

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 114—PART 6

MARCH 18, 1968, TO MARCH 27, 1968

(PAGES 6737 TO 8056)

regard Vietnam as a safe, limited, "mini-war", which could be prosecuted with little serious effect on life at home or events in other parts of the world. But, now—like the egg of the cuckoo bird—the mini-war in Vietnam has hatched into a monstrosity which threatens to eat us out of house and home.

Despite Dean Rusk's professed continuing confidence that Vietnam is the most manageable of all our post-war confrontations with the communists, I believe that the earlier "margins of safety" have largely been dissipated by the escalations of the past year.

The mood of the people of the U.S. is such as to deprive comfort to anyone espousing the theory that we should wait until after the November elections before acting to change our policy. The American people are ready, I believe, for a genuine compromise settlement of a reasonable character. If that cannot be obtained despite sincere overtures, the same movement among the people could express itself in demands for much higher and determined escalation. The people want to feel that we are now working to attain at least the beginning of the end of our struggle in Vietnam.

In short, the present ongoing glacial movement in the American body politics is to seek to end the stalemate in Vietnam. Any enemy assuming that this means we will simply give up, is an enemy taking a big gamble indeed. The power and the resolution of the U.S. remain incredibly great. It would be unwise for any enemy to overlook this reality.

While the dilemma of what to do about Vietnam has become very acute for us, the Soviet Union faces an equally acute dilemma. Despite the fact that the USSR is not directly engaged in Vietnam—as we are—the Soviets have contributed in a big way to the dangers to world peace which the Vietnam war now poses so menacingly.

Leaving aside for the moment the mistakes we have made in Vietnam—and there have been many—the direct danger to world peace stems from the attempt of small North Vietnam to inflict a humiliating defeat on the world's greatest power—the United States. Hanoi's intransigence in refusing to go to the negotiating table, and Hanoi's arrogance in thinking that it can win its own terms on the battle field in Vietnam—these are the root dangers to world peace in the Vietnam war.

There is no doubt in my mind that the U.S. has also been ill-advised in believing that we could totally thwart Ho Chin Minh's political aspirations in South Vietnam by limited American military intervention. The U.S. also has been grievously mistaken in thinking that we could create, by an act of our own will, a viable anti-communist democracy in a South Vietnamese society which lacks the elementary attributes of nationhood.

But for all of our sometimes naive self-confidence and our inclination toward overhasty action, the U.S. is, above all, fair-minded and instinctively willing to find compromise settlements to human disagreements.

Hanoi's intransigence, and the dangers of its effort to inflict a military defeat on the U.S., have been made possible by the continuing flow of sophisticated weapons it receives from the Soviet Union. By equipping Hanoi with a highly sophisticated air defense system, and by providing the new weapons systems which made the Tet Offensive possible, the USSR has made itself a party to Hanoi's standpatism.

I do not believe that there is any significant segment of the population of this country which is prepared to accept Hanoi's contemptuous terms for peace in Vietnam. I trust that this is understood by the wiser and more responsible heads in the Kremlin.

It is in this context that the USSR faces a dilemma as acute as our own, with regard to

what happens next in Vietnam. *Unless there is a move toward negotiation and de-escalation, the war could expand in every dimension, including a widening of the ground war into Laos, Cambodia and perhaps North Vietnam itself.*

Whatever satisfaction the USSR has derived hitherto from our disappointment and frustration in Vietnam, I do not believe that Party Chairman Brezhnev and Premier Kosygin could view the prospect of a significant expansion of the Vietnam war with anything but the most serious sense of anxiety and foreboding.

Therefore there is not only the desirability but the necessity of enlisting the USSR in the search for a negotiated compromise settlement. I use the word "compromise" advisedly here. In my judgment there can be no peace so long as the Administration stubbornly seeks to defeat Hanoi and the Vietcong militarily and totally to thwart their political aspirations. It is just not reasonable for us to expect that the USSR will acquiesce in—or contribute to—by pressure and withholding of arms—the total "defeat" of communist North Vietnam.

What needs to be defused on both sides is the symbolism of "defeat" and "victory." I think it is in this area that the deficiencies of Secretary Rusk's and President Johnson's handling of Vietnam have been gravest. Against all wisdom, they have continued to escalate the alleged "stakes" at issue in Vietnam. The more apparent it has become that our objectives were unrealistic, the more they have insisted that fulfillment of those goals was necessary to the security of the world and the prestige and honor of the U.S. By constantly proclaiming to the world that our pledged word elsewhere would be meaningless if we did not stand in Vietnam to the last ditch and that the deterrent effect of military power is essential to avoid collapse in South and Southeast Asia—ideas that surely never occurred seriously to others before we proclaimed them—President Johnson and Secretary Rusk have really complicated the problem of a peace settlement.

Aside from the foregoing, and the exaggerated ideological significance which Mao Tse Tung has attempted to give it—an effort which the Administration has so eagerly abetted—the conflict in Vietnam should really be an obscure struggle between contending indigenous strong-arm bands for political control of the remnants of France's Asian jungle colony.

South Vietnam has no intrinsic strategic importance either to the U.S. or the USSR. I seriously doubt that Kremlin ideological sophisticates have any more confidence in Ho Chi Minh's "true faith" as an apostle of Lenin than ADA President Kenneth Galbraith has in General Thieu's fidelity to the philosophy of Thomas Jefferson.

Accordingly, I see this course for the U.S. to adopt:

First, is to signal to the Soviet Union that Hanoi's effort to inflict a humiliating defeat on the U.S.—with Soviet-supplied armaments—is utterly unacceptable and has brought matters to a dangerous stage which could lead to a serious widening of the war and produce grave risks for all concerned.

Second, notwithstanding our earlier ideological hyperbole we should tell Moscow the U.S. in fact is prepared to negotiate a real compromise settlement, and that the USSR can bring this about.

The fact of the matter is that only the USSR has the leverage at this time in Hanoi, and that we cannot get peace in Vietnam without the cooperation of Russia. As I have pointed out, the USSR has its own inducements in the situation to move it away from a big power confrontation. The challenge and the opportunity to our diplomacy is to enlist Soviet cooperation in the search for peace, in a way which commits and at the same time contributes to Soviet prestige and

Soviet national interest in a durable compromise settlement.

I have made this suggestion previously several times on the Senate floor—last on February 5—in a less comprehensively developed way and in perhaps less urgent and auspicious circumstances.

I am very pleased to note that one of the leading contenders for our party's Presidential nomination—former Vice-President Nixon—has taken up this idea and added his own thoughts to it.

Also, it is significant to note that in his foreign policy declarations, Governor Rockefeller—whom as is well known, I have urged to seek the Republican Presidential nomination—has declared his view that U.S.-USSR concurrence is essential to major steps toward peace in the world. I have little doubt that he would include the Vietnamese problem when he addresses himself to this crucial aspect of our foreign policy.

I think it is an approach which all Republicans can support and I urge that it be developed and refined as a basic element of the Republican Party's thinking on Vietnam.

CONSUMERS UNION

Mr. MONDALE, Mr. President, recently the National Observer published an excellent article by Mr. John Morton concerning the activities of Consumers Union. This organization has, for a number of years, been at the forefront of efforts to provide American consumers with objective and impartial appraisals of a wide range of products. The product evaluations and comparisons presented in the organization's publication, Consumer Reports, have gained extensive public confidence and, consequently, have prompted manufacturers to correct product deficiencies and advertise products more directly on their merits.

The mobilization of consumer interest in recent years has had a marked influence on public policy. A number of important pieces of consumer legislation have become law in recent years largely as a result of the interest generated by such efforts as those undertaken by Consumers Union. The strong amendments to the Federal Meat Inspection Act adopted in 1967 are the most recent example of the great power possessed by the consuming public when it makes its wishes known in no uncertain terms.

Mr. President, I commend this excellent review of the activities of Consumers Union to the Senate and ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the National Observer, Feb. 26, 1968]
PRODUCTS PUT TO THE TEST—CONSUMER REPORTS: READ, RESPECTED, AND FEARED

MOUNT VERNON, N.Y.—Everything is fair game to Consumer Reports.

A target can be as prosaic as canned orange juice (most was judged pretty poor) or as venerated as the life-insurance industry. It can be as specialized as the high-fidelity component industry or as vast as the Federal Government, an agency of which the magazine plans to sue on the ground it is withholding consumer information.

In recent months, Consumer Reports has told its 1,250,000 subscribers that: The Rambler Ambassador and Chevrolet

Chevelle are "unacceptable" on safety grounds. An investigation into the television-repair industry shows "fraud is rife." Federal controls on the health aspects of the cigaret industry are "a sick joke so far."

In the March issue, a test of high-fidelity tape recorders will reveal a model costing \$179.50 that Consumer Reports says is far superior to others costing twice as much or more. An article on exercise and heart disease will contain worrisome statistics for those who, to paraphrase the magazine, propose to remain sedentary until they become permanently recumbent.

A TARGET FOR CRITICS

This independent, irreverent approach to all things has won Consumer Reports influence and dedicated readers. It has also brought it ample criticism.

The magazine has been accused of being political, prejudiced against business, and slipshod in its tests. It has even been accused of being a Communist front; for a time in the early 1950s it appeared on a list of subversive organizations maintained by the House Un-American Activities Committee, from which it was removed in 1954 after a hearing before the committee.

Declares a spokesman for the photographic industry who is dismayed over the magazine's influence: "If you don't do well in Consumer Reports, it's like having your throat cut."

The reverse can also be true. A Norge executive once said a favorable rating "put us in the washing-machine business."

The headquarters for this monthly round of exhortation and occasional praise is a collection of old factory buildings in an industrial suburb of New York City. It is here that Consumers Union (CU), the membership corporation that publishes Consumer Reports, maintains five laboratories and editorial, market-research, and circulation offices. There also is an auto-testing facility in Lime Rock, Conn. Employes number 300, including 40 engineers and an editorial staff of 12.

Walker Sandbach, a baldish, 51-year-old Midwesterner has been executive director of CU since 1965. A soft-spoken, friendly man whose manner seems to encourage the first-name atmosphere that prevails at CU, he explained for a visitor how CU decides what to test and how to test it.

PICKETING THE PRODUCTS

Seventy different types of products are tested each year. Some, like automobiles and major electrical appliances, are rated annually, others less often. CU's market-research department conducts surveys to determine which brands should be tested. The major sellers will be included, along with one or two less well-known brands that offer something special in price or features. "We try to cover at least 80 per cent of the market," says Mr. Sandbach.

The product is then assigned to an engineer and a writer. The engineer determines what tests will be needed and whether an outside consultant will be necessary. The writer is kept informed of developments and eventually is given a lengthy, final engineering report. His condensation of this is reviewed by the engineer and editors before being published.

CU itself buys, through shoppers located throughout the country, the goods it tests and the equipment used to test with. Since it is nonprofit and tax-exempt, CU permits no advertising in its magazine and does not permit its ratings to be exploited by advertisers elsewhere. In almost any month, CU starts half a dozen law suits to stop such exploitation.

The money for CU's operation comes solely from subscriptions, newsstand sales, and sales of paperback books published by CU on

a variety of consumer subjects. Its budget was \$6,500,000 last year.

Mr. Sandbach is confident that circulation and hence income will continue their dramatic increases of recent years. Subscriptions climbed 300,000 in the past two years, and he expects the total to double to 2,500,000 within five years.

FINANCING A FELLOWSHIP

Some of the new income has already been committed to finance a \$10,000 fellowship in Washington for a young lawyer, who will start digging into auto safety on April 1; more fellowships will be forthcoming. Also, CU plans to establish a Washington office to expand its role as a watchdog of Federal agencies.

"There isn't any question about it, the Federal Government's role in all that we do now is such that we ought to have somebody down there watching to see what they are doing on behalf of the consumer," says Mr. Sandbach.

One sign of this closer look at Washington is the plan to sue the Veterans Administration (VA) under the new Public Information Act. The VA tests hearing aids to assure that veterans will receive the best possible models, but so far it has refused CU's requests to make the results public.

Says Mr. Sandbach: "They used the public's tax money to make the tests, and there's no reason in the world why the public shouldn't know the results. It costs us \$50,000 to test hearing aids. If the VA makes its findings public that's \$50,000 we could spend testing something else."

Automobile testing, while expensive, has had one saving factor: CU could trade in one year's models on the next year's. But testing autos could become very expensive if CU starts crash-testing for safety features, something Mr. Sandbach thinks is sorely needed. He says if the Federal Government fails to crash-test on a significant scale as part of its new concern over safety, CU probably will be compelled to. Such an expensive undertaking would make a big dent in future budgets.

An auto test in the January issue brought CU national publicity when for the first time in its history it rated a car "unacceptable" for consumer use. The car was the Rambler Ambassador sedan, which CU said leaked gas when braked from high speeds. American Motors termed the leakage insignificant but said it would alter the fuel system to correct it.

In the February issue, CU rated the Chevrolet Chevelle unacceptable for swerving uncontrollably when braked from high speeds. "Chevy engineers informed us they were unable to duplicate our results," says Mr. Sandbach. "We offered to provide them with details on how we did it but we haven't heard from them yet."

The life-insurance industry was offended by a series of articles that ran last year, then were compiled into a book. CU's principal point, based on information from consultants, was that most people would be better off if they bought simple, inexpensive term insurance instead of high-premium life policies with savings clauses. The money saved on the premium then could be invested for a better return than the life-insurance policy could offer, CU argued.

NOT FOR EVERYONE?

Insurance men complained that CU's advice was extreme in being recommended to everybody. They said it might be good advice for a sophisticated investor, but that the average person benefits from having a certain amount of his insurance premium go automatically into savings. An agent who was incensed by the articles contended that CU used loaded words and slanted phraseology—"all elements of the typical sensationalized expose"—to appraise the different types of insurance.

Robert Smith, CU's assistant director, replies that CU does not intend to steer people away from investing in life insurance if they have trouble saving otherwise. "But we do try to point out there is a very substantial difference in where his estate ends up if he has it in a policy which has a large savings segment to it at 2 or 2½ per cent, or 3 per cent at best, as against investing those same funds at 3½ or 6."

A frequent critic of CU is Frederick J. Schlink, president and technical director of the only competing product-testing organization, Consumer Research of Washington, N.J., which publishes Consumers Bulletin. Consumer Research was the pioneer in the field, being founded in 1929, seven years before CU. In fact, CU was founded by a former employe of Consumer Research, Arthur Kallet, who had sided with strikers in a labor dispute in the organization.

"THEY'RE POLITICAL"

"The main difference between us and Consumers Union is that we're nonpolitical and they're political," says Mr. Schlink. "They're not only political but left political. They carry a running fusillade against business and advertising and want more government and more things run by the Government."

Mr. Schlink says that Consumer Research, by contrast, concentrates on product testing and criticizes only those business practices it considers wrong, not business as a whole "on general principles." Safety critic Ralph Nader, who has just joined Consumer Reports' board of directors, is a recipient of Mr. Schlink's barbs as well: "We don't consider ourselves crusaders, the way Nader and Consumer Reports are." Mr. Schlink refuses to say what his magazine's circulation is; most estimates put it at 100,000.

CU has returned the fire. It has, for example, criticized an arrangement under which Consumer Research tested photographic goods for Davis Publications, Inc. The results were published in a magazine that contained advertisements exploiting the test results.

CU ran an article in Consumer Reports deploring this link to advertising. It said test organizations so far had been able to offer only a modest guide through the Alice-in-Wonderland realm of advertising claims and lamented: "To see the granddaddy of them all becoming a courtier of the Queen of Hearts, even to a limited extent, can only evoke sorrow."

Nevertheless, says a CU official, "We think they do a remarkable job considering the limited budget they have to work with."

A number of industry leaders find fault with CU's testing methods. Herbert Keppler, editor of Modern Photography magazine, complains that CU's camera-testing procedures as explained in Consumer Reports seem inadequate, especially in apparently not testing lenses at close distances. Not so, say CU engineers; lenses are tested up close. They say the tests on cameras are so thorough, in fact, that the final report often runs 40 pages and that many details have to be left out to reduce the report to the three or four pages that appear in the magazine.

But even if Mr. Keppler is a critic, neither he nor most others question CU's basic integrity and independence. Says Mr. Keppler: "My wife reads it from beginning to end, and she wouldn't think of buying an iron without consulting Consumers Union." A critic in the insurance industry says simply: "They're clean."

A major goal of CU, of course, is to help its readers get their money's worth, whether in buying goods or services. That the odds are often stacked against the customer was demonstrated by CU recently in testing the honesty of television repair men. Twenty sets with identical, uncomplicated defects were presented to 20 repairmen. The bill should have been about \$8; all but three charged inflated prices up to \$37, and many of them

charged for work that subsequent investigation showed wasn't performed.

Or consider the results on tests of tape recorders in the March issue, wherein a \$179.50 machine outperformed more expensive ones. Says Mr. Sandbach: "Now an uneducated consumer would just assume that for \$399 he was going to get more than he was going to get for \$179. I think the American public ought to have this. I think it's good for our country and our economy to have this kind of competition. The pressure is on to improve quality."

When it comes to ferreting out bargains, CU is willing to consider anything, including liquor. A panel of tasting experts gathered by CU, for example, found all Canadian and American blended whiskeys almost indistinguishable, despite prices ranging from \$4 to \$9 a fifth.

The same thing was true with vodka, except for one test sample singled out as the experts' favorite in smoothness and over-all quality. What brand was it? It wasn't vodka at all. It was a mixture of ethyl alcohol and distilled water, concocted specially by CU's technicians.

JOHN MORTON.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT MARITIME PROGRAM

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, recently the Maritime Labor-Management Unity Committee, which is comprised of some six unions and 18 shipping companies, presented their recommended program for revitalizing the U.S. merchant marine.

Revitalization of our merchant fleet is essential, and many of us in Congress have worked diligently to promote a revitalization program.

I request unanimous consent that a brochure entitled "Labor-Management Action Program for a Strong U.S. Merchant Marine," which outlines the Maritime Labor-Management Unity Committee's 15-point program, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, and I urge all Senators to carefully read and consider the proposals advanced.

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

LABOR-MANAGEMENT ACTION PROGRAM FOR A STRONG U.S. MERCHANT MARINE

To the President and the Congress:

We believe that it is imperative that our Government—the Administration and the Congress—come to grips with the Merchant Marine problem. In times past the American flag was second to none on the high seas. Today, as Senator Warren G. Magnuson has pointed out on the Senate floor:

"There is no dispute that our Merchant Marine is woefully inadequate. We are now carrying—and this is a startling figure—under 8 percent of our foreign waterborne trade. The United States has dropped to 16th in the world's shipbuilding statistics. While the world fleet increased by 61 percent in the last 15 years, America's privately owned fleet has decreased by 24.5 percent."

This deplorable condition must be corrected immediately. We must revitalize the U.S. Merchant Marine. Our national security, as well as our pressing domestic problems, characterized by the balance of payments situation, cry for action now.

To help the Administration and the Congress in its formulation of a new Merchant Marine policy and program, we, the representatives of 90 percent of maritime Labor and Management, have held a series of meetings together to formulate a joint legislative program.

We believe that the following elements of our program are essential to a sound maritime policy and legislation should incorporate these points with parity continuing to be the keystone of our national policy. An increase in the percentage of U.S. Exports and Imports carried on U.S. Flag vessels is an essential predicate.

Following we are outlining the fifteen points of a program which we believe will accomplish the task of revitalizing the U.S. Merchant Marine. We respectfully urge the Administration and the Congress to give it immediate and careful consideration.

THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

Adopted February 8, 1968.

Presented to Congress March 7, 1968.

1. Thirty-five to forty new commercial ships a year.
2. Operating differential subsidy for non-berth vessels as well as liners for foreign trade, retaining the basic parity concept.
3. A positive program for the revitalization of passenger ship fleet.
4. An extension of tax deferred construction reserve fund to all American merchant and fishing vessels.
5. A more simplified system for determining construction-differential subsidy retaining parity as a basic concept of such support.
6. Research and development funds to revitalize the Merchant Marine and expand the cargo carrying capacity of U.S. ships, with full guarantees for jobs and security for the workers to be carried out.
7. Establishment of quasi-judicial subsidy board.
8. Establishment of a revolving construction reserve fund to provide for continuing fund replenishment from customs receipts.
9. A fleet of nuclear powered vessels for foreign and domestic commerce.
10. The strengthening and full implementation of the Cargo Preference laws.
11. Opposition to the Department of Defense appropriation for the Fast Deployment Logistic Ships.
12. Support of reorganization plan to place the Maritime Administration in the Department of Transportation and Cargo Preference in Marad.
13. Support of measures (S. 2086 and S. 2087) to require U.S. citizens for replacements in foreign ports and eliminate abuses of provisional registry.
14. Support for the revitalization of the fish industry (bill to be introduced shortly).
15. The use of U.S. flag ships in greater numbers as a positive tool to help eliminate the U.S. dollar gap.

A VICTORY FOR THE CONSUMERS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the electric power consumers of America have now been relieved of the threat of extremely troublesome legislation which has been pending in the Senate Commerce Committee and was defeated by a vote against it of 13 to 5 today. The measure which threatened the interests of consumers of electricity, was the bill, S. 1365, a mischievous measure designed to permit escape of the private power companies from regulation by the Federal Power Commission. The ambiguous language of the bill obscured its real purpose which was to cause private utilities to organize distribution systems entirely within individual States and, at the same time, allow certain interconnections with other States without the supervision of regulatory provisions of the Federal Power Act.

As one who has long championed the cause of consumers of electric power and the importance of adequate regulation of

suppliers of electricity, I am very glad that, at last, the threat of regulatory exemption of the principal suppliers of power has been defeated. At a time when it is clearly in the public interest that networks of power transmission facilities be constructed throughout the Nation to prevent blackouts and breakdowns in electric service, S. 1365 would have encouraged an entirely different approach.

As for the necessity of Federal regulation of public utilities, this has been apparent since an investigation by the Federal Trade Commission pursuant to a Senate resolution in 1928 revealed to the public the shocking manner in which the electric power companies, without any regulation, had made fortunes at the expense of helpless consumers. I recounted this scandal in my book "The Public Pays," published in 1931, and republished in 1965 as "The Public Pays—And Still Pays." The battle for adequate regulation of utilities goes on through the years and those who would protect the consumers' interests must be ever vigilant.

Now those who are concerned with protecting the interests of electric power consumers may advance those interests steadily without the imminent possibility of enactment of legislation which would make their efforts increasingly difficult.

THE SILENT INVASION

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, recently there appeared in Pace magazine an article entitled "The Silent Invasion," concerning our returning young veterans from Vietnam. The article was written by Pace Associate Editor Malcolm Roberts.

As Mr. Roberts points out, the young men returning from Vietnam are not the boys who left the States 12 to 24 months previously.

He said:

As a result, though they are moving almost unnoticed into schools, jobs and politics, they could become the most powerful influence in this country.

Mr. President, I for one do hope they become an influence and I hope further that these men who have risked their lives for their country will influence many of our young people who do not fully understand the price of freedom. I congratulate Pace magazine for choosing such a worthy topic and Mr. Roberts for a job well done.

This article should be of interest to every Member of this body and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE SILENT INVASION

(By Malcolm Roberts)

Watch out, America. They're coming! The vet invasion, silent, without fanfare, has begun. Last year 609,791 discharged servicemen hit U.S. shores with a quiet yet bulldozer determination.

This year 790,000 will come, with more than a million to follow in 1969. Where are the veterans headed? What do they think? How will they affect the election of 1968?

Something happened to these men in the jungles of Vietnam that has put maturity