

August 2, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

17105

reporting any gift or expenditures. In 1964, for instance, the Democrats obtained substantial funds on the state level, so that they never showed up in Washington reports. And the reports of candidates for the Senate and House are often a farce. Most candidates simply embrace the fiction that the committees which worked to elect them did so without the candidates' "knowledge and consent," so that a candidate only reports "personal" expenditures of an insignificantly small amount. Some report nothing at all. In 1964, four U.S. Senators reported they had neither received nor spent money in their campaigns: Senators VANCE HARTKE (D-Ind.), EDMUND S. MUSKIE (D-Maine), JOHN STENNIS (D-Miss.) and ROMAN L. Hruska (R-Neb.). Yet in at least three of these instances, the Senator had major opposition and major sums were spent to win re-election. Presumably others acting on their behalf spent it in ways not required to be reported.

Some candidates file no reports. In 1964, 38 House candidates—12 Democrats, 26 Republicans—failed to file the required reports with Congress.

The Corrupt Practices Act stipulates fines of up to two years in prison or a \$10,000 fine for willful noncompliance. Yet there has never been a single prosecution of a candidate for failure to report, or for false or incomplete reports, under the Corrupt Practices Act. The stated policy of the Justice Department, spelled out in a 1963 letter to this writer, is "not to institute investigations into possible violations of (the Act) in the absence of a request from the Clerk of the House of Representatives or Secretary of the Senate." Those officials, chosen by a vote of the Representatives and Senators, have never referred any possible violations to the Justice Department. Plainly the law is not effective.

Over the years, various laws have been proposed to close some or all of the loopholes in the Corrupt Practices Act. Some have passed the Senate, but none has cleared the House. The outlook for any kind of reform action in 1966 was extremely dark until President Johnson, in a section of his State of the Union address that surprised most of official Washington, suggested substantial reforms in the field of election finance. The President said he backed revision of "present unrealistic restrictions on (campaign) contributions—to prohibit the endless proliferation of committees, bringing state and local committees under the Act—to attach strong teeth and severe penalties to the requirement for full disclosure of contributions."

Thus, if Presidential backing can make the difference, there is a chance that the nation's most consistently evaded law may get a real facelifting some day. In the Congressional Quarterly poll, 88% of the Congressmen said they favored more thorough campaign spending requirements, covering both primaries and general elections.

Key points to watch, when Congress finally does get down to work on the problem, will be whether the requirements for reporting are extended to primary elections, both for Presidential and Congressional candidates; whether the multitudinous committees working for the candidates, as well as the candidates themselves, will be required to report; and whether responsibility for receiving spending reports and checking them for accuracy and completeness will be left in the hands of the politically chosen patronage employees on Capitol Hill or moved into the hands of a nonpartisan Government agency like the General Accounting Office, as the President's Commission on Campaign Costs recommended four years ago.

If Congress does act to stimulate small gifts to the parties and candidates by an income tax incentive, and then moves to revise the election finance reporting laws, the country will have made a real effort to make special interest groups count for less

in the counsels of Government and put campaign spending out on the top of the table for all to see.

But it is beyond reason to expect the lawmakers to adopt a remedy which only satisfies the moral appetite of the people. Campaign costs being what they are, any remedy will still have to assure that the money will be forthcoming, or it too will fail.

## THREATS OF PREMIER KY

(Mr. OTTINGER (at the request of Mr. FARNUM) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the June 29, 1966, statement by 47 of my congressional colleagues deploring the threats of Premier Ky to carry the Vietnam war to China.

Premier Ky has no right to make such unilateral decisions which could bring about World War III and immediately jeopardize the lives of the hundreds of thousands of American boys in Vietnam.

Military experts from Gen. Douglas MacArthur to Gen. Maxwell Taylor have warned against the folly of a land war on the mainland of China with its 700 million inhabitants.

To provoke a war with China could well bring about nuclear holocaust and the end of modern civilization.

I congratulate my colleagues for expressing the sense of Congress against Premier Ky's rash remarks, and urge the President to strongly repudiate them. I regret that I was not here to join in their original statement.

## SAIGON ELECTION PROCEDURES

(Mr. VIVIAN (at the request of Mr. FARNUM) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago, on July 19, I inserted in the RECORD, for the benefit of Members of this body, several news reports from South Vietnam expressing concern that its government, under Premier Ky, might unwisely try to rig the national elections set there for September 11. As I remarked at the time, Mr. Speaker, I consider these elections to be of enormous significance to every citizen of the United States, as well as to every Vietnamese citizen. Thus, I am anxious that the elections be conducted as fairly and openly as possible.

I am pleased at this time, therefore, to be able to bring to the attention of the Members a recent news report, published in yesterday's Christian Science Monitor, from its news correspondent in Saigon, who indicates that in Saigon the election procedures appear to be being carried out fairly and responsibly. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

Let me remind Members, however, that in spite of my satisfaction that favorable reports are being heard on this situation, I believe it remains incumbent upon us to observe continuously and very closely

the conduct of these elections in South Vietnam. We must be certain that the procedures are being followed fairly in the rural provinces, as well as in Saigon. We must be sure that no candidates already named who have significant support are disqualified by the Government for political reasons. And we must be sure that each candidate receives a fair chance to present his views, without harassment, to his electorate.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 1, 1966]

CANDIDATES HURDLE BAR TO VIET POLL  
(By John Dillin)

SAIGON.—Twenty-five out of 26 slates of candidates have leaped the first hurdle in Saigon to qualify for the upcoming National Assembly elections, it has been learned on good authority.

The source said only a single slate of five candidates was disqualified by the local review board.

If true, this indicates that the government of Premier Nguyen Cao Ky may be judging potential candidates with a relatively lenient eye. That would be a good sign for those supporting honest elections here.

The source said the disqualified slate was struck because two of the candidates engaged in "questionable activities." But the source did not know what these alleged activities were.

The disqualified candidates still have the opportunity to appeal the local council's decision. Under Vietnamese law, all lists of candidates are first reviewed locally to make sure they have met the qualifications for office. Then, on July 28, the review boards all over the country were to send the approved lists of candidates to a central council.

## DISMISSAL GROUNDS

This council will have until Aug. 8 to review the lists and to hear complaints from those disqualified earlier. On Aug. 12 the final lists of candidates are to be posted.

However, this process of judging the candidates' qualifications is filled with pitfalls. The bases of judgment are sweeping and open to very broad interpretations.

For example, candidates can be disqualified "who have directly or indirectly worked for the Communists or pro-Communists, neutralists, or neutralists whose actions are advantageous to the Communists."

Such phrases in the election law have led to widespread speculation in the local press that many, if not almost all, of the potential candidates would be struck. One leading newspaper had said it expected at least 60 percent of the candidates in Saigon would be eliminated.

But apparently this is not to be the case.

## ELECTION CRITICIZED

If the 25 lists of candidates for Saigon are also approved by the central council, it could partially undermine some of the opposition which has developed to the election among various religious, labor, and political groups.

They have contended vigorously in the past month that the election was to be a fraud. Rumor has been rampant that the "khaki party" would dominate the election around the country.

However, only a few of the 130 candidates approved to run for Saigon's 16 seats are military men. The lists span a wide range of the city's citizenry.

One list is comprised of city councilmen. Another consists largely of businessmen of Chinese origin. There are leading journalists, such as Dr. Dang Van Sung, publisher of the leading newspaper Chinh Luan. There are teachers and professors, a building contractor, civil servants, doctors, and numerous others.

17106

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

August 2, 1966

GREATER FEDERAL EFFORT  
SHOULD BE MADE FOR CHILDREN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the subcommittee that hears the request of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for appropriations, I have become increasingly aware that, on balance, too little of our Federal effort is going to our children. Childhood is the time for prevention of problems—the period during which we should try to prevent lasting damage to a child or, in order to prevent future damage, to meet as effectively as possible those losses to which children are vulnerable which are not avoidable. Because of this awareness, and after careful discussion with people in my own State who are knowledgeable about child welfare, I am today introducing legislation to strengthen and expand the Federal program providing child welfare services, authorized by title V, part 3 of the Social Security Act.

The Federal Government has long accepted responsibility for substantial help to the aged, the disabled, the widowed, the blind, the sick, and the child living in his own family when he is in financial need as the result of parental inability to care for him. But the Federal Government has failed to offer comparable help to the States in meeting the heavy costs of care of children who suffer from the devastating effects of family disorganization and breakdown, and which result in neglect, abuse, exploitation, delinquency, emotional disturbance, and a host of other psychological and behavioral difficulties. Child welfare services, which both supplement and substitute for parental care and supervision, are the primary defense for children who are in need of protection, care, and physical and emotional sustenance. These children can be helped only through a true partnership of Federal, State, and local governments, yet the costs involved in providing the necessary care, whether within or outside their own homes are a heavy drain on State funds. There are many costs included in child welfare services, such as those for safeguarding abused or neglected children, those for foster care, day care, homemaker services, as well as personnel for licensing, supervising and directing the programs. The Federal Government meets only about 10 percent of the total. In 1965, State and local governments provided approximately \$318 million for all public child-welfare services, while the Federal Government provided about \$34 million.

Child welfare services should be available to all children through State and local public welfare agencies, to help to prevent family breakdown and unnecessary separation of children from parents. Through the skilled intervention of a child welfare caseworker, a combination of casework counseling and the use of such community facilities as homemaker service and day care services may prevent the destructive experience of a child being separated from his family. On the

other hand, some children have no homes. Others cannot remain in inadequate or dangerous home situations. For some of these, the public child welfare agency can offer adoption and a permanent home. For many others, foster families or group care facilities may be necessary, especially for the most deprived young children, the handicapped and older children and youth, until they are able to take responsibility for their own lives.

Children receiving public child welfare services today are not the orphans that agencies frequently served in the past. About 10,000 of these children, less than 2 percent, have lost both parents by death. Currently, the majority are the helpless victims of a complex society which for all its magnificence, also contains immature and inadequate parents, often themselves damaged by harmful family conditions. It is estimated that at least 10,000 child abuse cases annually result from injury inflicted on children by their own parents, and this figure represents only 10 percent of the larger problem of child neglect. A recent study of newspaper reports indicates that at least 500 children are killed each year.

The bill I am introducing is designed to give today's children a second chance—a chance to escape this vicious cycle. We want them to grow up to be good parents and good citizens. This bill represents a vital investment in the future.

Just to pinpoint the terrible plight of these victims of family disaster and the high quality of one service alone—foster family care—required to reverse the damage they have sustained, I would like to give you two examples from my own State:

In 1963, the Rhode Island Child Welfare Services Division of the State Department of Social Welfare had to place on an emergency basis, a family of 7 children whose ages were from 5 to 16 years. Their father had become mentally ill and had killed the mother. He was placed in a State mental hospital. The children required intensive help to overcome the shock of their experience. They will continue to need extended foster care.

A mother deserted two boys, ages 5 and 7 and the father attempted to care for them. However, he had to be hospitalized. On examination, it was found that both boys had tumors of the spine requiring extensive medical care and a special foster family who could understand and work with the ensuing medical and convalescent problems.

I am sure that there are similar cases in every State in the Nation, Rhode Island was able to give immediate service, but I understand that because of the lack of funds, other States are not always able to accept all children needing service. Expenditures for foster care of children in 1965 were about \$229 million. State and local governments met 98 percent of this cost.

Many children have difficulties in adjusting because of their experiences, their personalities, and their complex needs. It is apparent from the problems

and ages of these children, that there is an enormous need for a wide range of child welfare services and facilities to care for them and heal their hurts. Therefore, the bill that I am introducing provides for the Federal Government to share in costs of these services and facilities. When a child needs to live in a certain kind of foster family or in a certain kind of group care facility it will be possible to provide the living experience which he needs. When a distraught mother begs for help in coping with her retarded child, that cry can be heeded. The bill also provides for Federal matching of costs for child welfare staff on the same basis as already provided for public assistance staff.

Our children are growing up now. They cannot wait. There is a great need for Federal help. I do not know the number of children needing help but not being served, but I do know that in 1965, 34 percent of the counties in our Nation did not have full-time public child welfare services available. On March 31, 1965, 531,200 children were receiving child welfare services from departments of public welfare, a 9 percent increase over the previous year. On this same day, 283,300 children lived in foster family homes or institutions for dependent children, a 15 percent increase. In 1975, according to the mandate of this Congress, child welfare services, including foster care, must be available throughout every State for all children in need of such services. It is extremely doubtful that the States, despite their efforts accelerated by this stimulating congressional action, can reach this important goal without much more substantial financial help from the Federal Government.

Provision of money for personnel, educational leave, and administrative costs, as well as for payment for direct care of children, is extremely vital. As I have illustrated, many children needing care have already endured in their short lives much neglect, inconsistency of treatment, or abuse. These children are difficult to help and require child welfare workers who are trained and who can concentrate their skills on a reasonably limited number of children, so that they can work at the same time to help the natural parents, the child, and the foster parents or child care staff. It requires specialized training and adequate time to provide these children an even break to develop their true potential. To develop these skills in their staffs, and at the same time to help meet the critical manpower shortage, this bill will help States to provide educational leave for staff and to pay other cost of training personnel. The shortage of child welfare personnel has been underscored in the recent report of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Task Force on Social Work Education and Manpower, which revealed that an additional 10,000 child welfare staff will be needed by 1970, almost double the number presently employed.

In their report to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, submitted on June 29, 1966, the Advisory Council on Public Welfare, authorized by

August 2, 1966

the 1962 Public Welfare Amendments, declared:

The existing program of child welfare services, authorized by Title V of the Social Security Act and State legislative enactments, has pioneered in the provision of services for children and youth but its coverage is so spotty, both geographically and in scope of benefits, that it offers little guarantee of protection to a large number of the nation's children. Some of the most vulnerable, especially children in minority groups who need it most, have had the least protection. Adapting to these needs and deprivations as best they can, today's neglected children become tomorrow's social problems.

This is a national problem and a national responsibility. For all these reasons, the Advisory Council on Public Welfare recognizes that child welfare services constitute a major component in the proposed comprehensive program of social guarantees.

The Advisory Council has recommended basic and far-reaching changes in public welfare. Among their recommendations for immediate action is the following:

Costs of certain expenses in the administration of child welfare and youth services (including professional staff and their immediate supporting clerical staff, and costs of professional education) should be financed immediately on the same open-ended matched basis as provided for comparable State costs in the administration of Title IV of the Social Security Act (Aid to Families with Dependent Children) and the Federal government should establish adequate standards for all such services.

This measure is urgently needed to equalize, to a greater degree, Federal responsibility in the provision of services to children and youth since the Federal government now carries a far greater share in the costs of personnel and training in the administration of Aid to Families with Dependent Children than for Child Welfare Services.

The increase in the number of children coming to the attention of public child welfare agencies nationally is reflected by developments in my own State of Rhode Island. The rate of children served by the State department of social welfare has steadily increased from 1960 to 1965. There was a 138-percent increase in the rate of services initiated for children, a 111-percent increase in the volume of children served, and a 75-percent increase in children being served at the end of the fiscal year. In foster care, for example, the department is providing foster care for over a thousand children, a 25-percent increase since 1961.

It cost over a million and a half dollars in 1965 to provide public child welfare services to Rhode Island's children, one-third of which was expended in our O'Rourke Children's Center, which I visited last fall. No Federal funds are used in Rhode Island for the payment of foster care costs or for operating the children's center, which means that these costs are borne entirely by State funds since there are no local funds. Lack of funds is delaying the development of special foster family and group homes to care for an increasing number of mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, physically handicapped, and predelinquent children who need such resources. Insufficient funds are preventing us from

paying higher board rates for regular foster home care, from acquiring more and better trained workers and supervisors, and from properly expanding our adoption and family day care programs, among other things.

To illustrate further, in Rhode Island, payments to foster families currently average less than \$2 a day for food and maintenance of children, scarcely enough to meet minimal health standards of basic needs, and nothing at all to the foster mother for her time and devotion. This is one reason why the recruitment of foster homes is becoming difficult. Many pressures are leading more mothers into employment in order to increase the family income thereby reducing the number available to accept foster children in their homes.

The bill I am introducing would enable the Federal Government to provide an expanded program to assist State public welfare agencies in meeting the costs of child welfare services, including the crushing costs of foster care, and to provide special project grants for developing new and necessary child welfare resources.

Each State would receive Federal funds to pay for part of the cost of child welfare services for children who are the responsibility of the State or local public welfare agency. Purchase of care from voluntary agencies is also included. Payments would be on a variable matching basis according to a State's per capita income and with Federal participation ranging from 50 to 83 percent.

The Federal Government would match 75 percent of salary and training costs of personnel employed or preparing for employment.

In order to make sure that the additional Federal moneys made available by the bill will be used to strengthen and expand the child welfare program, the legislation requires that State and local expenditures for child welfare services may not be less than such expenditures for the year ending June 30, 1966.

In addition, because I think it is essential to encourage new and different ideas and to try them out, Federal project grants would be available for developing and maintaining new or experimental forms of child welfare services, including services for children with special needs. If our services are to meet the needs of children with special problems, the mentally retarded child, the child of a minority group in need of adoption, the homeless child needing emergency shelter and care, project funds must be available to develop and provide such services.

Clearly, from the facts I have presented, substantial help from the Federal Government for child welfare services is urgent. I would hope that every effort will be made to bring this legislation before the full House at an early date.

#### WALTER J. TUOHY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the recent death of Walter J. Tuohy was a

great loss to the American railroad industry. Mr. Tuohy, the chief executive officer of the combined Baltimore & Ohio and Chesapeake & Ohio Railroads, was said to have been called, "my favorite railroad president," by President Johnson. Vice President HUMPHREY, on learning of Mr. Tuohy's death said:

Walter was a remarkable man—able and talented, and a dear and good friend.

But the charm and consideration which inspired these comments were not reserved for men of power and position. Ted DeAlba, the assistant trainmaster at Huntington, W. Va., recalls:

He was never too busy to stop and pass the time with other railroaders. Maybe you've heard of the time Mr. Tuohy was in Chicago and they were holding the train for him, but a porter, who knew he was passing through, had brought his several children to the station to meet him. Well, sir, Mr. Tuohy stopped and shook hands and talked with each child and told the reporter what a fine-looking family he had. Mr. Tuohy just wouldn't brush that man aside. . . .

Retired yard conductor, Wayne Bevard and Mrs. Bevard of Toledo, Ohio, give another example of Mr. Tuohy's consideration:

He never forgot us retired railroaders. When we met him at Veterans' Meetings, he always took time to shake hands and talk. He was a really big man, even if he wasn't tall. We'll miss him at Christmas when he always sent a card.

Mr. Tuohy himself had a modest background. The son of a police sergeant on Chicago's South Side, Walter Tuohy had to leave school at the age of 16 to help support his family. In the daytime he worked in the Chicago Freight Office of the Illinois Central Railroad, while at night he went to school, where he earned a high school diploma, a college degree and a law degree. He rose to be president of the Chicago-based Globe Coal Co., vice president of the Chesapeake & Ohio for coal traffic, Assistant Deputy Administrator of Mines in the Department of the Interior, and finally, President of the Chesapeake & Ohio.

In 1961, Mr. Tuohy's achievement was recognized by the presentation to him of the Horatio Alger Award for "Americans whose careers typify individual initiative, hard work, and honesty in the tradition of the Horatio Alger novels."

Reverend Father O'Malley, who delivered Mr. Tuohy's eulogy referred to this and another award when he said:

The qualities of his character were recognized by the honors and awards given him throughout his life. They were underscored by the Pope in naming him a Knight of Malta; by his peers in naming him for the Horatio Alger Award in 1961. Something of his true stature and personality is revealed in a letter he wrote me wherein he said, "The real joy of these honors came, not as a personal recognition, but for family, friends, and associates. Whatever tribute is due came because of others."

The qualities to which Father O'Malley refers were well known in my home city of Cleveland where Mr. Tuohy maintained his residence and headquarters. He had an office in Cleveland's Terminal Tower where he knew the first names of every elevator operator as well as the names of their children.

17108

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

August 2, 1966

President Johnson stated that:

Walter Tuohy brought great dedication and ability to all his responsibilities. He will be greatly missed by all of us who knew him.

We in Cleveland will miss him especially—and extend sympathy to his family, friends, and associates.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the May-June issue of *Brierchat*, an excellent editorial on the life of Walter J. Tuohy, 1901-1966:

WALTER J. TUOHY, 1901-1966

*"And now abideth faith, hope, love, these three; but the greatest of these is love."*—St. Paul's greeting to the Corinthians

Of all the wonderful qualities Walter Tuohy possessed, the greatest was love of his fellow man—for he rightly assigned to everyone, that individual's creation in the image and likeness of God.

As he rose from obscurity to become one of the truly outstanding business leaders of our time, his relationship with people, his total involvement with them, will mark him in men's memory.

The President of John Carroll University said of him—"few men have left a richer legacy of love than Walter Tuohy. A deeply spiritual person, he had a regard for his fellow man that never left him from his humble beginnings to the great heights he attained in his outstanding business career."

Reverend O'Malley, delivering the funeral eulogy said, "the qualities of his character were recognized by the honors and awards given him throughout his life. They were underscored by the Pope in naming him a Knight of Malta; by his peers in naming him for the Horatio Alger Award in 1961. Something of his true stature and personality is revealed in a letter he wrote me wherein he said, 'the real joy of these honors came, not as a personal recognition, but for family, friends and associates. Whatever tribute was due came because of others.'"

Supreme Court Justice Thomas Clark wrote, "Walter Tuohy was a member of the construction crew, not the wrecking gang."

President Lyndon B. Johnson stated, "Walter Tuohy brought great dedication and ability to all of his responsibilities. He will be greatly missed by all of us who knew him."

He demanded more of himself than he asked of others. He was always thoughtful, kind and considerate in his relationship with associates yet strong as hardened steel whenever the situation demanded it. His energy, enthusiasm, his zest for life were integral parts of Walter Tuohy. I wish it were possible to fully transmit his feeling for The Greenbrier... as often revealed to me... to each one of the 1,130 men and women on our staff today. He had, of course, a personal love of its beauty and enjoyment of its comfort and service. He knew it as a place of recreation and relaxation. He let each of us—as many can testify—know that he loved to come here, and thereby added to our pride in being a part of it.

There were many long, trying years, when the Railroad found The Greenbrier a financial burden. It took Walter Tuohy's faith, confidence, leadership, and his unique ability to inspire others, to guide us through the years of expansion of our facilities to bring The Greenbrier to profitable operation.

In the light of the tremendous responsibilities which were his as President of a great Railroad, the warmth of his interest in The Greenbrier was always encouraging, and the depth and scope of his grasp of the problems of a large resort operation often amazed me. His concern and devoted interest grew with the years. No matter how involved and difficult the legal, financial, and

political problems of railroad merger became, he seemed never to falter in his devotion to The Greenbrier; actually a very minor segment of his corporate responsibilities.

He made us feel that The Greenbrier was his pride and joy. He treasured the, all too few, hours of recreation that were his here. He found it an impressive place for conferences. He saw it as a "status symbol" for the C&O-B&O system. He felt with its age and historical association, "White Sulphur" had an obligation to carry on the finest American traditions of hospitality. This unique legacy of Walter Tuohy is left in our trust.

His constant thoughtfulness, encouragement, and staunch friendship, to me personally will never be forgotten. But I speak for each of us at The Greenbrier... Walter Tuohy enriched our lives. He was never too busy for a personal greeting, a warm handshake, and he called us by name. It is our privilege to have known him. We can be certain his message to us would be, in railroad parlance—"clear signal!"—full speed ahead!

—E. TRUMAN WRIGHT.

### FLOWERS FOR LUCI BAINES JOHNSON'S WEDDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago in the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], was on the floor discussing the airline strike. He yielded to the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER]. The gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] read a telegram from Mr. Bill Enomoto, of Redwood City, Calif., to the effect that the flowers for the Luci Baines Johnson wedding were being flown by Government aircraft while others are denied transportation.

The telegram, of course, will appear in the RECORD. I do not have the exact wording before me at the moment.

I made appropriate inquiry of Government agencies as to whether or not this allegation by Mr. Enomoto was true, and I was told categorically that it was not true, that none of the flowers were being flown from California in Government aircraft. I was given the name of the person who is arranging for the flowers and I was given the airline routing for the flowers. It was stated that the flowers are scheduled to be flown on American Airlines from San Francisco to Los Angeles and thence to Washington.

I was able to get Mr. Enomoto, the head of the Farm Bureau for San Mateo County, Calif., the sender of the telegram, on the telephone. I told him that his telegram had been read to the House, explaining to him that as chairman of the Appropriations Committee I was interested in the proper expenditure of Government funds, and I wanted to know the facts about these flowers allegedly being flown here for the wedding at Government expense.

Mr. Enomoto said that when he wrote the telegram he was very angry over the fact that the airline strike was causing flower growers in the area to lose large sums of money. He said that he had no proof that the flowers for the wedding were being flown to Washington in a Government plane.

Mr. Enomoto said that his charge in

regard to the flowers was based on a "wild rumor" and that he did not have anything to substantiate it. He further said that he would like to retract the statement and he asked me to help him see that the statement was retracted. I told him that I would quote to the House, now in session, that he wished to retract the statement as to the transportation of the flowers for the wedding. I told him that his statement was already on the press wires blanketing the country and that in my judgment it might be difficult for the retraction to catch up with the original story, or words to that effect.

After my conversation with Mr. Enomoto, I went to Mr. YOUNGER on the floor of the House and told him that I felt I should follow through on the request of Mr. Enomoto that his statement be publicly retracted. I make this statement here today. In fairness I could not do otherwise.

Of course, I think we have other matters of importance to discuss here, but I think the people of the country want the flowers brought here for this historic wedding. All the world loves a lover.

I did feel that since Mr. Enomoto wanted to retract his statement and had no substantiating evidence, and since I could find no substantiating evidence from any sources in the Government, it was only fair to young Luci and Pat, whom I know quite well, to make this statement.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I also appreciate his having made his investigation so that this allegation, which was unfortunately made here on the floor of House, can be refuted.

I, for one, want to reject it as far as it may be attributed to any Member on this side. I believe we have here a very attractive young couple. I am proud indeed that the groom comes from my district in Illinois. I know the Members are interested, as the whole Nation is, in the couple having a happy and long and successful marriage. Any suggestion which would in any way detract from the significant and historic and lovely ceremony, I believe, is most unfortunate.

I regret that the incident occurred. I am happy that the gentleman from Texas has ascertained the truth, so that the matter does not reflect in any way upon the ceremony which is to take place on Saturday.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

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

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to commend the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee for pursuing this matter, as he does all matters, to make sure that public funds are being used only for the purposes for which they are intended.

17130

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 2, 1966

## FIVE O'CLOCK SHADOW

Since the strike started, MORSE has risen in the Senate almost daily to denounce the union and the strikers and anyone who supported them. He has revived a technique he once used on behalf of Oregon's sheep raisers to break price control on wool. In the years after World War II, he became famous as the Senate's "5 o'clock shadow" for his late-afternoon speeches denouncing the Office of Price Administration.

Old timers report that in his bitterest moments he never treated the old OPA to such a bombardment of intemperate invective and insult as he has heaped on the airline strikers and their union officers.

MORSE began by calling the union leaders unpatriotic, charging them with failing to carry out their responsibilities to the troops in Vietnam. He has repeated the charge on several occasions despite the fact that Department of Defense officials were praising the union for continuing to service military flights without interruption.

At last week's Senate hearing, Secretary Wirtz testified that air movement of materiel and military personnel had actually increased during the strike.

To Senator MORSE, the strikers' failure to embrace his recommendations was "unconscionable," a "flagrant irresponsibility," an attempted "extortion."

One day on the Senate floor he described AFL-CIO President George Meany as one "who claims to be a labor leader."

Almost daily since the strike began, MORSE has questioned the competence, the sincerity, the emotional and mental stability of union negotiators.

It was Senator MORSE, not the President or the Department of Defense who decided that the airline strike had created a national emergency. Their testimony to the contrary did not influence him.

In the Senator's opinion, any settlement including a cost-of-living clause, hospital coverage for dependents, a company-paid pension plan, or a 10-cent premium for airline mechanics when they are using their Federal licenses would "lead the country over the brink into the bottomless pit of economic inflation."

In the last hysterical hours before the Senate Committee blocked his resolution, MORSE was charging that the union proposals would destroy the value of the dollar.

## THE METAMORPHOSIS

Those who probe for reasons why Senator MORSE switched from labor's champion to strikebreaker say that the change has been coming on gradually for several years.

In foreign affairs, Senator MORSE has been moving steadily away from the AFL-CIO position.

MORSE has become an implacable critic of the U.S. foreign aid program which the Government has used to encourage and strengthen resistance to Communist aggression. MORSE even left last week's Senate hearing on his own resolution to vote against the Administration's foreign aid program.

The AFL-CIO has always supported the foreign aid program.

## THE AGGRESSIVE DOVE

On Vietnam, Senator MORSE has been the most aggressive of the Senate doves, attacking U.S. military involvement in Southeast Asia. He has insisted that the job be done by the United Nations although the Hanoi government has spurned every effort of the UN to intervene.

The AFL-CIO, including the Machinists, has been outspoken in support of the President's policies of halting Communist aggression in Southeast Asia and elsewhere.

Coincidentally, two other Senate doves, BARTLETT of Alaska and CHURCH of Idaho, entered material in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD denouncing the airline strike.

Labor's most serious break with Senator MORSE happened last month in the Oregon Senate primary. MORSE hand-picked Howard Morgan, former member of the Federal Power Commission, for the Democratic nomination. The AFL-CIO and the IAM backed Rep. ROBERT B. DUNCAN. Morgan—and MORSE—were defeated.

Here too, the big issue was Vietnam. DUNCAN supporting the President, Morgan supporting MORSE.

Labor already misses Senator MORSE's able support. To his adversaries, the Oregon Senator has always been implacable and ferocious.

One thing is clear, Senator MORSE has won himself a whole new set of friends.

MR. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say about the article that, as the headline would seem to indicate, the machinists have appointed themselves to analyze what they think my motives are. Of course, they know my motives are not what they attribute to me. This is what happens in a situation such as this.

This is really a disservice to the great record of the machinists for industrial statesmanship in labor disputes, for it is not like them to engage in this kind of character assassination.

They start out with the statement:

The question has been asked a thousand times these past few weeks: What happened to WAYNE MORSE?

Let me say to the machinists: Not one single thing has happened as far as varying from my 32 years of record in the field of labor relations, and my 21 years of record in the Senate. Whenever I have felt that any group in the country, be it labor or any group, was following a course of action that could not be reconciled with the paramount public interest I disagreed with them on the merits.

What has happened in this case is that I think the machinists are following a course of action which cannot be supported by the merits of the dispute, when we look at the paramount public interest. I intend, as I have in all of my public career, to place the public interest first and the labor lobby far down on the scale of importance.

## WASHINGTON: THE DEADLOCK OF SUSPICION

MR. CHURCH. Mr. President, the respected journalist, James Reston, writes in the July 31 edition of the New York Times that the apparent decision of the Government of North Vietnam to spare the captured American airmen has given new hope to those who advocate a de-escalation of the Vietnam conflict. Mr. Reston continues:

The opportunity exists on the larger question of a negotiated settlement of the war.

He makes perfectly clear both that it is a gross miscalculation for Hanoi to believe that the U.S. military presence can be removed from South Vietnam by force, and that it is error to think that the so-called "doves" in America can bring about such an American military withdrawal before negotiation.

I strongly endorse Mr. Reston's analysis, and ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Washington: the Deadlock of Suspicion" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

WASHINGTON: THE DEADLOCK OF SUSPICION  
(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, July 30.—After almost every war, the historians think they can identify a point where both sides had more to gain by compromising than by fighting. It may be that this point has now been reached in Vietnam.

In the First World War, the Allied powers were so convinced that the Kaiser was the ultimate enemy that they insisted on fighting on to a military victory, and thereby helped bring into existence two much more dangerous and formidable forces—the Nazis on the one hand and the Communists on the other.

In the second World War, this same determination to achieve a military victory, pursued in the name of liberty, resulted in the loss of liberty for various countries in Eastern Europe and the Balkans—the very places whose freedom was the primary aim of both world wars.

This is one of the major lessons of war in the 20th century. No matter how hard the antagonists have tried to anticipate, the consequences of war, the fighting has inevitably produced unexpected results beyond their control.

## WASHINGTON'S REACTION

Washington has learned this lesson better than Hanoi. In fairness to President Johnson, he has tried to start the compromising process, but has been rebuffed so consistently that the fighting is again dominating the scene. The air war on North Vietnam was more severe in the last week than in any other week of the conflict. The Prime Minister of South Vietnam, General Ky, has started talking about either an invasion of North Vietnam or a very long war, and while it is easy to repudiate him, there is a certain tragic logic in his point that so long as the enemy has a jungle sanctuary in North Vietnam, bombing will not bring the conflict to a military conclusion.

The tragedy of this is that Hanoi now has a better chance of achieving its major objective by negotiation than it has by fighting, and does not seem to realize it. The major objective of both the North Vietnamese and the Chinese Governments seems fairly clear. They want all American military power out of Vietnam. No doubt they would like to establish a Communist regime in Saigon, but primarily they want to get rid of an air and naval force which could destroy every city in North Vietnam and Communist China, and even if their main aim is to communize South Vietnam, they still have to achieve the evacuation of the American forces in order to do so.

Hanoi has chosen to try to achieve this objective by force of arms rather than by negotiations, and this must be the worst political miscalculation since the Bay of Pigs. The United States is obviously not going to lose the first test of arms in its history to North Vietnam, of all places. China and the Soviet Union might compel a military solution by raising the cost beyond what Washington is willing to pay, but they are no more eager for a vast military test of strength there than the United States.

In this situation, North Vietnam has no hope of driving the American expeditionary force out of the country, but it could undoubtedly negotiate us out. The President has been quite explicit about this.

"We seek neither territory nor bases, economic domination nor military alliance in Vietnam," he said in his State of the Union Message in January of 1966.

"We seek no bases or special position for the United States," Secretary of State Rusk told the Congress on August 3, 1965. And dozens of similar statements have been made



August 2, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

17129

herded into the camps of Europe—and off in the distance a strange, untried land. The United Jewish Appeal played a heroic role in joining these people with that land.

I remember going to Eddie Warburg back in those days when he was the UJA chairman. I felt very deeply that the task of resettling this exodus of homeless Jews was a challenge and responsibility not only of the Jewish community but of free men of all faiths. Therefore, I asked him if he would permit me to organize a Non-Sectarian Community Committee for the New York United Jewish Appeal. His response was immediate, and I was proud to have become its first chairman.

To me, the work of the Non-Sectarian Committee dramatized an enormously important principle. It demonstrated our conviction that all civilized men shared the duty of redressing the outrage committed against the Jewish people.

Israel succeeded. The UJA played its part in that success. And I am grateful to have had the chance of playing even a small part over the years. But there is one thing, Mr. President, that I assure you we understand only too well.

Israel was born and Israel prospers in a sea of deep hostility. And as long as fear and danger cloud the lives of your brothers, as long as help is needed, I know that the UJA, under your able chairman, Max Fischer, will keep open its lifeline to Israel.

But I would also like to see fresh, new initiatives emerge from Washington in pursuit of a true and lasting peace for your troubled corner of the world.

America must not let its vital and active commitment to freedom in other parts of the world obscure the dangers to the peace of the Middle East. The United States should and must exercise its full moral force within the United Nations to bring Arab and Jew together in lasting peace.

Mr. President, over 140 years ago a great American said, "I am happy in the restoration of the Jews." In the fullest sense, Thomas Jefferson's words were premature. But today his sentiment is echoed by Americans from coast to coast.

We are happy in the restoration of the Jewish homeland. We are thrilled to have witnessed its birth in our time. We are proud to have assisted its swift growth. And we wish you and your brave, young nation long life . . . prosperity . . . freedom . . . and peace.

#### EASE OF OBTAINING FIREARMS RESULTS IN SLAUGHTER

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, Charles Joseph Whitman shot 15 people to death yesterday, and wounded 32 others. There was no rational explanation for this senseless slaughter; it was the product of the maniacal impulse of a diseased mind. But Charles Joseph Whitman was not alone. He was aided and abetted by the system of laws in this county—a system which makes it ridiculously easy for any criminal, any madman, any drug addict and, indeed, any child to obtain lethal firearms which can be used to rain violence and death on innocent people.

When the police finally stopped this mad killer, they found next to him on the Texas tower an incredible array of deadly weapons: a 12-gauge shotgun bought on credit at Sears, Roebuck that day, a 6-millimeter Remington magnum rifle, a .35-caliber Remington pump rifle, a .30-caliber reconditioned Army carbine, a 9-millimeter Luger pistol, and a .357-

magnum pistol; also, two rifles and two derringer pistols were found in his home.

It may be, as some people argue, that if someone wants a gun badly enough he will be able to obtain it one way or another, regardless of the existence of laws regulating the sale of guns. But it seems obvious to me that we have a responsibility to do everything we can to minimize the senseless bloodshed and crime effectuated through these instruments of destruction. I know of no other civilized country in the world where it is as easy for the dangerous and misguided members of a society to obtain firearms as in the United States.

We are all familiar with the statistics of our failure: 200,000 victims of gun atrocities each year, and the crimes of violence committed with a gun every 2 minutes in the United States.

Decisive action to regulate and control the dangerous traffic in firearms is long overdue. The Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, of which I am a member, has reported to the full Judiciary Committee a firearms control bill which would provide basic minimum controls over mail-order interstate traffic.

This bill is not a panacea, and it will have to be matched by responsible legislative action at the State level before truly effective gun regulation can be achieved. But this Federal action is clearly a necessary first step. Unless the Federal Government regulates gun traffic between the States, even strong State laws will be easily circumvented by gun traffic interstate. In 1963 alone, for example, over a million weapons were sold by mail order. In Massachusetts, which has strong gun laws, the traffic in guns cannot be halted because guns are easily purchased out of State. As a matter of fact, Commissioner Caples, of the Massachusetts Department of Public Safety, testified before our subcommittee that 87 percent of the concealable firearms used in crimes in Massachusetts came from out-of-State purchases.

Massachusetts cannot control this interstate traffic in guns, but the Federal Government can, and the Federal Government must, because such regulation is a precondition to effective State regulation, without which the grim statistics of death and destruction can only continue to mount.

It is well known that this legislation is strongly opposed by the National Rifle Association and other members of the gun lobby. I do not quarrel with their rights to express their opposition to this legislation, but I also do not believe that their opposition represents the best interests of this country or the wishes of the great majority of our citizens.

This legislation is supported by the President of the United States, by the American Bar Association, and by a host of religious and civic groups. It is given a high priority by the law enforcement groups throughout our Nation, and I think it commends the support of the great majority of the American people.

Senator Donn's bill, S. 1592, will be taken up by the full Judiciary Committee in the near future. I intend to work

to see it is favorably reported by our committee and that it is enacted into law. We have heard from the lobby representing the gun manufacturer and the sportsman and the hunter. Now let us hear from the lobby of the American people, for those of us in Congress who are concerned about the need for effective gun control need their support in the fight which looms ahead.

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] on this particular legislation.

I hope that this bill will be reported by the Committee on the Judiciary. It is long overdue.

I think that the unfortunate tragedy in Texas yesterday more than anything else points out the necessity of passing the bill.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Florida.

#### SENATOR MORSE CITES RECORD IN REPLY TO ARTICLE ENTITLED "HELL HATH NO FURY LIKE WAYNE MORSE SCORNED"

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have received a copy of the publication, the *Machinist*, for August 4, 1966. The publication has an article under the heading "Hell Hath No Fury Like WAYNE MORSE Scorned."

I am sure that the machinists would want that in the *Record*. I am sure that no one in the Senate would think he was free to insert it in the *Record* because of the rules of the Senate, but I certainly would like to accommodate the machinists by asking unanimous consent to have printed in the *Record* at this point the article from the *Machinist* of August 4, 1966.

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

#### HELL HATH NO FURY LIKE WAYNE MORSE SCORNED

The question has been asked a thousand times these past few weeks: What has happened to WAYNE MORSE?

The Senator from Oregon has been one of labor's heroes. With only the late Sen. William Langer of North Dakota beside him, he defied the steamroller that stamped the anti-union Landrum-Griffin bill into the law books.

In his 20 years in the U.S. Senate he has had scarcely a wrong vote in the *Machinist's* annual report card on Congress.

Last week, it was a new WAYNE MORSE who goaded the Senate, trying to ram through an emergency resolution to break the solid airline strike.

Last month, Senator MORSE chaired the Presidential Emergency Board that recommended an unacceptable settlement of that dispute. When airline employees struck, rather than accept the Morse Board recommendations, he tried to declare a national emergency and force union members to accept his terms.

August 2, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

17131

on behalf of the Washington Government ever since.

Hanoi obviously does not believe this. The officials there see the United States building an air naval base at Kam Ranh Bay that is the most modern base in Asia. They feel they were twice deceived by negotiation—once at the end of the Second World War, when the United States helped restore French power in Vietnam, and again at Geneva in 1954, when they thought the United States would keep its power out of Vietnam.

## THE UNITED NATIONS

The United States could be held to its no-bases promise, however, by international supervision of a compromise settlement, and this is another of the mysteries of Hanoi's diplomacy. The U.S. has offered to bring the United Nations and the International Control Commission into the negotiations, but Hanoi has rejected both, apparently counting on the peace sentiment in the United States to force the withdrawal of the American expeditionary forces before it will talk.

This is undoubtedly a major blunder. All the doves in America, backed by political pressure for peace, cannot bring about such an American military withdrawal before negotiation. Hanoi misinterprets both the objectives and the influence of those of us who want a negotiated settlement in Vietnam. If its main objective is the withdrawal of American power from the country, it can get it by negotiation, supervised by the U.N. or some other international body, but it cannot compel withdrawal by force of arms or pacifist sentiment in the United States.

On the contrary, the longer the war goes on and the greater the American sacrifice in lives, the stronger the pressure will be here in the United States to justify the war by retaining precisely that American strategic presence at Kam Ranh Bay the Communists are seeking to avoid.

## THE DOMINION OF FEAR

This is the tragedy of the war. Both sides are caught up in the dominion of fear—Washington in the fear of a Communist conquest of the peninsula and Hanoi and Peking in the fear of permanent U.S. bases that could dominate both North Vietnam and China. The problem is to break this deadlock of suspicion.

In recent days, a hopeful thing has happened in Vietnam. The Hanoi Government has listened to the appeals of the world to spare the captured American fliers.

The opportunity exists on the larger question of a negotiated settlement of the war. If Hanoi's objective really is to get rid of American power in Vietnam, it can undoubtedly do so in an internationally supervised negotiation. It cannot do so by counting on the force of arms or the force of peace sentiment in the United States.

## A NEW CAMPAIGN TECHNIQUE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the Friday, July 29, edition of the Chicago Tribune reveals what is to say the least, an astonishing new technique for political candidates, a recommendation suggested by Secretary of Agriculture.

In substance, what the Secretary is telling Democratic congressional candidates is that the best way to handle a difficult issue is to ignore it. "Just pretend that it isn't there" seems to be what he is saying about controversial issues such as inflation, according to this report by Chicago Tribune reporter Aldo Beckman, who quotes Mr. Freeman as saying:

Slip, slide, and duck any question of higher consumer prices if you possibly can.

I have no reason to doubt the accuracy of the statements attributed to Mr. Freeman, for, according to the article, the reporter, Mr. Beckman, was present for this conference, which was intended to instruct candidates in the techniques of how to win elections.

Mr. Freeman also has a suggestion on how to handle the housewives of America, who are up in arms because of the tremendous increases in the cost of living which have occurred in recent months.

While Mr. Freeman is quite right in saying that farm prices are not the cause of inflation, he expresses a wariness that Congressional candidates should report this fact, unless, of course, they are confronted with a situation where "slip, slide, and duck" will not work and a candidate must state his position. Then, believe it or not, the spokesman for American agriculture believes it is appropriate to take the farmer's side.

Mr. Freeman suggests taking the farmer's side only if pressed to do so, and then because he also believes it is the easier course to follow, for the politically expedient reason that "housewives are not nearly as well organized."

To compound the confusion of Mr. Freeman's campaign suggestions, the Secretary attempts to explain his action in urging the Defense Department to quit buying pork.

Mr. Freeman said the controversy was a "complete bunch of nonsense," because his action "did not affect farm income one bit." However, the Chicago Tribune reports that Mr. Freeman said he asked the Defense Department to resume their pork purchases as soon as the market price dropped several cents. If his action did not have any effect on market prices, why did he bother to make his suggestion to the Department of Defense in the first place? And why did he later withdraw it?

I have no idea what the candidates thought after hearing Mr. Freeman's outline of how to campaign, but if they are not confused, I am certain the American farmers and the American housewives are confused over this latest effort to refuse to pin the blame of inflation exactly where it belongs: Administration spending policies which have resulted in a national deficit accumulation of about \$30 billion in the past 6 years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record this most interesting report on how to run for office without talking about the issues, and also an editorial on the same subject which was published in the Chicago Tribune on July 31.

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

[From the Chicago Tribune, July 29, 1966]

LEBJ AID WARNS CANDIDATES OF FARMERS' IRE—DON'T TALK INFLATION, FREEMAN ADVISES

(By Aldo Beckman)

WASHINGTON, July 28.—Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman has told Democratic congressional candidates at a closed briefing that they must overcome deep resentment against the administration in farm areas and should stay away from discussion of inflation.

"There is a reaction far deeper and more bitter than I could ever have anticipated" among the nation's farmers over recent re-

marks by administration officials concerning farm prices, Freeman told the candidates. "Farmers know what a tremendous minority they are and they are very sensitive."

Several weeks ago, President Johnson indicated that high farm prices were partly to blame for the increased cost of living and two days later, Freeman announced he was "pleased to report" that certain farm prices were down.

## DIRECTED TO CONFERENCE

Both remarks triggered almost instant criticism from farm belt congressmen and from farm leaders throughout the nation.

A Chicago Tribune reporter listened in on Freeman's discussions with congressional candidates, after a girl, who was a staff member of the Democratic national committee, directed him into the room for a scheduled "news briefing."

The reporter was wearing a badge which had been issued by press officials, but it was similar to those worn by the candidates and was never checked closely. The reporter later learned that the news briefing, which was to be held in an adjacent room of a Washington hotel, had been canceled.

## ASKS FOR ADVICE

A candidate from Columbus, Ohio, told Freeman that a poll in his district showed that the major issue was inflation, and he sought advice on how to handle questions about the increased cost of living.

"I've been trying to figure out an answer to that question for six years," Freeman replied. "Slip, slide, and duck any question of higher consumer prices if you possibly can."

"Don't get caught in a debate over higher prices between housewives and farmers," he cautioned. "If you do, and have to choose a side, take the farmers' side. It's the right side, and, besides, housewives aren't nearly as well organized."

## GET 40 PERCENT

Freeman said that farmers get only 40 per cent of the dollar that housewives spend for food at the supermarkets and suggested that candidates could point out that housewives pay extra for the luxury of ready-made foods. "A TV dinner that costs 60 cents at the store could be fixed at home for 20 cents," Freeman said.

He urged the candidates to emphasize that net farm income is at its highest in history. "Farm income and farm outlooks are better under this administration than they have been under any other in years," he said. "But," he warned, "farmers never like to be told they're doing all right."

## BUNCH OF NONSENSE

Freeman said grain surpluses that were such a problem several years ago have diminished so much that "we may be able to increase wheat acreage allotments" this fall.

He described as a "complete bunch of nonsense," the controversy over his letter to Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, asking the defense department to stop buying pork several months ago, when the farmers were receiving 30 cents a pound for hogs at the market. "It didn't affect farm income one bit," he said. "It was the absolutely logical thing to do and was consistent with the farmers' interest."

He indicated he would take the same action if a similar situation arose again. "It is only good sense that the defense department should buy beef when there is less demand for it by the nation's consumers," he said.

## THEY WON'T BUY IT

Freeman said he asked the defense department to resume their pork purchases as soon as the market price dropped several cents.

The former Minnesota governor told the candidates that the percentage of each pay check that now goes for food is lower than in 1960. "You could tell them [the housewives] that, but we know they wouldn't buy it," he said.

17132

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 2, 1966

The three-day closed meeting will end tomorrow. During the sessions the candidates were permitted to question either cabinet members or representatives from each cabinet-level department.

[From the Chicago Tribune, July 31, 1966]

#### SECRETARY FREEMAN OVER A BARREL

(The newspaper is an institution developed by modern civilization to present the news of the day, to foster commerce and industry, to inform and lead public opinion, and to furnish that check upon government which no constitution has ever been able to provide.—THE TRIBUNE CREDO.)

Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman has managed to drape himself over a barrel in a "confidential" briefing of Democratic congressional candidates on the subjects of inflation, food costs, and the political mood of the nation's farmers. A Tribune reporter who wandered into the supposedly closed session heard Mr. Freeman unload the following observations.

—"There is a reaction far deeper and more bitter than I could ever have anticipated" among farmers.

—"To a candidate who asked how to handle questions about the increased cost of living: 'I've been trying to figure out an answer to that question for six years. Slip, slide, and duck any questions on higher consumer prices if you possibly can.'"

—"Don't get caught in a debate over higher prices between housewives and farmers. If you do, and have to choose a side, take the farmers' side. It's the right side, and, besides, housewives aren't nearly as well organized."

—"On the contention of the administration that the percentage of each pay check that now goes for food is lower than in 1960: 'You could tell them [the housewives] that, but we know they wouldn't buy it.'"

The Minnesota Machiavelli therewith wrapped up as deceitful a body of political philosophy as has ever been produced by any exponent of the Great Society, which covers a lot of ground. This administration has distinguished itself by its predilection for "managing the news," but Mr. Freeman is in a class by himself.

What he told the Democratic candidates for confidential consumption is something quite different from what the administration chooses to tell the people publicly. The administration has engaged in the window dressing of establishing a "consumer counselor" in the person of Mrs. Esther Peterson in the labor department. This is intended to evidence its huge concern for the consumer, who is usually depicted as a nitwit who can't read the label on a package.

Another of the administration's Potemkin villages calls for enactment of "truth-in-packaging" legislation. The consumer is supposed to be befuddled by the large range of packages on the store shelves, so that, as one proponent of the legislation contends, he is unable to buy knowledgeably and stay within the family budget.

But the fact is that it is Democratic fiscal policy that promotes inflation and drives up prices to new records with each succeeding month. As Mr. Freeman made clear, it is a subject from which the administration prefers to steer away, because there is no sensible political answer to it. So the party's candidates are advised to "slip, slide, and duck."

Secretary Freeman on a field trip around the middle west learned of widespread discontent among farmers. They resent President Johnson's statement that high farm prices were partly to blame for the increased cost of living, and they were not mollified when Freeman followed up with the statement that he was "pleased to report" that some farm prices were down.

Mr. Freeman has maneuvered himself into an unenviable position. He is no more popular with the farmers than the administration is with the consumers. The only out for both is to try to do a snow job on the people.

#### LET TELEVISION REACH ITS POTENTIAL

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, once again the Ford Foundation has done our Nation a great service.

The foundation's suggestion that consideration be given to formation of a nonprofit nationwide satellite television system which would carry an extensive schedule of educational programs financed by transmission of commercial TV shows is a bold and exciting proposal to help upgrade the quality of American life.

Few persons will argue that television has lived up to its great potential or to its great responsibility. If the technological revolution is to have any meaning for our culture, that revolution must not only be concerned with making daily tasks easier to perform. It must not only be concerned with offering people ways to escape the realities of the day.

This revolution must also be shaped to serve the cultural, intellectual and informational needs of the people. Television offers unique opportunities to meet these needs. Freed from the tyranny of audience polls, freed from some of the harsh economic facts of producing programs, television can reach its potential as a great instructional and cultural medium.

For that reason I welcome the Ford Foundations' proposal.

For that reason I strongly urge the Federal Communications Commission to delay any decision on proposals for the construction and operation of communications satellite facilities by other than recognized common carriers until the proposal of the Ford Foundation has been carefully reviewed and other important studies relating to this question are completed.

Regardless of how the FCC rules on this matter, I will consider introducing legislation designed to make certain that national legislation does not stand in the way of educational television reaching its potential when new communications satellites are launched to serve this Nation.

In addition, I hope that when communications satellites are launched service to Alaska will be included in the plan.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter of McGeorge Bundy, president of the Ford Foundation, to Rosel H. Hyde, Chairman of the FCC, concerning the foundation's proposals, be printed in the Record as it appeared in this morning's edition of the New York Times.

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

AUGUST 1, 1966.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have the honor to submit herewith a statement from the Ford Foundation which responds to the invitation of the Federal Communications Commission for "the views and comments of interested parties" on "proposals for the construction

and operation of communications satellite facilities" by others than recognized common carriers. I am also addressing this same letter to each of the other Commissioners.

In this covering letter I want to summarize our conclusions—and also to explain informally the deep concern which moved us to make the studies which have led to this submission.

First, I note that the Ford Foundation has no commercial interest and no operating interest in this matter. We exist for the purpose of giving money away—as wisely and constructively as we can. This is the source of our deep interest in the present question.

We have a wider and longer experience of the effort to establish effective noncommercial television than any other single institution in the country. We have been by far the largest single source of funds for this effort. We have fifteen years of experience. We have made grants, directly and indirectly, of more than a hundred million dollars a year; currently we are making additional grants at the rate of more than ten million dollars a year.

From this experience we have learned three lessons:

(1) The first and most important lesson is that noncommercial television has unlimited potential, for human welfare and for the quality of American life. The best achievements of the best existing stations are proof enough—but there is still more powerful evidence in the best achievements of the best services abroad. And the most powerful evidence of all is in the all-but-unanimous conviction of the ablest men in American television today: that nothing is more needed—for television itself as well as for the country—than a first-rate national noncommercial service.

#### PRESENT SERVICES INADEQUATE

(2) The second lesson is that existing services, and existing means of support, cannot hope to develop more than a fraction of this potential. The existing systems are much better than nothing. Compared to what this country deserves, they are a depressing failure. This is not the fault of the talented and dedicated men who have worked their hearts out for noncommercial television. It is the fault of all of us—in that we have not yet found a way to give this work the resources it needs. It can well be argued that we at the Ford Foundation have contributed to this failure. When we give \$6-million a year to the National Educational Television and Radio Center (NET), we seem to have done a lot. And for us it is a lot—it is our largest continuing annual grant. But the brutal fact is that our big gift is much too small.

(3) The third lesson follows from the first two: it is that the nation must find a way to a wholly new level of action in this field—one which will release for our whole people all the enlightenment and engagement, all the immediacy and freedom of experience which are inherent in this extraordinary medium and which commercial services—as they freely admit—cannot bring out alone.

These three general conclusions are broadly shared, I believe, among all who have studied this problem—by leaders in the Congress, by the members and staff of your Commission, and by independent experts. They underlie the establishment last year of a distinguished commission of private citizens to study the future of non-commercial television, under a charge from the Carnegie Corporation and with encouragement from President Johnson. Under the chairmanship of Dr. James Killian that commission is working hard to produce a prompt and constructive report. It will be good if we can avoid major decisions affecting the future of educational television until we have the benefit of the Car-



17144

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 2, 1966

Eisenhower's and Vice-President Richard Nixon's re-nomination.

In 1960 she sought the Republican nomination for Governor, but was defeated in the primary by State Senator John Cooper of Humboldt.

She was a member of First Plymouth Congregational Church of Lincoln, and served on its board of trustees.

At various times she also served as trustee for Lincoln General Hospital, Doane College, Nebraska Wesleyan University, Hastings College and the University of Nebraska Foundation.

## U.N. AWARD IN '44

She received the U.N.'s distinguished service award in 1944, an honorary Doctor of Humane Letters from Doane College in 1955 and the distinguished citizen award of Nebraska Wesleyan University in 1958.

Survivors include her son and four daughters: Alice Abel of Lincoln, Mrs. Gene (Hazel) Tallman of Lincoln, Mrs. Harry (Helen) Ragen of San Diego, Cal., and Ann Abel of Nice, France; a brother, Eugene Hempel of Santa Barbara, Cal., a sister, Mrs. A. J. Sistek of 605 Beverly Drive, Omaha; and seven grandchildren.

## WHERE IS ESCALATION LEADING US?

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, although it has not been called a new step in escalation of the war in Vietnam, I think there can be little doubt that our bombing of the demilitarized zone in Vietnam this week is in fact another new step in escalation.

We are told that this is a military necessity, that the zone which is supposed to be militarily free under the Geneva agreements, and which until now has not been deliberately bombed, is harboring enemy forces we must destroy.

This has been the plea—military necessity—each time we have expanded further our operations in Vietnam. When we began the bombing of North Vietnam in February 1965, we were told that the rate of infiltration from north to south was about 1,600 men a month, and that our air strikes would halt or slow that flow. But within a few months we learned that, far from that being the case, the rate of infiltration had tripled to 4,500 or 5,000 men a month.

I have said before that escalation breeds escalation. The President has said repeatedly that "we seek no wider war," but our constant increase of military pressure is widening that war. There is good reason to believe that we are moving our forces constantly upward toward a projected mark of at least 800,000.

The result is that, declarations of war or their lack notwithstanding, we now have far more than guerilla skirmishes, far more than a peacekeeping operation, far more than subsidiary support for the South Vietnamese forces. In looking at these facts the New Republic recently spoke out editorially.

In the course of doing so, the editorial noted the belief of Gen. Ben Sternberg, who commands the 101st Airborne Division, that 500,000 more U.S. troops are needed in Vietnam. Will this further escalation draw in, not just the present 12 North Vietnamese regiments now engaged, but the 300,000-man army which it has in existence? Will this bring us

to a further escalation, perhaps a million of our boys? Will it bring the "military necessity" for landing of troops in the north? Will it bring the land war with China we have long sought to avoid?

These are gloomy possibilities, fearful to consider, but logical and all but inevitable under our present policy. In the meantime, we have a war psychology growing apace, a war economy coming into being, and, as the editorial is entitled, a "War President."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the July 16 issue of the New Republic may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

[From the New Republic, July 16, 1966]

## THE WAR PRESIDENT

In Omaha, the day after Hanoi and Haiphong were first hit, the President called on God to forgive his critics, "for they know not what they do." All of us stand in need of enlightenment; human judgment is fallible. Just how fallible, Mr. Johnson illustrates. "We have made it clear," he said, "that we wish negotiations to begin on the basis of international agreements made in 1954 and in 1966"; and, "those who say that this is merely a Vietnamese 'civil war' are wrong. The warfare in South Vietnam was started by the government of North Vietnam in 1959." God forgive us, we don't think so.

As early as 1956, the then government of South Vietnam with the backing of the United States, violated the 1954 Geneva agreements, which provided, among other things, for "general elections which will bring the unification of Vietnam"; it also prohibited "the introduction into Vietnam of any troop reinforcements and additional military personnel." Within two years, Ngo Dinh Diem, with our military aid, had made himself a dictator, smashed all political opposition and spurned elections to bring about unification. The Viet Cong began as an armed rebellion against Diem (of whom the U.S. itself finally tired and in 1963 allowed to be overthrown and murdered by a military junta). Intervention from outside Vietnam has been largely American—so far.

Nevertheless, the President now affirms that he will accept and abide by those Geneva agreements. Why, then, don't the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese agree to negotiate on that basis? Our hunch is, because they don't believe him, and they may well be right. Actions do speak louder than words, and Mr. Johnson is acting out his determination to preserve South Vietnam as a client state, close to China, so that there may be another link in a solid chain that includes South Korea, Formosa and Thailand. The well-being of the Vietnamese is a secondary concern. They must serve our purpose—the military containment of Peking. That is the objective, and it is nonnegotiable. We therefore cannot, Secretary Rusk informed the SEATO conference in Australia the end of June (and later told Congressman FRANK HORRION [R., N.Y.] on TV), permit the Viet Cong to be formally admitted to a peace conference: that would give them a veto on a settlement; they might haggle over terms, whereas what Mr. Rusk and the President really want is unconditional surrender.

When the bombing of North Vietnam began in February last year, the Pentagon stated that the rate of infiltration from North to South was about 1,600 men a month; air strikes, so the logic then ran, would halt or slow down this infiltration. After 15 months of constant pounding from the air, the infiltration rate is said to have tripled to 4,500-5,500 men a month, and the

jungle tracks, according to the President, have become "boulevards." Therefore, the original justification had to be discarded and another found. It was. In his July 6 press conference, Mr. Johnson acknowledged that: "We do not say that [the raids] will even reduce it [infiltration]," but they will make life "more difficult" for the enemy. And so they will.

We have been seeing, week after week, where such logic leads us. The estimate of Peter Arnett, who has been reporting from Vietnam for the Associated Press since 1962, is that by bombing the North and pouring American, Korean and Australian troops into the South, "we can beat the major units of the enemy," but "in so doing, we make very little impact on the other two levels of the war." By "the other two levels of the war," Arnett means the battles of the "very tired" Vietnamese army against "local, homegrown" Viet Cong battalions; and the battles of local militia forces against Viet Cong guerrillas in the mountains, in the Mekong Delta rice fields, and along the highly populated coastal plains. It is at this third level that "the real blood of Vietnam is seeping away," and also "at this level the war could continue indefinitely." The Viet Cong can go on fighting as guerrillas for a long, long time.

American forces, who are "beginning to bear the brunt," according to Arnett, are waging war on the enemy units with vastly superior air power, modern artillery and such refinements as the "cluster bomb unit" that shoots out both napalm and hand grenades. But he warns that in order to destroy the main enemy units, the US will have to double its forces; "certainly at least twice as many as are here now will be needed." And, he adds, "it will also probably mean the destruction of much of Vietnam—both North and South. As the war grows, the destruction is getting very considerable over the countryside. Villages are being devastated as a matter of course." The end of this road is genocide, with no one left with whom one need negotiate.

Arnett is a top-flight reporter, but he is not a professional soldier. General Ben Sternberg is. Commander of the 101st Airborne, he recently returned from 26 months in Vietnam, where he served on General Westmoreland's staff. General Sternberg sees "no stabilization of the military regime, at least in the near future"; he thinks Premier Ky eventually "will have to go," but "civilian government is not possible in South Vietnam now." He believes that 500,000 more US troops are needed in Vietnam—a total of about 800,000—to seal off infiltration and supplies from the North.

But first, the gamble of victory through air power must be played out, with doubled and redoubled bets, even though the systematic destruction from the air of North Vietnam, as Richard N. Goodwin, former Special Assistant to both Presidents Kennedy and Johnson has pointed out, is more likely to pressure the North into sending into battle its 300,000-man army, instead of the 12 North Vietnamese regiments thus far engaged. This in turn would bring a million or more GIs into the war and make it very tempting to consider landing US troops in the North.

Politicians in both parties meanwhile press the President to "get it over with," hit harder and more often—and hope that a fiat in the face of the North will not provoke too brutal a counterpunch. At the moment, official Washington is rather complacent about the danger of Chinese intervention, believing that Peking has enough troubles without borrowing more. It is a hazardous assumption in view of the history of our entrapment in Vietnam, a history that is littered with miscalculation.

Who could have foreseen it? The Great Society exponent, the practitioner of common sense, compromise and consensus, has become The War President—sworn to prevent

August 2, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

17143

school system, or for a better salary, even though this was not the intention of the teacher when he enrolled for the course or courses involved. I also take exception to this interpretation. Teachers should be able to have considerable latitude in the educational means they choose to improve their teaching, regardless of the job consequences, good or bad, of such additional work on their part.

I strongly urge that these portions of the proposed changes in the regulations be eliminated, and also request that you develop regulations which will allow teachers to claim all legitimate educational and other related expenses they incur.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH W. YARBOROUGH.

## THE LATE FORMER SENATOR HAZEL ABEL, OF NEBRASKA

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I wish to speak concerning a former Member of this body, Senator Hazel Abel, who died in a Lincoln, Nebr., hospital on Saturday, July 30, 1966.

Senator Abel's service in this body was short, but it was impressive. She had a broad grasp of public questions. She possessed a very keen mind, and she was representative of everything that is fine and good in our country.

Senator Dwight Griswold, of Nebraska, died in the spring of 1954. Senator Abel was elected to fill out the unexpired term on November 2, 1954. She received 233,589 votes as against the Democratic candidate who received 170,823 votes. That election will be remembered by many Nebraskans. It was on that day that Nebraska elected three U.S. Senators. My senior colleague, Senator ROMAN HRUSKA, was elected to fill the unexpired term of 4 years plus of the late Senator Hugh Butler. In addition to Senator Abel and Senator HRUSKA, I was elected to the U.S. Senate on that day for a full 6-year term.

Mr. President, all of Nebraska and many fine Nebraska institutions owe a great debt of gratitude to Mrs. Abel for her generosity, her help, and her leadership. I, as an individual, am greatly indebted to her. She was helpful to me in many ways, and she resigned her seat in the U.S. Senate effective at the end of the day of December 31, 1954, so that I might become Nebraska's Senator on January 1, 1955.

Senator Abel was a distinguished businesswoman. She was prominent as a civic leader. She was a philanthropist. She helped many individuals and many causes that were never publicized. Hospitals, colleges and universities, churches, youth organizations, and a multitude of worthy individuals were the recipients of Mrs. Abel's time, talent, and money.

Many honors came to Mrs. Abel. In 1957 she was American Mother of the Year. In the same year she received the Distinguished Service Award of the Native Sons and Daughters of Nebraska. In 1958 she received the Distinguished Citizen Award from Nebraska Wesleyan. The University of Nebraska gave her a Distinguished Service Award in 1944 and an honorary doctorate degree was given to her by Doane College in 1955.

Mr. President, Nebraska and the Nation has indeed lost one of its stalwart

citizens. I know that I speak for this entire body in extending to her family our words of sincere sympathy.

Mr. President, I wish to extend my remarks by including the account of Mrs. Abel's death which appeared in the Omaha World Herald and the Lincoln Journal. Both articles were published on July 31, 1966.

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

## MRS. HAZEL ABEL DIES; STATE LEADER

Mrs. Hazel Abel, 78, of Lincoln, whose successful business and political careers were capped with a term in the U.S. Senate, died Saturday night at a Lincoln hospital.

She had reportedly been at the hospital for several days.

Mrs. Abel was elected at a 1954 general election to fill the two months unexpired Senate term of the late Dwight Griswold, former Nebraska governor.

She was the first Nebraska woman and the third in history to be elected to the U.S. Senate.

Her other political venture was a campaign for governor in 1960, when she finished second in the Republican gubernatorial primary.

Following this defeat, she never became active in Nebraska politics.

## MOTHER OF YEAR

Named American Mother of 1957, Mrs. Abel also received that year the distinguished service award of the Native Sons and Daughters of Nebraska and in 1958 the Nebraska Distinguished Citizen Award from Nebraska Wesleyan.

She was chairman of the board of Abel Investment Co. after serving as secretary of the Abel Construction Co. from 1916 to 1936 and president from 1936 to 1951. She had also been president of the George Philip Abel Memorial Foundation.

In May, 1958, she was elected vice president of the American Mothers Committee.

During that month, she was named to the resolutions committee for the 10th biennial convention of the National Federation of Republican Women. She was Nebraska president at that time.

In July, 1958, she accepted chairmanship of the fund-raising campaign for the construction of the W. K. Kellogg Center at the University of Nebraska.

She was chairman of the 1958 Governor's Committee for Youth and a delegate to the White House Conference on Education.

## STATE CHAIRMAN

Mrs. Abel was state chairman of the committee working for the Juvenile Court Amendment and vice president of the Lincoln Centennial.

She had been a member of boards of directors for Doane College, Hastings College and Nebraska Wesleyan University.

The Plattsmouth native had also been a former member of the First-Plymouth Congregational Church board of trustees.

She enrolled at the University of Nebraska at the age of 15, graduating in 1908 with a major in mathematics, a B.A. degree and a teacher's certificate.

For 10 years before her marriage to George P. Abel she taught in several Nebraska secondary schools.

After her marriage in 1918, Mr. and Mrs. Abel moved to Lincoln into the house in which Mrs. Abel lived until her death.

For many years Mrs. Abel had been on the board of directors and executive committees of the Community Chest and Red Cross.

## HOSPITAL POSTS

She was also a director of Lincoln General Hospital, and for one year was president.

She also was president of the Hospital's women's auxiliary.

Mrs. Abel has been president of the Lincoln Branch of the American Assn. of University Women, Parent-Teachers Assn. and Native Sons and Daughters of Nebraska.

She was also a key leader in the Nebraska League of Women Voters, the Lincoln YWCA, Lincoln Camp Fire Girls, Lincoln Girl Scout Council, National Board of Camp Fire Girls, and the Women's Division of the Lincoln Chamber of Commerce.

Survivors include a son, George P. of Lincoln; four daughters, Miss Alice Abel of Lincoln, Mrs. Gene (Hazel) Tallman of Lincoln, Mrs. Harry (Helen) Ragen of San Diego, Calif., and Miss Ann Abel of Nice, France; a brother, Eugene Hempel of San Bernardino, Calif.; a sister, Mrs. A. J. Sistek of Omaha; and seven grandchildren.

Services are pending at Roper and Sons' Mortuary.

## DEATH TAKES EX-SENATOR HAZEL ABEL—NEBRASKAN, ALSO ONCE MOTHER OF YEAR

Mrs. Hazel Abel, the only woman elected to the United States Senate from Nebraska, died here Saturday evening at the age of 78.

Mrs. Abel was the widow of George P. Abel. After he died in 1936, she became president of the Abel Construction Company, a post she held until her son, George P. Abel, Jr., assumed it in 1951.

Among her other honors was her selection as American Mother of the Year in 1957. She was also Nebraska Mother of the Year that year.

## BORN IN PLATTSMOUTH

A third-generation Nebraskan, she was born in Plattsmouth on July 10, 1888, daughter of a Burlington Railroad employee, Charles Hempel. Her paternal grandfather fought in the Civil War.

She was graduated from Omaha High School (now Omaha Central High) in 1904 at age of 15. The University of Nebraska would not accept her at that age, so she waited a year and then graduated in three years.

She was a high school principal at Papillion, Ashland and Crete and taught mathematics at Kearney High School before marrying Mr. Abel in 1916.

## SUCCEEDED EVE BOWRING

She served as secretary of the Abel Construction Company from 1916 until 1936. Later she was chairman of the board of the Abel Investment Company and president of the George P. Abel Memorial Foundation.

In the fall of 1954, she was elected to serve the unexpired two months of the term of Senator Dwight Griswold, who died that spring. As the first woman elected to Congress from Nebraska, she succeeded the first woman to represent the state in Congress, Eve Bowring of Merriman, who was appointed when Mr. Griswold died.

## CENSURED M'CARTHY

Mrs. Abel resigned on December 31, 1954, allowing CARL CURTIS, who had been elected to the seat for a full term, to be appointed a few days before other freshmen Senators began to serve, thus gaining in seniority. Mrs. Abel had supported Mr. CURTIS in his campaign.

Probably her most important act as a Senator was to vote for the motion to censure Senator Joseph McCarthy (Rep., Wis.). She made a point of listening to "every single minute" of debate on the censure motion and was the first Senator to vote on it. Nebraska's other Senator, ROMAN HRUSKA, voted against it.

## SUPPORTED EISENHOWER

In 1956, she was chairman of Nebraska's delegation to the Republican National Convention, where she supported President

August 2, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

17145

at any cost one set of Vietnamese (unfriendly, we have guaranteed that) from overcoming other Vietnamese (who could not hold power without us).

### A PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEER WRITES OF VIETNAM

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, in the considerable volume of mail which I have recently received concerning Vietnam, one letter in particular has appealed to me as deserving of wider attention.

This is a letter which came to me, handwritten on the thin paper of an overseas self-mailer letter sheet, from a Peace Corps volunteer living and working in a southeast Asian country. From the standpoint of a dedicated person, concerned with improving the living conditions of the underprivileged in another land, the writer looks at our actions in Vietnam. Our escalation—and in this there is indication that many others in the Peace Corps have similar feelings—is seen as an embarrassment which undermines the work and morale of this Peace Corps worker.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the contents of the letter to which I refer may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

JULY 15, 1966.

Senator VANCE HARTKE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HARTKE: I do not know how to adequately express my vast indignation and shame for the pathetic atrocity of our position in Viet Nam. Continual escalation, such as was recently carried out on Hanoi and Haiphong, cannot from this vantage point be interpreted as anything but an arrogant and childish show of force. The question of who the real aggressor is, could, I believe, stand some clarification.

I am not deluded into thinking that the protestations of a few, or even very many, people, will have any effect upon the dogmatic and power-opulent men in the State Department, Pentagon, and White House. However, I would be pleased to add my name to a list of 12,000 Peace Corps Volunteers who would commit themselves to leave their countries of assignment unless something is soon done about the embarrassing escalation. Although such an action may be slightly radical, I feel it could be one of the few adequate means of significant protest.

Sincerely,

### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

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

### THE AIRLINES LABOR DISPUTE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the previous order, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending business, which the clerk will report.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 186) to provide for the

settlement of the labor dispute currently existing between certain air carriers and certain of their employees, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. CLARK obtained the floor.

Mr. MORSE and Mr. MANSFIELD addressed the Chair.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I shall yield first to the majority leader and then to the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MANSFIELD. I was going to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator's resolution is the pending business, and I, by way of an amendment in the nature of a substitute, wish to send to the desk a substitute.

Mr. CLARK. To be called up later?

Mr. MORSE. To be called up later.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I will have copies of my substitute shortly for the Members of the Senate. This is the first copy that I have obtained from the typewriters and the Mimeograph machine. I send to the desk for myself and certain other Senators, whose names I will announce to the Senate shortly—there will be several Senators joining me in offering this measure as a substitute; I do not have their names on it yet and I would like to have it in printed form—an amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 186 in the form of a substitute.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I now yield to the majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD], with the understanding that I shall not lose my right to the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] yielding the floor for that purpose? Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. 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, it is my understanding that our Republican colleagues have a luncheon in progress, which probably is due to end soon. Since there are no Republicans here on the floor as this important legislation is about to be considered, I am going to suggest the absence of a quorum. I am not going to let it run very long, but I will ask those on the Republican side to advise the Republican Senators that the bill is about to be called up.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. 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, Senate Joint Resolution 186 was reported yester-

day from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare by a final vote of 10 to 6.

The joint resolution provides the mechanism for the settlement of the labor dispute currently existing between certain air carriers and their employees. First, let me briefly describe the measure which resulted after long and arduous consideration by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The committee, over a period of 5 days, discussed, in considerable depth, the airline strike and what, if anything, to do about it.

The joint resolution recites that there is a strike called by the machinists' union, which represents employees of Eastern, National, Northwest, Trans World, and United Air Lines. Machinists on a sixth airline, American, also voted to strike, but were restrained from doing so by a Presidential finding that such a strike would substantially interrupt interstate commerce, the order issued under the Railway Labor Act in the American strike, as in earlier strikes of the five airlines, was for a period of 60 days.

The resolution recites that this strike "threatens substantially to interrupt interstate commerce to a degree such as to deprive any section of the country of essential transportation services." Those are the words of art used in the Railway Labor Act. A finding to this effect is a prerequisite to an order under the Railway Labor Act.

The resolution finds, on behalf of Congress, that emergency measures are essential to the settlement of the dispute. Then, in section 2, the resolution extends for a period, not to exceed 180 days, the time during which no strike or lockout will be permitted. In the measure as reported, the President is given discretion to invoke this new authority. He is also given discretion as to whether he wishes to break that 180-day period up into one or more segments, but in no event may the period exceed 180 days. Roughly speaking, this would result in the authority expiring about the 1st of February of next year.

The resolution then gives the President permissive, not mandatory, authority to appoint a special Airline Dispute Board, which shall attempt to mediate the dispute between the parties. It also provides that any wage settlement eventually entered into should be retroactive to January 1, 1966.

Section 6 of the joint resolution provides that if, prior to the settlement of the present dispute between the five airline carriers and their employees, a dispute affecting any other air carrier, such as American Airlines, shall in the judgment of the President threaten substantially to interrupt interstate commerce, the President can by Executive order include such an airline and its employees in the directive forbidding a strike or lockout for a period short of the 180 days.

Injunctive relief is provided by the resolution, and the provisions of the Norris-LaGuardia Act are waived.

Those are the essential provisions of the committee measure. I shall now briefly explain the background which resulted in this proposed legislation having been brought to the floor of the Senate.

17146

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 2, 1966

The five airlines to which I have referred represent more than 60 percent of the domestic trunkline air industry, as measured in passenger miles. The International Association of Machinists represents some 35,000 employees who are on strike. Those employees are primarily mechanics, ramp and store, flight kitchen, dining service, plant protection, and related classification employees.

The controversy with which we are dealing began on August 9—almost a year ago—when an agreement was entered into between the carriers and their employees establishing a procedure for joint negotiations between the five airlines and the employees of each airline.

I shall not dwell on the intricate negotiations which ensued. The National Mediation Board attempted to mediate the dispute. On March 18 last, it proffered arbitration, as authorized by section 8 of the Railway Labor Act. The carriers accepted arbitration; the union rejected it.

Then, on April 21 of this year, it being apparent that the parties were nowhere near a settlement, the President, pursuant to the provisions of section 10 of the Railway Labor Act, created an Emergency Board, and the union withdrew a strike notice which it had theretofore issued.

Under section 10, no strike or lockout was permitted for 60 days after the Presidential action in appointing the board. Note well that it was the President, and not Congress, who triggered the 60-day order requiring the men to stay at work. He did so because he found, in the words of the Railway Labor Act, that the strike "threatened substantially to interrupt interstate commerce to a degree such as to deprive any section of the country of essential transportation services."

Thus, the President last April made a finding on his own that a condition existed which, under present law, required him to keep the men at work.

He made the same finding 3 or 4 days ago when the American Airlines strike was threatened. The President acting in his own discretion has twice within recent months taken action to prevent the men from walking off the job.

The president appointed a distinguished Board of three, chaired by our colleague, Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon. The other members were David Ginsburg, an extremely competent lawyer from Washington, and Richard Neustadt, a well-known professor of government at Harvard University who also served President Kennedy with distinction.

The Board filed its report with the President on June 5.

In my opinion the Senator from Oregon and his colleagues did an outstanding and statesmanlike job in making a comprehensive and incisive report of the issues between the parties, and in recommending terms for a just settlement.

I concur fully in the statement with respect to the report made by the President when he said:

The recommendations of the Board reflect the highest order of judgment, imagination, and wisdom.

Those recommendations form the framework for a just and prompt settlement, which is in the national interest.

The union rejected the report. The carriers accepted it as the basis for negotiation.

On July 8 the union called a strike and the men left their jobs. They are still out today, on August 2, almost a month later.

The process of collective bargaining, so much respected by all of us as a basic precept—a basic right, if you will—in management-labor affairs has thus been operating since August of last year including the month since the strike started.

On July 22, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Chairman of the Emergency Board—and one of the most competent and skilled labor mediators and arbitrators in the country today, and certainly the most skillful one among our membership—offered a resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 181, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for consideration.

A number of other resolutions most of them authored by our Republican friends were also referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Some called for compulsory arbitration.

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare determined to hold a 1-day hearing to explore the desirability of reporting legislation to the Senate. That hearing was held on July 27. Witnesses were the Secretary of Labor, W. Willard Wirtz, Mr. Curtin, representing the five carriers, and Mr. Siemiller, representing the Machinists Union.

Yesterday morning, in view of other critical developments, Secretary Wirtz came back and was examined by members of the committee for the better part of 3 hours. At the hearing a number of matters were clarified, while others were not.

There has been a great deal of talk in Congress and in the press as to whether a national emergency exists which justifies congressional intervention in this dispute.

The phrase "national emergency" comes from the Taft-Hartley Act and has reference to a condition in which the national health and welfare are adversely affected by a labor dispute so that the national security is involved.

An important point to make is that the question of whether a national emergency exists has nothing whatever to do with whether the Senate should presently act. The airlines are not under the Taft-Hartley Act, but are under the Railway Labor Act. The test for intervention under the Railway Labor Act is not whether there is a national emergency which threatens the health and safety of the country, but whether the labor dispute, strike or lockout, threatens to interrupt substantially interstate commerce to a degree such as to deprive any section of the country of essential transportation services.

Secretary Wirtz testified that no national emergency existed, and he gave some persuasive statistics to cause most of us on the committee to concur in his judgment. For example, of the travel in

interstate commerce today, 94 percent of it is by other than aircraft. That traffic has not been interrupted—89.5 percent of the travel was by automobile, including truck—2.6 percent was by bus. Two percent was by railroads, and only 5.9 percent was by domestic air carriers. Those are the figures for passenger interstate travel.

With regard to freight, less than one-tenth of 1 percent of all domestic interstate freight traveled by air.

In my judgment one cannot fail to conclude, that disruption of the relatively small amount of air traffic does not constitute a national emergency threatening the health and safety of the people of this country, or indeed threatening the national security.

It was alleged by at least one member of the committee—and he had some telegrams from his own State to support him—that the strike was impeding the war effort in Vietnam and that essential material and transportation of military personnel were being slowed down thus endangering the military effort. Secretary Wirtz was very clear that this is not so. I read from his prepared statement before the committee, under the heading "The Military Program":

The Department of Defense reports little direct impact upon the movement of military personnel, except for those service personnel traveling on leave status.

At the inception of the strike arrangements were made through the Department of Labor, in cooperation with officials of the Machinists Union, to provide for the orderly and expeditious clearance of all commercial charter flights requested by the Department of Defense. As a result, group movements of military personnel have been accomplished with little delay and in numbers comparable to those transported by commercial air carriers before the strike began.

The Defense Department, speaking through the Secretary of Labor, made no complaint about the strike so far as his operations were concerned.

Thus, the committee had no hesitancy in accepting the position of Secretary Wirtz that there was not a national emergency which would threaten the health and safety of the country. However, the Secretary testified that if the strike continued indefinitely, conditions might change. He said that there is an ever-present threat that if the strike continues indefinitely, a national emergency might well occur.

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

Mr. CLARK. I shall yield in one moment.

The Secretary said:

We are confronted with a serious, substantial adverse impact on the national interest, an impact which, however, has not yet brought the country to an emergency stage. However, any prolongation of the current strike, by increasing the strain on existing services, and by multiplying the current delays and inconveniences may well bring the Nation to that crisis, emergency stage.

I am happy to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I was just wondering what Secretary Wirtz meant by the term "indefinitely." How long does it take to reach "indefinitely"? I indicate that

A4072

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

August 2, 1966

**They Had Security but Valued Freedom  
More****EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF****HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, August 2, 1966*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, freedom does not come easily. Men must fight and some must die to secure that freedom. That is the price that is paid.

Many of our citizens today take their freedom for granted. Perhaps these Americans would think twice about their security if they would read about the men who signed the Declaration of Independence, and the prices they paid to obtain our freedoms.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues an article by Bishop Joseph M. Harte entitled, "They Had Security But Valued Freedom More," which appeared in the Empire State Mason of July-August 1966.

Our troops are fighting and dying right this minute to preserve our freedom and our security. We owe them our material as well as our moral support.

The article follows:

**THEY HAD SECURITY BUT VALUED FREEDOM  
MORE**

(By Bishop Joseph M. Harte, D.D., S.T.D.)

You are afforded the high privilege of living at one of the great times in history. But with privilege comes responsibility. Let me put it like this, with sober startling frankness and clarity: It may be that God has entrusted you personally and individually with a particular mission to perform.

It may make a difference to all eternity what you do!

In the differing days ahead for each of you, there will be problems. Let no one try to tell you that life is meant to be easy. Life is not easy, and it is not perfectly ordered.

Let me tell you a story. You didn't read this in your history books. I don't know why. And I think it a shame that every American citizen doesn't know what happened to the inspired men who risked everything at the time of our Nation's history when the Declaration of Independence was signed.

Five signers were captured by the British as traitors, and were tortured before they died. Twelve had their homes ransacked and burned. Two lost sons in the Revolutionary Army, another had two sons captured. Nine of the 56 fought and died from wounds or the hardships of the Revolutionary War. What kind of men were they?

Twenty-four were lawyers and jurists. Eleven were merchants, nine were farmers and large plantation owners, men of means, well-educated. These men were not swept up in any delusion of security or comfort.

They signed the Declaration of Independence knowing full well that the penalty would be death if they were captured. They really did pledge their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor. Carter Braxton of Virginia, a wealthy planter and trader, saw his ships swept from the sea by the British Navy. He sold his home and properties to pay his debts and died in rags.

Thomas McKean was so hounded by the British that he was forced to move his family almost constantly. He served in Congress without pay, and his family was kept in hiding. His possessions were taken from him and poverty was his reward.

Vandals or soldiers or both, looted the properties of Ellery, Clymer, Walton, Gwinnett, Heyward, Rutledge, and Middleton.

At the battle of Yorktown, Thomas Nelson, Jr., noted that the British General Cornwallis had taken over his home for headquarters. He quietly urged General George Washington to open fire, which was done. The home was destroyed and he died bankrupt.

Francis Lewis had his home and properties destroyed. The enemy jailed his wife, and she died within a few months.

Lewis Morris was about to sign, when he received word the enemy was at the gates of his Long Island home, but that his property would be spared if he would withhold his vote for liberty. "There are plenty of homes," he said, but only one country.

Somehow we avoid talking about the sacrifices of the American Revolution. But these were not wild-eyed, rabble-rousing ruffians. They were soft-spoken men of means and education. They had security, but they valued liberty more. Standing tall, straight and unwavering, they pledged:

"... for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our Fortunes, and our sacred Honor!"

**Treatment of Prisoners in Vietnam****EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, August 2, 1966*

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I have noted with interest and relief Ho Chi Minh's recent statement concerning the treatment of American prisoners of war. He has reprieved our captured airmen for the present, but his pronouncement does not in any way guarantee their futures.

I have, therefore, introduced today a resolution indicating that the sense of the Congress and the American people is firm on insisting that humane treatment be accorded our captured soldiers now and in the future. As signatories to the Geneva Convention of 1949, the Government of North Vietnam should abide by the provisions in the agreement concerning prisoners of war. Any violation of accepted codes of international behavior in this regard would be inhumane, and would tend to estrange North Vietnam from the family of nations. Further, improper treatment of American prisoners of war justifiably arouses the anger of the American people thus damaging the prospects of ending hostilities.

Unfortunately, the issue of proper consideration of prisoners of war is not as clear as we might desire. In the Washington Post of August 1, Joseph Kraft astutely comments on the difficult position of the United States vis a vis captured North Vietnamese troops. Currently the United States turns over to the South Vietnamese all North Vietnamese prisoners taken by American forces. Our South Vietnamese allies have themselves often been accused of inhumane treatment of such prisoners.

When the American commitment in Vietnam was limited to an advisory one, we were not in a position to deal with prisoners of war. However, having assumed a principal military role in the struggle, we should now also accept responsibility for all prisoners whom we capture. When we accept this responsibility, we would, of course, comply with the letter and the spirit of the Geneva accord.

As a step in this direction, the International Red Cross should be permitted to inspect all existing detention facilities in the South and to otherwise carry out their obligations to prisoners. Their reports should be made public and submitted to the International Control Commission. In return for such consideration of North Vietnamese prisoners, it is hoped that North Vietnam will take equivalent humanitarian steps for their prisoners.

It is my hope that my colleagues in this Congress will support the President in his endeavors to explore all possible channels leading to the humane treatment of prisoners on both sides. Justice and humane consideration for these individuals is an essential part of our efforts to establish groundwork for negotiations in an atmosphere of trust and mutual respect.

**Civil Rights and Riots****EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, August 2, 1966*

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as we continue in the second week of debate on civil rights, we are troubled by the expanding riots across the country; and, naturally, ask for the reason. Two very frank, timely newspaper commentaries written on this subject caught my eye. I would like to insert the following editorials from the August 1 edition of the Chicago Tribune and the August 1 edition of the Evening Star:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Aug. 1, 1966]

**THE RIOTS AND THE WAR**

Floyd B. McKissick, national director of CORE, says President Johnson's policies in Viet Nam have caused "widespread frustration and anger in the ghettos," and that this may have contributed to the recent rioting, vandalism and looting by Negroes in the big cities.

Perhaps so, although the more familiar statement of reasons for the riots runs to resentment of such things as the "white power structure," "police brutality," slum housing, lack of job opportunities and so on.

If there is any basis for Mr. McKissick's belief, however, it is also a fact that his appraisal of the Negro mood in the ghettos stands in noteworthy contrast to Whitney Young's evaluation of the attitude of Negro soldiers actually fighting in Viet Nam.

After an extensive tour of the combat areas, the executive director of the Urban League said on Saturday that morale among Negro servicemen there is high. "In addition to such things as patriotism," Mr. Young told



August 2, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4071

Milk is scheduled to go up in price another cent a quart today, butter and eggs are at high levels after sharp price rises and bread is at a record price of 30 cents a pound loaf.

Mr. Kearing told a television audience in an appearance on WNBC-TV's "Direct Line" show that the first item on the agenda of the supermarket committee was an inquiry into why prices vary between one food chain outlet and another.

Complaints to the city's Markets Department have pointed out that not only do prices vary between one outlet and another, but within the same chain they sometimes tend to be cheaper in "silk-stocking" neighborhoods and higher in slums.

Mr. Kearing said in an interview after his television appearance that such differences sometimes reflected different competitive conditions but that he also suspected that they sometimes reflected a difference in consumer reaction to higher prices.

"We try to publicize prices so housewives will know what prices to expect and will resist paying prices higher than the market," he said.

"We don't organize anything like boycotts, but we do try to get consumers to buy substitute items which are a bargain and leave the high-priced items alone."

The Commissioner said that a municipal agency was limited in its legal powers for fighting excessive prices but that he hoped to make consumer education an effective weapon in moderating the price rises.

Apart from dealing with consumer complaints, such as the variation of prices between outlets of a single chain, the committee will seek to aid the consumer to combat rising prices by intelligent shopping, he explained.

On the committee, the Commissioner reported, are representatives of all food chains operating stores and supermarkets in the city.

Education of consumers can be achieved through newspaper advertising and point-of-sale information in posters in supermarkets, he said. With the variety of goods in stock in supermarkets, the possibilities for substituting lower-priced commodities for higher-priced items were greater, he pointed out.

"If housewives would switch from the large white Grade A eggs most of them buy to medium eggs, white or brown, which are a bargain right now, they would get more egg for their money and the price of the large would be more reasonable," he said.

"Any time mediums sell for 7 or 8 cents a dozen below the large, they're a bargain. Right now mediums are selling for 20 cents a dozen less," he added.

But for the family with children, substitution is no solution to the problem of rising milk prices, he said. Once they could switch to powdered milk, but now, he pointed out, prices of powdered milk have risen in the same proportion as liquid milk.

"The creameries and the distributors of milk, and the bakeries in the case of bread haven't given the consumer a satisfactory explanation of the rising prices," Mr. Kearing said.

"They claim higher farm prices are responsible. But if they are, milk should have gone up 1 1/4 cents a quart, not 3 cents, and bread should have gone up half a cent a pound, not 2 cents."

Commissioner Kearing said he suspected there was collusion in the case of the milk price. In May, he pointed out, he turned over to the United States Attorney's office affidavits from dealers stating that they were subjected to trade pressure when they sought to sell milk at a penny or so below the prevailing price. But the antitrust division of the Department of Justice, which has been investigating, has not indicated that any action can be taken, he said.

"When prices cluster around the average as they do with milk," he continued, "it certainly argues that there is an explicit price understanding in the trade."

## NO CONCRETE EVIDENCE

But his inspectors have not been able to turn up any concrete evidence of collusive price fixing, he said. He pointed out that some farm prices that went up had been abnormally low and that milk prices have been affected by the reduction of herds and of producers. Also some produce prices have been affected by drought.

But this does not explain why bread is at an all-time high, the Commissioner said, since wheat and other materials account for less than 20 per cent of production cost.

One glaring omission in public policy is the failure of the Federal Government to have the consumer interest represented when the Department of Agriculture works up Federal farm price programs, Mr. Kearing said. These are producer-dominated, he believed.

Asked if Mrs. Esther Peterson, the President's consumer counsel, was not supposed to represent consumer interest, he said that Mrs. Peterson was concerned with developing consumer protection programs and had no effective voice in food price policy.

### Introduction of Legislation To Establish the Sheep Mountain National Monument

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, northwestern Wyoming contains a complex of physiographic features of exceptional scenic and recreational value, some of which are of great scientific interest. Here, in the Middle Rocky Mountain province of the Rocky Mountain physiographic division, Sheep Mountain lies in the depression of the Bighorn Basin surrounded by mountains and plateaus.

Sheep Mountain is an impressive sight, rising some 1,000 feet above the immediately surrounding and relatively low-lying country. The sides of the mountain reveal successive layers of multi-colored rock, beginning at the bottom with a gray limestone of Mississippian Age, continuing with bright red sandstone of the Triassic Period through green and yellow shales of the Jurassic, and ending in rather dark and drab Cretaceous sediments. The Bighorn River, as it flows northward through the Bighorn Basin, has cut a deep canyon directly across Sheep Mountain. This deep, narrow canyon provides a natural trench or cross section across the mountain in which one may view the structure of the rocks.

The structure of the mountain as clearly shown in the canyon is that of a relatively large upfold of bedded sedimentary rocks. The upfold, or anticline, is convex upward and both limbs or sides of the fold dip away from one another in opposite directions. Walking through the canyon, one can readily trace indi-

vidual strata or beds from one side of the fold to the other. This anticline, which can be so easily traced both at the surface and in cross section at the canyon, represents one of the principal types of structures formed during mountain-building movements, which add to the construction of the landscape.

Equally obvious in the vicinity of Sheep Mountain are the results of erosion which, through the action of wind and water, cause destruction of the landscape of the fold on the sides of the mountain. observe that sedimentary rock layers, which once were continuous over the fold, have been worn away and only their truncated beds are found on each limb of the fold on the sides of the mountain. The mountain owes its topographic expression to a very resistant sequence of beds which are now exposed over most of the crest of the fold. Erosive forces active even today can be seen at work destroying this fold which was formed millions of years ago.

Numerous heart-shaped patches are cut through the resistant beds on the mountain and mark the sites of intermittent streams which during flash storms carry water and cut ever deeper into the core of the fold, exposing older rocks to erosion. Gravity, along with water runoff, causes the endless downward movement of rock fragments and particles to the flanks of the fold. The Bighorn River, while cutting the canyon ever deeper across the fold, carries off particles and fragments that have moved downslope from the mountain itself. All these processes of destruction act very slowly, but they have greatly reduced the original size of the fold over the millions of years since its formation.

Sheep Mountain thus represents an unusual exposure of a breached, topographically expressed anticline where the results of both the constructive and destructive forces that shape the face of the earth can be easily observed. This area presents such excellent possibilities for depicting many significant geologic processes that Sheep Mountain has been cited in Life magazine in the series "The World We Live In" and in college historical geology textbooks. The area has been mapped, geologically, by the U.S. Geological Survey. In addition, Sheep Mountain has been visited by numerous oil company geologists making detailed stratigraphic studies and by students from many universities across the country in connection with summer field studies.

Today, Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce legislation designed to establish Sheep Mountain as a National Monument in the State of Wyoming.

This proposed legislation would preserve this site for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations and would provide another link in this historic and scenic chain of Teton National Park, Yellowstone National Park, Bighorn National Recreation Area, Custer Battlefield National Monument, Devils Tower National Monument, the Black Hills, and Mount Rushmore.

August 2, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4083

## Overcrowding at National Airport

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1966

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, two recent editorials in the Washington Post point out clearly the dangers of overcrowding at Washington National Airport. Without advocating the resumption of the ban on jets at National—and it may be that this is the only real solution—I have urged airline officials, the Federal Aviation Agency, and the Civil Aeronautics Board, to divert this jet traffic away from the densely populated urban areas that surround National.

Friendship and Dulles were planned in sparsely populated areas to lessen the danger to residents, and to limit the noise factor associated with jets to rural areas.

I am sure we can all recall what happened in Buckroe Beach, Va., just a short time ago when a military trainer crashed and devastated a block of homes. I do not want to hang black crepe. But I do want to stress the horror of such a possibility right here in this area.

As members of the highest deliberative body in our country, as leaders in our own communities, as men capable of thinking through problems and anticipating ramifications, we cannot close our eyes to the serious threat being perpetrated just across the river by this senseless overcrowding. It has even been rumored that we should open Bolling and Andrews to take care of some of this jet traffic, because of their longer runways. The plain truth, gentlemen, is that there is only a limited amount of air space above our Capitol and longer runways is not going to be the solution.

We have Friendship and Dulles airports, both underused and capable of increasing the volume of traffic they now handle. The other day I introduced a bill to authorize a comprehensive study of rapid ground transportation linking these airports to the downtown areas of Baltimore and Washington. As thinking men and responsible citizens, we must find a solution before it is too late.

At this point, I would like to share these editorials from the Washington Post with my colleagues and with permission granted I insert them in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 28, 1966]

## TRAFFIC AT NATIONAL

The Federal Aviation Agency, batted back and forth like a shuttle-cock between the airlines and Midwest members of the congressional Tuesday to Thursday club, has issued a new order limiting flights at Washington National Airport.

It provides no permanent solution either for National or for the air traffic pattern of this area. The new order will impose a limit of 40 operations an hour. This is four less than the volume desired by the airlines. And, of course, it abandons the 500 mile

limit and permits several schedules in excess of 650 miles.

The daily operations will be limited to 600. Without the limitations, according to FAA, the number would have risen to 760. Within the instrument limit of 60 an hour there can be 40 airlines operations, 16 general aviation operations and four air-taxi flights.

If the airlines can agree on the allocation of the available operations—and they have not done so yet—the volume will exceed the amount of traffic that ought to be allowed in and out of National. This amount of business still will overburden the facilities at the airport, oppress the residents of the community with an intolerable amount of noise and inconvenience, those who travel by air and those who do not, throughout the metropolitan area. The time will arrive when no city will tolerate the risks and hazards of increasing traffic over built-up urban areas. This city would not do so if it had self-government. Any elected government would promptly close National or limit its use to general aviation and move the airlines to Dulles International Airport.

The new rule, no doubt, will move back to National a number of schedules that would go to Dulles under a 500 mile limitation. The finest airport in the world will continue to be only partially utilized. The convenience of Congressmen and airline operators has won out over the comfort, safety and convenience of citizens. Residents of the District are not totally without means of showing their own preference. They cannot vote, but they can "vote with their feet" by using the services available at Dulles International Airport and Friendship Airport. The last word has not yet been said on Washington National Airport. Sooner or later, the great volume of Washington traffic will be moved to an airport that is convenient, comfortable, commodious and safe.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 22, 1966]

## BAN THE JETS

The Federal Aviation Agency is being so unmercifully pressured by Congress and by the airlines industry to relax current restrictions on jet use of National Airport that it ought to reconsider the decision which opened National to jet use on April 24.

The initial decision of General William McKee was commended by this newspaper. But the commendation rested on the assumption that jet traffic could be kept by regulation at a level consistent with the convenience, comfort and safety of the community. As soon as any jet traffic became possible, the industry proved itself incapable of keeping the volume within reasonable limits without arbitrary Federal controls. And as soon as FAA imposed arbitrary Federal controls, confining National's use to originating and terminating flights of less than 500 miles, the airlines and Congress set up intolerable clamor for alteration. It is pretty clearly indicated by this deplorable experience that the airlines, animated by a passion for volume and Congressmen solely concerned with their own convenience are not going to permit intelligent limitations on jet use of National. General McKee ought to go back and start all over again, beginning with no jet flights at all into National.

The CAA first recommended a second Washington airport in 1949. The demand for another and safer airport was greatly sharpened when, a little later, a Bolivian military plane collided with a passenger transport. The community was frightened at one point by the report of 33 near misses in a year at WNA.

Now it is argued that the accelerated traffic at National has not brought movements up to the 1959 peak—but the 1959 peak was not satisfactory or safe. And the type of aircraft now involved present greater difficulties

than the piston aircraft of 1959. It looks as though neither the airlines nor the Congressmen will be content with a limited jet use of National. An unlimited use will impose hardships on passengers, as it did a few weeks ago. And ultimately it will involve genuine risks to passengers and to the citizens in the densely populated urban areas that surround National. It will certainly result in delays by stacked aircraft waiting to land and by overcrowded luggage facilities and congested parking conveniences. Of course, many Congressmen are able to escape some of the ground inconveniences by VIP treatment, but rank and file users without congressional prerogatives cannot by-pass these annoyances and delays.

The traveling public apart, the citizens of this city have a great stake in the way National is used. Only some seven per cent of the population ever travels by air. And the non-flying majority of the public has its rights to air space over the great cities. They ought to have a voice in decisions that deluge their communities with sound, blacken them with soot and threaten them with the worst consequences of air disasters involving crashes in built-up regions. All in all, it looks as though the FAA ought to go back to its point of departure—the ban on jets at National in effect before April 4.

If FAA is coerced by the pressures of Congressmen and airline operators into promoting, against its judgment, an unlimited use of National, with all the hazards entailed, it will be a sorry day. The names of those who have pushed FAA into such a capitulation ought to be set in standing type in every newspaper in the country, to be held for the day when the inevitable air tragedy occurs. And then these names could be promptly and appropriately published along with other "causes" for the disaster.

## Hanoi Risks Brink if It Mistreats U.S. Prisoners

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, a recent Sacramento Bee editorial points out the grave consequences to North Vietnam should the Hanoi government attempt to try American prisoners as war criminals. I commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Sacramento Bee, July 22, 1966]

HANOI RISKS BRINK IF IT MISTREATS U.S. PRISONERS

The threat of North Viet Nam to try American prisoners as criminals poses both a tremendous threat to world peace and the risk to communism of having its tactics of aggression exposed for what they really are.

The greatest threat is to North Viet Nam, for the United States has left no doubt that the suggested breach of the Geneva conventions in force since 1864 will have the gravest consequences. These conventions spell out the obligation of warring nations to accord their enemies humane and healing treatment.

North Viet Nam has argued that the present strife in Viet Nam is not a war but merely a political struggle into which the United States has illegally intruded itself.

The world may be forced finally to confront the tactics of the Communists and to

A4084

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

August 2, 1966

call them by their right name. All over the world for more than two decades the Reds have been seeking to expand their sway by subversion, civil strife and infiltration.

Oh, this is not war, they cry, despite the fact the guns sound like war, the dead and dying make it indistinguishable from war and the planes bomb and spray bullets just as they do in war. It is war, all right, but the Reds have hoped to hide behind the technicality of their jargon and their deception to escape the responsibilities of war.

In line with their disclaimers of war the Hanoi government has refused the International Red Cross access to prisoners, to North Viet Nam territory and to that held by their puppets, the Viet Cong in South Viet Nam.

When U Thant, United Nations secretary general, urged "all sides" to comply with the Geneva conventions, he demonstrated that the chief peace enforcement body in the world regards the war in Viet Nam as just that war.

Already the North Vietnamese have trundled American prisoners through the streets just as savage, uncultured nations and barbarians used to do.

Hanoi by treating American prisoners like criminals can only unite America against North Viet Nam and shatter all hopes for a negotiated peace. Hanoi may be trading on dissent over Viet Nam within the U.S. Let it treat American prisoners cruelly and it will find it has done more to quell that dissent than anything else could have done. Nations before have underestimated America at the price of their final destruction.

### One Standard for All

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1966

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, one of the primary concerns of the American people is the quality and effectiveness of modern drugs. The organ for the Federal Government responsible for policing the drug industry to insure that the drugs which reach the public are safe and effective is the Food and Drug Administration. Its Commissioner, Dr. James L. Goddard, is a very competent and highly principled man. He has been working hard to provide the public with the safest and best drugs we can get.

On June 8, 1966, he made a speech at the annual meeting and seminar of the Drug & Allied Products Guild in Ellenville, N.Y., entitled "One Standard for All." In this speech Dr. Goddard declared that only one standard will be used to enforce the law against all the drug companies, big and small alike. He remarked that the Food and Drug Administration will never interpret the law so as to deliberately stifle research on new drugs. He also discussed the matter of manufacturing practice in which both large and small companies share the burden of an unsatisfactory performance.

It is a revealing and informative speech. It clarifies the position of the Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration and shows what must be done to provide the people with the best

and safest possible drugs. The speech follows:

#### ONE STANDARD FOR ALL

(Address by James L. Goddard, M.D., Commissioner of Food and Drugs)

As you know, these have been very busy weeks for us at the Food and Drug Administration. Our friends in Congress have been quite interested in us lately, and this is good. This is as it should be.

Yesterday and today we appeared before Representative L. H. FOUNTAIN of North Carolina. You are probably familiar with the "Fountain Committee." Representative FOUNTAIN is Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations. He has given us the opportunity on three occasions, since I became Commissioner last January, to lay the facts of our operations before him and the Members of his Subcommittee.

Frankly, we welcome this kind of assignment. It makes me and my staff take a second, hard look at what we are doing and how we are doing it.

I'm sure many of you here this evening have been told by an accountant or treasurer or legal counselor or brother-in-law to take stock of your business situation—to take a look at your books and your inventory and weigh these against the kinds of decisions you've been making.

It may be an uncomfortable assignment sometimes. But very good organization—in or out of Government—should go through it at least a couple of times a year.

In our case, we have found that our control over Investigational New Drugs has not been all that the public should expect. The reasons are many, but I won't bore you now with a recitation of them. I can tell you, however, that I am not satisfied either with our performance or with the drug industry's performance in this matter.

During this coming fiscal year, and for succeeding years, more of our field staff will routinely review the activities of an increasing number of clinical investigators listed by IND sponsors. Our agency needs to have a clearer understanding of what clinical investigators are doing. We intend to get it.

We have already brought to light one incident in which a research group, regularly used by manufacturers to do clinical research on new drugs, furnished false data to manufacturers for use in support of IND's. The group worked for 80 different manufacturers, large and small.

We have issued one notice, proposed withdrawal of an NDA and have asked three other manufacturers to come through with replacement data or face the loss of their NDA's, also. Nor does this end the affair. The research group—known as Cass Research Associates, Inc., of Cambridge, Massachusetts—has been in this field since before the passage of Kefauver-Harris. So you can see the problem we are faced with.

We will place additional people to work on this problem as of the beginning of fiscal 1967—that is, beginning next month.

Let me reinforce this message if I can. I think it is important because of the massive effort industry is putting into new drug research. Manufacturers of every size and specialty are investing in the future.

In 1955, manufacturers put about 91 million dollars into research and development for new human ethical products. Ten years later, 1965, the figure climbed to an estimated 317 million dollars for human ethical drugs, with an additional 22 million dollars going to back up the new and growing veterinary ethical market.

We are aware, of course, that this vast research effort in ethical is largely due to the increased demand made by the public for more sophisticated, more effective, more carefully targeted drugs. The public expects the doctor to be able to prescribe such a drug.

The public is willing to pay for it, whether directly out-of-pocket or indirectly through private or government health insurance.

In addition, I think we must recognize that the medical profession itself has been keeping up the pressure for more and better products.

Therefore, at this time I think it would be appropriate for me to make two flat statements that reflect fundamental policy of the Food and Drug Administration as long as I am its Commissioner:

First, we will never interpret the law in such a way as to deliberately stifle research on new drugs.

Second, we will never use more than one standard in the enforcement of the law and regulations entrusted to us.

There may be disagreements between the FDA and industry on our interpretation of law. There may be disagreements on the standard of enforcement we adopt.

But let me emphasize that we wish neither to inhibit research nor discriminate against any single company or group of companies. I believe we can serve the public interest to the fullest extent and still maintain those two fundamental policy positions.

I make this point specifically before this group, gentlemen, because I know you may feel your group has problems that are different from the problems in other groups; basically they are not different, in my opinion. You may recall the message I carried to the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association in April. The audience was comprised of executives representing the major pharmaceutical companies in the world.

My speech was not an easy one to deliver, at it was not easy to receive. But since then I have been encouraged; many leaders in the PMA have said both privately and publicly that they were going to press for better clinical investigations, better NDA material, a more responsible approach in advertising, and a general lifting of standards throughout the industry.

While we have appreciated these sentiments, we have continued, nevertheless, to carry out the law as the agency sees it. There is, of course, no moratorium. Nor can there be—and I am happy to report that no one has been foolish enough to even ask for one.

I have been told, however, that the approach of the Food and Drug Administration is one that favors the big corporation; that our approach demands costly IND work, costly NDA preparation, costly advertising talent; and that on a dollar basis, the FDA is pricing the smaller firm out of the market.

Let me answer, first, that we will not enforce the law in a strong manner among large companies and enforce it in a weakened manner among small companies. There is one law and there will be one standard of enforcement: we will not discriminate among companies.

Secondly, we all know that there is waste right now in the IND and NDA stages because work presented to us is poorly done. I believe our approach will stimulate better animal work, better clinical work, and the introduction of the same number—or possibly more—really new drugs per year than otherwise.

And these drugs will cause their sponsoring companies fewer problems in the future, than if our agency relaxed its vigilance at any stage or at any time in the drug development process. I need not remind this group what a drug withdrawal or recall can cost. And I need not remind you that many of these withdrawals and recalls can be traced back to sloppy work at the IND and NDA stages.

Now let me turn to another area which we must discuss candidly. This is the area of manufacturing practice. After all the research effort, after the clinical work and