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Tribute to the Foreign Service

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, a recent issue of the Reader’s Digest contained an article entitled “We Can Be Proud of Our Foreign Service” which was a readable article which sets forth a great many facts regarding our Foreign Service and some of the conditions of living and work which our Foreign Service personnel must endure.

I have often thought that those who are perhaps among the least appreciated in the service of this country are the Foreign Service people, including the Foreign Service officers themselves, and certain individuals, including children, who spend many years at hardship points.

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

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, a recent issue of the Reader’s Digest contained an article entitled “We Can Be Proud of Our Foreign Service” which was a readable article which sets forth a great many facts regarding our Foreign Service and some of the conditions of living and work which our Foreign Service personnel must endure.

I have often thought that those who are perhaps among the least appreciated in the service of this country are the Foreign Service people, including the Foreign Service officers themselves, and certain individuals, including children, who spend many years at hardship points.

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

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

WE CAN BE PROUD OF OUR FOREIGN SERVICE

By Charles D. Lewis.

(It’s not all striped-dress and cocktail parties, and service in a hardship post means exactly what it says. A businessman gives a one-time job to a Foreign Service officer, who, after living in a Foreign Service post, says he feels like he has a second home."

I was down on my farm in Virginia when one of my business friends telephoned from Florida to congratulate me on a Foreign Service post that you’re going to Washington to look over the State Department, Charlie. I hope you are half as happy as I am.


I’m a businessman. For the last 15 years I’ve been in the tobacco business, for five of those years as president of the American Sumatra Tobacco Corp., of New York. Now the State Department had invited me and five other businessmen, labor leaders, and a university professor—to serve as public members on the 1961 Foreign Service Selection Boards.

The Foreign Service is the body which largely man the policy offices of the State Department as well as our embassies and consulates overseas. It was going to be our job to look over the 1961 Selection Boards to study the record of every one of the 3,700 Foreign Service officers and to report what we found.

Over the years the talk among friends and business associates has always been precisely the same: the State Department, an ivory tower, full of dreamers, eggheads, incompetents. So I went to Washington excited to find that a lot of bureaucratic heads should roll.

A few days later I was sitting at a stark metal table in an office of the State Department, with the other members of the board. Piled before us were $57 folders with Foreign Service performance stamped on them in big red capitals. These were the confidential personnel files on Foreign Service officers.

I eyed the files hesitantly, wondering what shocks they would contain. And they did contain some shocks, at least to a man who was not in the Foreign Service. Later, I found that all the other public members had suffered a similar blow to their childhood illusions.

When we compared notes, we found that the main ideas we had come to Washington with were false.

Idea: “Let’s face it, the diplomatic life is pretty cushy.”

The files quickly dispelled that illusion for all of us, for good. Foreign Service officers regularly and cheerfully take their families to live for years in places where I would hate

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary.
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PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND WATERSHED PROTECTION PROJECTS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the Public Works Committee, the senior Senator from New Mexico (Mr. Chavez), and in order that the Members of the Senate and House, particularly the Appropriations Committees, and other interested parties may be advised of projects approved by the Committee on Public Works, under the provisions of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, and the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Congressional Record, information on this subject.

The first is a list of eight public buildings projects, six projects for new buildings, and two projects for alterations to existing buildings.

Approval of these building projects is based on prospectuses submitted to the committee by the Administrator of General Services, or reports on surveys of Federal building needs, in compliance with the provisions of Public Law 294, 86th Congress. All these projects have been discussed with representatives of the General Services Administration, who justified the need for these buildings.

The small watershed protection projects were approved under the provisions of Public Law 566, 83d Congress, as amended.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Buildings</th>
<th>Date of Approval</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, Calif., Courthouse and Federal Office Building</td>
<td>Sept. 18, 1962</td>
<td>$32,544,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akron, Ohio (2) Courthouses and Federal Office Building and Post Office</td>
<td>Aug. 22, 1962</td>
<td>$11,050,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsa, Okla., additional court facilities to authorized building</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin, Tex. (2), U.S. Building, and Post Office</td>
<td>Sept. 18, 1962</td>
<td>$9,262,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knoxville, Tenn., Federal Office Building</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C., office building for H.C.A.</td>
<td>Sept. 27, 1962</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ALTERATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alterations</th>
<th>Date of Approval</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C., South Building, Agriculture Department</td>
<td>Sept. 18, 1962</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C., Old Post Office Building</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>$718,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,969,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WATERSHED PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Watershed Projects</th>
<th>Date of Approval</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Branly Creek, Del.</td>
<td>Aug. 22, 1962</td>
<td>$2,060,978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weldon Creek, Ga. (upstream)</td>
<td>Oct. 2, 1962</td>
<td>$64,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twin Cane Creek, Kans.</td>
<td>Aug. 22, 1962</td>
<td>$245,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coosa Creek, Ala.</td>
<td>Oct. 2, 1962</td>
<td>$3,822,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware Creek, Okla.</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>$1,177,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badger Creek, Tex.</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>$2,034,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellaire Creek, Tex.</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>$2,034,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder Lake, Wyo.</td>
<td>Oct. 2, 1962</td>
<td>$790,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$18,058,817</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar, under the rule, was dispensed with.

BASIS LAID FOR OBTAINING BALANCED POSTAL BUDGET BY 1965

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, before this current session of Congress is adjourned, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to the basis laid in the postal rate and pay bill, H.R. 7927, for obtaining a balanced postal budget by 1965. I shall ask to include in the Congressional Record a statement concerning this matter which should be heartening to every Member of Congress.

As Senators will see from this statement, once the postal rate bill has run its course, the revenues and expenditures of our great Post Office Department will be in balance. It is my sincere hope that we shall be able to keep it in balance for many years to come.

It seems to me that, with the proper use of modern systems, we should be able to develop necessary to increase volume and at the same time reduce unit costs. Under a Democratic Postmaster General, we have already made significant strides in the direction of increased efficiency and elimination of frills. I believe that studies to be commenced next year on mail classification, postal costs, and mechanization will go a long way toward attaining a balanced postal budget, and will keep it so in the future.

I ask unanimous consent to have the statement previously referred to printed in the Record at this point.

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

A BALANCED POSTAL BUDGET BY 1965

H.R. 7927, as amended in the Senate, provides rate increases in excess of those approved by the House committee in September 1961. The Senate version of this measure provides a firm basis for achieving a balanced postal budget. Recognizing, of course, that volume and expense will increase; nevertheless, as volume increases, so will revenues. Postal efficiency should permit volume increases at lower unit costs.

An analysis with respect to the deficit

[In millions of dollars]

H.R. 7927 will produce 1 $600
Public services allowed 1373
ICC hike in parcel post revenues 1385

Total additional income 1,108

1 Additional postal pay ($583 million less 25 percent, or $431 million) 272

Total additional cost 1,104

1 Any further upward adjustment in postal rates would be contrary to the 1956 act (Public Law 84-406) which provides that revenue and expense should be approximately equal, after adjustment for public services.

STATE DEPARTMENT REBUTTALS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, some time ago, there was discussion on the Senate floor with regard to two incidents reported in the press. The first involved an article which appeared early in September by the reporters Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott. The article charged the existence of a note from Khrushchev to President Kennedy the weekend before the 1961 ill-fated Cuban invasion, a note threatening Soviet occupation of Berlin if the United States used American forces against Cuba.

At the time of that discussion I stated that I had asked the Department of State for clarification of the extent to which there was a connection between Berlin and Cuba and, specifically, to respond to the inquiry whether there was such a note from Mr. Khrushchev to President Kennedy.

I said that I would place in the Record later the reply from the Department of State. The Department of State has replied. It has denied the existence of such a communicated communication prior to the Bay of Pigs invasion. I ask unanimous consent to have that letter printed in the Record at this point.

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

H.R. 7927 will produce 1 $600
Public services allowed 1373
ICC hike in parcel post revenues 1385

Total additional income 1,108

1 Additional postal pay ($583 million less 25 percent, or $431 million) 272

Total additional cost 1,104

1 Any further upward adjustment in postal rates would be contrary to the 1956 act (Public Law 84-406) which provides that revenue and expense should be approximately equal, after adjustment for public services.

Sincerely,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, nevertheless, I am assured by the newsman concerned, who are known as well-informed and responsible observers, that in its basic essentials their original charge was true and that such a message in some form or other was conveyed to the President prior to the fateful decision to withdraw full U.S. support from the invasion.