

UNITED STATES

U.S. Congress.



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 93^d CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 119—PART 20

JULY 20, 1973 TO JULY 27, 1973

(PAGES 25051 TO 26424)

No one can gainsay that those who claim that Congress will never act on this subject have thus far been right. Yet, the formation of the Senate Subcommittee, which complements the House Judiciary Committee, seriously increases the probability of affirmative action, at least in the judgment of many who have followed the problem over the years.

I think that the states will err badly if they appear before Congress as mere obstructors, without a substantive measure of their own to support. The old adage, "You can't beat something with nothing," is apropos here. If business with its some 2,000,000 members can appear before Congress with the semblance of unanimity in support of S. 1245, then it seems to me that the 50 states should be able to do no less. Thus, it would be risky for the state administrators to be unprepared for the Senate hearings and to be faced with the prospect of merely opposing bills submitted by industry.

For this very important reason, I appeal to all state administrators to support the efforts of the Special NATA tax administrators' committee, and to the bill which I have every confidence they will be able to draft.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, some of the interstate taxation bills now before Congress contain certain features which have caused great concern to state tax administrators because of their potentially adverse impact on effective state tax administration and the unfair competition which would be created against locally based businesses, and

Whereas, the Executive Committee of the National Association of Tax Administrators has established a special committee to draft an Interstate Taxation Act generally representative of the views of state tax administrators, and

Whereas, the special committee is now engaged in drafting such a bill and will submit its report shortly, now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the National Association of Tax Administrators respectfully requests Congress to take no action on any interstate taxation bill until the special NATA committee draft is prepared and made available to the Senate Subcommittee on Interstate Taxation.

BASIC RESEARCH PROGRAMS PAY OFF

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the comments of Prof. Alan Van Huevelen, Department of Physics, New Mexico State University with regard to the urgent need for continued basic research assistance programs.

The financial benefits or the contributions to society are not always obvious when exploring new arenas in scientific research. Professor Van Huevelen uses for an example the unsuspected final "payoff" of microwave research when compared to the initial outlay in Federal moneys. I felt his comments to be most relevant in view of the recent debate in this chamber regarding the need for further Federal assistance to all kinds of scientific endeavors, and I want to bring his remarks to the attention of my colleagues.

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

THE PROBLEM OF JUSTIFYING BASIC RESEARCH

There is an accelerating tendency by Federal and state agencies and by universities to encourage applied research and development with a subsequent reduction in funds

for basic research. This tendency seems to have evolved out of a need to justify to taxpayers the use of their dollars in research. It is very difficult and perhaps impossible to explain to a taxpayer the future value to him of a present research grant for basic research. The researcher in such a project is trying to understand a facet of nature which is at present not well understood by himself and certainly not well understood by the average taxpayer. It is then difficult to show how that particular basic research project can "pay off." However, if history is any lesson, then it is easy to show (but seldom done) that basic research is probably the best investment of government money that can be made. Much of it is done at universities and should be encouraged at universities.

As one example, let us look at a dollar and cents analysis of basic research in microwaves which was started in the late 30's. At that time microwaves were known to be a part of the electromagnetic spectrum, but little else about their properties was known. There were not even devices available for generating microwaves. Research was begun in the late 30's by a small number of physicists, and it is obvious that the vast majority would have been utter failures at indicating any useful result of microwave research. It was mainly their curiosity and desire for understanding which led them to explore this otherwise barren field. As a first major step in their studies they were able to develop microwave generators called klystrons. Microwave research accelerated in the early 40's and during World War II considerable effort was spent in applying microwave understanding gained by the early basic research. Microwave radar used during the war was credited by one prominent general as being second only to the atomic bomb in our success at winning World War II.

Whereas for many years following the war, microwave technology was used primarily for military purposes, it now has entered the free enterprise sector of our society with full force. Some of its uses are: WATS System, data transmission by time sharing computers, remote supervisory control in industry, cooking industrial drying processes, Penn Central Railroad remote reservations, Datafax for testing and control by U.S. Steel, signature approved systems by NY branch banks, Tokyo newspaper reproduction in other localities, communications satellites, closed circuit TV, etc.

The total market for microwave equipment in 1970 was 9 billion dollars. This is 1000 times the cost of all basic research in 1940, about the time of the development of microwaves. Thus, it seems clear that just the taxes collected from microwave sales in 1970 would more than have paid for our support of basic research in all fields during the several years in the late 30's when basic research in microwaves was started. A 5% tax on the microwave industry sales would easily support the entire budget of the National Science Foundation on a year for year basis at the present time.

The microwave industry is not an isolated example of the dollar and cents success of learning about unknown areas of our environment. It is, however, one area which is easily observed at this point in time.

In summary, one might conclude:

(1) Basic research more than supports itself if one allows a certain lag time.

(2) Our whole standard of living depends on a better understanding of nature and products developed to control our environment as a result of this understanding.

(3) A particular university cannot always show that basic research done there is especially useful to the citizens of that state. But then e.g. N.M. has benefited greatly by basic microwave research done at Stanford and MIT in the late 30's and early 40's. New Mexicans paid no special fee for this except a

few federal tax dollars (certainly no state taxes supported those universities.) There are, however, a great many New Mexico engineers whose salary is a consequence of microwave technology and of similar technology. Each of us in New Mexico receive added convenience and enjoyment because of microwave communications and devices.

EHRlichMAN: POWER AND ARROGANCE

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, for many of us, the testimony of John Ehrlichman over the past few days has revealed the extent to which the Presidency has become an institution apart, detached from the Congress and the people. Mr. Ehrlichman typifies this attitude of arrogance, what Joseph Kraft in a most perceptive column in this morning's Washington Post terms "maniacal arrogance."

I believe this is not overstating the case. The testimony of Mr. Ehrlichman has revealed the corruption which unfettered power has brought to the Presidency and those who surround the institution. It has revealed the lack of respect for our Constitution, for those institutions which were designed to represent the people, and indeed for the basic intelligence of the American people.

Mr. President, I commend Mr. Kraft's article and urge that it be read both as a perceptive study in the misuse of power, and as a warning that we in Congress must assess our role in contributing to the dangerous constitutional crisis which looms on the horizon and attempt to right the imbalance between the branches of government which threatens us all.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Kraft's article be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

[From the Washington Post, July 26, 1973]

EHRlichMAN: POWER AND ARROGANCE

(By Joseph Kraft)

John Ehrlichman, the former No. 2 man in the Nixon White House who has been starring in the Senate hearings this week, is the quintessential witness to Watergate. As nobody else in the drama, he expresses the corruption of power.

For he entered office, four years ago, as probably the most sensible and reasonable man in the Nixon entourage. He comes now, at a moment of terrible personal difficulty, as a man of maniacal arrogance.

Mr. Ehrlichman first became well-known in the 1968 campaign in connection with a remark he made about now-forgotten action by Mr. Nixon. "It'll play in Peoria," Ehrlichman said.

That comment showed a lot of qualities. There was first a measure of detachment. Ehrlichman was not on the offensive but the defensive. He was not self-involved. He was looking at an action and making a coolish appraisal.

There was next a measure of judgment. Ehrlichman was not claiming that everything the boss did was great or terrific. It was good enough to get by.

Finally, there was a degree of intelligent articulation. Ehrlichman said what he meant in a spare way. He made his point with originality and effectiveness, even humor.

I used to see something of Ehrlichman in the first years of the administration, and I consistently found the qualities of detachment, judgment and intelligence. He could talk well and easily about such abstractions as the decision-making process. He understood the inner structure of an argument and the range of possible alternatives in a given situation.

He seemed particularly interesting in the matter of civil rights. Certainly he was no bigot. My strong impression is that he tried to hold the line against a position of total opposition to busing. Prof. Alexander Bickel of Yale, who often went to see him on civil rights issues, found him highly responsible.

Now, if ever, these qualities should be showing. Mr. Ehrlichman is in very deep trouble. Unlike H. R. Haldeman, who was his friend and mentor in the Nixon entourage, he has no great family resources. He has a wife to support and school-age children to educate.

He is under investigation by an eager district attorney in Los Angeles county for directing the burglary of Daniel Ellsberg's psychiatrist—a common crime which carries a sentence of five years as a felony. He may well be indicted by Special Prosecutor Archibald Cox for much deeper Watergate offenses including perjury and conspiracy to obstruct justice.

Apart from his family, moreover, Ehrlichman is naked and alone. He is not part of the Haldeman gang anymore. Indeed, Haldeman and his former assistant, Dwight Chapin, were badmouthing Ehrlichman even as he prepared to take the stand. Only last weekend they were saying that he was not tough enough. In particular they attacked him for expressing a belief that tapes of the President's conversations and phone calls should be released.

So how did Ehrlichman behave in these circumstances? Well, his opening statement knocked the Senate Watergate committee, the "news media" and the "gallery." The questioning was barely under way when he made a sneering reference to committee counsel Samuel Dash as "the professor."

A little later he was tangling with Chairman Sam Ervin about points of constitutional law. Then Ehrlichman indulged himself in a long calculated slur on the memory of J. Edgar Hoover.

I do not feel sorry for Ehrlichman in any way. I think he is deep into the cover-up. I think he is lying about his own role and that of the President. Moreover, it is clear that he did despicable actions and is still without a sense of contrition.

But I am puzzled. It is not clear to me how a man of such intelligence and detachment could have been so horribly deformed. I suspect that many of us in Washington are to blame.

The climate of exaggerated respect paid the President and his agents had something to do with the development of Ehrlichman's arrogance. The disposition of the Congress to lie down before any challenge probably contributed to his cynicism. Those of us in the press did give him reason to think that we asked what he once called "dumb questions."

Whatever the importance of these elements, there is one cardinal point. The story that the President was corrupted and fooled by his aides does not pass muster. It was not the likes of John Ehrlichman who made Richard Nixon defiant and suspicious and contemptuous. The flow went the other way.

OFFICIAL DECEPTIONS RULE THE PENTAGON

Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. President, within the past several weeks we have stressed a series of deception and outright calculated lies that defy the imagination. Unfortunately they have come from one

of the most powerful departments of government—the Pentagon.

First came the deliberate withholding of information from the Senate Armed Services Committee about the B-52 bombing in Cambodia. Somewhere in the vast reaches of that five-sided building, a decision was made to lie to Congress. It was decided to alter official data to cover up the B-52 missions. It was decided that Congress had no right to know; that Congress should not be told these military secrets.

We do not know who did this or why but we can expect the normal series of disclaimers and stammering professions of innocence. Cover-ups have become a way of life in Washington and the Pentagon is no exception.

The second example deals with the secret intelligence gathering forays into Laos and Cambodia since 1965. Although 81 Americans died during these secret raids, they were officially reported to have died in South Vietnam. These false statistics again were given to Congress.

THE B-1 COVERUP

The third example concerns the expensive and controversial B-1 program. Apparently the Senate Armed Services Committee has been given rosy reports about progress the Air Force is making on the B-1. Gen. Douglas Nelson, head of the B-1 program, testified that the recent schedule slippages only became known in May of this year, after his original testimony that the program was going well.

According to a series of 10 Air Force memorandums made available to me, however, the Air Force and General Nelson in particular, were well aware of these problems. They knew about the cost increases and schedule slippages as early as January of 1972. And yet the Air Force has continued to testify that the program was in great shape.

This was a calculated false statement designed to get the B-1 money out of Congress at all costs. But as with all lies, eventually they return to haunt their masters.

Mr. President, I have recently heard an editorial of personal opinion by Edward P. Morgan on the ABC News. No one could have put the problem in better perspective.

I recommend it to anyone who is concerned about the tendency in this country to accept half-truths and official lies as business as usual. We cannot afford to lose that basic American sense of critical judgment. A government that does not represent the people and their ideals is not fit to govern.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the recent remarks of Edward P. Morgan be printed in the RECORD.

REMARKS OF EDWARD P. MORGAN

This is Edward P. Morgan, ABC News Washington, with the Shape of One Man's Opinion. A look at lies from the Pentagon after this word.

Deception seems to be just as much an accepted way of life at the Pentagon as Watergate reveals it has been at the Nixon White House. So what we have been getting in large measure out of the two most powerful establishments in the executive branch is government by the big lie.

Now it comes out, officially, that thousands of B52 raids were "secretly" made on "neu-

tralist" Cambodia in 1969 and 1970, the missions falsified as strikes in South Vietnam and the actual records of the original sorties destroyed as the Defense Department's own method of "cover-up." Similar deception was practiced with B52 raids over Laos. The Pentagon brass were even brazen enough last month to dispatch to the Senate Armed Services Committee, which is supposed to control the multibillion-dollar defense budget, a distorted copy of the Indochina bombing. In one of the understatement of the season, Pentagon spokesman Jerry Friedhelm says "in retrospect, that probably was not the wisest thing to do."

No wonder, in such an atmosphere of arrogance and deceit, that an Air Force general received a mere rap on the wrist when it came out that in direct violation of declared administration policy, he had repeatedly ordered offensive air action against North Vietnam during the bombing halt and disguised it on the record as "protective reaction strikes." No wonder that such sharp-nosed Wisconsin bird dogs as Senator Proxmire and Representative Les Aspin have consistently flushed out staggering cost overruns on weapons systems and shocking hanky panky in manipulating such trifles as Army budget figures.

What do such sinister charades gain the nation outside of concealed spending of taxpayers' dollars and involvement in potentially explosive policies that even key committees of Congress, not to mention the public, are lied to about? Yesterday, I asked a reliable government source, in a position to know, how or whether he would justify such official behavior. He replied that insofar as Laos was concerned, the secret bombing was requested by Prince Souvanna Phouma, head of the so-called neutralist Laotian government. But in hindsight, he thought it was a mistake because under our system we cannot (or should not) conduct ourselves the way the Communists do. Instead of covert response to North Vietnamese violation of the Laotian "truce" he thought it would have been better to have responded openly with a great fuss over the other side's infractions.

This strikes me as sound if belated wisdom. We have waited too long to blow the whistle on government by the big lie, whether fabricated in the classified cloisters of the Pentagon or wherever. With the public being slowly but steadily aroused by the Watergate nightmare to how Nixon administration officials attempted at top levels to subvert the democratic process, there's no time like the present to blow that whistle.

I'll have a footnote in 30 seconds.

The highly respected Brookings Institution has released a study suggesting the defense budget could be cut by \$25 billion a year through a shift in military strategy. The Pentagon must regret that Brookings was scrubbed as a target for a break-in by the White House "plumbers" seeking to trace security leaks.

This is Edward P. Morgan ABC news Washington with the shape of one man's opinion.

BASIC OPPORTUNITY GRANT PROGRAM

Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. President, the Office of Education has recently distributed to Congressmen and Senators information concerning the basic opportunity grant program as it will operate in 1973-74, along with the forms to be used for application. They requested assistance in dissemination of this material to students and their families in order to expedite matters, as it is quite late in the year for young people to be making plans for the coming school year.

This is a new kind of student assist-