

Official Reporters of Debates of the Senate, is retiring at the end of this month.

Mr. Wilfong has had a long career as a reporter. He entered the field about the time when Woodrow Wilson became President; and besides the reporting of cases in court, he reported the hearings before many of the important committees of the House and Senate, as well as executive agencies. He thus has had a broad experience in reporting the three coordinate branches of the Government.

About 10 years ago he became a member of the corps of the Senate Official Reporters of Debates, and has rendered fine service in that capacity. No matter how stormy the debates, he has distinguished himself as well poised and calm, and has contributed to the excellence of the debates as they have appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. President, I never cease to marvel at the outstandingly fine job done by those who have the responsibility of producing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I simply cannot understand how they can perform under such exacting circumstances and still have an accurate RECORD available to us each morning before we get out of bed.

I am sure that every Member of the Senate will wish for Mr. Wilfong and his fine family many years of enjoyment of the rest he has so well earned.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to join the distinguished majority leader in the expressions he has just made.

Mr. J. Chester Wilfong, one of the corps of Official Reporters of Debates of the Senate, is to retire at the end of this month, as has just been pointed out.

After a long career as a reporter, both in court and in the committees of the Senate, he became a member of the corps of Senate Official Reporters of Debates, and has made an enviable record for efficiency, poise, and hard work. He has been self-effacing; and no matter how exciting or stormy the proceedings—and at times there are some stormy proceedings, even in the Senate of the United States—he has maintained a calm which has enabled him to weather the tumult and turn out copy which has excellently portrayed the proceedings in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. and Mrs. Wilfong have raised a fine family; and his friends, both in the Senate and out of the Senate, extend their best wishes for a well-earned rest.

Mr. President, I also wish to join the majority leader, in addition to expressing our high regard for Mr. Wilfong, in extending it to the other members of the corps of Official Reporters of Debates, who day in and day out, many times under trying circumstances and during long hours, so well and faithfully serve the Senate of the United States.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, Mr. J. Chester Wilfong, one of the Official Reporters of Debates of the Senate, will retire at the end of this month.

Mr. Wilfong, I am happy to say, is a very highly respected resident of Virginia. He had a long and distinguished career as a reporter before he became one of the Official Reporters on the floor of

the Senate. Soon after he opened his office, about the time when Woodrow Wilson became President, he reported hearings before the Senate Committee on Finance, and during the years had reported investigations conducted by many important Senate committees.

During this time, and throughout the long years he has been one of the Official Reporters on the Senate floor, he has rendered outstanding service, characterized by devotion to duty and the intelligent discharge of the obligations he and his associates felt they owed the Senate.

We all wish Mr. and Mrs. Wilfong long years to enjoy the rest they have so well earned.

In addition, Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to all those who report the proceedings of the Senate. They are men of great ability and great industry. It is marvelous to me to observe how they can report the debates when one Senator interrupts another Senator, and record them as accurately as they do. As a Member of the Senate, I wish to pay my tribute to them as a whole, and express my appreciation for their service.

NECESSITY FOR A POSTAL RATE BILL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, as indicated in the Senate one day this week, I submitted all the provisions of the postal rate bill as an amendment to another bill which was germane to the Post Office Department. I think this matter is of great urgency. That is one reason for my sustained interest in it.

I thought when the hearings were terminated on July 26 last year there would be a speedy resumption of the hearings in the next Congress and that there would be early action. The 85th Congress has been in session since January 3, 1957, 73 working days, and thus far no action has been taken.

I cite as a reason for my idea about the urgency for such a bill the fact that failure to enact revenue legislation for the Post Office Department is, in the judgment of the Postmaster General, costing the country about \$1½ million a day. So we can in truth say the delay has caused the country \$110 million or more since the first day of the present session.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. My attention was temporarily diverted. Did the Senator from Illinois say the delay in adjusting postal rates was costing \$1½ million a week or a day?

Mr. DIRKSEN. A day. I shall give the language of the Postmaster General, who said that "Since the Post Office Department is losing at least \$1½ million every working day, this 73-day delay has already cost the taxpayers nearly \$110 million—and this figure will continue to increase by \$1½ million tomorrow and every day thereafter until legislation is enacted producing needed revenues from adjusted postal rates."

I feel very deeply about this question, and I earnestly hope the Committee on

Civil Service and Post Office will give it expeditious attention, so that before too much time elapses in the present session, we shall have a bill before the Senate for action.

I understand that during the first week in April the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will start their hearings. There is reason to believe a bill will be reported after sustained hearings. I trust the Senate will follow that action at an early date.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Speaking as a Senator, and also as chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and not as the Presiding Officer, the Chair must remind the Senator that when he speaks of losing revenue, that money is paid out of another pocket. When it is put on the basis of an increasing expense, the money is merely paid by the people in a different manner. That is all there is to it.

TOUGHEST JOB IN THE STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, many people in this country and throughout the world look upon the presidency of the United States as the most important and difficult job on the face of the globe. I agree. The other day the President said that, in his opinion, the job of being Secretary of State was the most important in the world. That may be true, but I think that one of the most difficult jobs in the nation is that held at the present time by the Honorable Robert C. Hill, Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Affairs.

Secretary Hill has been on the job for many months now and has ably upheld the fine traditions and high standards set by his predecessors, Ernest Gross, Jack McFall, and our colleague, now the distinguished and able Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morrow]. Mr. Hill has had to maintain close liaison and cooperation between the State Department on the one hand and the House and the Senate on the other. He has performed his job remarkably well, and he is to be commended for the outstanding service he has performed, not only in behalf of the Department of State, which he so ably represents, but because of the job he has done in behalf of the Congress as well.

Secretary Hill is a staunch Republican, but he is a man of great wisdom, understanding, tolerance, and know-how and I think the Secretary of State has been extremely fortunate to have a man of Secretary Hill's caliber acting as a "go-between," so to speak, between the Department of State and the Congress of the United States. The country is better off because of men like Bob Hill.

An excellent article appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of March 15, 1957, under the byline of Rowland Evans, Jr. I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Evans may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

Toughest Job in the State Department
(By Rowland Evans, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—The job of American Secretary of State was described the other day as "the greatest and most important job in the world" by President Eisenhower, the man who really holds the most important job in the world.

The President also said, at that news conference 6 weeks ago, that both he and John Foster Dulles have made mistakes, just as all human beings must. He did not list these alleged errors, but if he had, he might easily have overlooked one of the most important of all, in an area that is not diplomatic in the traditional sense but, nevertheless, requires the most skillful kind of diplomacy.

That area, of course, is the relationship between the Executive and Congress, particularly the Senate. The mistake that Mr. Dulles seemed to make, and that the President now knows he himself made in the early weeks of this year, was a tendency to take the Senate for granted.

In 1948, the Hoover Commission took a long look at relations between the State Department and the Congress, then recommended that a new Assistant Secretary of State be appointed solely to deal with Congress. The job was created in February 1949. Experience since then has shown that, if the Secretary himself has the most difficult job in the world, his Assistant Secretary for Congressional Liaison probably holds the most difficult job in the State Department.

Oversimplified, the highest duty of the occupant of that office is to keep the Secretary in tune with the most sensitive vibrations from the Capitol on all important matters of policy, and conversely to keep the leaders in Congress, especially the Senate, wholly abreast of developing American policies in all parts of the world. He can be a most useful instrument in obtaining congressional, and hence general public acceptance, for foreign policies.

The Assistant Secretary has total access to the Secretary and, as an agent of the Secretary, has the same access to the leaders in Congress. His loyalty to the Secretary and his policies must be absolute. Conversely, he must command the respect and confidence of the men who wield the power in Congress, the men who often may be working at precisely cross-purposes to the administration.

But he has no power at all of decision, either on policy matters or on high-level questions as to how far he may go in detailing tentative policy outlines to the leaders, or whether the influence of the President himself should be used to rescue a policy request in trouble on the Hill and similar matters.

On the latter point, for example, the Assistant Secretary might be convinced that, to avoid a legislative impasse in the Senate such as the threatened stalemate on the Middle East resolution, the President should call in the leaders to the White House—or take his case to the country.

But the Assistant Secretary can only warn. The White House will not use the President's great prestige except on rare occasions. Gen. Wilton B. Persons, the President's own legislative liaison officer, is fond of pointing out: "If you fire the big gun too often, all you have left is a smooth bore."

Mr. Dulles' present deputy to Congress is Assistant Secretary Robert C. Hill, only the fourth man to hold the job. His predecessors were Ernest Gross, Jack McFall and Thurston B. Morton, now a Republican Senator from Kentucky. A few aspects of Mr. Hill's 7-day-a-week job follow:

He telephones or makes a personal contact with Members of Congress an average of 40 times a day; his office receives in a year some 10,000 telephone calls and 30,000 letters; during the session, he is in the Capitol at 10 a. m. 4 days a week; he lunches on the Hill with 1 of the top men in Congress 3 times a week; he briefs the Secretary and the area Assistant Secretaries on all important developments in Congress; he maintains strict nonpartisanship as between the 2 political parties and the 2 Houses of Congress.

Letters from Congress are supposed to be acknowledged within 48 hours; but, in the kind of frenzied warfare between the Senate and the State Department of the last 2 months, sometimes there is a slip along the line. Congressional vanity is easily piqued, and these slips can be costly. Whether responsible or not, the Assistant Secretary usually takes the rap.

The great contribution of Mr. Hill during the turbulent weeks of January and February was that he never lost the confidence either of Mr. Dulles or of the most influential men in Congress. Although often caught in the web of charge and countercharge between the Senate and the State Department, Mr. Hill kept the trust of both. His influence unquestionably eased the crisis at its peak. The Senate will not be taken for granted for some time to come.

More attention should be paid to this extraordinarily important aspect of the relations between the executive and legislative branches. If the Senate will not accept a new policy, it is a safe assumption that neither will the Nation. And then, no matter how acceptable the new policy might be to the nations abroad, it might as well be tossed in a wastebasket.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to join in the statement just made by the distinguished Senator from Montana, who is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, relative to the capabilities of Mr. Robert Hill, the Assistant Secretary in charge of congressional liaison work. In my opinion he has done an outstanding job. His is very difficult and very trying work in many respects, but I believe he has performed his tasks diligently, efficiently, with fairness, and without partisanship. General comment I have heard on both sides of the aisle indicates appreciation of the work which he as a person holding a difficult position has done, and of the general efficiency which has characterized his services.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think the measure of a man's capacity can be discerned from the type of work he does. Effecting a liaison between the executive and the legislative branches requires a very special talent, in my judgment, first, to maintain fidelity to the Department with which he is identified, and then to bring to his task good nature, capacity and understanding so that, more and more, there is a development of good will between the two branches in the Government.

I think Bob Hill has rendered excellent service in that field. I have known him a long time. He is a man of splendid personality, and he does not shun long hours in order to accomplish his task. He has served the State Department and the executive branch well, and in doing so I think he also has served the legislative branch well. I salute him as a loyal, trusted, and able public servant.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL AND TRIAL BY JURY

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I have charged, and I renew the charge here, that the civil rights bill now pending before Congress is a device to rob Americans of the sacred right of trial by jury in civil-rights cases. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an excellent editorial on this subject, entitled "Device for Evading Trial by Jury," which appeared in the Times-Picayune, of New Orleans, on March 24, 1957.

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

DEVICE FOR EVAIDING TRIAL BY JURY

Southern Members of Congress and other informed people who charge the liberals and the Department of Justice with seeking to circumvent the right of trial by jury through the proposed civil-rights bill, have a real issue. It is not a phony as some liberals would have people believe.

A reading of the bill leaves no doubt that jury trials could be omitted in injunction cases—and would be omitted if current court practice were followed. That is so even though it would be a contradiction of the plain reading of the Bill of Rights and still another article of the Constitution.

Attorney General Brownell's own testimony shows how the skipping could be done, and one of the fervent civil-rights Senators told the Senate committee he favored dropping jury trials in these cases.

Isn't it a bit odd that hot-under-the-collar liberals who so frequently shout about constitutional rights should be so willing to have the plain, unobscured provisions of the Constitution circumvented? One might think they agreed sometimes with Professor Myrdal, the Swedish sociologist who the Supreme Court cited in its segregation decision, that the Constitution is practically a plot against the people.

Here is the setup for bypassing the constitutionally prescribed jury trials: The Federal Code says that in contempt cases, the defendant, on demand, shall be entitled to "trial by jury" but "this section shall not apply in any suit or action brought in the name of, or in behalf of, the United States." Mr. Brownell's proposed bill says that injunction proceedings shall be instituted, not in the name of the real plaintiff who thinks he has been prevented from voting or exercising some other right, but in the name of the United States. The Department of Justice says the substitution of names in these suits "is accepted practice in criminal contempt cases."

The jury-skipping provision in the code is frequently explained, we believe, as a device to enable judges to take summary action to preserve courtroom order, protect threatened damage to United States property, etc. But what is the urgency in so-called civil-rights injunctions and contempt cases? Yet it is sure that if the Brownell bill passes, making the United States the complainant, Federal judges will have the option of denying jury trials.

The Constitution makes no exceptions to jury trials on criminal charges except impeachment. Article III, section 3, says: "The trial of all crimes, except in cases of impeachment, shall be by jury, and such trial shall be held in the State where the said crimes shall have been committed . . ." As if this was not plain enough, it was added in the Bill of Rights that "in all criminal prosecutions the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury in the State or district wherein the crime shall have been committed."