

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 113—PART 22

OCTOBER 18, 1967, TO OCTOBER 31, 1967

(PAGES 29209 TO 30688)

former GS-14 examiners except four, are now at the GS-15 level. We will continue to upgrade all examiners."

Now I know that some of you feel you are not yet adequately paid for the high level and most important service you render—I happen to share this view. I hope, however, you will reflect seriously on the improvements that have been made in the years that coincide with your own tenure in office.

I assure you that many of my colleagues on Capitol Hill have joined me in continuing to narrow the differential that has existed in pay available from Government and the private sector of our society. This work has not been in vain. We narrowed the gap and I promise our efforts will continue. I think the key thing to remember concerning an increase in pay is the statement by your President—

"We will, of course, be alert for any change in the present situation that could lead to realistic proposals for increased compensation."

I am sure that virtually everyone that works for a living feels proper compensation is his basic or primary goal. However, this country is beginning to realize that all Americans—regardless of occupation—must also have recognition and dignity. Dignity that stems from the knowledge that they are doing an important job—and doing it well.

Frankly, I feel the confusing title of Hearing Examiner now applied to your office should be replaced with something more accurately describing the service you perform—a title that would also dignify your office.

All too often in government today, names are changed to protect and perhaps protect the ego of the agency. However, I feel that any change that would add to the dignity and the definition of your office in the eyes of the public and those people who come before you as witnesses and litigants is certainly worthwhile. I have heard several suggestions—Administrative Judge or possibly Federal Trial Judge—both. I think, more accurately describe your work.

Whatever the title, it should lend dignity and clarification to your office. Many people do not realize who Hearing Examiners are or what their function is.

I am reminded of the time a man in a rural community read in the local newspaper where a Hearing Examiner had been assigned to a specific case. He told his friends a traveling ear specialist had come to town.

Now, I know few people would come up with that definition, but it is quite likely many more are not fully aware of the wide scope and tremendous importance of the decisions a Hearing Examiner makes. Usually, the agency you represent, state or federal, gets the credit—or the blame—but if the job is well done and credit is due, it should go to that man who is known now as a Hearing Examiner and whose title in the future should reflect this kind of contribution towards our American Government.

Let us look now at the other side of the coin and mention a word that many times seems to be forgotten in today's world—responsibility. Quite a storm raged around Administrative Law in the past. Your critics argued that administrative agencies were infringing upon the traditional function of the court system and charged with bitterness that there was a basic defect in a system that permitted one entity to act as prosecutor, judge and jury in a given case.

I feel this storm has subsided considerably and largely due to your efforts. It is tremendously important that we who work in government must remain impartial. We must eliminate the mistaken idea that administrative decisions are based on partisan politics. It should be the goal of you here today to achieve that degree of public acceptance and high respect paid to our courts and judges.

In a highly publicized decision some years

ago, involving the "Appalachian Conspiracy" and the Mafia, a U.S. Court of Appeals said, "we cannot state too strongly our view that it is incumbent for trial judges to analyze with meticulous care the evidence as to each defendant. You, as trial judges, have a grave responsibility to go over the evidence in every case you try and to relate it to the Congressional intent of the statute you interpret, rather than to render decisions on a basis of personal opinions concerning social improvement."

In essence, what I am trying to say is that your interpretation of social justice must not become the controlling reason for pronouncing our citizens in violation of administrative law as a substitute for adequate evidence and proof of the violation.

I have a pretty strong conviction that no court can be better than the judge presiding over it and that no quasi-judicial system or Administrative Process can be any better than the individual or the Board or the Commission that renders the decision. It seems certain to me that no one individual has as great an impact on the end result of the whole Administrative Process as the Hearing or Trial Examiner who makes the initial decision.

The importance of what you ladies and gentlemen are doing really becomes significant when we realize the Administrative Process reaches into our lives and affects each and every one of us in the vital problem areas of what we shall eat—what we shall wear—what we shall earn—and under what conditions we shall work. Every step that you take must be with the highest integrity—the greatest ability—and the fairest sense of justice.

Reflecting upon the importance of your task, it becomes obvious to me that you should be adequately paid—that you should enjoy the recognition and dignity that your performance of this most difficult and important job deserves—that you should be provided with the appropriate facilities needed to render your services at a maximum level of performance.

Too often we take the obvious for granted however. I acknowledge that it is one of my duties and the duty of each of my colleagues to keep in close touch with the requirements necessary for trial judges to continue to do such a fine job.

When I started this talk, I made a mental note that I wouldn't try to outtalk a group of talented lawyers. It occurs to me that perhaps I have already spoken too long and said far too little.

I want to say though, that I have really enjoyed being here with you—that I appreciate so much having been invited—and that I personally have a keen respect for the most important and vital job that you are doing.

We are both so very lucky. You as lawyers—and more precisely as lawyers who exercise your legal skill as judges—and I as a member of that great lawmaking body called the United States Senate, are both engaged in activities unexcelled in the opportunities they afford to be of service to mankind.

There can be no finer service or occupation than guaranteeing to all men everywhere, reasonable justice, personal liberty and a favorable climate and situation in which every individual can secure for himself and his family the fruits of a life well lived.

This is your purpose and your function. It is also mine. I pledge to you my continued support of your activity and congratulate you for what you have done and what you will continue to do.

JEWES IN THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, this year the Soviet Union celebrates the 50th anniversary of the revolution which brought its present form of government to power.

It is a time for Russians to look back at what they have accomplished and to look forward to what may be possible. Taking stock is serious business for a great power in a world which depends for its future existence on improving international relationships.

Still unaccomplished in the Soviet Union is the complete guarantee of rights to 3 million Jewish citizens who seek nothing more than to be allowed to be Jews. Although there has been considerable progress in recent years, Soviet Jews who wish to practice their religion and cultural tradition are still not as free to do so as other minority groups in that country.

Publication of devotional literature and production of devotional articles are both restricted. Official communication with Jews throughout the world is prohibited, in contrast to the practice with other religious groups. Study at home and abroad for prospective religious leaders is almost completely prohibited, and worship facilities themselves are becoming increasingly inadequate.

Jews who wish to leave the country are kept from doing so, and Jews are discouraged from holding significant positions in and out of government. In short, there is still an important difference in the Soviet Union between the treatment of Jews and the treatment of other minority groups.

Mr. President, it is difficult to understand why this should be true. Soviet ideology condemns anti-Semitism, and officially there is no rationale in Russia for discrimination against Jews. Still, even though the treatment of Jews in the Soviet Union today bears no resemblance to earlier persecution there and elsewhere, Russian Jews remain a disadvantaged minority—with restrictions which affect the practices and traditions which are vital to their continuing existence as Jews.

The desire of Russian Jews to be Jewish is certainly no threat to the Soviet structure. It is difficult to see why Soviet Jews should be denied the rights afforded other religious and ethnic groups.

Mr. President, every great nation of the world has much to accomplish in guaranteeing the rights of minorities of all kinds. Let us hope that one manifestation of continuing progress toward a better world will be the relief of discrimination against Jews in the Soviet Union.

THE CHAMIZAL TREATY: NOT AN END, BUT A BEGINNING

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, this Saturday will be a historic day in my State, and a landmark day in the history of cooperation and friendship between the people of Mexico and of the United States. On Saturday, President Lyndon B. Johnson of the United States and President Gustavo Diaz Ordaz of Mexico will meet on a piece of land between the cities of El Paso, Tex., and Ciudad Juarez, Chihuahua. The land is called "El Chamizal" by the Mexicans, which means "the thicket."

The two Presidents will sign the final acts carrying out the Chamizal Treaty, finalizing an agreement that stems from