

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

JOURNAL

OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL

Friday - 7 July 1972

25X1 1. [redacted] Jim Woolsey, Senate Armed Services Committee staff, called to say he and Larry Garcia, of the staff, will be leaving Monday for a two-week trip to Saigon to investigate the LaVelle case. Woolsey asked for some [redacted] material which would assist them in identifying bombing raids into North Vietnam but said there would be no reason to be in touch with our people in connection with the substance of the trip. I told him we would alert our Saigon station to their presence there and to feel free to call on us if we could be of assistance in any other way. A bundle of [redacted] books and sections of their "Trends" on this subject were hand-carried to Woolsey later in the day. An appropriate cable is being sent to Saigon.

STATSPEC

STATSPEC

25X1 2. [redacted] Called Robert Hull, Department of State, to get a status report on the Department's dealings with OMB on the funding of the Foreign Service retirement system. OMB has backed off somewhat and Hull foresees a favorable resolution in the near future. See Memorandum for the Record.

25X1 3. [redacted] Called Robert Vagley, Director, General Subcommittee on Labor, Committee on Education and Labor, concerning the insertion by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee of a provision dealing with age discrimination in Federal employment in the Fair Labor Standards Act amendments (S. 1861). Vagley was unaware of this provision and after checking into it he agreed we probably could, at a minimum, work out legislative history in the conference report, along the lines we had worked out on the Equal Employment Opportunities Act, to show that there is no intention to subordinate any discretionary authority or final judgment reposed in Agency heads for national security reasons in the interest of the United States. He also said the Senate Committee staff was adamant that the provision not be struck in conference. Vagley agreed it would be difficult to deal with the issue on the Senate floor and that the Civil Service Commission was the logical rallying point against its objectionable features. (We had previously learned the CSC had drafted the language of the provision for the Senate Committee and probably informally supported the provision.)

CRC, 5/20/2003

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

25X1