"Whereas numerous bread price increases
are being distributed entirely to higher farm
prices, including those on farm products which
are attributable to increased costs of farm
Inputs.,

"Whereas some newspaper accounts accu-
crately state that the practice of raising farm
prices has been attributed to the increase in farm
prices,,

Now, therefore, by the authority vested in us

The Secretary of Agriculture is requested to make
a survey through the field offices of his Department of
the amount of retail price increases since
April 1 in towns and cities of the Nation,
their relationship to increases in farm price
support prices, and the extent to which
the public was harmed, or mis-
infomed, as to the reason for such increase;
and that the Secretary similarly survey broad
price changes and their relationship to farm
returns for wheat, reporting to the Commit-
tee as early as possible.

The "Credibility Gap" Widens in
Our War in Vietnam

The President's Office. The Secretary of
Defense, Mr. McNamara, is in unfamiliar

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, it
should not be news to my colleagues in
the Senate and the House that the American
people are not buying what is going on in Vietnam.
Indeed, they have never gotten the truth,
the whole truth, and nothing but the
truth about our involvement in southeast
Asia.

Actually, the whole basis alleged for
our military intervention is false. It is not
ture, as the official pronouncements have stated an-
and again, that we were asked by a friendly government
to help it repel aggression. The official
record, found in the State Department's
publication: "Why Vietnam," issued
August 20, 1965, with the foreword by President Lyndon B. Johnson, is bare of
any such commitment. It is not found
in the crucial letter of President Eisen-
hower to President Diem of October
18, 1963, which President Eisenhower
provided but coupled his offer with
conditions of reform and good performance
which were never carried out. The
only form of his aid had been one to
assist in the transportation of several
hundred thousand North Vietnamese to
South Vietnam.

The lack of such a request by Diem-
to help repel aggression—and the evi-
dence that it was we, the United States,
who asked ourselves in, is further con-
firmed in the White House statement of
November 3, 1964, which states that
President Eisenhower had instructed
Gen. J. Lawton Collins, as his special
representative, to explore with President
Diem and his government how to help
them overcome their critical problems and to
supplement measures adopted by the
Vietnamese themselves. The initiative
for intervention came from the United
States. At no time under President
Eisenhower and President Kennedy, and
not until after the inception of the John-
son administration, were any U.S. troops
sent into combat, without prior orders to do
so, by Vietnamese military advisers. There-
fore, the official allegations repeatedly
made that three Presidents have made
this commitment, and that it has thereby
become a national pledge, are, without
foundation. The fact is, we asked our-
selves in and, by our subsequent actions,
we have become the aggressors.

Equally unfounded is the subsequently
drugged up assertion that the SEATO
Treaty, the North Vietnamese used in our
Military Intervention. That likewise is a decep-
tion. This article of the SEATO Treaty
makes clear that in the case of aggres-
sion all the parties to the treaty shall be
consulted and, once a conclusion by unan-
ymous agreement. There never
was any consultation, and, of course,
there was, and could be, no unanimous
agreement among the signers of the
SEATO Treaty—France and Pakistan—are completely out of
sympathy with our attitude and actions
in southeast Asia.

The stark and unpalatable fact, which
the official propaganda has never been
willing to face, is that we went half
way around the world to inject ourselves into
a civil war and, including so, violated
every pertinent treaty commitment—the
United Nations Charter, the SEATO
Treaty—which, in article 1, refers to
the United Nations requirement not to
resort to force but only to peaceful
means, as further enumerated in article
33—and we likewise violated the
unilateral commitment made by the United
States and Secretary of State Walter Bedell Smith that we would
respect the Geneva agreements and its
pledge of all-Vietnam elections. All
these treaties, under our Constitution,
are of the highest class
of commitments.

We might add that there was a further
commitment which the American people
understood and thought they understood,
that President Johnson made in his cam-
paign not to follow the Goldwater poli-
cies, but to find a peaceful solution to
our involvement in Vietnam, which, at the
time of his campaign, had not escalated
into sending our troops into combat.

President Johnson, in the course of his
campaign, said:

"There are those who say I ought to go
North and drop bombs to wipe out the sup-
ply lines .... But we don't want to get tied
down in a land war in Asia.

And President Johnson also said:
We are asking the American boys
nine or ten thousand miles away from home
to do what Asian boys should be doing for
themselves.

When he made these statements in the
fall of 1966, he did make a commitment to the
American people.

That commitment has been totally
breached. We are going further and fur-
ther now. We are being bogged down
in a land war. And we are sending more
and more American boys 9,000 or 10,000
miles away from home.

No wonder there is a "credibility gap." It
is evident.

The allegation that we are fighting
aggression and that North Vietnam—
Hanoi—is the aggressor, is also a distor-
tion. There has been no injil-
tration from the North, but it followed
U.S. violation of our agreements and was
far less in quantity than ours. Moreover,
we are expected to follow the law-abiding,
treatment of a nation.

So much for the past, with its awe-
some present and future consequences.

We now find four veteran reporters,
newspaper men of integrity and repu-
tation, now in Vietnam, assailing the United
States' news policies in Saigon. They
are Dr. Hugh Harrill, of the National Broad-
casting Co.; Malcolm Browne, formerly of
the Associated Press and Pulitzer Prize
winner, who has been in Vietnam for
years; Chauncey Boice, a former New
York Times correspondent; and Jack
Poisie, a star correspondent for the Los Angeles Times, also
an old Asia hand.

An article published in the New
York Times under a three-column head-
line reading: "Four Reporters Assail
U.S. News Policies in Saigon," Mr.
Browne points out that Saigon's
news policies prevent reporters from
getting first-hand information about
military activity in Laos and Thailand.
"As far as the command is concerned
publicly," Mr. Browne averred, "Laos
doesn't exist. Neither does Thailand.
Surely, the American people are entitled
of to know of our steady widening of the
war and that the American people are op-
posed of South and North Viet-
name in both of these other countries.

Mr. Browne also referred to Arthur
Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense
for Public Affairs, as among the great
practitioners of the 'art' of news
management.

I ask unanimous consent that the news
article from the New York Times of Aug-
ust 2, 1966, be printed here.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. A more detailed
commentary on Assistant Secretary Syl-
vester and his performance is published
in the August issue of the Progressive
magazine, published at Madison, Wis.
In it is an account about Mr. Sylvester
which appeared in Dateline 1966, a pub-
cation of the Washington Free Press Club,
which reported that Sylvester made no
secret of the fact that he expected Amer-
ican newsmen to disseminate only infor-
mation "that made the United States look
good.

At this point, a network television cor-
respondent said:

Surely, Arthur, you don't expect the Ameri-
can press to be the handmaiden of govern-
ment?

Sylvester, he recalled, replied:

"That's exactly what I expect.

That is what an official in a tot-
allitarian country would and could expect.
It is shocking to hear that from an
American official.

Considering the widening "credibility gap," which is a euphemism for what
actually goes on—namely, that the
American people are being misled by
their government officials—when this
matter was brought up, Sylvester replied:

"If you think any American official is going to tell you the truth, then you're
stupid. Did you hear that—stupid?

There is much else in this revealing
resume as to the liaison that exists
between Pentagon officials, and espe-
cially Assistant Secretary Sylvester,
about getting the truth to the American
people; and I ask unanimous consent
that this article, entitled "The Bull Ses-
sion," from the August issue of the Pro-
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position at that time to make any contract concessions.

Mr. NELSON. I do not interpret the questioner's answer in that way. I am sure the Senate will agree in retrospect, Mr. Stiemaker was giving an honest and accurate answer. Because the fact of the matter is that the contract was rejected by a large margin.

I think his guess is correct, that they would not go back to work without the contract resolved, because of course they would lose the bargaining position and then, to go back and bargain while working, and then go out on another strike.

Mr. PROUTY. They would not lose their bargaining position, because they would retain the right to strike again at any time, a right which they shall lose by our passing a resolution regardless of its final form.

Mr. NELSON. Yes, but to have two strikes in a row is something I do not believe that union membership or leaders would want to get engaged in. But my point here is, I think there may well be a time when Congress should act. But as of last Wednesday—and the distinguished from Vermont was on the committee, and made a fine contribution to the discussion and the questioning at all stages—I think the Senator will agree we thought there was hardly any chance; and when I was urging that we wait until Friday for a reply from the Secretary, many people there thought the chances were almost nil, and that perhaps they should wait out and see what would happen immediately. I, too, felt they were almost nil; but, bam, on Friday they reached an agreement.

I say that as of this moment, today, there is a better chance of getting the bargaining back together and negotiating the relatively small points which I think now separate the membership's willingness to accept and the employers' willingness to accept, in fact if they could in the next 3, 4, or 5 days reach an agreement that was reasonable and not too costly, one that could be met, usually double the normal price immediately, to delay action if nothing could be done immediately, than for Congress to move in, for the first time in 40 years, in this kind of a situation.

Mr. PROUTY. If we had any assurance that would take place, I am sure we would all agree. However, I cannot see it in the same light as the Senator, particularly in view of the Secretary of Labor's statement on Monday to the effect that he did not anticipate a voluntary settlement in the immediate future.

Mr. NELSON. As the Senator knows, the Secretary of Labor could give us no assurance on last Wednesday, and yet dramatically they reached an agreement. If they can do it once, they can do it again.

Mr. PROUTY. Last Wednesday, the Secretary asked us to delay resolving the bill in order to permit certain avenues to be explored. Day before yesterday, however, he testified that these avenues had been exhausted and he was no longer hopeful of an early settlement. The agreement reached Friday also troubles me, or, rather, the failure of the union membership to ratify its terms troubles me. I believe the union's national negotiating committee was under extreme governmental pressure to settle, and that it was also under pressure to reach an agreement from a public relations standpoint.

However, when the officers and leaders of most of the IAM locals involved were afforded an opportunity to discuss the contract terms as rejected, I do not think that many of us were surprised at the outcome of the vote. This might be a case where the union's national leadership is responsible, but one where the leaders of the various local unions did not. I think the ratification vote might have shown quite a different result if the local leaders had urged approval of the new contract.

I thank the Senator. Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

INVESTIGATION OF PRICE INCREASES ON MILK, BREAD, AND OTHER COMMODITIES

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I am happy to announce to the Senate that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry this morning unanimously approved a resolution which I presented to the committee.

This resolution would direct the Secretary of Agriculture to undertake an immediate investigation and survey of price increases for milk, bread, and other commodities.

The purpose of the investigation is to provide the committee and the Congress and the American people with information that will give us an understanding of what is behind sharp food price increases, particularly the price increases for bread and milk, that have taken place in recent days.

There has been an unfortunate effort on the part of some industry spokesmen to attribute increases of as much as 2 cents a loaf in the price of bread to the rapidity of the increase in the price of milk, perhaps in an effort to deflect attention from the fact that, in this price increase, much of the increase is due to factors in excess of the amount of federal price supports.

There is the implication that increases of as much as 2 cents a loaf in the price of bread can be explained entirely by modest advances in wheat prices.

I think that investigation will demonstrate very quickly that the farmer's return represents a very small part of the increase in milk and bread prices.

The purpose of the investigation which our committee believes the Secretary should undertake immediately is not to make anyone a scapegoat, but simply to demonstrate the facts, and to show that when there is an increase of 2 cents on a loaf of bread or 3 cents on a quart of milk—as we have had in a number of market areas around the country—many factors go into an increase other than the amount the farmer receives.

The farmers' share is actually a minor part of the total.

The Metropolitan Milk Institute of New York wrote in the morning that the figures on milk price increases in a New York Times story of last Friday were in error. It may very well be that there is some error or conflict in various statistics that have been cited. If this is true, then it further points up the need for a reliable and fully publicized investigation and statement of the true facts by the Department of Agriculture.

When the investigation is completed—and I hope that it will begin immediately and be completed within the next 2 or 3 weeks—the Senate will be informed of its results. At that time, if hearings seem to be in order, I hope our committee will take that action.

I do think that this investigation is in the interest of not only farm producers, but also consumers. Consumers have a right to know the facts and to understand what is behind these very marked increases in food prices which have occurred during the last few weeks. I know that farmers are not to blame and I am determined that this be demonstrated to the American people.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my resolution as unanimously approved by the committee this morning be printed at this point in the Record, along with a press statement which I released this noon.

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

SENATE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE APPROVES McGOVERN FOOD PRICE RESOLUTION

The Senate Agriculture Committee today unanimously approved a resolution introduced by Senator George McGovery directing the Department of Agriculture to survey and report to the Senate and the American people to which farmers are being improperly blamed for milk, bread and other food price increases.

The resolution directs the Department to make a survey, community-by-community, of the amount of farm price increases, the amount of consumer price increases, and the extent to which these increases are due to excess of the farm return were blamed on increased farm prices.

In presenting the resolution, McGovery read newspaper articles which he said falsely blamed farmers for milk price increases that were due to a number of factors, including the farmers' get. "Bread prices have gone up in many places several times more than is justified by increases in wheat prices," he said.

"The investigation I have requested as approved by the Committee is not an effort to make a scapegoat of anyone," Senator McGovery said. "It is an effort to be sure that consumers can understand that farm prices are only a minor factor in most of the current round of food price increases."

The resolution, which will go directly from the Committee to Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, asks him to report back to the Committee on the price increases as early as possible. The Committee will then consider the need for hearings.

The Committee agreed to amend the resolution to cover several food commodities, including butter, cheese, and eggs, and increases in meat costs resulting from specification buying.

The resolution was approved by the Committee, as originally submitted by Senator McGovery, follows:

"RESOLUTION

Whereas members of the Senate Agriculture Committee are receiving protests against milk price support increases indicating public misunderstanding of the extent of April 1 and July 1 rises in support to farmers, and,
gress, be presented also at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

See exhibit 2.

EXHIBIT 1

FOUR REPORTERS ARRIVAL, U.S. NEWS MEDIA IN SAIGON—ON TV, THEY SAY BRIEFINGS BY MILITARY ARE OFTEN LATE, INACCURATE, AND COLORLESS

Defense Department information polices and press briefings in Vietnam were sharply criticized by all American correspondents there in a television program last night. The correspondents, whose remarks were taped in Saigon, said briefings by United States military spokesmen are often colorless, sac and lack substance. The daily briefings are called “The 6 o’clock follies” by many correspondents, Dean Breis of the National Broadcasting Company said.

Malcolm Browne, a former Associated Press reporter and Pulitzer Prize—winner now doing free lance work in Vietnam, said on the NBC news program on “WNDT” that the briefing officers often fail.

Charles Mohr, a New York Times correspondent, said the information officers in Saigon “were more interested in policy than facts” and “had no effect of a story—rather than an accuracy.”

A SANITARY WAR

He said the administration was reluctant for correspondents to write about napalm or asphyxiating bombs. They want to make it a sanitary war,” he said.

Mr. Browne criticized the Pentagon’s news policies, saying he was prevented from getting first-hand information about American military activity in Laos and Thailand. “The command is off-camera,” he said, “and the Laotians do not exist. Neither does Thailand.”

He said, “A Sanitary War,” Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, was one of the great practitioners of the art of news management. He said the administration, “particularly Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, have deliberately misled American public on a number of examples of this, he said, “is the continual harping on the North Vietnamese aggression.”

Mr. Browne said the war was being conducted by a civil war. The three other correspondents agreed.

Jack Folio, a reporter for the Los Angeles Times, asked the White House if “informal censorship” to news management “that squashes information at the roots.”

There was sympathy for the briefing officers, though Mr. Mohr said they were “a distorted picture, not out of either bad motive or viciousness, but simply because they themselves have a clear idea of what happened.”

The correspondents agreed with a statement by Mr. Breis that no one could cover the war from Saigon. “You’ve got to go out there,” he said.

EXHIBIT 2

THE “BULL SESSION”

As Assistant Secretary for Public Defense, Arthur Sylvester, a former newspaperman, is charged with the top responsibility for the official news from Washington.

This most sensitive task demands, among other qualities, an appreciation of the people’s right to know that they now do about the war they are paying for with their taxes and the lives of their sons.

If an attack written by Morley Safer, a respected Columbia Broadcasting System correspondent in Vietnam, on the press of Saigon, the Assistant Secretary of Defense has attacked it without effectively refuting it—then the Assistant Secretary holds views on the handling of war news that should horrify the press and public, and justify his resignation.

Safer’s account, which appeared in the New York Times, describes the meeting was held in Saigon between Sylvester and a group of American correspondents to discuss some of the problems involved in covering the war. Safer wrote that the press officer, “seemed anxious to take a stand to say something that would jar us. He did.”

The first job of the story, came when Sylvester said, “I can’t understand how you fellows can write what you do while you’re in Saigon. What are you doing?” Then he went on, as Safer described it, “to the effect that American correspondents had a patriotic duty to disseminate only information that made the United States look good.”

A network television correspondent said, “Surely, Arthur, you don’t expect the American press to be the handmaidens of government?” Sylvester, Safer recalled, replied, “That’s exactly what I expect.”

When the same credibility of American officials was brought up, Sylvester responded: “Look, if you think any American official is a liar, go out and write about it, then you’re stupid. Did you hear that—stupid?”

One of the newsmen suggested that Sylvester was acting like a “ninja.” The Assistant Secretary, according to Safer, replied: “Look, I don’t even have to talk to you people. I deal with you through your editors and publishers back in the States.”

Safer’s account of what immediately followed is that the threat is astounding: “At one point, the hon. Arthur Sylvester put his thumbs in his ears, bulged his eyes, stuck out his tongue, and sulked.”

At one point Sylvester asked: “Do you guys want to be spoon-fed? Why don’t you get out and cover the war?” The effect, as described by Safer: “It was a jarring and inhuman spectacle. Most of the people in that room had spent as much time in actual operations as members of the television correspondents walked out, saying they had enough. A few minutes later, two more correspondents left.”

If Sylvester made a single one of the remarks attributed to him he merits dismisal. When the story was published, a representative, Representative Douglas, W. Hall, Missouri Republican, entered the House and said to the House that “if Mr. Safer’s reporting of this meeting is accurate—and based on my personal experience I have no doubt that it is—then Mr. Sylvester should either resign, or be fired.”

Sylvester later wrote to Representative Hall, attaching a copy of his correspondence with Victor Riesel, president of the Overseas Press Club. The Congressman inserted Sylvester’s letter in the Congressional Record—where it has been published with the same press silence that was accorded the original incident for a whole year.

In his letter to the Assistant Secretary Safer referred to Safer’s account as a “gem of misrepresentation,” and charged him with distortions and inaccuracies attributed to me.”

Sylvester said that Safer was correct on only one point—that in opening the session he read minutes to the House of the U.S. Embassy in Saigon, (the usual briefing for information, but a 10-minute session.) wrote Sylvester, “this (Safer’s) reckoning of the evening was ‘bull.’ ” He made specific denials of only one of the comments attributed to him. Two then concluded with an attack on Safer’s reputation as a “newspaper”.

The difference of Congress and the press to this incident is shockingly callous. If Safer still stands by his story, as we understand, he does, his description of the official Pentagon position on the handling of news from Vietnam, especially that the people are entitled to only that news which makes the United States look good, should be brought to the consideration of this Congress and the sooner the better.

THE AIRLINE LABOR DISPUTE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 185) to provide for the settlement of the airline labor dispute currently existing between certain air carriers and certain of their employees, and for other purposes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the majority has in mind suggesting a unanimous-consent agreement to apply to the Lausche amendment only. I think that perhaps the staff on both sides of the aisle will wish to modify Senate, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senate yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withhold his suggestion?

Mr. KUCHEL. I withhold it.

Mr. KUCHEL. My understanding is that the action would go into effect about half an hour from now.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I have a briefing statement of 3 or 4 minutes. Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll. Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the approval of the floor manager of the bill, the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania, and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and also the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the approval of the floor manager of the bill, the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania, and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and also the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. KUCHEL. I withdraw the request.

Mr. KUCHEL. Fru 2 minutes; then the Senator will be here.

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll. Mr. MANSFIELD. 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. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Florida.
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am prepared to support vigorously and vote for any equitable measure that will assure prompt restoration of air service for the benefit of the general public.

There is no further need to recite statistics to demonstrate how serious an effect this dispute between labor and management has had on the American economy. We have heard numerous statements in this Chamber that have recounted the hardships suffered by everyone from the stranded tourist to the merchant who has watched his business dwindle away to a trickle.

There is strong evidence that, if allowed to drag on much longer, this walkout could set off a general economic downturn that would be highly resistant to any corrective action.

I am convinced that not more than one or two Senators doubt the words of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in Senate Joint Resolution 186, that "emergency measures are essential to the maintenance of this dispute and to the security and continuity of transportation services by such carriers."

I am convinced that nearly every Senator is aware of the urgent necessity for steps to protect the welfare of the general public.

Yet, I am also convinced that many Senators are reluctant—for whatever reason—to associate themselves with those steps.

It is ironic that some of these Members of Congress who frequently proclaim the absolute surrender of the legislative branch of the Government to the executive branch are the ones who are now hesitant to move in this field. They chide the President and other members of his administration for attempting to bypass or ignore the Congress. In their flights of wrath, they proclaim that Congress has become an "errand boy" to the President— that his wish is our command. They recall with a road heavily mined with political explosives, they would turn back and have the President lead the way for them. No, the Congress has clear authority in this matter. This is our road to walk, and article 1, section 8 of the U.S. Constitution is our guide. It provides that Congress has the power to regulate interstate commerce.

Should we fail to assume our responsibility, should we attempt to shut it to the President, Congress would be gravely imperiling the concept of separate and co-equal branches of government.

We would be setting an ominous precedent for future generations to place in Presidential hands sweeping discretion over any powers that should rightly be exercised by the Senate and the House.

As the directly elected representatives of the people of our various States, it is we who should protect their interests in this current crisis. We cannot look down for direction. The initiative and the responsibility are ours.

Mr. President, at one point in the show "The Front Page," William Holden cries out in anger at "words, words, words, words, words."

It is my hope that the American public will not have to rise up in anger and shout for action instead of words from the Congress.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the majority leader unfortunately cannot be present in the Chamber at this time, but I propose, with his approval, the approval of the majority leader, the minority whip, and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. LAUSCHE), the following:

I ask unanimous consent that commencing at 1:30 p.m. the Lausche amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 186 be made a part of this bill that I have been allotted to its consideration, 30 minutes to be allotted to each side, the proponents' time to be controlled by the Senator from Ohio (Mr. LAUSCHE), and the opponents' time to be controlled by me, as floor manager of the bill; that the vote shall be had at the expiration of 1 hour; and that any quorum calls which may be had in the meantime shall not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. Gruening in the chair.) Is there objection?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I suggest to the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CLARK) that there be included in the unanimous consent agreement that at the end of 40 minutes—20 minutes used by the opponents and 20 minutes by me—there shall be a live quorum call, leaving 20 minutes used after the quorum call is completed.

Mr. CLARK. I have no objection to that, but I do not think it is necessary to write it into the unanimous-consent agreement because we have agreed that the quorum call shall not be charged to either side.

Mr. LAUSCHE. With that statement I am satisfied.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, late yesterday afternoon, when the only Senator from Louisiana (Mr. Long), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Morse), and I were on the floor of the Senate, the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. Long), with the concurrence and approval of the Senator from Oregon introduced into the Record a letter from the Attorney General, which is printed at page 17179 of the Record and which I shall read in full. It is addressed to Senator Long, who stated yesterday that it was written at his request. The letter reads:


Hon. Russell B. Long,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: I am writing in response to your inquiry regarding any constitutional or other legal problems involved in S.J. Res. 181 as reported by the Senate Labor Committee yesterday.

While I do not wish to comment on the need for Senate action I would like to call your attention to Section 2 which delegates the broadest possible authority to the President in the event of a pending settlement of a labor dispute. No standards are expressed in the resolution by which to gauge the results of this extraordinary delegation of power.

Section 5 provides for enforcement through

injunctive relief. In any judicial proceedings a court would have to find that the power had been exercised properly. Thus the absence of express standards would invite the judicial process. Such procedural functions are largely of a minor character and do not extend to such constitutional matters as are now at issue in this extraordinary delegation of power.

Mr. President, I wish to point out with respect to the Attorney General's letter that there is either a typographical error or the Attorney General was reading the wrong resolution before he wrote the letter to the Senator from Louisiana, because he refers to "S.J. Res. 181" which is not the pending measure or the committee resolution. The committee resolution is Senate Joint Resolution 186.

Senators Joint Resolution 186 does contain the finding of the Congress in accordance with the criteria of section 10 of the Railway Labor Act, that this labor dispute "threatens substantially to interrupt interstate commerce to a degree such as to deprive any section of the country of essential transportation service."

That finding having been made by the Congress in section 2 of Senate Joint Resolution 186, the President is then given discretion as to whether or not to order the men back to work.

As I stated on the floor yesterday, as many other Senator have stated, and as is abundantly clear in the committee report, this resolution uses not only the criteria of section 10 of the Railway Labor Act, but follows exactly the procedure set forth in the Railway Labor Act, with respect to the exercise of discretion by the President.

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

Mr. CLARK. I shall be happy to yield in a few moments.

Under the Railway Labor Act, section 10, as the National Mediation Board, which makes the finding that the dispute threatens substantially to interrupt interstate commerce. That having been made, the President decides whether or not to create a dispute board.

I wish to quote from the provisions of section 10 of the Railway Labor Act:

Sec. 10. If a dispute between a carrier and its employees be not adjusted under the foregoing provisions of this Act and should, in the judgment of the Mediation Board, threaten substantially to interrupt interstate commerce to a degree such as to deprive any section of the country of essential transportation service, the Mediation Board shall notify the President, who may thereupon—

Mr. President, I call attention to the words—"who may thereupon"—in his discretion, create a board to investigate the cause of a dispute.

Note the words "in his discretion."—Such board shall be composed of such number of persons as to the President may seem desirable: Provided, however, that no member of such board shall be interested in such dispute, or otherwise interested in any organization of employees or any carrier. The compensation of
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Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, under the previous order, that the Senate go into recess until 10:30 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.) the Senate recessed, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Thursday, August 4, 1966, at 10:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS
Executive nominations received by the Senate, August 3, 1966:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE
The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 2 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consular officers of the United States of America:
A. John Cope, Jr., of Washington, District of Columbia.
John H. Adams, Jr., of Virginia.
Now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consular officer of the United States of America:
Clarence J. McIntosh, of Florida.
L. G. Phillips, of New York, as a Foreign Service officer of class 5, a consular officer, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:
Ralph W. St. John, Jr., of Ohio.
Now a Foreign Service officer of class 6 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consular officer of the United States of America:
Fernando E. Rondon, of California.
For promotion from a Foreign Service officer of class 7 to class 6:
John D. Holger, of the District of Columbia.
For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 7 to class 6 and to be also consular officers of the United States of America:
Edward P. Allen, of Massachusetts.
Samuel B. Babb, of Massachusetts.
Don E. Bean, of Virginia.
Lee S. Bigelow, of Texas.
Henry Clay Black II, of Illinois.
Marion V. Creekmore, of Tennessee.
Elroy E. Cunningham, of Michigan.
Edmund T. Durland, Jr., of Virginia.
Frank R. Devine, of Pennsylvania.
William H. Gussman, of New York.
Richard J. Hargrave, of California.
Walter Ho, of California.
Leon M. Johnson, Jr., of Colorado.
D. L. Kowalewski, of Massachusetts.
Norman C. Larrick, of Massachusetts.
Dennis Lumb, of New York.
James M. Lynch, of Maryland.
John R. Lampe, of Minnesota.
George H. Lunsford, of Illinois.
Mark L. New, of New York.
Michael J. Mercuro, of Ohio.
Geoffrey Ogden, of California.
Donald R. Parsons, of California.
Harry W. Quillan, of Virginia.
Alan D. Romberg, of New York.
Charles F. Salmon, Jr., of New York.
Donald E. J. Stewert, of the District of Columbia.
Peter O. Suchmani, of New York.
Walter H. Federkzik, of California.
David S. Wilson, of California.
For promotion from Foreign Service officers of class 8 to class 7 and to be also consular officers of the United States of America:
Edward James Alexander, of Colorado.
David E. Brown, of California.
O. Gardner Brown, of Ohio.
Donald C., of Georgia.
Gordon J. DuClos, of the District of Columbia.
John J. Hurley, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Walter J. Kearns, of Montana.
Frank P. Kelly, of New Jersey.
John R. Keily, of Virginia.
Stuart W. Lippe, of Michigan.
Thomas E. Macklin, Jr., of California.
Thomas J. O'Flaherty, of New York.
Miles Eleanor Vance, of California.
Miles Elizabeth, of Indiana.
James E. Thyden, of California.
Miles Judy Anne, of Utah.
William H. Wall, of New York.
Anthony H. Wallace, of New York.
Miles Carol A. Weidenhefer, of Michigan.
Paul E. Wiesinger, of California.
For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 7, consular officers, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:
John H. Adams, of California.
John W. Billings, of New York.
Norman R. Buesbaum, of New York.
Timothy J. Burke, of Wisconsin.
Michael R. Conselyea, of New York.
Bruce Cousins, of New Jersey.
James F. Cresan, of Ohio.
Carl C. Cundiff, of Oklahoma.
John H. Currle, of Utah.
Lawrence A. Dasch, of Pennsylvania.
Edward S. Dubel, of New Jersey.
Bernard Engle, of Ohio.
Albert E. Fairchild, of North Carolina.
Daniel F. P. Higgins, of Iowa.
Robert M. Johnson, of New York.
Richard J. Higgins, of Missouri.
Dell J. Hood, of Texas.
Duane L. Inman, of Washington.
James O. Knowles, Jr., of Washington.
Barbara M. Krueger, of Michigan.
Lawrence C., of New York.
Philip Thomas Lincoln, Jr., of Michigan.
James B. Magnor, Jr., of New York.
James R. Nader, of New York.
Gene R. Preston, of California.
Jerry Lincoln Prillaman, of Virginia.
Denis R. Regan, of New York.
James L. Roberson, of Tennessee.
Erik S. Ronhovde, of Montana.
C. Michael Schneider, of Ohio.
James F. Shively, of Pennsylvania.
Charles S. Spencer, Jr., of Tennessee.
Thomas E. Spooner, of New York.
Wills J. Sturrock, of New Jersey.
Miss Caroline Marie Turley, of Arizona.
Phillip J. Walls, of Michigan.
Stephen P. Watson, of New York.
Howard S. Witner II, of Michigan.
Kenneth Yalowitz, of Illinois.
For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8, consular officers, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:
Miles J. Antar, of New York.
William S. Butler, of Ohio.
Robert J. Call, of California.
Robert J. Crockett, of California.
Thomas H. Carter, of Florida.
Herbert L. Cochran, of North Carolina.
Frederick W. Condon, of New York.
James P. Dodd, of Kentucky.
David J. Dunford, of California.
Miss Katherine M. Durkin, of New York.
Robert C. Felder, of New York.
Thomas Austin Forbord, of California.
William A. Gallager, of California.
Miss Patricia J. Howell, of Indiana.
Robert D. Johnson, of Missouri.
Phillip A. Jones, of Florida.
Miss Isabel D. Lamy, of Missouri.
Edward Gibson Lanpher, of Virginia.
Alexander L. Lucas, of New Jersey.
James N. May, of North Carolina.
Norman D. McCann, of Michigan.
Jonatha C. McEachern, of California.
Ralph R. Moore, of Virginia.
Robert J. Palmier, of Massachusetts.
Raymond J. Pardee, of New York.
David D. Paseage, of Colorado.
Robert Stephen Pastorino, of California.
Gerald D. Ramsey, of the District of Columbia.
Arnold L. Raphael, of New York.
James J. Reid, of Texas.
Lange Schleiffman, of New Jersey.
Edric Sherman, of California.
Thomas H. Shugart, Jr., of North Carolina.
Steven E. Steinheiser, of Pennsylvania.
Byron R. Stephens, of Kansas.
Miss Carol E. Stocker, of Illinois.
Terrence P. Tiffany, of Oregon.
Kenneth H. Torp, of New York.
Miles Ruth L. Willard, of Ohio.
Walton W. Stanislaw II, of Indiana.
A Foreign Service reserve to be a consular officer of the United States of America:
James D. Baldwin, of New Jersey.
Edward D. Becker, of Virginia.
Edward B. Balderson, of Virginia.
Paul H. Brent, of California.
Miles W. Brooks, of Michigan.
Ralph E. Buntz, of Maryland.
Stewart D. Burton, of Utah.
Will J. Carter, of Texas.
H. Daniel Clay, of Maryland.
James F. Fahey, of Maryland.
Robert N. Shipfield, of Illinois.
John D. Clayton, of Virginia.
Walter R. Cox, of Texas.
Robert E. Day, Jr., of Virginia.
Eddie Deerfield, of Florida.
Clyde E. Dixon, Jr., of Maryland.
Richard L. Doerschuk, of Maryland.
William W. Douglass, of Kentucky.
James F. Fieldman, of Maryland.
Al'an Fisher, of the District of Columbia.
James M. Flint, of Maryland.
C. M. Fry, of Maryland.
Allen Fuehrer, of Virginia.
Burton L. Gerber, of Missouri.
Robert S. Hewitt, of Virginia.
Neil Hickley, of Utah.
Paul W. Hodges, of Virginia.
John T. Kirby, of the District of Columbia.
Joseph Yost, of Pennsylvania.
John F. Kordek, of Illinois.
Arthur E. Lee, of Idaho.
George H. McElroy, of Virginia.
Samuel Duncan Miller, of the District of Columbia.
John S. Morgan, of Florida.
Peter Cary Muncle, of Maryland.
Edmund R. Murphy, of California.
Richard H. O'Malley, of the District of Columbia.
Herschel F. Peak, of California.
Walter F. Preby, of California.
Metro Romankiw, of Virginia.
Richard E. Scott, of Pennsylvania.
George Sherman, of Ohio.
Glenn Lee Smith, of California.
Jerome J. Stenger, Jr., of Maryland.
George M. Stull, of New York.
John M. Taylor, of Virginia.
Robert Allen Thomas, of Pennsylvania.
Joel D. Ticknor, of California.
Eugene W. Tomlinson, of Pennsylvania.
Donald C. Weaver, of Virginia.
Joseph C. Wheeler, of Pennsylvania.
Robert E. Winter, of Ohio.
For promotion to Foreign Service officers to be consular officers of the United States of America:
Donald J. Bouck, of Maine.
Richard A. Calfee, of Georgia.
Allen Cooper, of Florida.
Henry P. Dayton, of California.
Lloyd M. Dufu, of Iowa.
Charles E. Eate, of California.
Evelyn J. Haddix, of New Jersey.
George M. Hiran, of California.
Miss Catherine M. Hurley, of Connecticut.
Mary C. Huster, of California.
Robert A. MacCallum, of Pennsylvania.
Joseph P. Malone, of Massachusetts.
Joseph L. Marmond, of New York.
P. Coleman Parrott, of Alabama.
George J. Peterson, of California.
Chester F. Polley, Jr., of Illinois.
Charles T. Poole, of North Carolina.
David A. Roberts, of Pennsylvania.
George F. Rodman, of North Carolina.
Danny B. Root, of California.
Miss Mary J. Singhouse, of Pennsylvania.
Miles Frances Lee Weinman, of Washington.

A TIME OF SADNESS, A TIME FOR HOPE
(By David Gimbil)
I remember, my little girl, when you were only two,
The world around you seemed so bright and new.
Your smile would brighten every room with eternal, previous light,
And my happiness would reign supreme when you were in my sight.
I remember when we went outside, the snow was soft and true,
And like costly jewels, flakes kissed your face
but you never made a sound.
Then came the Spring, blossoms on trees,
and sweetness filled the air,
But when neighbors passed by, they would always stop and stare.
By the time you reached the age of three my concern began to grow,
I began to travel from place to place, for I really had to know.
The truth just hit me with such force, my dreams were all in vain,
And I found myself like in a trance, just walking by the rain.
Like parents of past centuries I keep on asking "Why?"
The question is as old as time, so I bear my pain.
But the parents of retarded children with their unlimited courage and devotion,
Are all filled with love that is deeper than any ocean.
But the years slipped by and like a flower you blossomed with beauty rare,
And now when folks would make remarks concerning you,
I was never seen or heard.
For Right is Right, its also they world in its own limited way.
Now Einstein sang song, "Dear God", I'll always pray.
Oh, I'll help to build a citadel to erase those ugly years,
So that we can bring in sunshine where there were once tears.
From a past of endless sorrow and a system.
We'll look forward to a future filled with Progress, Love and Hope.

Vietnam Statements
EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL OF ILLINOIS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 3, 1966
Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the following editorial from the August 1, 1966, issue of the Peoria Journal Star:

SATISFING WHAT IS EXPECTED

We seem to have a standing habit in the country of paying great respect and examining the great details pronouncements that are actually meaningless on their faces.
It is more standing practice.
After all, we dropped the atomic bomb because we believed the repeated Japanese statements that they would burn their "sacred son" and happily die before giving up—taking millions of American lives with them. Actually, while such statements were being made, preparations for a suicidal defense being made, the maneuvers to seek a surrender had already been decided.
The loud threats and boasts were attempts to get a better offer and a negotiating position.

But we are slow learners. We got in a big slap when the Buddhists threatened to resume their own civil war with the Ky regime and fight to the death any effort to discipline them or restrain them. They burned their pagodas in Hue, specifically, that any attempt of government troops to enter would be met by a wall of burning oil and a flight to the death and the blowing up of the whole shabang. Yes, we got in a big slap but Ky didn't.
His troops moved in. The pyres in front of the pagoda went unlit, the interior unburned, and the defenders surrendered without a shot. The supposed package centered out into the burning of a couple of hysterical teenagers and a couple of street demonstrations, poorly attended.

How many times has this game been played? What would you expect an enemy to say when he's trying to get YOU to back down: "Really, we'll quit if pressed." 7/7/7
Now, North Viet Nam shrinks that they'll fight for another 20 years if necessary, and Americans write their hands to want to either pulverize Hanoi or "get out of Viet Nam!"

What is the world do we expect Ho to say? He says what he HAS to say to try to get his way—and anybody that speaks up and says, "No, we won't! Are you nuts?" will get shot.

(Only here can the efforts of the government to be interpreted in a determined manner for the same reason and purpose—do a bunch of folks eagerly jump to their feet—or the nearest microphone—to holler: "Don't you believe it!")

Politics domestic or international offers a host of situations in which the public view of the terrorists are perceived as virtually inevitable, regardless of the truth.

When that occurs we certainly ought to recognize that we mean one way or the other, instead of taking them so seriously.

McNamara's 1963 statement about all Americans being home from Viet Nam in 1965 was such a statement, and we said so at the time. It may be a means of telling the world we were NOT trying to take over that place—and seeking peace in the event the Communists felt fearful of an American presence and otherwise willing to end the fracas.

Yet, it was taken literally then, and is still hard to back off as if McNamara was smoking opium or something!

Lyndon Johnson in 1960 said flatly that under no circumstance whatsoever, would he be a candidate for first vice president if Kennedy best him for the presidential nomination. He HAD or weaken his position in the convention. We said so at the time. The nation's professional commentators, however, took it and treated it as gospel truth.

Now, we are going through the same sort of game with Presley in South Viet Nam, taking his statements at face value and then "analyzing" what this means to the international situation.

Everybody seems to have forgotten that promised elections are coming, now, in South Viet Nam, and Presley is deeply involved and concerned with those election results.

He is not candidly discussing war policy with reporters at the top of his head. He is making statements calculated to make his fellow citizens say: "We are going to need Gen. Ky."

And he says what he HAS to say to lead them to that attitude.

It is as simple as that.

As meaningless as the statements made by Lyndon Johnson in the last presidential campaign hearings to try to get.Cooperation and meet with Presley.

Or those made in the election campaign of 1960 by John F. Kennedy about Quemoy and Matsu and a "missile gap."

Or those made by Eisenhower in his first campaign about slashing the budget to fifty billions.
Or those made by Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1932 about balancing the checks and the political. We are slow learners, indeed, on the subject of political statements made to meet obvious political responses. It's too much to expect us to change as we face another "silly season" in the election campaigns now getting underway right here.

Urge To Serve in Washington Can Go Too Far

EXPRESSION OF REMARKS OF HON. LEE H. HAMILTON OF INDIANA IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 3, 1966
Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial by Hugh Sidey which appeared in the July 29, 1966, issue of Life magazine that reasserts that all things do not revolve around the Federal Government and that men and women with a sense of citizenship are the country's greatest strength.

The author, Hugh Sidey, has touched a nerve here, and, hopefully, it should give a twinge to the Kremlin that it has become preoccupied with the belief that all things revolve around the Federal Government.

Mr. Sidey reminds us that this country's strength and greatness still lies in its millions of men and women who choose others to run the government while they run their own lives.

This "government of the people, by the people, for the people" has succeeded because it has continued to be aware of the wants of the people.

The article follows:

USA: TO SERVE IN WASHINGTON CAN GO TOO Far

(By Hugh Sidey)

The men in the higher reaches of the national government sooner or later suffer, in varying degrees, a virulent affliction which inhibits the eye, pinches the brain and exercises the victim with the belief that the noblest calling of mankind is to work in Washington for the Administration in power. In extreme infections, the love of job prot-</p>
The President talks of putting responsibility on the people back home in connection with his concept of creative federalism. In a week when we had one of our worst mass murders in this country's history, where riots flare from Cleveland to Jacksonville, it is much doubt that some of the biggest challenges this country faces are in the town halls, corporation offices and the homes.

Feeding the Flames

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

of

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

of Missouri

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1966

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, on the 22d of July 1966, there appeared in the Joplin Globe, an editorial entitled "Feeding the Flames," which I now submit for Insertion in the Congressional Record. It involves the current disregard for law and order in our cities and reveals some of the fallacies of the present approach to the civil disorders problem. The editorial is well worth pondering and I recommend it to our colleagues.

Feeding the Flames

The most blatantly irresponsible statement we have ever heard from a supposedly responsible person encouraging mounting race riots in our cities was the assertion by Vice President Hubert Humphrey that if he had to live in a ghetto he, too, "might lead a mighty good revolt."

That's one sure way to fan the flames of violence, with more burning, looting and bloodshed, such as we have been witnessing in Chicago, Cleveland, Jacksonville, Fla., and other cities this summer. That kind of talk from on high, plus federal handouts to bribe, and other acts of appeasement of the lawless can only tend to keep the tempo of anxiety and insurrections rising.

There has been far too much of this kind of sympathy, sit-in agitation and pampering by do-gooders and politicians alike, not only on our TV screen, sometimes to the point of surrender, that can only tend to cater to and encourage the very forces they purport to be fighting. While giving hoodlums and criminals what amounts to a license to commit more depredations in disregard for life, property and law.

There is a growing feeling that we are witnessing a pattern of planned organized violence under the guise of "civil disobedience" for racial justice. Evangelist Billy Graham is quoted as having said the riots are organized by petty criminals, violence, some of whom "are no more interested in civil rights than is the Ku Klux Klan." He charged that they are interested in the tactical disorder for sinister motives; that the President and the FBI know who the fomenters are and what is going on.

If this is true, then the President and the FBI have a sworn duty to inform the people and to act swiftly against these insurrectionists. They have a sworn duty to protect the constitutional rights of all Americans and to see that we can maintain the rule of law.

Another quite important man has his doubts about the whole exercise. "People who have a special and immediate interest in the matter, Lyndon Johnson said pointedly to a Senate committee, also means that some of those who do not enter public service are the housewives, the businessmen." He went on to say, "I am here to solve our problems, our citizens must develop a sense of citizenship, a new concern for the public good."
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Truth in Packaging Bill Has False Label

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

of

HON. CATHERINE MAY

of Washington

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1966

Mrs. MAY, Mr. Speaker, in my view the pending Federal packaging and labeling bill carries a false label when it is referred to as "Truth-in-packaging." I submit that we would do well to take a careful look at this legislative package—to examine its contents as well as its label—before passing it and passing on to encumber the national economy and the American consumer at this time.

In my opinion this proposed legislation is little more than a superfluous, inexact and inflationary time bomb for the American food and grocery consumer. I was pleased, therefore, to note in this morning's Washington Post the article by the distinguished Mr. Roscoe Drummond, entitled "Buyer Beware: Deceptive Packaging Bill."

Earlier this week I noted with pleasure another fine article in the subject by Alyce Hazeltine, the Seattle Post-Intelligencer's "Prudence Penny."

At the conclusion of my brief remarks I should include both articles and commend them to the attention of my colleagues. The points made by the authors of these articles are well taken.

What concerns me most of all about this Federal packaging and labeling bill, Mr. Speaker, is that while it offers little new protection to the American consumer, it would like the escalating cost of food and groceries. Evidence in Committee meetings before the Subcommittee on Food processors would have to spend millions of dollars in converting equipment to meet requirements of the proposed bill.

As Mr. Speaker, experience shows that increased food processing costs mean higher prices on our supermarket shelves.

As the articles to follow point out, what is unfortunate about this situation is that the so-called truth-in-packaging bill actually gives consumers few legal safeguards they do not already have.

It is fortunate, indeed, that at long last the American consumer is being made aware of the potential dangers the contents of this proposed legislation. In my view, consumers need higher food costs right now like they need square wheels on their supermarket shopping carts.

As a Member of Congress, as a consumer, as a housewife, I urge the Congress and the American public to give careful study to the inflationary effects of this bill before final action is taken.

From the Washington Post, Aug. 3, 1966

Better Beware: Deceptive Packaging Bill

(By Roscoe Drummond)

This "truth in packaging" bill, now before Congress, is just about the most decep-
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A Mother Does Her Bit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. Speaker, the morale of our men in our Armed Forces overseas is vitally important, not only to the men but to the performance of duty. As every soldier and sailor knows, such morale is lifted immeasurably by the arrival of parcels and mail from home.

One mother realizes this and who is doing more than her share to boost the morale not only of her own son but of all members of his outfit is Mrs. Leonard Sellers of my own district in California. Mr. Lee Chilson, who writes a column in the Chula Vista Star-News, took note of this in the issue of July 14.

Under unanimous consent I insert in the Congressional Record a heartwarming newspaper account of the activities of Mrs. Sellers in sending to the troops overseas such typically American products as hamburgers, and the Joyous and the Piggies that are received by men fighting in Vietnam:

A Mother Does Her Bit

"It's hard to put down a paper without being happy when I read of today's radio talk. Your son Paul is lucky to have such a wonderful family. The goodie box was just great. Thank you so much."

"The box was wonderful. It brought back many happy memories of home. It gets lonely here."

Those were just a few of the quotes from letters received this week by Mrs. Leonard Sellers of Chula Vista. They came from her son and a dozen or so of his Marine pals fighting the war in far-off Nam. The "goodie box" she sent them all the thanks were mailed several weeks ago by Mr. and Mrs. Sellers. They wouldn't ship the usual boxes of candy and cookies, though. They were filled with real American hamburgers.

We told you about Mrs. Sellers and her efforts to get the "burgers all the way to Viet Nam several weeks ago. She packed cans of beef patties and wrapped buns in special material so they would stay fresh on the long trip. This week she received pictures and letters of thanks. She let us read them, libelizing them from the airship.

"The box that I remember (and always will) was the box of hamburgers, and there's a little story I'd like to tell you about how we finally got a chance to eat them. Sunday at about 11 a.m. we got the word to pack up our gear because we were moving out. We loaded our trucks and came to our base in Chu-Lai. We made up field transport packs and went to the airship.

"While we were waiting to board the plane we had mail call. I got some letters and a couple of boxes. We opened the smaller box containing the cookies and the big package. I was so loaded down with gear that carrying the box was a little difficult so a couple of the guys carried my pack and gear.

"Believe me, we really guarded that box. We handled it like it was glass. Finally we boarded our plane and took off for Da Nang. We got on trucks again and they took us south to a camp. When we got to the camp it was almost dark. Most of us had eaten all day.

"We opened the box. (I took some pictures and it was just about dark so I hope they came out.) I guess I don't have to tell you how fast the hamburgers disappeared. They were delicious. And you should have seen some of the other guys digging by when they saw our gang eating real hamburgers. They couldn't believe their eyes!"

Tom Tobin of LaFuent, Calif., was on duty during the DaNang riots when his box of burgers came. He wrote Mrs. Sellers.
Proposal for Minimizing the Public Hardship in Transportation Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 3, 1966

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, it must be clear to those involved—the machinists, the airline operators, the public, and the Government—that a protracted strike of five major airlines, or the discontinuance of air transportation service, is no longer tolerable.

Regardless of the efficacy, even need, of the strike device in ordinary labor-management disputes, it is no longer an appropriate weapon in labor disputes when public hardship or a national emergency is involved.

The public has a major interest in the transportation business. Transportation—air, water, land, or rail—is a service, a public service, whether passenger, mail, or freight.

The taxpayer has a large stake in all transportation businesses. Profits are essential to the airlines and important to the public. The wages should be fair for the work done. The profits should be fair for the risk, investment, and service rendered. Neither excessive wages nor excessive profits should be taken at the expense of the user of the transportation or at the expense of the taxpayer who contributes to the subsidies and governmental services to the industry.

Any excessive profits or wages which are not returned to the public in reduced fares are just as inflationary and unacceptable as are salaries that are required by excessive wage or profit demands. The fare-paying traveler is just as entitled to a slice of the extraordinary profits as are the employers and employees. The taxpayer is just as much entitled to a slice of the extraordinary profits as they were obligated to subsidize when profits were impossible.

In many places public transportation is an absolute necessity. Interruptions of transportation can quickly and easily become a public inconvenience or hardship or a national emergency.

Presently it must be clear that a political solution is usually wrong or often impossible, as though President Johnson has refused to intervene in either the airline or the New York City transport strikes for political reasons. Politics has no place in labor disputes while the national interest or public convenience is involved.

President Johnson is quick to use his office to control steel, aluminum, and other industries, but lagately when unions exceed the administration economic guidelines allegedly designed to forestall inflation. Perhaps another President would be similarly encumbered and shackled by the feared political consequences.

Through press-agency, President attempted to link as much political advantage as possible out of the negotiation proceedings. His curious outward detachment from the negotiations until settlement appeared imminent, then the nighttime summons of the American Federation of Labor to the mandatory closing of the negotiators in the Executive offices, and the grand TV announcement of the “noninflationary settlement,” the devilish withholding of the fruits of the agreement from the public, the taxpayers, and the families of the machinists until the time of the election must have demonstrated that this President and his aides, and the mandating closing of the negotiators in the Executive offices, and the grand TV announcement of the “noninflationary settlement,” the devilish withholding of the fruits of the agreement from the public, the taxpayers, and the families of the machinists until the time of the election must have demonstrated that this President and his aides, and the