million. It is estimated, therefore, that the amendment would raise \$554 million.

The bill has been the subject of hearings before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

If we are to vote money with which to pay employees, we shall have to find the money somewhere. I asked the Bureau of the Budget today for a statement covering the most nearly current period—and the statement is dated June 16—to ascertain now where we stand, with respect, first, to the revenue measures asked for by the President which have been denied; the unbudgeted proposals to increase expenditures, some of which have not yet been enacted, but which would be a threat to the budget; and then the unbudgeted proposals, which would reduce revenue.

I point out that the Committee on Finance, as I understand, has taken action to repeal the telephone tax and to repeal taxes on other items. The distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] has just reported a bill from the Committee on Finance. The revenue involved, as I understand, is estimated at between \$150 and \$250 million.

We have done nothing about aviation fuel. The proposal requested by the President is estimated to produce \$89 million.

The discontinuance of the telephone tax would, in the first fiscal year, cost \$346 million. There are other items with respect to budget proposals which would have an impact of roughly \$1.5 billion.

As I sum up the rest of the items, they amount to \$3.2 billion.

So the grand total is a little more than \$5 billion.

It can be seen that if we continue to spend money—and \$750 million is provided in this bill—an estimated and much-hoped-for surplus of \$4.2 billion, when the budget was submitted, is rapidly and gradually and constantly going down the drain.

Congress may still do something about it, but I would be remiss in my duty if I did not say that in proportion as we spend \$1 billion over the budget estimate in the Defense bill, and \$750 million in this bill, somewhere, if we are to have a balanced budget, we shall have to find revenues, instead of chopping revenues out of the budget and then denying a Presidential request for revenue. That is all I have to say on this subject.

1960

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I shall support the Senator's amendment. I shall do so because I feel, as the Senator has stated, that as a matter of fiscal policy that must be done.

In doing so, I am aware that we do not have the benefit of any hearings or a committee report on this amendment or on the bill itself.

Although I wish to go on record as being in favor of increased postal revenues, I likewise wish the Record to show that I do not adopt in detail the provisions of the Senator's amendment.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Can the minority leader tell us the answer to a question which I shall now submit? It is charged that if the amendment of the minority leader is added to the bill, it will result in killing the bill; it is said that the House will not accept the amendment, and that the result will be to destroy the bill.

On the other hand, a number of Senators, including myself, are perfectly willing to vote for increased postal rates, in order to meet our responsibilities.

Can the Senator from Illinois tell us—and the majority leader is also in the Chamber, and I also direct this question to him—whether, if we defeat this amendment at this time, we shall have an opportunity to vote on the question of increasing the postal rates?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I can only say that the effort has been made over a period of time, but it has not succeeded. We have a terrific deficit—nearly \$600 million—in the Post Office Department alone. If we add \$236 million for the postal workers, by means of this bill, the postal deficit will be more than \$836 million, which must be taken out of the general revenue; and, therefore, this deficit in the operations of this Government agency will become a charge against the taxpayers and against the Treasury generally. I do not believe that is a sound way to run a Government department, and I do not believe it is sound financing.

Mr. President, I shall not request a ye-a-and-may vote on the question of agreeing to this amendment. I simply say to the Senate and to the country that not long ago we were greatly inspired by the hope that there would be a \$4 billion surplus and that there might be a tax reduction for the beleaguered taxpayers of the country; but I am afraid all that is going down the drain.

I may add that perhaps yet today we shall consider the Health, Education, and Welfare Department bill; and I think the amount it calls for is in the neighborhood—according to the version reported by the Senate committee—of \$400 million over the budget. Perhaps we can chop all of it out of the mutual security funds; I do not know. But I doubt it.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to ask the majority leader that question. Will we have an opportunity—if this amendment is defeated at this time—to vote at this

session of the Congress on the question of increasing the postal rates?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am informed that the House committee yesterday killed a proposal on postal-rate increases, by a vote of 14 to 7. I am further informed that the proposal offered by the distinguished minority leader is the first program of the administration, and is not its revised plan. I think it has a new plan, which is different from the one he offered in January.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I revised this, in order to make it conform.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think the Senate should consider a rate bill; and I am prepared to vote for a rate bill of that type, although at this time I do not wish to go into the specifics. I do not know that it will be reported before we leave for the conventions, if we do. I think it should be considered on its merits. I do not think it fair to the employees to make the fate of the pay bill for them dependent on the success of a measure of the sort referred to, which already has been defeated in the House committee; and in view of the fact that the House committee defeated it by a 2 to 1 margin, certainly it is unlikely that the House as a whole would do otherwise.

But I should like to see the committee begin to evolve a formula which would provide us with more revenue.

Mr. JAVITS. Of course, that situation puts me in the position of believing that this is the only chance we shall have to vote to make the income meet the outgo. I think most Senators wish to do the things which need to be done, whether in regard to research or in regard to paying the Government employees properly or in regard to foreign aid. Of course, I very much favor foreign aid. I also wish to have the Government pay its bills.

I respectfully submit that if we do not receive those opportunities from the committees, then we have to do what the minority leader is doing; namely, utilize the rules of the Senate to attach such proposals to any bills that are available.

Mr. DIRKSEN. First, let me assure the Senator from New York that this proposal is not designed to kill this bill. I am opposed to this bill, and I have been opposed to it from the beginning. I shall do my best to get the President to veto it, if he will listen to me; and I may have something to say about it—I do not know. But that is not the design of this amendment.

We know that, as the bill now stands, its cost, if it is enacted into law, will be \$750 million.

I suppose the bill will be passed. I am reasonably confident that the House would override a veto of the bill. I hope the Senate would sustain a veto.

But the record must be made, and I want to make it as we proceed. I do not want anyone in the country to be able to say, at any time, "If you were interested in fiscal sanity and fiscal responsibility, why did you not concretely offer something to offset the expenditure of \$750 million?"

The amendment is offered in the utmost good faith.

If I were to undertake to embarrass anyone, I might ask for a vote on the

amendment by a show of hands, or for a year-and-may vote on the amendment. But I shall not do so.

I am quite content to let the Record stand as it now is.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall support the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, because I think he is doing the only thing that can be done in order to demonstrate that we are willing to pay the bill if we wish to provide benefits for the people whom we think need to receive benefits.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is well spoken.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am ready to vote.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senate that we find ourselves in this position because we have always considered this a revenue matter, and we always wait until the House sends us the revenue bills.

It may be news to some Senators to know that the money which is raised from the Post Office operations does not go into the Post Office Department funds, but goes into the general fund; and then the Department goes to the general fund, as does every other department, for the money it needs.

We once passed such a bill, and sent it to the House of Representatives. But the House sent it back to us, with a note saying:

We in the House originate the revenue measures.

For that reason, we find ourselves in this position at the present time.

I realize that something should be done. But I wish to call attention to the fact that in the case of second-class mail, the increase in rates will go into effect on July 1.

As regards third-class mail, another increase in rates will come next January. That will result from the original bill which we passed in 1958, which at that time increased the revenue for the Post Office Department approximately \$547 million.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, when the Congress passed the Postal Pay Raise Act of 1958, it said—and it was recorded as clearly as print could set it forth—that after making allowance for the things that can be charged to the postal service, there shall be a rate adjustment in order to provide the revenues with which to meet the expenditures of the Department. But we have been remiss in the duty of carrying out the very thing we solemnly wrote into the law only 2 years ago. The words are so clear that they cannot be mistaken. I take that responsibility pretty seriously, and it is the reason why I have offered this proposal.

I am grateful to my distinguished friend the chairman of the committee for not making a point of order. I am not going to ask for a record vote, but I shall ask for a division, and I will let it go at that.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. BUSH. I commend the Senator for bringing up this amendment, and I wish to associate myself with the Sen-

ator from New York in approving the proposal and declaring, in view of the fact that there is not to be a record vote, that I wish to support the Senator's amendment.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I subscribe to the comments made by the Senator from New York. I received a letter from a citizen of Ohio who said, "I have been your friend all your life. Viewing things as they are going, I have a recommendation to make to you. While you are in the Senate, vote for every spending program, against every taxing bill, and for every tax repeal bill."

I pondered his advice, and I wondered whether that was the glorious path to eternal membership in the Senate.

Let me point out that in this session we have acted on several money bills. We repealed the cabaret tax. It is now being proposed to repeal the excise tax on telephone use and other taxes. We increased the subsidy to the merchant marine.

In the tax field, we have gone only in the direction of reducing revenues, even though we know that in 24 out of the last 29 years we have had deficits. But what are we doing in regard to spending? Every spending proposal that has been offered has received approval. Every proposal to attempt to set the budget in balance has been rejected. Mr. President, it just cannot be. There must come an eventual accounting.

I shall vote for the postal rate increase, although I do not like to connect it to a salary bill. However, under the conditions which prevail, I must do so.

Instead of having a \$4 billion surplus—provided the postal rate increase and gasoline tax increase were adopted—I want the citizens of Ohio to know now that we cannot continue to repeal taxes and increase spending without further cheapening the dollar, without further putting tax burdens upon our children and grandchildren, and without further robbing holders of U.S. bonds and thrifty people who put their money in the banks for their future.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Idaho, and then I shall yield back the remainder of the time I have on the amendment.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, the distinguished minority leader has said he hesitates to ask for the yeas and nays on his amendment because he does not want to embarrass Members of this body. Does not the distinguished minority leader agree with me that this body, by its actions day in and day out, is embarrassing the American taxpayer, and embarrassing our children and grandchildren, by forcing them to assume the responsibility of our giving them more government than revenues will justify at this time? When will we reach the time when we stand up and face our responsibility to give the American taxpayer only as much government as we are willing to make him pay for? Does not the Senator think the time has come

when we must stop embarrassing the American people?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am prepared to yield back my time.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois. (Putting the question.) The "noes" seem to have it. The "noes" have it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The chair states to the Senator from Illinois that the result was announced.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion to reconsider.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A division has been requested on the motion to table the motion to reconsider.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then, Mr. President, I withdraw my motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to reconsider is withdrawn.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I withdraw my motion to table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Both motions have been withdrawn.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I rise for the purpose of making a motion to recommit.

I am satisfied, from my study of the subject matter of this bill, that Congress should enact the proposed pay increases for the postal service. I do not feel justified on the facts, however, in voting for the increases totaling about half a billion dollars a year which this bill provides for those in other Government employment.

For those reasons, I move that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with instructions that it divide the provisions of this bill into two bills, and report back to the Senate one bill containing the present provisions respecting the postal employees, and a second bill containing the provisions of this bill relating to other Government employees.

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

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas, from the time available to me, whatever time the Senator requires.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the distinguished Senator from North Carolina. I believe the postal pay increase ought

to be passed at this session of Congress. I urgently suggest to my colleague that he make a part of his motion the requirement that the committee separate the bills and report them to the Senate by next Monday, so that the bills can be enacted at this session of Congress. Then we shall have the issues separated. Those of us who feel as the distinguished Senator from North Carolina and I feel, that the postal pay raise is fully justified, and that the other pay raise is not, will have the opportunity to vote for the increase we feel is justified, and will have the opportunity to vote against the increase we feel is not justified. Thus we shall not be put in the position of penalizing those who deserve the pay raise by denying the raise in order to vote against that part of the bill which we feel is not justified—two thirds of the bill in money value—and for which the case has not been made.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, in consequence of the suggestion made by the able and distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas, I amend my motion to recommit so as to provide that the committee shall forthwith report back two bills of the nature specified by me.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, unless the able and distinguished chairman of the committee or some other Senator desires to speak, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we have been in session since early this morning. These issues have been resolved. Senators who have been for the raise for the postal workers have had an opportunity to indicate it. Senators who have favored the increased for all workers have had an opportunity to indicate it.

I hope we shall not spend all day working on the bill and then recommit the bill. I hope the motion to recommit will be defeated, and that we can pass the bill, to give equity and justice to people who are entitled to receive it.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Carolina, to recommit with instructions to report forthwith two bills.

On this motion, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Texas, [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the



Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CORTON] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPEL] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPEL] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 56, as follows:

## [No. 228]

## YEAS—21

Bennett	Dirksen	McClellan
Bridges	Dworshak	Morton
Bush	Ervin	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Goldwater	Talmadge
Church	Holland	Thurmond
Cooper	Lausche	Wiley
Curtis	Lusk	Williams, Del.

## NAYS—56

Aiken	Gruening	Martin
Allott	Hart	Monroney
Anderson	Hartke	Moss
Bartlett	Hill	Murray
Beall	Humphrey	Muskie
Bible	Jackson	Pastore
Brunsdale	Javits	Prouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Johnson, Tex.	Proxmire
Cannon	Johnson, S.C.	Randolph
Carlson	Jordan	Robertson
Case, N.J.	Keating	Scott
Clark	Kerr	Smathers
Dodd	Kuchel	Smith
Douglas	Long, Hawaii	Sparkman
Eastland	Long, La.	Symington
Fong	McCarthy	Williams, N.J.
Frear	McGee	Young, N. Dak.
Gore	Magnuson	Young, Ohio
Green	Mansfield	

## NOT VOTING—23

Butler	Chavez	Fulbright
Byrd, Va.	Cotton	Hayden
Capehart	Ellender	Hennings
Carroll	Engle	Hickenlooper

Hruska	Morse	Schoeppel
Kefauver	Mundt	Stennis
Kennedy	O'Mahoney	Yarborough
McNamara	Russell	

So Mr. ERVIN's motion to recommit with instructions was rejected.

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

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the passage of the bill. Is all time yielded back?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a live pair with the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPEL]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay"; if I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CORTON] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPEL] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CORTON] would each vote "yea."

The pair of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPEL] has been previously announced by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

On this vote, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 17, as follows:

## [No. 229]

## YEAS—62

Aiken	Gore	Martin
Allott	Green	Monroney
Anderson	Gruening	Moss
Bartlett	Hart	Murray
Beall	Hartke	Muskie
Bible	Hill	Pastore
Bridges	Humphrey	Prouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Proxmire
Cannon	Javits	Randolph
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Case, N.J.	Johnson, S.C.	Scott
Chavez	Jordan	Smathers
Church	Keating	Smith
Clark	Kerr	Sparkman
Cooper	Kuchel	Symington
Dodd	Long, Hawaii	Talmadge
Douglas	Long, La.	Wiley
Eastland	McCarthy	Williams, N.J.
Ellender	McGee	Young, N. Dak.
Fong	Magnuson	Young, Ohio
Frear	Mansfield	

## NAYS—17

Bennett	Dworshak	McClellan
Brunsdale	Ervin	Morton
Bush	Goldwater	Robertson
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Thurmond
Case, S. Dak.	Lausche	Williams, Del.
Curtis	Lusk	

## NOT VOTING—21

Butler	Hayden	Morse
Capehart	Hennings	Mundt
Carroll	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Cotton	Hruska	Russell
Dirksen	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Engle	Kennedy	Stennis
Fulbright	McNamara	Yarborough

So the bill (H.R. 9883) was passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

(Senate proceedings continued after House proceedings of today's RECORD.)

# House of Representatives

FRIDAY, JUNE 17, 1960

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Luke 6: 12: *He continued all night in prayer unto God.*

O Thou transcendent and immanent God, who alone can satisfy our mortal needs and our immortal longings, grant that in the tragic unrest of our day, we may have a faith that finds its center and circumference in Thee.

Inspire us with a fortitude that can master and dispel all the somber moods of doubt and despair which are hovering over the minds and hearts of so many members of the human family.

May our vision of Thy divine will and righteous purposes be so clear and commanding that we shall feel constrained to dedicate ourselves wholeheartedly to bring them to fulfillment.

Hear us in the name of the Captain of our Salvation. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 11998. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists on its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HILL, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mrs. SMITH, and Mr. BYRD of Virginia to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2929. An act to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to repeal certain provisions requiring affidavits of belief; and

S. 3670. An act to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the renewal of urban communities, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the

House to a joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 39. Joint resolution proposing amendments to the Constitution of the United States to authorize Governors to fill temporary vacancies in the House of Representatives, to abolish tax and property qualifications for electors in Federal elections, and to enfranchise the people of the District of Columbia.

## CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered. The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 136]		
Ashley	Hull	Moulder
Barden	Ikard	Patman
Blitch	Jackson	Powell
Bolling	Kearns	Randall
Bow	Kilburn	Roosevelt
Buckley	Kitchin	Shipley
Burdick	Kowalski	Taylor
Carnahan	Leser	Walter
Celler	McGovern	Williams
Dorn, S.C.	Marrow	Willis
Durham	Mitchell	Wilson
Foley	Morris, Okla.	Withrow

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 396 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

## LIMITATIONS ON CONSTRUCTION DIFFERENTIAL SUBSIDY

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 10644) to amend title V of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to remove certain limitations on the construction differential subsidy under such title, as amended, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. BONNER, THOMPSON of Louisiana, GEORGE P. MILLER, TOLLEFSON, and VAN PELT.

## MUTUAL SECURITY AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the

Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 12619) making appropriations for mutual security and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 12619, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday there was pending the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. Without objection, the Clerk will rereport the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER. On page 2, line 15, strike out "\$1,600,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,800,000,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this, to my mind, is the heart of the bill, and the question is, Do you want to carry forward a bill that will do some good and will help to make this program one which will be operated in the interest of the people of the United States? If we are going to do something of this kind, let us do it as near right as we can. I am only asking to restore to this item in the bill 50 percent of what has been cut by the committee in writing the bill.

The question resolves itself into how much money is needed to carry this thing on and do it in such manner that it would be of some value to the people of the United States.

I am going to quote just a word from General Palmer, the military officer in charge of this operation, and let me say that General Palmer has had great experience for several years as Chief of Staff under General Norstad over across the water. General Palmer said on page 2327 of the hearings:

The unexpended carryover will have fallen to approximately \$2 billion by June 30, 1960, and the program is also falling. The forecast of expenditure during the current fiscal year (fiscal year 1960) is \$1.83 billion, while it is forecast that the program in fiscal year 1961 will be marked by an expenditure of \$1.79 billion. In these 2 years there is a drastic drop of \$60 million below the rate of the preceding 5 years.

Now, we are getting to the point where there is hardly a 12-month period in the chain of merchandise being produced and delivered. We have got to have these things if we are going to help those countries across the water and to keep them in shape so that they can help us to keep communism from spreading.