

February 16, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 2083

of laboratory testings and thus improve the medical care of the Nation's citizens.

PETE BRANDT, A GREAT REPORTER RETIRES

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, Raymond P. "Pete" Brandt has retired after serving nearly half a century as a political reporter on the Washington scene. Pete Brandt is known to all of us not only as an outstanding newsman—a reporter and editor of unmatched ability—but as one of the most respected members of the press corps. I have always cherished and shall continue to cherish his friendship and counsel.

Though I deeply regret his announced retirement, I was most happy to note in a February 8 editorial in the *St. Post-Dispatch* that Pete will continue to offer his lucid, objective, and independent judgment to the reading public by way of occasional articles on such matters as politics and economics—areas where his expertise and broad understanding have been valued so highly.

So well does he understand and articulate the most transcendent issues of the day that his counsel was often sought by Presidents. And just as he has been a respected adviser to Presidents, so has he been a trusted and valuable adviser to most of us here in the Senate. His judgment has been consistently sound, his thoughtfulness and courtesy greatly appreciated. One of the great journalists—I wish Pete well in his retirement. But I know Pete Brandt will continue to contribute his valued thoughts and judgment and for this we may all be grateful.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the *Post-Dispatch* editorial of February 8, concerning Pete Brandt, be printed at this point in the Record.

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

MR. BRANDT RETIRES

Raymond P. Brandt's long and distinguished career as a member of the *Post-Dispatch* staff comes to a virtual close with his retirement as contributing editor. Fortunately, he will continue to write occasional articles on politics and economics, the fields in which he has specialized for most of his working lifetime.

Since 1923 "Pete" Brandt has represented this newspaper in Washington, where his keen insight, honesty and sound judgment made him perhaps the most respected figure in Capital journalism. Over the years, many a statesman sought Mr. Brandt's advice; he knew more about the Federal Government than most of the politicians and bureaucrats and judges—and Presidents—on whose activities he reported.

Mr. Brandt brought to his work the qualities young reporters are taught to admire—accuracy, scholarship, objectivity, integrity, intellectual curiosity, industry, and an aggressive determination to get to the heart of the matter—the qualities, in short, that are insisted upon by Joseph Pulitzer.

His biography in *Who's Who* Mr. Brandt called himself a "newspaperman," a designation of which he was proud and which reflected his devotion to the profession on which his career cast so much credit.

MEDICAL DEVICES AND CLINICAL LABORATORIES

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, we are in an age of medical miracles, an age of technology which has ushered in a wide variety of new medical devices. Surgical implants, contact lenses, and artificial kidneys are but a few examples.

We are in an age that requires the highest competence and skill on the part of those who administer to the health of our citizens. Yet, today, we have no assurance that medical devices, vital to the health of those who are ill, meet even minimum standards.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I welcome the President's health proposal contained in his message, "to protect the American consumer."

The President has called for the Medical Device Safety Act of 1967. This act will require the premarket clearance of certain medical devices, particularly those used in or on the body. The bill will also establish standards for such items as diathermy machines, bone pins, and X-ray machines.

The President also has suggested a program of improvement for clinical laboratories. Licensing requirements would upgrade the performance of clinical laboratories, and the status of technicians, technologists, and senior-level professional staff. The Surgeon General would assert leadership by licensing laboratories that deal in interstate commerce, thereby furnishing the States with standards that they, in turn, can use with Federal support to improve laboratory services in their own jurisdictions.

These proposals represent a sound and reasonable approach to improving the medical care offered the citizens of our Nation. The hopes of so many people—and, indeed, very often the lives—depend upon reliable medical devices and accurate clinical information. Any steps to improve the quality of these devices and of the information which are open to us, we must, in conscience, take.

DEVELOPMENT LOANS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I desire to draw attention to the press reports of a letter which the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee has sent to the President regarding the President's determination that the number of nations receiving development loans should be increased from 10 to 29.

I have seen that letter. I participated in the meeting with AID Administrator Gaud when he attempted to justify ignoring a congressional mandate that development loans be limited to 10 nations, plus loans to Latin America.

We have here a classic case of the way in which the administration treats the Congress and the laws we pass. Let me review this record briefly.

Last year during consideration of the foreign aid bill the administration told the Committee on Foreign Relations that 10 countries would be eligible for de-

velopment loans during this fiscal year. In the presentation to the committee, the administration witnesses said that an additional three countries might become eligible during the year.

After careful consideration, the Committee on Foreign Relations included in the bill a numerical limitation stating the development loans should not be extended to more than 10 countries. The committee considered whether or not to put the limit at 13 countries, thus including those countries which the administration thought might become eligible. We decided to keep the figure at 10, hoping thus to discourage the administration from spreading our resources far and wide on the theory that everyone should get something. We wanted the administration to concentrate its efforts on development and not to use development loans for political purposes in a large number of countries. We believed that the thin spreading of largesse does not serve the interests of the United States.

Naturally the administration did not like this 10-country limitation. It fought the committee restriction in the conference. Finally, as a gesture to help get the bill adopted, the Senate conferees accepted a compromise. We agreed to keep the 10-country limitation in the act but to provide that if the President found it in the national interest he could increase the number of development loan recipients above the figure 10, provided only that he give the appropriate committees 30 days' notice of his intention to do so.

The purpose of the 30-day notice was to give the committees an opportunity to explore the feasibility of any proposed increases in the number of development loan recipients.

Within 4 months after the passage of the Foreign Assistance Act, AID proposed to the President that the number of development loan recipients be increased not by one or two, not doubled, but nearly tripled. AID proposed to the President that the number of recipients be increased from 10 to 29.

If the AID administration thought the Committee on Foreign Relations would stand quietly while the development loan program was saddled with 29 countries instead of 10, it knows very little about horses.

When Mr. Gaud reported that this increase in the number of AID recipients was already in the works, he ran into trouble with the Committee on Foreign Relations. Members from both sides objected most vigorously.

It is an understatement to suggest that most of us thought we had been duped. We have here a clear case in which congressional intent was not only ignored, it was kicked in the teeth. I have long since become convinced that any time we provide one of these Presidential escape clauses, we are going to be treated in bad faith, and that is exactly how we were treated. The administration never had any intention of observing a restriction. Even while we were

talking about it, AID was negotiating more loan commitments, unknown to us.

It is becoming accepted practice for AID, State, Defense, and CIA to tell us not what they are doing, but only what they want us to know.

The issue here is broader than a little disagreement between the Foreign Relations Committee and the administration. This is the same issue almost every committee of the Congress encounters at one time or another. It is part of the trouble this administration is having and will have with this Congress.

I may say that as far as I am concerned, the committee should not have relied upon a polite letter from the chairman to the President protesting this matter. We should have reported forthwith a resolution amending the basic legislation.

Employees of the executive branch seem too often to forget that they are not elected representatives of the people. They act as if their judgment were a substitute for democratic government.

Under these circumstances it is absolutely essential that elected Members of Congress be ready to take off their gloves to fight for the policy decisions which they have embodied in law. Failure to react to usurpations of legislative power will gradually destroy our system. I am not going to become a party to that process.

There is a saying which holds: "Fool me once, your fault. Fool me twice, my fault." Congress has been fooled not once or twice but over and over again in what has become an annual shell game over the AID program. We try to guess which shell the pea is under and no matter which one we pick, the pea is always somewhere else. That is why so many of us remain unimpressed by the advertising for the new aid message. That is why so many of us are beginning to conclude that there are no reasonable guidelines that can be written into the program. Objectives are not enough. The law must be ironclad or we are better off with no law at all. That is my conclusion from this latest episode in which the clear objective of Congress was totally ignored.

The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations has sent to the President a letter expressing the concern of the Committee on Foreign Relations at the decision to increase the number of countries receiving development loans. The letter is unclassified. Copies were sent to each member of the committee.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Record.

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

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
February 8, 1967.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This letter concerns your determinations of January 5, 1967, received by the Committee on Foreign Relations on January 17, increasing the number of countries eligible for development loans from ten to twenty-nine and for technical assistance and cooperation grants from forty to forty-eight.

The Committee has heard Mr. William Gaud's justification of the action. Unfortunately, because of the press of other business there has not been an opportunity for the Committee to meet to take formal action since his presentation. With the Lincoln Day recess now upon us, the thirty day waiting period will be over before the Committee can consider the matter further. In view of this, I feel that I am obligated to advise you that I personally deplore this action and I believe that many members on both sides of the aisle are also seriously concerned.

Sincerely yours,
J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

NEW YORK TIMES ENDORSES PRINCIPLE OF S. 981, TO PROVIDE FUNDS THROUGH THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE FOR TRAVEL TO INTERNATIONAL YOUTH CONFERENCES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, among other consequences of the revelations of CIA involvement in domestic youth groups, it is imperative that there be a thorough housecleaning of the activities of the Federal Government concerning travel subsidies for those attending international conferences in fields such as science and education, activities in which the search for truth is paramount and in which CIA involvement makes a sickening perversion of the educational or scientific aims. These conferences contribute to international understanding and to the advancement of science and education, and it would be a tragedy if Federal support for such activities were to be permanently clouded because of the events of the past few days.

Two things are clear: First, Federal support for travel to these conferences is important. Second, the credibility of Federal support must be established beyond the shadow of a doubt. Credibility in this case means that when a man goes to an international education conference on a Government travel grant, he goes for the purpose of education and not as a spy.

Yesterday I introduced S. 981, a bill to amend the International Education Act of 1966 to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to make grants to finance travel to international youth conferences by individuals broadly representative of the Nation's students.

I am glad to see that today's New York Times has endorsed the principle of my bill in an editorial which states:

It is nonsense to suggest that, because they arouse suspicion abroad, public subsidies should not be offered. Virtually all nations offer such subsidy. The point at issue is how to provide the funds, without perverting the purpose.

A first step should be to speed the divorce, already suggested under the International Education Act of 1966, of international educational affairs from the foreign policy branches of the Government. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare is far better suited to sponsor educational exchanges than the State Department, let alone the C.I.A.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the February 16 New York Times, entitled "Infiltrating the Cam-

pus," be printed at this point in the Record.

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

INFILTRATING THE CAMPUS

The impropriety and folly of permitting the Central Intelligence Agency to subsidize the National Student Association cannot be mitigated by post-mortem rationalizing. It is absurd to suggest that, because the student organization was too impoverished to take part in international meetings, the C.I.A. merely assumed the role of a benevolent patron of youth.

It is not the business or the habit of intelligence services to underwrite indigent good causes unless the beneficiary can be expected to pay off the debt, directly or indirectly. It was more reprehensible for Washington to let its intelligence service jeopardize a representative voice of the nation's college youth than it was for a few student leaders, in secret agreement, to succumb to the temptation.

At least as serious has been the breach of public faith by private foundations acting as go-betweens. The very existence of foundations is a privilege granted by the tax-paying public. The mandate that goes with this tax exemption is to provide nongovernmental support for worthy causes, not to serve as a cover for clandestine Government operations.

The sordid episode has dealt another serious blow to the credibility of American students and scholars abroad. Faith in their detachment already had been damaged by earlier disclosures of secret links between the C.I.A. and some American universities. A total ban on all C.I.A. underwriting of collegiate activity is plainly long overdue.

It will be tragic if the present effect is an undermining of the National Student Association's total record. Often under fire from the right, it has usually represented courageous liberalism. To discredit the organization because of the secret indiscretion of a few of its leaders would sap the strength of elected student governments across the country and endow New Left extremists with unwarranted power just when their hold on students is crumbling.

More is needed now than a halt in C.I.A. subsidies to the N.S.A. or other academic organizations. All such groups should open their books and sources of funds to their own membership and to public scrutiny. To permit a few student leaders to make far-reaching policy decisions without consent of the membership exposes them to pressures and temptations far beyond the scope of their political experience.

As for foundation activities, the penalties for engaging in undercover activities should be clearly established. The Patman investigations long ago made clear the need for reforms, and the President has promised to send to Congress this year proposals for stamping out abuses in foundation practices.

Most important, explicit guidelines should be laid down to regulate all policies of Government support of international activities of students and scholars. It is nonsense to suggest that, because they arouse suspicion abroad, public subsidies should not be offered. Virtually all nations offer such subsidy. The point at issue is how to provide the funds, without perverting the purpose.

A first step should be to speed the divorce, already suggested under the International Education Act of 1966, of international educational affairs from the foreign policy branches of the Government. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare is far better suited to sponsor educational exchanges than the State Department, let alone the C.I.A.