

September 21, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 12355

But you have to read the small print below the headline to discover that people will still choose President Johnson over every other possible candidate now being talked about—Republican or Democratic.

We saw some polls put out by a major labor organization some months ago which showed the President ahead of everyone else, yet the press played that one as showing the President had fallen behind.

Well, in New Jersey we now have some positive proof about just who is leading whom.

A recent poll taken by a leading public opinion expert, John Bucel, for the Republican State Committee of New Jersey, shows Lyndon B. Johnson outpolling six other Democratic and Republican contenders.

The poll showed the President ahead of Nixon by 9 percent, ahead of Romney by 15 percent, ahead of Rockefeller by 15 percent, and defeating Reagan by a solid 19 percent.

The poll also showed that 52 percent of the voters in New Jersey are Democrats—although I think that is a low estimate; 30 percent Republican, and the rest independent.

Here we have a Republican polltaker publicly telling us that President Johnson is going to beat all comers. And even though Mr. Bucel is a Republican, I believe him.

I also believe that whatever newspapers are now saying, they will be singing a different tune when Lyndon Johnson goes to the country with his story of the most magnificent legislative record in the history of American government.

When the people get the clear picture of what Lyndon Johnson has done for business, what he has done for the schoolchild, what he has done for the farmer, what he has done for the city and the countryside, we will not need any polls to count our victory in November 1968. We are just going to let the computers total up the smashing plurality which Lyndon Johnson and the Democratic Party are going to roll up.

I insert in the RECORD an article from the Philadelphia Bulletin of September 19 describing the results of a recent Republican poll of New Jersey voters:

JOHNSON LEADS VOTE POLL IN NEW JERSEY

Trenton—(UPI)—President Johnson has outpolled six other Democratic and Republican presidential possibilities in a survey of New Jersey voters conducted by a professional pollster for the Republican State Committee.

A Republican candidate, however, still would have a good chance of winning the state, the pollster found.

Mr. Johnson was selected by 26 percent of the 600 voters interviewed in all the state's 21 counties. His nearest rival was Sen. Robert F. Kennedy (D-N.Y.), the only other Democrat in the survey, who drew 19 percent of the votes.

The others, all Republicans, were former Vice President Richard M. Nixon, 17 percent; Gov. George Romney, of Michigan, 11 percent; Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, of New York, 11 percent; Gov. Ronald Reagan, of California, 7 percent; and U.S. Sen. Charles Percy (R-Ill.) 4 percent.

The poll, taken last month by E. John Bucel, of Public Opinion Surveys, Swarthmore, Pa., indicated that 52 percent of the

voters in New Jersey are Democrats, 30 percent Republicans and 18 percent independent.

SEA-BASED MISSILE DEFENSE

(Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, one of the more astonishing features of this last decade and a half is the relative equanimity with which nations have accepted the flat military fact that the power to decide their survival or destruction lies with others. In the realm of strategic war, the mightiest of nations possess the power—at hand, not potential—to destroy any other state. Yet none among them can presently defend itself from strategic nuclear attack. We confront each other watchfully as swordsmen in a small ring, each with a terrible blade poised, none possessing a shield. Defense becomes deterrence and an uneasy peace prevails upon what Winston Churchill termed "a balance of terror."

Now we have long known that the peace of mutual deterrence has in its nature certain ominous features of instability. First, the security from attack of any one major power rests upon the rational perception and decisions of all the others. The record of the practice of nations provides us scant cause for faith in the prevalence of such rationality. Especially disturbing is the fresh development of a nuclear strike capability by a nation which is simultaneously ambitious, internationally frustrated, desperately poor, self-isolated from the world community, and demonstrably paranoid.

Second, the configuration of destructive power places a decisive advantage with any contender who could deliver a disabling surprise attack on his adversary. Where you have a confrontation of swords without shields, protection and conquest are achieved by the same act—disabling your opponent. This condition tempts the ambitious and intensifies pre-emptive considerations by the defensive.

So it is not surprising that both we and our potential adversaries seek to develop an effective shield. And up until now, at least, we have shared the common frustration of technological inability to create a defense that could meaningfully reduce the impact of a determined ballistic missile attack.

Now we have reason to believe that our strongest potential adversary is deploying a marginally effective, terminal phase antiballistic missile system around his cities and strategic weapon sites. We believe that we can saturate, confuse, and breach his new defenses without great difficulty. We certainly also are under great pressure to deploy a terminal phase missile interception-type defense for our own most important and vulnerable potential targets. But we have hesitated in this costly commitment because we suspect that by the completion date of our proposed defense system, it too will be obsolete.

We have now committed ourselves to

the deployment of a "thin" land-based, terminal-phase missile-interception system oriented primarily toward a total war threat from Communist China. This ABM system is conceived to be a minimal unit to be augmented or changed as the situation demands. I submit that SABMIS offers a clear and feasible improvement of our strategic position for both defense and deterrence against every potential adversary and against various possible threats of limited nuclear war directed at either ourselves or our allies. Its flexibility and mobility offer capabilities of concentration and dispersal to meet a variety of challenges and a wide range of threats not in any way affected by our presently planned terminal-phase system.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following articles by the distinguished military affairs analyst, L. Edgar Prina, concerning the SABMIS:

[From the South Bay (Calif.) Daily Breeze, June 30, 1967]

INTERCEPTION AT SEA EYED (By L. Edgar Prina)

WASHINGTON.—Navy planners believe it would make sense to put anti-missiles at sea so that enemy ICBMs could be destroyed far from the continental United States.

Accordingly, the Navy—with the blessing of the Defense Department—has asked industry to join in a study it hopes will lead to the design of a ship-based missile intercept system.

The Office of Naval Research on June 1 advertised for help, as follows:

"Firms and organizations having demonstrated capabilities for performing a study of ballistic missile intercept systems and subsystems are invited to submit information regarding their qualifications.

"Selected firms and organizations will be considered for participation in a study program leading to preliminary design of a sea-based ballistic missile intercept system (SABMIS) . . . It is expected that a study effort in this field will cover a six-month period."

The Navy got 31 responses from industry. After reviewing them, it selected six firms or teams of firms, to submit proposals for the study. The firms were given classified briefings and have until July 19 to turn in their proposals.

It is understood that one—and possibly two—firms or teams will get the contract for the study, probably by Aug. 1 or soon thereafter. The Navy hopes to have the study completed by next Feb. 1.

The Navy has declined to identify the six firms in the competition.

Navy planners say that the beauty of a sea-based anti-missile system is that the U.S. could knock down enemy rockets long before they approached the continental limits. This is particularly important in this era of multiple warheads.

Defense officials have told reporters that the Navy's submarine-based Poseidon rocket will have several warheads.

It is understood that each of these thermonuclear "bombs" could be directed to individual targets several hundred miles or more apart.

[From the Elgin (Ill.) Daily Courier-News, Apr. 18, 1967.]

PENTAGON EYES NEW MISSILES (By L. Edgar Prina)

WASHINGTON.—Navy Secretary Paul H. Nitze says the Pentagon is studying new offensive and defensive ballistic missiles for launching from both surface ships and submarines to help meet the potential Soviet threat in the 1970's.

Writing in the April issue of *Navy*—the magazine of sea power, out tomorrow (Monday), Nitze asserts that increased U.S. missile forces, more certain penetration systems on American rockets and an ability to launch attacks from any direction, may be required.

He cited the major future threats to U.S. strategic capabilities as (1) the potential ability of Soviet ICBMS to threaten our fixed-based missile systems and (2) the deployment of Soviet anti-ballistic missiles.

Pointing out that the U.S. could respond in various ways, the secretary said:

"Advanced intercontinental missiles could be developed, using either fixed or mobile basins on land and possibly protecting the missiles with ABM defenses.

"In addition, new sea-based systems could be developed and deployed in surface ships as well as submarines. We could also build additional Poseidon submarines.

Poseidon is the more powerful, twice-as accurate successor to the Polaris missile. It will be installed aboard 31 fleet ballistic missile submarines when it is combat-ready.

According to Nitze, "U.S. options for maintaining nuclear deterrent forces and for anti-ballistic missile forces" include new naval systems of strategic importance.

"We are investigating possible advanced ballistic missile systems, using submarines and surface ships as launch platforms," he said. "Our studies show that both surface missile ships and submarine can survive to accomplish their mission."

[From the San Diego Union, Dec. 20, 1966]

NAVY PUSHES SEA-BASED MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM—EUROPE, ASIA ALLIES SEEN PROTECTED

(By L. Edgar Prina)

WASHINGTON.—While Pentagon, congressional and White House experts warm up for next year's debate over the Army's Nike X system, Navy planners quietly have come up with a proposal for a sea-based anti-ballistic missile system that could help protect the United States and its allies around the world as well.

It is understood the plan already has been discussed with Defense Department officials, and their interest has been piqued. They want more facts and figures as to feasibility, projected effectiveness and cost.

The Navy plan would involve the installation of modified Nike X antiballistic missiles aboard picket ships deployed in strategic parts of the world's oceans.

FORWARD LOCATION

The advantage of such a deployment would be its forward position, allowing interception of an enemy missile at a relatively early stage of its flight. The Nike X uses a line-of-sight radar, which, because of the curvature of the earth, would be able to pick up a rocket fired at the United States from the Soviet Union only after it was half-way to its target.

Aboard ship in the Adriatic, Mediterranean or North Sea, the Zeus—the long-range missile in the Nike X system—it is contended, could knock down a Soviet intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) while it still was behind the Iron Curtain. Thus, it would afford protection to America's North Atlantic Treaty Organization allies in Western Europe. How much protection, of course, would depend upon how many antimissile ships were deployed.

An antiballistic missile ship in the Sea of Japan would provide a missile screen for the Japanese home islands. One in the northern sector of the South China Sea could help protect the Philippines, Australia and New Zealand, all allies of the United States aiding in the war against the Communists in Vietnam.

STATE DEPARTMENT VIEW

With aggressive, tough-talking Communist China racing to build a nuclear missile force,

such an American defensive system doubtless would ease the fears of these countries.

State Department officials are understood to have shown a keen interest in the sea-based antiballistic missile system because of its promise of protecting U.S. allies without requiring any installation of weapons and equipment on their national territories. American bases abroad often have produced a train of political problems—for them and for the United States.

[From the San Diego Evening Tribune, Feb. 3, 1967]

NAVY FORMS AUTHORITY TO DEVELOP WEAPONS—MORE USE OF OCEANS HELD VITAL

(By L. Edgar Prina)

WASHINGTON.—Underlining the Navy's rapidly expanding role in strategic warfare, Navy Secretary Paul H. Nitze announced yesterday the establishment of an authority for a major offensive and defensive weapons system. The program is linked to the greater use of oceans.

The new unit will be headed by R. Adm. George H. Miller, 56, a senior officer and one of the Navy's foremost planners.

The Nitze announcement said Miller's office would "provide over-all guidance and coordination for planning, development and study of the Navy's growing strategic forces."

BIG-WAR ROLE

In a memorandum to Adm. David L. McDonald, chief of naval operations, Nitze added:

"The establishment of this office recognizes within the Navy Department the increasing importance of naval forces in national strategic systems."

Just a day earlier, in testimony before the Senate's Armed Services Committee and defense appropriations subcommittee, Nitze had focused attention on the Navy's big-war role, saying:

"Navy strategic forces are an important and growing segment of our national deterrent forces. In fact, over half of the programmed U.S. ballistic missile re-entry vehicles will be sea-based."

MAINLY AT SEA

When the new Poseidon submarine-launched missile force is completed in the early 1970s, more than half of the nation's ballistic-missile nuclear warheads will be deployed at sea.

Poseidon, the planned successor to Polaris, will be armed with many warheads—up to 14, to assure penetration of enemy defenses.

The Johnson administration has asked Congress for \$1 billion in fiscal 1968 to get production started on Poseidon.

Under present plans, 31 Polaris submarines will be converted to carry the larger Poseidons—16 to each vessel. The remaining 10 missile subs will carry the 2,500-mile-range A3 Polaris. That would mean a total of 496 multiple-warhead Poseidons and 160 Polaris.

OVERALL VIEW

Defense Secretary Robert McNamara, in his military posture statement to Congress on Jan. 23, said that more Poseidon submarines might be built. He indicated that this would depend on whether the Soviet Union continued to increase its intercontinental ballistic missile force.

Miller's office will be concerned with sea-based antiballistic missiles as well as with Poseidon, Polaris and future offensive systems.

Nitze suggested that the new office would look at strategic warfare systems across the board to determine how the Navy can increase its contribution to the national security.

The secretary is known to feel that the fact the Soviet Union has more than twice as much territory as the United States makes it imperative that new ways of broadening

America's strategic operating base be found. This points to greater use of the oceans.

[From the Springfield, Illinois State Register, June 29, 1967]

SECRET STUDY ON NEW OFFENSIVE MISSILE SYSTEMS

(By L. Edgar Prina)

WASHINGTON.—A super-secret study on possible advanced strategic offensive missile systems for the United States in the 1970s will be laid before Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara in the very near future, probably early next month.

While little if any information on the results of the eight-month-old study, called "Strat-X" (for "strategic exercise"), is likely to be made public, the objective, in general terms is this:

To set forth the leading alternatives open to the U.S. for the development of improved long-range ballistic missiles, both sea-based and land-based, with special attention to (1) survivability of the systems and (2) the cost to the enemy to defend against them.

McNamara ordered the study last fall. Fred Payne, on leave from a vice presidency with the Marquardt Corp., a California aerospace firm, reported in as director of the project last Nov. 1.

Payne, a former deputy director of defense research and engineering (for strategic and space systems) at the Pentagon, gathered a blue-ribbon panel of scientists and military men, with the help of the Defense Department and the Institute for Defense Analyses (IDA), the Strat-X manager.

By Jan. 1, the study was fully under way and the Payne group began an evaluation of several dozen "candidate" missile systems.

It is understood that the field has now been narrowed down to four proposals, two sea-based and two land-based. No air-based candidates, such as the old Air Force Skybolt project, survived.

Payne's group was not charged with recommending a particular system. What it will be doing next month, before polishing up its final report by Aug. 1, is to brief defense officials and industry representatives on the following alternatives:

1. A surface ship-based long range missile system, with perhaps as many as 32 weapons per ship.
2. A new under-water long-range missile system, which would be an improvement over the yet to be developed submarine based Poseidon Rocket.
3. A deep underground missile system in extra hard silos, an improvement over the Minuteman III.
4. A land-mobile strategic missile which could be carted about by huge tractors and/or on specially built railroad cars.

Estimated costs of the above alternatives are said to run from approximately \$15 billion to \$30 billion, with the sea-based systems less expensive than the land-based ones.

Despite the allegedly lower cost for the sea-based systems and their reduced vulnerability, there have been reports in the trade press that Dr. John S. Foster, director of defense research and engineering, has already told Congress that he favors land bases for advanced U.S. long-range missiles. One reason cited: land-basing supposedly would permit better command and control.

When asked about this, the Pentagon replied that Foster, who will have an important voice in the ultimate decision, had not made up his mind one way or the other.

One of the major determining factors in whether or when the U.S. will go beyond the Poseidon and Minuteman III rockets and order a full-scale research, development and production program for a new missile for the mid and late 1970s concerns the Soviet Union.

Should the Russians continue what now appears to be an accelerated missile deploy-

September 21, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

ment and should they develop multiple warhead rockets—both are within their capacity—the U.S. would have no choice. It would have to push forward, too, lest a "missile gap," a myth in the past, actually develops.

Top U.S. defense officials have said that Poseidon will carry a number of warheads. Some estimates place the number at a dozen or more. Minuteman III also is expected to be armed with multiple warheads or MIRV (Multiple Individually Targeted Re-entry Vehicles).

As McNamara told Congress earlier this year:

"It is not the number of missiles which is important, but rather the character of the payloads they carry; the missile is simply the delivery vehicle."

PROPOSED NATIONAL SHRINE A NATIONAL SCANDAL

(Mr. RARICK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, on September 23, 1967—this coming Saturday—a U.S. shrine will be dedicated in honor of an "American" who: First, heralded the Communist revolution in Russia; second, defended Lenin's execution of countless thousands and thousands of White Russians; and third, attacked and bitterly denounced the American system of free enterprise and capitalism.

This character was arrested on at least three different occasions. He was found guilty and sentenced to imprisonment at least twice—the most serious of which was for sedition. He was sentenced to 10 years in a Federal penitentiary for this action against his country—never to regain his American citizenship.

Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall is scheduled to dedicate the home of Eugene V. Debs, Socialist and anti-American, as a national historical landmark.

Sad indeed this is, when the home of a seditious, pro-Communist criminal is turned into a shrine while American boys are fighting and dying at the hands of atheistic Communists every day.

Such actions as this by the present Federal bureaucracy cannot help but make one wonder in disbelief. Of all people, why Debs? And why at such a crucial time?

Certainly, this criminal Debs did not have the respect nor the admiration of true Americans of his day, for he ran for President of the country five times—never even once receiving 925,000 votes nationwide.

Yet this man—who spoke against free speech and freedom of the press in Russia and for the Communist revolution—is today bestowed a great honor. Why? Who are those responsible for such action?

Mr. Speaker, when this place is officially dedicated by Secretary Udall it will signify a slap in the face of every American who has fought for his country.

It will be a trampling disrespect upon the graves of those who have paid the supreme sacrifice serving their country, and a knife in the back of the surviving relatives of these departed heroes.

This act on the part of "big brother" government is scandalous. It is a national disgrace, and an outrage.

I insert the pertinent portions of the biography of Eugene V. Debs, taken from the "Dictionary of American Biography," and an article from the August 14, 1967, *Enginemen's Press* of Detroit following my remarks:

Debs, Eugene Victor (Nov. 5, 1855–Oct. 20, 1926), Socialist advocate, born in Terre Haute, Ind.

On June 9, 1885, he was married to Katherine Metz of Pittsburgh, and in the fall of the year was elected to the lower house of the Indiana legislature.

From an early day he was an opponent of the organization of labor by crafts and an advocate of organization by industries. In June 1893, he took part in the formation of a labor society of the "Industrial" type, the American Railway Union, of which he was chosen president.

On July 10, 1894, a federal grand jury, charging conspiracy to obstruct the mails, indicted Debs and three others, who were immediately arrested, and were again arrested on July 17 for contempt of court in violating the injunction. The trial before Judge Grosscup, Feb. 6–12, 1895, resulted in a discontinuance because of the illness of a juror, but on the charge of contempt Debs and six others were sentenced by Judge Woods to six months in the McHenry County jail at Woodstock. Here Debs spent much of his time in reading, with the result that he avowed himself a convert to Socialism. Released on Nov. 22, he returned to Chicago.

In June 1897, helped bring about the Socialist Democratic Party of America. Three years later a tentative combination was made with the faction of the Socialist Labor party and Debs, as the fusion candidate for president, polled 96,116 votes.

In the following year the two wings were formally united under the name of the Socialist Party of America, and in 1904 Debs was again nominated for president, polling 402,321 votes.

About this time he became associate editor of the Socialist weekly, the *Appeal to Reason*, of Girard, Kans., and for five or six years gave his time to editorial work and to lecture tours in behalf of the *Appeal* and the Socialist party.

In 1908 he was again the Socialist candidate, and in a train known as the "Red Special" made a speaking canvass of the entire country; but his vote (420,973) showed only a slight gain over that of 1904. In 1912 he was nominated for the fourth time, and he again made a general canvass. That year the Socialist vote increased to 901,062.

The manifesto of the St. Louis convention of the party (April 1917), denouncing the war and counseling party members to oppose it by all means in their power, was warmly approved by Debs.

In the following year, stirred no doubt by resentment over convictions for sedition, he took more extreme ground. At the Socialist state convention in Canton, Ohio, June 16, 1918, he delivered a speech in which he bitterly assailed the administration for its prosecution of persons charged with sedition.

Four days later, at Cleveland, he was indicted by a federal grand jury for a violation of the Espionage Act, and on Sept. 14, after a four-days trial, was sentenced to ten years' imprisonment on each of two accounts, the sentences to run concurrently.

Appeal was taken to the federal Supreme Court, which on Mar. 10, 1919, upheld the verdict. On Apr. 13 Debs was taken to the penitentiary at Moundsville, W. Va., and on June 13–14 was transferred to the penitentiary at Atlanta.

In the following year, while still a prisoner, he was nominated for the fifth time as his

party's candidate for president, and polled 919,799 votes. On Christmas Day, 1921, by order of President Harding, he was released, though without restoration of his citizenship.

He returned to his home. In 1924 the Socialist party, with Debs' approval, joined with the La Follette forces. In the following year it established in Chicago a national weekly organ, the *American Appeal*, of which Debs was made editor. His health declining, early in 1926 he went to Bermuda. In April he returned home, but in September became an inmate of the sanitarium at Lindlahr, where a month later he died.

Though the standard-bearer of his party, Debs was not a student or a reasoner, but a passionate advocate, and his words and acts were impulsive. He initiated none of the policies of the party, and he formulated none of its programs.

Even his place as standard-bearer was anomalous; for though the fundamental tactic of the party was to seek a close affiliation with the trade-unions, Debs was their steadfast opponent, and in his prime there was perhaps no man in the labor movement whom the union leaders regarded as a greater menace.

Debs thundered out his invectives against the capitalist system and sought to bring home to each of his hearers a guilty sense of responsibility for its continuance. Each of his addresses was, from the standpoint of its immediate influence over his hearers, a personal triumph. Though the common people heard him, most of them voted against him. His message did not convert them.

His language, both of denunciation and of praise, was often extreme. His social philosophy was naïve and all-embracing; capitalism, with all its works, was an unqualified evil, and Socialism, with all its promises, a panacea. He had neither time nor thought for any modification of this simple creed; what was not white was black, and he spoke his convictions with a positiveness that revealed a mind untroubled with doubts. He was often inconsistent.

Though he opposed repression and violence, he could find palliation for either provided it was employed in behalf of "the cause."

To a friendly interviewer who talked with him in the Atlanta penitentiary he asserted (*Appeal to Reason*, Apr. 17, 1920) that because the Russian revolution was "a forward step" it was right for the Soviet Government to suppress free speech and a free press, whereas it was wrong to deny free speech in his own case because American participation in the war was "a reactionary step." In a long manifesto on October 8, he indulged in a sweeping defense of the Communist Government in spite of its imprisonment and execution of dissenters.

UDALL TO DEDICATE DEBS HOME AS U.S. SHRINE IN SEPTEMBER

TERRE HAUTE, IND.—The home of Eugene V. Debs, labor leader and five-times Socialist candidate for President of the United States, will officially be made a national shrine on September 23.

Secretary of Interior Stewart L. Udall will dedicate the Debs home here as a National Historical Landmark of the National Park System and unveil the Park System's bronze plaque marking the house and telling why the house has been designated as a historic landmark.

The evening of September 23, Udall will be the principal speaker at the Eugene V. Debs Foundation third annual awards dinner.

The 1967 recipient of the Debs award is A. Philip Randolph, president of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters and AFL-CIO vice president. Randolph, whose headquarters is in New York City, will come to Terre Haute to be honored.

Randolph, as a young man, knew Debs personally and vigorously supported him. He

has been an outstanding leader in the labor movement for 50 years and has been one of the elder statesmen of the Civil Rights movement.

The award to Randolph is in the field of labor. He was selected by the Debs award four-member panel—Patrick E. Gorman, secretary-treasurer of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and president of the Debs Foundation; Victor Reuther, director of the International Affairs Department of the United Auto Workers; Dr. David Shanon of the history department, University of Maryland; and Harry Golden, noted writer and editor of the *Carolina Israelite*.

PROPOSED PARALLEL BRIDGE ACROSS THE CHESAPEAKE BAY

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Public Works today reported favorably H.R. 11627, which would authorize certain toll projects in Maryland. The House will now vote soon on this bill which includes a parallel bridge across the Chesapeake Bay that the voters of Maryland rejected decisively last November on public referendum.

Last week, I spoke of the relationship between this parallel bridge and the J. E. Greiner Co. You may recall my disclosure that E. J. Donnelly, the J. E. Greiner partner who recently signed a report recommending the parallel bridge, had, along with another J. E. Greiner Co., official, been indicted earlier, in 1957, on a charge of "conspiracy to cheat and defraud the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission of millions of dollars."

Moreover, the Turnpike Commission dismissed the J. E. Greiner Co. as consulting engineers and brought a \$7.7 million civil negligence suit against the firm.¹ The two indicted officials escaped conviction, but the J. E. Greiner Co. paid the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission to settle the civil suit out of court.²

The J. E. Greiner Co. recently was recommended by the Maryland State Roads Commission to the State Board of Public Works as consulting engineers for the parallel bridge. In view of the imminent award of this contract, and in view of the coming House action on H.R. 11627, I hereby place in the RECORD further information on the J. E. Greiner Co., brought out by a Grand Jury investigation in Tampa, Fla.

In 1965, a Florida Grand Jury ruled that fees charged by the J. E. Greiner Co. for engineering and designs for the Tampa Airport were "unduly excessive" by \$907,000.³ This J. E. Greiner Co., which has recommended the parallel bay bridge, is now being recommended by the Maryland State Roads Commis-

sion as consulting engineer for that project.

Greiner's total fee for the Tampa Airport project amounted to \$2.4 million, of which \$907,000 or 37 percent, was found by the Hillsborough County Grand Jury to be "excessive."

The grand jury findings were supported by an independent probe by the Consulting Engineers Council of Florida, which agreed that the J. E. Greiner Co.'s fees for the proposed airport were too high.⁴

As a result, the aviation authority drew up a new contract with J. E. Greiner, which the local newspaper reported "could result in substantial savings."⁵

This reduction in Greiner's fees was made despite an attempt by another panel of engineers to refute the findings of the grand jury and the Consulting Engineers Council of Florida.⁶

The vice chairman of the aviation authority, George W. Barron, had led a lone fight against the aviation authority. Mr. Barron said in November 1965, prior to the grand jury probe, that even though he was vice chairman, he was denied material in the authority's own files on its own investigation into architectural and engineering fees.

"Is there something being hidden?" he asked. "There seems to be a private dynasty trying to handle this as a private deal rather than the public's business."

Three days later, State Attorney Paul Antinori announced that he was beginning his own investigation, which prompted the grand jury ruling on December 27, 1965, that the fees were excessive.⁷

There may be a similar mystery in the State of Maryland. Why, after the people of Maryland decisively rejected the parallel bridge, are Governor Agnew, the State roads commission, and the J. E. Greiner Co. pressing so insistently for this bridge alongside a bridge?

The Governor of the State of Maryland was found to own land near the parallel bridge in company with eight business and political associates. The State roads commission has indicated that the J. E. Greiner Co. will be awarded a contract as consulting engineer on the parallel bridge. But the State roads commission has not yet made the details of this contract public. What the exact terms are must still, therefore, be a matter of conjecture. However, the J. E. Greiner Co. once listed its prospective fee on the parallel bridge as 10 percent of construction costs, or \$5.1 million, despite the fact that it had done the design for the present bridge in the same location, a design which is presumably still available to assist the Greiner Co. in designing the parallel bay bridge. Because

construction costs will have risen since Greiner listed its prospective fee in 1965, Greiner's fee, on this 10-percent basis, could be \$7 to \$10 million. Could this land deal and this huge possible fee help explain the powerful pressures to build the parallel bridge over the voters' objections?

To quote Mr. Barron, "Is there something that is being hidden?" Is there "a private dynasty trying to handle this as a private deal rather than the public's business"?

IF THE UNITED NATIONS IS TO PLAY A USEFUL ROLE IN BRINGING PEACE IN VIETNAM, WE MUST STOP BOMBING NORTH VIETNAM

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

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the United States is again talking about invoking the aid of the United Nations in bringing peace to Vietnam.

I believe the U.N. can play a constructive role in this quest. But for a move in the United Nations on our part to be worthwhile it must be a move that has some chance of success. If it is not a move that has some chance of success—if it merely reiterates our stand that North Vietnam must stop interfering with the South before there can be negotiations—we shall not only fail to get anywhere in the United Nations. By forcing the United Nations to bite off more than it can chew, we shall materially weaken the organization.

The only appeal to the United Nations that appears to have any chance of succeeding is one accompanied by an announcement that the United States is unconditionally stopping the bombing of North Vietnam.

Hanoi has repeatedly said that an unconditional cessation of the bombing is a necessary precondition to talks.

Scores of United Nations members obviously take this view. In his conversations with Prime Minister Wilson in London last February, and with President Johnson at Glassboro last July, Soviet Premier Kosygin again said that peace negotiations could begin if the bombing were stopped unconditionally.

Accompanying our cessation of the bombing should be a request to the United Nations—either the Security Council or the General Assembly—to ask the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom, cochairmen of the Geneva Conference powers, to reconvene that conference, and to invite all parties to it, including Peking and Hanoi. The National Liberation Front should also be invited. At the same time, the United Nations should make known its willingness to assist the negotiating parties in any way it can, including the provision of a United Nations force to police any settlement that may be arrived at.

I have no way of knowing whether Hanoi or the National Liberation Front would respond to this request to negotiate, or on what terms. I do know that they both seem prepared to fight forever unless we do negotiate.

¹ Dauphin County Reports, Vol. 72, 1958. Twelfth Judicial Circuit of Pennsylvania, Page 34.

² Civil Action No. 10250, U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland.

³ Minutes of meeting of Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission, November 18, 1957.

⁴ Tampa Tribune, article by Jerry Wallace, December 29, 1965, based on report of the Grand Jury of Hillsborough County, Florida, Fall Term, 1965.

⁵ Tampa Tribune, article by Jerry Wallace, December 30, 1965.

⁶ Tampa Tribune, article by Herschel Cribb, February 9, 1966.

⁷ Tampa Tribune, articles by Herschel Cribb, February 2, 1966 and February 9, 1966.

⁸ Tampa Tribune, article by Fred Smith, November 10, 1965.

⁹ Tampa Tribune, unsigned article, November 13, 1965.