

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

18379

eligibility. This would not operate, however, in contributory pension plans until an individual receiving pension on October 31, 1964, had recouped his contribution.

Second, amounts paid by the veteran for the last illness and burial of his deceased spouse or child.

Third, profit from the disposition of real or personal property other than in the course of business.

Fourth, payments received as a result of jury duty or other obligatory civic obligations.

Fifth, payments under the war orphans educational assistance program.

Sixth, bonus or similar payments from a State.

Section 2 removes the requirement that a child file a report every year showing annual income received during the preceding year.

Section 3: Under Veterans' Administration pension regulations a veteran, in order to receive pension at age 65, in addition to meeting the income requirements must be unemployable, and have a 10-percent disability. Section 3 would remove the requirement of a 10-percent disability as well as unemployability attributed thereto.

Section 4 provides increases in benefits which are modest but when coupled with income exclusions approved in this bill will increase most pensions.

Section 5 increases the additional allowance for aid and attendance cases from \$70 to \$100.

Section 6 provides a new rate of \$35 additional to any veteran who is permanently housebound.

Section 7. Existing law excludes \$1,200 of the wife's income and counts the balance in determining the veteran's eligibility for pension where the veteran is married. The amendment would exclude \$1,200 or all earned income, whichever is the greater.

Section 8 provides the same sort of protection for the non-service-connected aid and attendance pension cases as is now available for the service-connected cases receiving compensation under 38 United States Code 314(r). That is, the allowance shall not be discontinued until the first day of the second calendar month which begins after the date of the admission for VA hospitalization rather than immediately as is the case today. This section also makes similar provisions for aid and attendance compensation allowances under provisions other than 314(r).

Section 9 authorizes individuals who are receiving aid and attendance pension allowances provided by 38 United States Code 521(d) to be furnished drugs or medicine which are prescribed by a physician.

Section 10 makes a technical correction to existing law to make certain that a widow may not receive more than an award of death pension on account of the service of her husband in more than one war.

Section 11 permits the same 10-percent exclusion factor described in section 1 for the "old law" cases—pensioners under law in effect on June 30, 1960.

Section 12. The bill is generally effective January 1, 1965, except that the section relating to recoupment shall not apply to any individual receiving pension on October 31, 1964, until his contributions have been recouped.

In addition to the increase in benefits, there are many other improvements which are contained in H.R. 1927, in particular, as they affect needy veterans who also need medical attention.

Mr. Speaker, I am and always will be a fiscal conservative. I think that reckless spending policies of our Federal Government have done as much to work a hardship on our senior citizens, veterans and nonveterans alike, as any other factor. Wise fiscal policies strengthen the dollar and preserve purchasing power, thereby protecting those who live on fixed incomes. At the same time, I look on veterans' pensions as an obligation of our Government, and in this obligation we should not pinch. It has been 4 years since the last pension increase, and neither that increase nor the one contemplated in this bill is substantial. I have supported all veterans' measures during my 4 years in Congress and intend to continue these efforts if I return to this body in January.

I particularly have an affection for the causes of the veterans and enjoy working on their claims. Many hundreds of them have been assisted by our office. My father was known as "Pension Bill" during his 20 years in the House representing the same district, the 17th of Ohio. During his day, most pensions were private bills, and the Member, therefore, took a personal interest in every single veteran pension. Now we have general statutes which grant benefits to entire classes of veterans, and we do not require specific legislation for individual veterans. Possibly this is why we are not as mindful as we should be of the limited nature of veterans' benefits. As any rate, I am glad we were able to make this much deserved improvement in non-service-connected benefits, and I hope that the Senate will promptly pass H.R. 1927 so that its provisions will be available to our veterans in January of next year.

ANNUAL INCOME LIMITATIONS FOR SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFICIARIES

(Mr. GURNEY (at the request of Mr. SCHWEIKER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation designed to raise the annual income limitations for social security beneficiaries from \$1,200 to \$1,800 and to reduce from 72 to 70 the age at which such deductions cease to be made.

My bill will amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide these changes for our senior citizens.

I have long been concerned with this problem. Our senior citizens want to be productive, but provisions in the existing law hamper their ambition.

These provisions tend to hold down

the ambition of our senior citizens who have been so loyal to their country and have contributed to the great growth of this powerful Nation.

Moreover, with the constantly rising cost of living, this bill would permit our senior citizens to augment their earnings and income. This is badly needed.

Too often in dealing with the everyday problems of governing this Nation, the Congress is negligent when it comes to considering the needs of senior citizens. Too often these patriotic Americans, in their twilight, are shunted in the rush of everyday life.

This legislation I have introduced today will hopefully help meet the problem facing our senior citizens. JN

TO PROMOTE THE MAINTENANCE OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

(Mr. BARRY (at the request of Mr. SCHWEIKER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, Kenneth T. Young, Jr., has made a strong endorsement of the congressional resolution to promote the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia. Mr. Young speaks as the former U.S. Ambassador to Thailand and U.S. representative to SEATO.

At this time I would like to submit Mr. Young's recent letter outlining the urgency of the action taken by this body on Friday, August 7 in unanimously approving House Joint Resolution 1145.

AUGUST 6, 1964.

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: I am writing you in strong support of the proposed joint resolution on southeast Asia which the President submitted to both Houses of the Congress on August 5. This resolution is both timely and urgent.

It is particularly significant that in section 2 the Congress, representing a united people, informs the world that the "United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia." From my recent experience in southeast Asia, I became convinced some time ago, as I have previously written you, that such a legislative declaration would help prevent war, secure peace and stabilize progress with protection in Vietnam and the other free states of southeast Asia. An independent, peaceful southeast Asia is vital to the peace and safety of Asia, the Pacific countries, and the United States.

I also welcome the resolution to take such steps as are necessary to prevent further aggression and to use our Armed Forces to help our treaty allies and friends—such as Thailand and Vietnam—defend themselves. While the President's firm deliberative actions and a congressional declaration may hopefully deter hostilities, we all must be prepared in the immediate future for a very unpleasant deterioration in southeast Asia and the necessity for the American people united together to take stern effective action to achieve our objectives with success.

I for one would hope that the task in Vietnam and southeast Asia could now become an American challenge for all of us to meet together for the duration until that success is ours—and theirs.

Much political, social, and economic reconstruction remains to be done there. A whole new movement of popular resurgence will come if there is freedom from terror and bullying. There is much constructive work for the United Nations to do there too. I am gratified that the final section of the proposed resolution recognizes that too.

Perhaps a stand of firmness now will open ways later for southeast Asia to become an international sanctuary of true peace and progress for the new younger generation in the cities and schools, the millions of farmers and their families, and the many different minorities. But only a declaration of our vital concern and a demonstration of our resolute determination will make this promise possible.

I hope this proposed resolution passes both Houses unanimously.

With best regards.

Sincerely,

KENNETH T. YOUNG, Jr.,
Former U.S. Ambassador to Thailand
and U.S. Representative to SEATO.

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 202 I am recorded as absent. I was here and answered to my name. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD and JOURNAL be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

THE MILITARY MAN—OUR BEST INVESTMENT IN THE CAUSE OF PEACE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

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

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker—

You have not been mistaken in supposing my views and feelings to be in favor of the abolition of war. I hope it is practicable, by improving the minds and morals of society, to lessen the disposition to war; but of this abolition I despair.

So wrote Thomas Jefferson on November 26, 1817, in a letter to Noah Worcester.

The American people have not forgotten Bunker Hill, Appomattox, Chateau-Thierry, Guadalcanal, and Panmunjon. Though memories have dimmed with time, the hearts of our people still hold a quiet pride in the achievements of our military men. Today in South Vietnam the bravery of our fighting men is vivid once again in the minds and hearts of every American. Two years ago it was clear beyond dispute that the ultimate factor which brought this country through the Cuban crisis with its safety and honor intact was not negotiation. It was the realistic fact that this Nation's military power was too great, too dedicated, and too skillful for the Soviets to challenge it.

But during periods of relative calm and the absence of crisis, we hear the voices of a few who would discredit the military man. Waves of antimilitarism sweep this Nation punctuated with emo-

tional outbursts playing on the natural anxieties of our people, in the hope that anything military can be discredited.

Often our professional fighting men are represented as witless opponents to civilian intellectuals in their pursuit of wise negotiations which lead to peace. Often the military man is represented as a trigger-happy fool and a dangerous rightwinger. In these times between crises, we see an all-out effort to discredit the military mind and military thinking.

What is the purpose of this effort?

The attackers say they fear military domination of our country. They point to the great size and power of our Military Establishment and recent examples of military takeovers in other countries.

But these takeovers are not at all analogous to our own situation.

Historically and down to the present there has been complete civilian control of our Military Establishment. This is as it should be. The heads of the Department of Defense are appointed civilians. The power of the purse, an absolute prerequisite for domination of military power, is in the hands of a civilian Congress. Our form of government provides these and other effective checks and balances to prevent military domination.

Rather than an imbalance favoring the military over the civilian, we actually have the reverse. Within the Department of Defense, the Secretary has increased the size and power of the Secretary's Office. At the time Secretary McNamara took office there were less than 2,000 employees in the Office of the Secretary of Defense. As of the first of this year, there were over 34,000 employees responsible to the Secretary's Office. This has been brought about by increased centralization plus the growth incident to an increased absorption of power.

Some of this group have been referred to as the whiz kids. They are civilians who primarily rely upon the computer rather than a balance of experienced judgment. The technique of cost effectiveness has been their trademark.

Contrary to popular opinion cost effectiveness is not new. It has been used for years in the Department of Defense. In the past, however, the experience and judgment of the military has been more properly weighted.

To the civilians in the Secretary of Defense office today, cost effectiveness is an end in itself rather than a tool to use in only part of the decisionmaking process.

Decisions relative to new weapon systems, strategy, and tactics require that we utilize the firsthand knowledge of men with practical experience. It requires intuition and many other elements of human judgment that cannot be computerized. Computer decisions are logically limited by the information that is put into it. War, however, is an illogical act, and therefore, can never be computerized.

We have seen weapons such as the new aircraft carrier selected by the misapplication of the cost effectiveness technique. Every responsible military man decided in favor of a nuclear powered

carrier. The Secretary of Defense and his whiz kids chose a conventional version. Particularly disturbing is the fact that the published testimony of the Senate investigating committee clearly showed that much of the basic data and premises used in the cost effectiveness study was manipulated in favor of the conventional carrier.

We do not have a new bomber because of a so-called cost effectiveness study. Again, every responsible military member of the Air Force has clearly stated the need for such a weapon system. In the case of the TFX aircraft cost effectiveness studies again allegedly showed one version as superior. Members of the military and the defense industry overwhelmingly opposed this decision. And as of this date actual events seem to be proving the error of computer decisions.

In addition to weapons selection, there are other examples of increased centralization and power in the Secretary's office. By controlling intelligence and public information, the Secretary can control information going out to the military, up to the President, to Congress, and to the people. This power is dangerous because it is much too easy to exercise it for political reasons rather than to serve the national security.

Thus, civilian power can regulate the input into the cost effectiveness technique to disregard military expertise. It has produced decisions which have accepted stalemate as a policy at the expense of new and better weapons systems. And at the same time the channels of information have been manipulated to foreclose the avenue for final appeal to the true sovereigns—the American people. Far from being domination by the military this is an imbalance of civilian power in our Department of Defense.

The effect of this imbalance is not temporary. It will project into the future and its danger will increase. Remember that the Department of Defense is a branch of the executive department. The increased power of civilians in the Pentagon is multiplied many times by the intimate relationship of civilian defense officials with the White House, the Department of State, and particularly the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. All of these groups have been more singleminded than ever before and have organized themselves with common purpose and direction to further emphasize the power imbalance. Using the normal powers of the executive branch of Government and increased use of the Executive order and the technique of news control, this power entente has made giant strides toward objectives which tend to downgrade sound military thinking and expertise.

In the DOD there have been many indications of the control of news. One of the most outstanding is in the case of the TFX. A policy memorandum was issued which clearly stated that all news releases would show the validity of the Secretary of Defense's decision on this program. Another and more important example is the directive to all military personnel that they report their con-