

April 14, 1970

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

United States that the State University will continue to grow and prosper in centuries yet to come.

SENATE RESOLUTION 388—SUBMISSION OF A RESOLUTION RELATIVE TO THE MISSION AND SAFETY OF THE APOLLO 13 ASTRONAUTS

Mr. MURPHY (for himself and other Senators) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 388) relative to the mission and safety of the Apollo 13 astronauts, which was considered and, by unanimous consent, agreed to.

(The remarks of Mr. MURPHY when he submitted the resolution, and the ensuing debate, appear earlier in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 14, 1970, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 3690) to increase the pay of Federal employees.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON DRUGS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH), I wish to announce that the Health Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will hold 2 days of hearings on April 28 and 29, 1970, on the following bills: S. 3096 and S. 3297, regarding prescription drug identification programs; S. 3651, regarding the inspection of firms manufacturing prescription drugs; and S. 3652, regarding the labeling of prescription drug containers. **3.782**

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS OF SENATORS

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT INVADERS THOUGHTS AND PRIVACY OF ITS CIVIL SERVANTS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, in addition to keeping files on the way in which other American citizens exercise their first amendment rights, the Defense Department frequently undertakes to monitor the thoughts, habits, and personal lives of the people who work for it.

The Constitutional Rights Subcommittee studies over the last 9 years show that some, or all, of the Defense agencies attempt to obtain such information through privacy-invasive interviews, questionnaires, lie detectors, and personality tests. Other management techniques have been used to stifle free expression of the individual's opinions and to intimidate him beyond the bounds of the employer-employee relation. Telephone monitoring, better known as wiretapping, psychiatric evaluations, and suspension of security clearances are such techniques. Other Federal agencies share in this indictment, though perhaps to a lesser degree.

It was for this reason that I introduced S. 782, a bill of rights for employees of the executive branch. The bill now has 56 cosponsors, an impressive showing of

the determination of Senators on both sides of the aisle that they mean to put an end to violations of the constitutional rights of Federal employees. It passed the Senate in the last Congress with the approval of 90 Senators. Although it then died in the House committee, I believe its prospects for passage are now much more favorable.

While it will not cure all the maladies in the executive departments and agencies, this proposal will halt some of the tyrannies practiced by Federal agencies and prevent some of the follies to which many Americans are subjected simply because they work for Government and thus are a captive audience.

Two of the latest examples of what these citizens must endure recently came to the attention of the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee. The first is a questionnaire to determine the political attitudes of civil servants. Distributed by an Army deputy civilian personnel officer, this form asks such questions as the following:

How old are you?
What is your race?
When did you last vote in a local election?
When did you last vote in a presidential election?

Are you a registered member of any political party?

With the views of which party do you most usually agree? American Independent? Democratic? Republican? Other? No party?

Have you ever actively campaigned for any candidate or worked for a political party?

Have you ever contributed money to a political party or candidate?

I think the best form of city government is: City manager/council. Strong mayor/council. No opinion.

I feel that local school boards ought to be: Politically responsive. Above politics.

I believe that elections for offices such as city councilman ought to be: Partisan. Nonpartisan. It makes no difference.

I believe the political rights of civil servants ought to be: Limited. The same as any citizen.

In order to have the best chances for advancement, I believe the career military officer should: Become involved in party politics. Get a politician to "sponsor" him, but avoid political commitment himself. Keep out of any political involvement.

Civil servants know more about the real world of politics than do military officers.

Military officers are at a disadvantage in dealing with civil servants because the latter understand politics better.

Foreign service officers are more politically sophisticated than civil servants. "Block" voting by members of minority groups is a thing of the past.

"Pressure groups" perform no legitimate function.

Recipients honored with this 50-question form are reassured that their reply is anonymous. The project is, they are told, conducted in the Army staff as part of a larger research project encompassing several military installations. In ad-

dition, the results will be part of the basic research required for an advanced degree of a former Army staff officer. The civilian personnel officer then continues, "I urge you to complete and mail the questionnaire ASAP," which we presume means "as soon as possible."

Nowhere is the recipient accorded the courtesy of being informed that his participation is voluntary, that he is under no obligation to reply. Rather, since this comes from his personnel officer who holds a life-death power over his job and who "urges" him to respond, the employee must assume he has little choice unless he wants to get on a blacklist. This former Army staff officer is most likely to report a lack of cooperation.

Mr. President, I submit that it is very probable that the Chief Executive and his political appointees are interested in the past and present political beliefs and activities of civil servants. Indeed, it is to the interest of the administration to support any research at any level which might predict how Federal employees will vote in any election, and how they feel about their boss.

I venture a guess that, if the military continue to support this sort of research, they will be given a vivid demonstration of employee political "attitudes" at the ballot boxes.

Mr. John Cramer, writing about this survey in his Washington Daily News column, offers the following sound advice to employees:

Mail the questionnaire as directed. Just don't bother to fill it out.

I offer some advice to managers and personnel officers faced with decisions involving research on the personalities or the persons of their employees:

Forget it. You have more immediate duties at hand: Managing the U.S. Government, while maintaining the morale and respecting the right of employees who work for you.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of the questionnaire be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The inclosed survey is being conducted in the Army Staff as part of a larger research project encompassing several military organizations. The results will become part of the basic research required for an advanced degree of a former Army Staff officer.

You have been selected to complete the questionnaire because you represent part of the desired cross section of grade and functional specialty. You will note anonymity is desired. I urge you to complete and mail the questionnaire ASAP.

To mail simply fold top to bottom and staple. Address and stamp are then in the appropriate position for handling by U.S. Postal Personnel.

ROBERT L. MOUSEL,
Deputy Civilian Personnel Officer.

SURVEY

You are being asked to complete this questionnaire as part of a study being conducted of group attitudes and opinions on certain political matters. Three distinct and separate groups are being surveyed. Your group is part of one of the larger groups.

The questionnaire is divided into six parts; it contains a total of 50 questions. Please

S 5676

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

April 14, 1970

read the directions at the beginning of each part. As you complete each part go directly to the next part. Please answer all questions. There is no time limit.

Please do not put your name anywhere on the survey form.

Now, please turn the page and begin.

PART I.—The questions in this part are designed to gather statistical data about the people who complete this questionnaire. Please circle the letter in front of the word or phrase which most nearly answers the question as it pertains to you.

1. How old are you? A. Less than 25. B. 25 to 30. C. 30 to 35. D. 35 to 40. E. Over 40.
2. What is your education? A. Less than high school. B. High school graduate. C. Two years college. D. Bachelors Degree. E. Masters Degree. F. Doctors Degree.
3. What is your race? A. Caucasian. B. Malayan. C. Negroid. D. Oriental. E. Other.
4. What is your yearly income? A. Less than \$10,000. B. \$10,000 to \$14,000. C. \$14,000 to \$18,000. D. More than \$18,000.
5. How would you classify the place in which you grew up? A. Rural. B. Small town. C. Small city. D. Medium city. E. Large city.
6. What do you consider to be your geographical background? A. Eastern. B. Southern. C. Midwestern. D. Western. E. Pacific Coast.
7. Are you a registered voter? A. Yes. B. No.
8. Are you a registered member of any political party? A. Yes. B. No.
9. When did you last vote in a local election? A. 1969. B. 1968. C. 1967. D. Other. E. Never.
10. When did you last vote in a Presidential election? A. 1968. B. 1964. C. 1960. D. Other. E. Never.
11. With the views of which party do you most usually agree? A. American Independent. B. Democratic. C. Republican. D. Other. E. No party.
12. Have you ever contributed money to a political party or candidate? A. Yes. B. No.
13. Have you ever actively campaigned for any candidate or worked for a political party? A. Yes. B. No.
14. Have you ever run for public office? A. Yes. B. No.

PART II.—The questions in this part are also designed to get statistical information, but require you to write a one-or-two word response. Please fill in the blanks below. If you do not know the answer, or if none is appropriate, please write "unknown" or "none."

15. What do you do for a living?

16. In what congressional district do you now live?

17. What is the name of the congressman from that district?

18. What is your state of legal residence?

19. What is your congressman's name?

20. What is the name of the Attorney General of your home state?

PART III.—The questions in this part are designed to obtain some information about your opinions on certain political matters. Please circle the letter in front of the word or phrase which most nearly answers the question as it pertains to you.

21. Of the three alternatives, I believe it is most important for government to be: A. Responsive. B. Efficient. C. Fair.
22. I think the best form of city government is: A. City manager/council. B. Strong mayor/council. C. No opinion.
23. The major defect of the city manager/council form of local administration is: A. It puts too much power in the hands of an individual not elected by the voters. B. Dynamic leadership, progress, and innovation occur less than in other forms: the city tends to stagnate. C. The city manager may

step beyond the limits of administration and enter the area of policy. D. An incompetent manager is hard to fire.

24. County governments tend to provide better services to residents when: A. Department heads are professional public administrators who are hired. B. Department heads are elected directly by the voters. C. Department heads are appointed by elected officials. D. It doesn't matter.

25. I feel that local school boards ought to be: A. Politically responsive. B. Above politics.

26. I feel that elections for mayor and similar positions ought to be: A. Partisan. B. Non-partisan. C. It makes no difference.

27. I believe that elections for offices such as city councilman ought to be: A. Partisan. B. Non-partisan. C. It makes no difference.

28. I believe the political rights of civil servants ought to be: A. Limited. B. The same as any citizen.

29. I believe the political rights of military officers ought to be: A. Limited. B. The same as any citizen.

30. In order to have the best chances for advancement, I believe the career military officer should: A. Become involved in party politics. B. Get a politician to "sponsor" him, but avoid political commitment himself. C. Keep out of any political involvement.

PART IV.—The questions in this part are designed to survey your opinions about some matters related to politics. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with each of the following statements by circling the letter "A" for agree, or "D" for disagree to the right of each statement.

31. Civil servants perform more effectively at higher management positions than do politically appointed officers (A) (D).

32. Civil servants know more about the real world of politics than do career military officers (A) (D).

33. Military officers are at a disadvantage in dealing with civil servants because the latter understand politics better (A) (D).

34. Politicians often dupe or use career military officers because the latter are politically naive (A) (D).

35. Civil servants are more politically sophisticated than career military officers (A) (D).

36. Foreign service officers are more politically sophisticated than civil servants (A) (D).

37. Foreign service officers are more politically sophisticated than career military officers (A) (D).

38. Career military officers are too open and honest to deal effectively with politicians (A) (D).

PART V.—The next two questions are designed to learn what you think you would do under certain circumstances. Each question contains a hypothetical situation. Please indicate which alternative you feel you would take by circling the letter in front of the phrase which most nearly describes what you feel your actions would be in the situation described.

39. One of your hometown friends is elected to the Congress. You are assigned to the Washington, D.C. area. Would you: A. Tell your friend that because of his position and yours, the two of you should have no contact, in order to avoid even the appearance of political influence? B. See your friend socially. Introduce him to your friends, and introduce him to your supervisor? C. See your friend, but keep your friendship very very quiet? D. Report the situation to your supervisor?

40. You have final authority to make a personal management decision affecting one of your subordinates. You haven't made up your mind, and your decision could go either way. You receive a telephone call personally from a member of Congress who says he would appreciate it if you would approve the action.

Would you: A. Approve it? B. Disapprove it? C. Ask your supervisor what to do? D. Tell the Congressman politely that you would decide the case on its merits?

PART VI.—The questions in this part are designed to test your knowledge of the workings of our political system. Please indicate whether each statement is true or false by circling the letter "T" for true, or the letter "F" for false to the right of each statement.

41. Third or minor parties rarely affect National policy (T) (F)

42. All primary elections are partisan? (T) (F)

43. Membership in American political parties is based mainly upon social and economic class? (T) (F)

44. "Block" voting by members of minority groups is a thing of the past? (T) (F)

45. A member of the Congress who achieves great national prominence can likely do more for his home state or district than a relatively obscure member who has a committee chairmanship? (T) (F)

46. "Pressure groups" perform no legitimate functions? (T) (F)

47. In the operations of our National Government, the separation of executive, judicial, and legislative powers is carefully adhered to? (T) (F)

48. Centralization of party control is a distinguishing feature of American political parties? (T) (F)

49. The aims, policies, and directions of some bureaus of the Federal Government are set solely by the applicable committees of the Congress? (T) (F)

50. The open primary is the most common form of primary? (T) (F)

Mr. ERVIN, Mr. President, the second questionnaire, also sent to Army employees is a little closer to having a management purpose. This is to measure the effectiveness of certain aspects of the Department of the Army's sick leave provisions. It is not clear to me, however, how this management purpose will be achieved by asking an employee to state truthfully whether he would like to fire his boss.

Nor can it be expected that any sensible employee, informed by the commanding officer that he has been selected as part of the group to be surveyed, will provide frank and honest answers to such questions as these. At least, assurances of anonymity would not suffice to encourage my responses were I in their places.

In my job, I am paid: More than the work I am doing is really worth; about what the work I am doing is worth; less than the work I am doing is really worth.

In my office: We all think very highly of the boss; most of us respect the boss; most of us do not respect the boss; none of us think too much of the boss.

Off the job, I socialize: Mostly with people I know from work; about as much with people I know from work as with people I know from other places; mostly with people I know from places other than work.

Compared with other places you know about, is your office a good place to work: I would rather work here than any place else I know; I think it is about average; it is just average; I think it is below average.

Check the statement which best applies to you: I believe that, sooner or later, I am going to be promoted; I think I have a good chance of being promoted; I do not think I have much chance of

April 14, 1970

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

S 5677

being promoted; I am sure that I am not going to be promoted.

In dealing with me, my boss is: Always very fair; he plays it straight; usually fair; he always means well, anyway; sometimes unfair; in a pinch, he does what is good for him; usually unfair; he is out to get me if he can.

Pity the office with one respondent who dares to indicate that he thinks his boss is really a figurehead who only thinks he is in charge.

Again, the recipient was not told that this form was voluntary, and he was free to ignore it or not, as he saw fit:

As Mr. Cramer appropriately writes:

It's an amateurish questionnaire which will measure little and produce less . . . an imposition on employees who have been asked (not ordered) to fill it out . . . and almost certainly a waste of whatever tax dollars the finance office spent in distributing and collecting.

Yet this form, although purportedly helpful to the Army, like the first, was apparently basically for the personal research needs of another Army officer engaged in graduate study.

Mr. President, I recognize the need for research to produce better management techniques. However, at a time when the strains on the Federal service are many, there is also a real need for creative thinking to produce management theories which rely on more than frivolous personality studies and behavior questionnaires.

I can perceive no reason why the Defense Department or any other agency should support governmental or private research which invades the privacy which employees possess as citizens. Certainly the need for the research and the relevancy of the questions to the purpose should be carefully reviewed at the highest level.

The least we can expect of Federal managers, whether civilian or military, is that they will demonstrate the basic commonsense as well as the courage to veto such obviously questionable research projects.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the questionnaire, the perceptive articles on this subject, written by John Cramer, and published in the Washington Daily News of April 3 and 7, 1970; and my letter to the Secretary of Defense be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the questionnaire, letter, and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C., March 25, 1970.

Subject: Sick Leave.

1. References: a. CPC 2 dated 24 April 1969; b. CPP 60 dated July 1960.

2. In accordance with the above references, the attached questionnaire is designed to measure the effectiveness of certain aspects of the Department of the Army's sick leave provisions to determine what improvements in application are needed.

3. You have been selected as part of the group to be surveyed. Your frank and honest answers will contribute to the success of the task. Your answers will remain anonymous. Do not place your name on the questionnaire.

4. Instructions:

a. Fill in items 1-6 as indicated.
b. Questions 1-18 inclusive should be answered by placing an "X" in the appropriate blanks. Only one answer should be given for each question.

c. Questions 19, 20 and 21 may be answered in any way you choose.

d. Please complete and return the questionnaire by 6 April 1970. Tear off this letter before you forward the questionnaire so that your answers will remain anonymous.

M. E. RICHMOND,
Colonel, FC, Commanding.

SICK LEAVE QUESTIONNAIRE

To: CIVILIAN PERSONNEL OFFICE,
Room 302 Headquarters Bldg
Fort Lesley J. McNair.

Paygrade:----- Time in Grade:-----

Male:----- Female:-----

Length of employment with this organization:-----

Length of civil service employment:-----

1. Check the statement that best applies to you:

----(a) I'm the breadwinner in the family and I make enough money at this job to support us and enjoy most of the luxury items we want as well.

----(b) As breadwinner, I make enough money to support myself (or my family) with a little left over for luxuries.

----(c) As breadwinner, I don't make quite enough money to support myself (or my family) in this job.

----(d) As breadwinner, I cannot support myself (or my family) on what I make in this job.

----(e) I am not the principal breadwinner in our family but I have to work to help support us.

----(f) I am not the principal breadwinner in our family and I do not really have to work to support us.

2. Check the statement which best applies to you:

----(a) I am sure my boss cares about me.

----(b) I think my boss cares about me.

----(c) I don't think my boss cares about me.

----(d) I am sure my boss doesn't care about me.

3. In my job, I am paid:

----(a) More than the work I am doing is really worth.

----(b) About what the work I am doing is worth.

----(c) Less than the work I am doing is really worth.

4. In my office:

----(a) We all think very highly of the boss.

----(b) Most of us respect the boss.

----(c) Most of us do not respect the boss.

----(d) None of us think too much of the boss.

5. The people I work with:

----(a) Are congenial; we get along very well together.

----(b) Are all right; we get along about as well as could be expected.

----(c) Are only so-so; sometimes we don't get along too well.

----(d) Aren't much good; we don't get along at all.

6. Check the statement that best applies to you:

----(a) I do not hesitate to discuss job-related problems freely with my boss.

----(b) I usually hesitate a bit before bringing job-related problems to the attention of my boss.

----(c) I do not bring job-related problems to the attention of my boss unless I have to.

----(d) I never bring job-related problems to the attention of my boss under any circumstances.

7. Off the job, I socialize:

----(a) Mostly with people I know from work.

----(b) About as much with people I know from work as with people I know from other places.

----(c) Mostly with people I know from places other than work.

8. Check the statement which best applies to you:

----(a) My boss keeps me well-informed about what is going on in our organization without my having to ask.

----(b) My boss usually keeps me informed about what is going on in our organization; if I want to know something special, I can find out by asking him.

----(c) My boss seldom tells me what is going on in our organization; he doesn't like me to ask questions.

----(d) My boss never tells me what is going on in our organization; he won't answer questions if he can help it.

9. Check the statement which best applies to you:

----(a) I would never take on a second job.

----(b) I might take on a second job.

----(c) I am looking for a second job.

----(d) I have a second job now.

10. Compared with other places you know about, is your office a good place to work?

----(a) I would rather work here than anyplace else I know.

----(b) I think it is about average.

----(c) It is just average.

----(d) I think it is below average.

11. Check the statement which best applies to you:

----(a) I believe that, sooner or later, I am going to be promoted.

----(b) I think I have a good chance of being promoted.

----(c) I do not think I have much chance of being promoted.

----(d) I am sure that I am not going to be promoted.

12. In dealing with me, my boss is:

----(a) Always very fair; he plays it straight.

----(b) Usually fair; he always means well, anyway.

----(c) Sometimes unfair; in a pinch, he does what is good for him.

----(d) Usually unfair; he is out to get me if he can.

13. The work I am doing:

----(a) Is very interesting and satisfying.

----(b) Is fairly interesting and satisfying.

----(c) Is pretty dull and boring.

----(d) Is a waste of my time.

14. If I could, I:

----(a) Would promote my boss.

----(b) Would not promote my boss, but I would keep him on the job.

----(c) Would demote my boss.

----(d) Would fire my boss.

15. Choose the statement that best applies to you:

----(a) I know I could handle a bigger job than the one I have now.

----(b) I think I could probably handle a bigger job than I have now.

----(c) I am not sure I could handle a bigger job than the one I have now.

----(d) I know I could not handle a job any bigger than the one I have now.

16. Check the statement which best applies to you:

----(a) I always know where I stand with my boss.

----(b) I am pretty sure I know where I stand with my boss.

----(c) I am not so sure I really know where I stand with my boss.

----(d) I have no idea where I stand with my boss.

17. On the whole, I would say that:

----(a) My boss leaves no doubt that he is in charge; he runs a "taut ship".

----(b) My boss generally keeps control of what is going on; at least he keeps tabs on important things.

S5678

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD-- SENATE

April 14, 1970

----(c) My boss exercises only loose control over what is going on; he doesn't influence as many activities as he likes to believe.

----(d) My boss is really a figurehead; he only thinks he is in charge.

18. Do you have a transportation problem getting to and from work?

----(a) I drive my own car.

----(b) I am in a car pool or ride with someone else.

----(c) I take the bus and have no difficulty.

----(d) I take the bus and have great difficulty.

----(e) I walk to and from work.

19. Please write below any comments you have about your office which you feel are especially good.

20. Please comment on any practices which you feel are especially bad.

21. If you had the power to do so, what would you do to improve employment conditions?

APRIL 8, 1970.

Hon. MELVIN R. LAIRD,
*Secretary of Defense,
The Pentagon,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In the course of the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee's study of governmental invasion of the privacy of Federal employees, it has come to my attention that Defense Department employees are being asked to complete questionnaires about their social and political beliefs, attitudes and activities, and about their personal thoughts and beliefs about people in their offices.

One example of these questionnaires is enclosed with this letter. As you will see, it is distributed to selected employees by a Deputy Civilian Personnel Officer with the comment, "I urge you to complete and mail the questionnaire ASAP." The directions state that the "survey is being conducted in the Army Staff as part of a larger research project encompassing several military organizations, and that the results will become part of the basic research required for an advanced degree of a former Army Staff officer."

Among the questions which this questionnaire asks employees are the following:

How old are you?

What is your race?

When did you last vote in a local election?

When did you last vote in a Presidential election?

Are you a registered member of any political party?

With the views of which party do you most usually agree?

A. American Independent.

B. Democratic.

C. Republican.

D. Other.

E. No party.

Have you ever actively campaigned for any candidate or worked for a political party?

Have you ever contributed money to a political party or candidate?

I think the best form of city government is:

A. City manager/council.

B. Strong mayor/council.

C. No opinion.

I feel that local school boards ought to be:

A. Politically responsive.

B. Above politics.

I believe that elections for offices such as city councilman ought to be:

A. Partisan.

B. Non-partisan.

C. It makes no difference.

I believe the political rights of civil servants ought to be:

A. Limited.

B. The same as any citizen.

In order to have the best chances for advancement, I believe the career military officer should:

A. Become involved in party politics.

B. Get a politician to "sponsor" him, but avoid political commitment himself.

C. Keep out of any political involvement. Civil servants know more about the real world of politics than do career military officers.

Military officers are at a disadvantage in dealing with civil servants because the latter understand politics better.

Foreign service officers are more politically sophisticated than civil servants.

"Block" voting by members of minority groups is a thing of the past.

"Pressure groups" perform no legitimate functions.

A member of the Congress who achieves great national prominence can likely do more for his home state or district than a relatively obscure member who has a committee chairmanship?

I think you would agree with me that the answers to these questions clearly are none of this student Army officer's business, nor are they the business of the Army. The fact that this reply is supposed to be anonymous is irrelevant.

As an old infantry drill regulation states, a request from a superior is equivalent to a command, and no citizen should be commanded to supply such information, regardless of the purpose.

I strongly urge that this and any similar surveys be cancelled and that procedures be established in all of the services to assure an adequate review at a high level of such research, whether it be private or governmental.

The second questionnaire is apparently also for private research by an Army officer, although ostensibly designed to aid in management of sick leave programs. Again, employees are not told this survey is voluntary, but rather, the Commanding Officer tells them to "please complete and return the form by April 8." Although it is noted that the replies of this "selected" group are "anonymous," recipients are told by the Commanding Officer to send questionnaires back to the Civilian Personnel Office which supposedly selected them in the first place.

I know it will perplex you as much as it does me why the Army sees fit to spend taxpayers' money asking employees' "frank and honest" answers to questions such as:

I am sure my boss does not care for me.

In my job, I am paid more than the work I am doing is really worth.

In my office, none of us think too much of the boss.

I am sure that I am not going to be promoted.

In dealing with me, my boss is usually unfair; he is out to get me if he can.

If I could, I would fire my boss.

On the whole, I would say that my boss is really a figurehead; he only thinks he is in charge.

In my opinion, the only worthwhile question is the last, which is "If you had the power to do so, what would you do to improve employment conditions?"

It would be most useful to have, for each of the armed services and the Defense agencies, copies of all similar statistical research questionnaires asking civil servants to report on their thoughts, habits, beliefs and personal lives.

In the interest of employee morale and protection of individual privacy, I urge you to

give serious consideration to issuance of a Department-wide directive:

(1) Requiring that every governmental or private research questionnaire sent to civil servants in the Defense Department state on the first page that response is voluntary, and that the recipient is under no compulsion to reply;

(2) Requiring a high level clearance for all such questionnaires;

(3) Banning all such forms asking about an individual's political, economic, and social beliefs which have nothing to do with his employment.

With all kind wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

SAM J. ERVIN, Jr.,

*Chairman, Subcommittee on
Constitutional Rights.*

[From the Washington Daily News,

Apr. 8, 1970]

RARE AND RANK

(By John Cramer)

Today we have rare, rank bit of bureaucratic abuse—an Army personnel guy using his official muscle to pressure Army employees into helping an Army officer get a graduate degree.

Specifically, he asked them (in terms which could be construed as an order) to fill out a six-page questionnaire of 50 questions on their "political attitudes."

The personnel guy is Robert L. Mousel, deputy civilian personnel officer for the Office of the Army Chief of Staff. Perhaps he's merely a victim of the system.

The controversial questionnaire was distributed over his signature with a note which read:

"The enclosed survey is being conducted in the Army staff as part of a larger research project encompassing several military organizations. The results will become part of the basic research required for an advanced degree of a former Army staff officer.

"You have been selected to complete the questionnaire because you represent part of the desired cross section of grade and functional speciality. You will note anonymity is desired. I urge you to complete and mail the questionnaire ASAP."

The employees were "urged" to complete the questionnaire . . . were not told they were free to ignore it. Unquestionably, subtle pressure to "cooperate" was there.

Mr. Mousel said the research project, designed to analyze differences in political attitudes between civilian and military personnel, was the work of a Lieutenant colonel whom the Army has assigned to George Washington University while he pursues a master's degree in political science.

He also said:

That the colonel's planned course of study, including his research project, had been approved in advance by the Army.

That civilians who received the questionnaire were 250 GS-12s, 13s, and 14s, selected at random by a "small computer run."

That the questionnaires were distributed to the 250 thru the Pentagon mail system.

That the Army frequently performs similar services for other researchers.

The questionnaire came with a cover sheet bearing the colonel's home address and a stamp. Employees were told: "To mail simply fold top to bottom and staple. Address and stamp then are in the appropriate position."

My suggestion to employees: mail the questionnaire, as directed. Just don't bother to fill it out.

This won't help the colonel get his degree. It may, however, ennoble his future career by pointing out to him one dominant "political attitude" of Army civilians.

They dislike being showed around.

April 14, 1970

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 5679

[The Washington Daily News, Tuesday,
Apr. 7, 1970]

(By John Cramer)

Apparently it's common practice in Army—
MORE BRASS USING CIVILIANS FOR RESEARCH—
the business of letting its civilian employes
be used as semi-captive guinea pigs for the
research projects of Army officers assigned
to graduate schools.

Last week, there was mention here of a
six-page questionnaire recently distributed
by the Office of the Army Chief of Staff
to 250 employes at the GS-12-14 level.

It was the work of a lieutenant colonel
studying differences in "political attitudes"
of Army civilian and military personnel as
a research project required for an advanced
degree at George Washington University.

ANOTHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Now we have a different lieutenant colonel,
also at GWU, with a different question-
naire—this one a mere four pages.

It purports to "measure the effectiveness
of certain aspects of the Department of
Army's sick leave provisions."

And the captive guinea pigs for this one
are employes of the Army's Finance and Ac-
counts Office here.

Actually, this second questionnaire in no
way deals with "sick leave provisions." In-
stead, it apparently seeks to discover rela-
tionships between sick leave use and such
things as employe earning . . . their rapport
with co-workers . . . attitude toward their
bosses . . . chances of promotions . . . etc.

But it's an amateurish sort of question-
naire which will measure little and produce
less . . . an imposition on employes who have
been asked (not ordered) to fill it out . . . and
almost certainly a waste of whatever tax
dollars the Finance Office spent in distribut-
ing and collecting it.

BLAME ARMY

In the long run, it will be of value only
to the lieutenant colonel who foisted it off
on the Finance Office. But don't blame him.
Blame the Army for letting him get away
with it.

The best that can be said for his project
is that it makes more sense than the Office
of Chief of Staff research on "political
attitudes."

The Finance Office questionnaire was au-
thorized by Col. M. E. Richmond, new com-
mander of the office, who explains himself
so decently that I'm almost inclined to for-
give him.

He said he has a sick leave "problem" in
the Office . . . that he hopes to correct it by
providing better motivation . . . that he
thinks the questionnaire might point the
way.

But I can't quite see spending taxpayer
dough, and imposing on employes with ques-
tions such as No. 5 in the questionnaire:

"The people I work with:

"(a) Are congenial; we get along very well
together.

"(b) Are all right; we get along about as
well as could be expected.

"(c) Are only so-so; sometimes we don't
get along too well.

"(d) Aren't much good; we don't get along
at all."

"Check the statement that best applies
to you:

Or No. 7—

"Off the job, I socialize:

"(a) Mostly with people I know from work.

"(b) About as much with people I know
from work as with people I know from other
places.

"(c) Mostly with people I know from
places other than work."

Sen. Sam Ervin, D-N.C., and others have
made the point that we already have an
excess of professionals licensed to practice
their psychological tests, attitude surveys,
and other assorted sorceries on federal
workers.

So spare us, please, the Army's student-type
amateurs with their one-time ventures into
the sticky world of attitude testing.

FILING DATES FOR PERSONAL
FINANCIAL REPORTS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, recent
inquiries to the Select Committee on
Standards and Conduct suggest that not
all Senators and employes are familiar
with the filing deadlines for personal dis-
closure and outside employment reports
required by the Senate rules of conduct.
Senators, candidates for Senator, and
officers and employes of the Senate are
reminded that personal financial state-
ments must be filed before May 15 and
that reports of outside employment must
be filed on May 15.

The Select Committee on Standards
and Conduct has prepared forms for
these reports whose use is recommended
but not mandatory. The committee also
has issued instructions for preparing the
reports, which state among other things
when and where to file.

Copies of the forms and the instruc-
tions may be picked up in the commit-
tee offices in room 1417 of the New Sen-
ate Office Building or may be requested
by telephone on extension 2981. The staff
of the committee will assist anyone who
requests help in preparing reports.

LET REASON PREVAIL IN OUR
TRADE POLICIES

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. Presi-
dent, on October 13 of last year my dis-
tinguished colleague and fellow West
Virginian, (Mr. RANDOLPH) and I intro-
duced S. 3022, the Trade Expansion Act
of 1969. Since that date, due in part to
the subsequent supporting debate on this
floor, the fog shrouding the issues con-
fronted by the bill has lifted enough to
reinforce my belief that it has immedi-
ate merit.

The fundamental reason for my sup-
port of the bill is my conviction that in
the currently expanding world economy
the rate of growth of industrial produc-
tion must be subject to a modicum of
order. The present structure tends to-
wards overproduction in some industrial
fields, with seriously disruptive con-
sequences to parts of the American
economy.

The fact that the United States is the
largest market, and the major open mar-
ket in the world economy, does not viti-
ate my argument. On the contrary it
makes it more relevant and timely. Hard-
ly a week passes by without reports of
difficult or unsuccessful meetings and
official negotiations dealing with the
problem of mounting imports in face of a
relative decline in our exports. Gener-
ally, statements from all parties con-
cerned are more self-seeking than self-
evident. But there is also noticeable a
change in mood and a stiffening of na-
tional positions. The seriousness of this
situation is underscored by the very fact
that meaningful international relations,
both political and economic, must be
based on a give-and-take formula. I find
that we have been doing most of the
giving and little of the taking. In fact, we

have been giving so long that our trade
partners have frozen in their position of
taking to such an extent that they seem
now to consider it the natural state of
affairs.

Mr. President, I think that the time
has come for Congress to do what it can
to correct this situation. Our Govern-
ment's dealings with the Japanese Gov-
ernment on the matter of textile imports
have been marked by intransigence. The
high point of this was reached by the
statement of the powerful Japanese Min-
ister of International Trade and Industry
who in February was quoted saying:

There can be no way of pushing ahead
talks unless the United States accepts Ja-
pan's basic thinking.

Only recently, the chairman of the
Japan Textile Federation warned the
Japanese Government that the federa-
tion would not honor any agreement be-
tween the United States and Japan on
the textile issue if unreasonable conces-
sions were made to the Americans. The
chairman implied that there was no need
for such concessions since critical voices
in Washington could be counted upon
to prevent the passage of protectionist
legislation by Congress.

In an unprecedented move, the United
States presented to Japan in late Janu-
ary of this detailed economic data to
show that the U.S. textile firms and ap-
parel industries are being injured by im-
ports. On March 10 a report from Tokyo
described the current United States-
Japan export curb talks as fruitless. A
dead end has been reached, the report
said, in the year-long search for an
agreement on textile imports to the
United States when our "final offer" was
made. This, however, was followed by a
flying visit to Washington by a high Ja-
panese diplomat who reportedly envis-
aged Japanese voluntary restraints only
after Japanese exports to this country
exceeded a 50-percent rise over any pre-
ceding year. Is this a realistic and rea-
sonable approach in trying to solve a
problem on a mutuality of interests? The
same report also noted that the Japa-
nese public opinion is increasingly
marked by a new awareness of national
self-confidence which, according to their
culture, requires them to "stand up" to
American "pressures."

Japan will have to learn that the in-
ordinate expansion of its trade and fi-
nancial exchanges with the rest of the
world, but especially with the United
States, is no longer consistent with its
restrictive practices and policies. Meas-
ures that made some sense when Japan
was rebuilding its war-ravaged economy
and trying to create industries that could
stand on their own in international com-
petition have no shred of justification
now.

Of course, the problem does not lie
with textiles alone, nor is it confined to
Japan. Other major industrial products
are affected by mounting imports, among
them glass, hardware, steel, and elec-
tronic products.

Assistant Secretary of Commerce Ken-
neth N. Davis, Jr., bluntly cautioned
Western Europe and Japan in March
that they must give fairer treatment to
American exports sold in their markets

S 5680

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

April 14, 1970

and that both trading areas should not underestimate the American administration's determination to achieve an equitable solution.

Mr. Davis said:

For the benefit of all the world's trade, it is time for Japan and Europe to respond more fairly than heretofore to 20 years of U.S. leadership in expansionist world trade policy!

Subsequently, Mr. Davis mentioned that a series of missions of U.S. business leaders will visit other nations in the interest of fairer trade relations. Moreover, it is reported that Commerce Secretary Maurice Stans is considering calling to Washington leaders of American industry and trade associations to map an all-out drive on unfair restrictions against U.S. business activities by some of the major industrial nations.

But is our Government pressing the issue strongly enough? The lack of results and the seeming widening policy of restrictionism of the various nations involved would indicate that this is not the case. Extended consultations and talks across the Atlantic have yielded at best accusations and counteraccusations. Mr. Davis termed troublesome the attitude of the Europeans and their lack in understanding that serious differences exist between the two trading areas. True, it may not be within the spirit and the letter of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade for the United States to retain the American selling price provision in our trade with GATT members. But for the Europeans to insist on our repeal of ASP while they are about to erect new barriers discriminating against American electronic components is an unreasonable and untenable position. The French-German-British accord may well be considered by its members as nondiscriminatory, but it is aimed at what the Electronic Industries Association estimates to be about 35 percent of the U.S. shipments of electronic components to Europe.

A visit here in February by a trade representative of the European Economic Commission in the wake of U.S. criticism of the Common Market was preceded by a salvo of criticism from Europeans warning about the danger to world trade by the protectionist measures advocated in the U.S. Congress. The European Commission also maintained that the common American notion that the U.S. complaints of the European Community by far outweigh in number and importance their complaints of the American system is unfounded. They cited U.S. import restrictions in the agricultural and mechanical industries, but failed to mention the severity of their barriers in agriculture, which surpass any rationality. If the European Commission is publicly expressing anxieties about import restrictions pending in Congress, then they ought to publicly or privately consider the issues in terms of their merits and in line with their avowed extremely liberal policy toward trade, instead of contributing to the atmosphere of criticism and suspicion of intentions.

Quite contrary to many of its pronouncements, the European Community has been busy in protective action lately.

The Common Market has been signing preferential trade agreements with a variety of African and Mediterranean countries. These trade pacts often violate the spirit if not the letter of the GATT principles.

The process is fast becoming a mockery of the most-favored-nation principle which, in international trade, requires that the extension of preferential treatment to one trade partner be extended to all partners. This principle is fast becoming something to invoke in one case and to disregard in another while in hot pursuit of national self-interest.

The initial beneficiaries of the preferential trade pacts of the Common Market were Greece and Turkey and the former French and Belgian colonies, now independent states. In the past several years the list expanded to include Yugoslavia, Tunisia, and Morocco. Lately, the European Community has been quietly creating a network of preferential trade pacts with Mediterranean countries. This area has been buying about \$1.3 billion worth of goods from the United States. Two nations particularly involved are Israel and Spain which alone imported more than 1 billion of these American exports. This trade is bound to be affected not because of improved competition, but because new barriers will be erected discriminating against our goods. Meantime, waiting in the wings are Egypt and Lebanon, Libya and Algeria, and little Malta, all lining up for preferential trade accords with the Common Market.

No doubt there may be economic justifications for such a policy and the European continental powers are frank about their main goal in these arrangements. They seek political influence if not dominance. While the United States should perhaps not complain on the latter aspect, we have the right to examine the methods used as they would seem not only contrary to existing agreements but directly injurious to our national interests. At stake are the welfare of our business firms and our workers' jobs in the years ahead.

The proliferation of preferential trade ties can only lead to a growing polarization of regional interests with the eventual emergence of large rival trading blocs.

It is interesting to note that privately the Common Market has been saying that the basic circumstances of international trade have been altered since the industrial tariffs were reduced almost 40 percent in the Kennedy round. This is exactly the point that I have been expounding. If GATT principles within which the Kennedy round have been conducted and, so far, partly implemented are no longer viable, then it is high time for this Congress to establish new guidelines consonant with our current national interest and policy. It may well be that the Common Market does not want a division of the world in economic blocs. Nor, would this I believe, be in the interest of the United States. But we cannot sit here just watching events as they unfold. Furthermore it does not help us that the European Common Market officials are ready and willing to swear that

their intentions are to preserve the GATT, while at the same time their actions indicate a different course of events. Some of the Europeans have successfully blocked the current initiative of GATT in its attempt of starting negotiations later this year on agricultural trade and nontariff barriers. Moreover, the total direction of current efforts crossing the Atlantic and the Pacific would indicate a return toward erecting new nontariff barriers so that the major GATT members can consolidate their negotiating positions for the next bout.

I am not in favor of either political war or economic war. I believe that reason can prevail. But now is the time to use reason and bring our house in order. We cannot wish our problems away. We have a responsibility toward our citizens and our Nation's economy. We cannot allow the present unsettled situation to rule us or to continue unchecked. If the administration is unable to achieve its stated goal within the existing framework of international trade agreements, we in Congress have the duty to do it here and now. I am not proposing major surgery. But I am convinced that preventive medicine is far preferable to the treatment of an organism in an advanced state of decay. Every doctor will also tell you that in the long run such an approach is both more effective and more economical.

Mr. President, the bill that I support is not repressive or protectionist in nature. It would only assure us and our trading partners full participation of a fair share of an orderly growth of our markets. This I do in the face of growing direct subsidies of foreign exports undercutting our efforts to sell our goods abroad, while at the same time U.S. manufacturers are being asked by the same governments to transfer production and jobs out of the United States.

What it finally comes down to is the preservation of American workers' jobs—the preservation of West Virginia jobs and jobs in every State where our magnanimous trade policies are resulting in loss to our own citizens.

The bill of which I am a cosponsor would apply to imports of flat glass, glassware, steel, footwear, manmade fibers, and electronic products. Other commodities, of course, can be included in instances where economic loss is occurring.

In my own State, 30,000 jobs, in round figures, are represented by the industries to which the bill applies. That is a very substantial number in our work force.

Too many people tend to think of unemployment in terms of statistics when they should be thinking of it in human terms. Being unemployed, being without a job and the means to support oneself or one's family is a cruel and degrading experience. We simply cannot afford, Mr. President, for the overliberal import policies of government to be the cause of joblessness and misery among our own people.

Theory and practicality have historically collided in America's foreign trade experience. Too often have we erred on the side of theory. Wishful thinking about the intentions of others has too often blinded us to the fact that in the real

April 7, 1970

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S5189

Other objections to direct election have been rather fully discussed. No great principle is involved in the speculation that it might increase the importance of small states. Purely as a matter of interest, however, I believe that those who anticipate such a consequence would be seriously disappointed.

Most presidential campaigns are directed at a "swing vote" of about 10 to 20 per cent of the electorate. Any candidate in search of those votes must focus his money and efforts on the large states, for that is where the people are and where the most volatile vote is to be found.

In 1968, about half the total vote for the two major candidates came from just seven states. A change of less than 1½ per cent in those states would have canceled out Richard Nixon's entire Southern margin over Hubert Humphrey. No political strategist could wisely advise a candidate to take the slightest risk in the big states in order to pick up a few Southern or border states.

Thus if direct election is approved, the proponents of the "New Federalism" will preside over the dissolution of one of the few remaining levers which less populated sections have on national politics. This may be a healthy thing, but it always helps to be clear about what you are doing when you change the Constitution.

NO PURE DEMOCRACY

The electoral college has not only faithfully reflected the popular will; it has usually strengthened it by giving a candidate with a narrow popular margin a far larger electoral mandate. Against this historical experience is now set the argument that the electoral system offends the theoretical democratic principle of "one man, one vote."

This is certainly so, at least in abstract possibility. We must remember, however, that this is not the uniform principle of our government. The Supreme Court, with its power to overrule President and Congress, is responsible to no electorate. And its insulation from popular will has helped strengthen it to protect liberties.

A Senator elected by a few hundred thousand votes in Idaho has as much power over national affairs as a man selected by several million citizens of New York. Yet the Senate has often been a more liberal and principled body than the House. Men like the Secretary of Defense, whose power over our lives far exceeds that of most of our earlier Presidents, are appointed and removed by one man.

Our national government is not a pure democracy, nor does anyone suggest that it should be. None of our institutions of governments acts exactly as the Founding Fathers expected. Yet they have managed to evolve some kind of enduring and relatively fruitful harmony.

The system is not perfect, and I believe we need some fundamental changes. But when we are asked to change an institution as basic as the Electoral College, the only relevant questions are practical ones. How is it working? What are its functions? What will be the consequences of the change? To act on the basis of rhetoric about pure democracy may have threatening consequences for the future of our actual democracy, and would be in a spirit foreign to the Constitution itself.

For all the influence of mass media and fast planes, we are still a continent, sheltering diverse peoples with very different ways of living. The Electoral College has been one of the institutions tending to strengthen the curious, irrational and frustrating political system which has held us together. Before embarking on the irrevocable course of abolition, we should be sure that we understand and are willing to risk the possible results.

DIRECT ELECTIONS AN INVITATION TO NATIONAL CHAOS

(By Theodore H. White)

Last September, in a triumph of noble purpose over common sense, the House passed and has sent to the Senate a proposal to abolish the Federal System.

It is not called that, of course. Put forth as an amendment to the Constitution, the new scheme offers a supposedly better way of electing Presidents. Advanced with the delusive rhetoric of *vox populi, vox Dei*, it not only wipes out the obsolete Electoral College but abolishes the sovereign states as voting units. In the name of The People, it proposes that a giant plebiscite pour all 70,000,000 American votes into a single pool whose winner—whether by 5,000 or 5,000,000—is hailed as National Chief.

American elections are a naked transaction in power—a cruel, brawling year-long adventure swept by profound passion and prejudice. Quite naturally, therefore, Constitution and tradition have tried to limit the sweep of passions, packaging the raw votes within each state, weighing each state's electoral vote proportionately to population, letting each make its own rules and police its own polls.

The new theory holds that an instantaneous direct cascade of votes offers citizens a more responsible choice of leadership—and it is only when one tests high-minded theory against reality that it becomes nightmare.

Since the essence of the proposal is a change in the way votes are counted, the first test must be a hard look at vote-counting as it actually operates. Over most of the United States votes are cast and counted honestly. No one anymore can steal an election that is not close to begin with, and in the past generation vote fraud has diminished dramatically.

Still, anyone who trusts the precise count in Gary, Ind.; Cook County, Ill.; Duval County, Texas; Suffolk County, Mass.; or in half a dozen border and Southern states is out of touch with political reality. Under the present electoral system, however, crooks in such areas are limited to toying with the electoral vote of one state only; and then only when margins are exceptionally tight. Even then, when the dial riggers, ballot stuffers, later counters and recounters are stimulated to play election-night poker with the results, their art is balanced by crooks of the other party playing in the same game.

John F. Kennedy won in 1960 by the tenuous margin of 118,550—less than 1/5 of one percent of the national total—in an election stained with outright fraud in at least three states. No one challenged his victory, however, because the big national decision had been made by electoral votes of honest-count states, sealed off from contamination by fraud elsewhere—and because scandal could as well be charged to Republicans as to Democrats. But if, henceforth, all the raw votes from Hawaii to Maine are funneled into one vast pool, and popular results are as close as 1960 and 1968, the pressure to cheat or call recounts must penetrate everywhere—for any vote stolen anywhere in the Union pressures politicians thousands of miles away to balance or protest it. Twice in the past decade, the new proposal would have brought America to chaos.

To enforce honest vote-counting in all the nation's 170,000 precincts, national policing becomes necessary. So, too, do uniform federal laws on voter qualifications. New laws, for example, will have to forbid any state from increasing its share of the total by enfranchising youngsters of 18 (as Kentucky and Georgia do now) while most others limit voting to those over 21. Residence requirements, too, must be made uniform in all states. The centralization required breaches all American tradition.

Reality forces candidates today to plan campaigns on many levels, choosing groups and regions to which they must appeal, importantly educating themselves on local issues in states they seek to carry.

But if states are abolished as voting units, TV becomes absolutely dominant. Campaign strategy changes from delicately assembling a winning coalition of states and becomes a media effort to capture the largest share of the national "vote market." Instead of courting regional party leaders by compromise, candidates will rely on media masters. Issues will be shaped in national TV studios, and the heaviest swat will go to the candidate who raises the most money to buy the best time and most "creative" TV talent.

The most ominous domestic reality today is race confrontation. Black votes count today because blacks vote chiefly in big-city states where they make the margin of difference. No candidate seeking New York's 43 electoral votes, Pennsylvania's 29, Illinois' 26 can avoid courting the black vote that may swing those states. If states are abolished as voting units, the chief political leverage of Negroes is also abolished. Whenever a race issue has been settled by plebiscite—from California's Proposition 14 (on Open Housing) in 1964 to New York's Police Review Board in 1966—the plebiscite vote has put the blacks down. Yet a paradox of the new rhetoric is that Southern conservatives, who have most to gain by the new proposal, oppose it, while Northern liberals, who have most to lose, support it because it is halloved in the name of The People.

What is wrong in the old system is not state-by-state voting. What is wrong is the anachronistic Electoral College and the mischief anonymous "electors" can perpetrate in the wake of a close election. Even more dangerous is the provision that lets the House, if no candidate has an electoral majority, choose the President by the undemocratic unit rule—one state, one vote. These dangers can be eliminated simply by an amendment which abolishes the Electoral College but retains the electoral vote by each state and which, next, provides that in an election where there is no electoral majority, senators and congressmen, individually voting in joint session and hearing the voices of the people in their districts, will elect a President.

What is right about the old system is the sense of identity it gives Americans. As they march to the polls, Bay States should feel Massachusetts is speaking, Hoosiers should feel Indiana is speaking; blacks and other minorities should feel their votes count; so, too, should Southerners from Tidewater to the Gulf. The Federal System has worked superbly for almost two centuries. It can and should be speedily improved. But to reduce Americans to faceless digits on an enormous tote board, in a plebiscite swept by demagoguery, manipulated by TV, at the mercy of crooked counters—this is an absurdity for which goodwill and noble theory are no justification.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the senior Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY) be added as a cosponsor of S. 782, the Federal employee "bill of rights."

I am happy to report that this brings to 56 the total number of sponsors of this bill which is so urgently needed to secure the liberty accorded by the Constitution to over 3 million American citizens.

S 5190

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

April 7, 1970

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAVEL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 3164

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTOYA) I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS) be added as a cosponsor to the bill, S. 3164, to amend the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act to require a packaged perishable food to bear a label specifying the date after which it is not to be sold for consumption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HANSEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 3388

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BOGGS) be added as a cosponsor of S. 3388, to establish an Environmental Quality Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 3528

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE) I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) be added as cosponsors of S. 3528, to amend the Small Business Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 3552

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) be added as a cosponsor of S. 3552, to provide certain privileges against disclosure of confidential information obtained by newsmen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 3565

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) be added as cosponsor of S. 3565, to provide for the establishment of national standards for warranties made with respect to consumer goods distributed in or affecting interstate commerce, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 3566

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) be added as a cosponsor of S. 3566, to establish, within the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, a National Council on American Minority History and Culture

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 3586

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS) be added as a cosponsor of the bill S. 3586, to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act to establish eligibility of new schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, pharmacy, optometry, veterinary medicine, and podiatry for institutional grants under section 771 thereof, to extend and improve the program relating to training of personnel in the allied health professions, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAVEL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 3604

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) be added as a cosponsor of S. 3604, to authorize the establishment of an older worker community service program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HANSEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 3643

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYNE) be added as a cosponsor of S. 3643, to provide for the issuance of a gold medal to the widow of the Reverend Doctor Martin Luther King, Jr., and the furnishing of duplicate medals in bronze to the Martin Luther King, Jr., memorial fund at Morehouse College and the Martin Luther King, Jr., Memorial Center at Atlanta, Ga.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 211

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT) be added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 211, seeking agreement with the Union or Soviet Socialist Republics on limiting offensive and defensive strategic weapons and the suspension of test flights of reentry vehicles.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HANSEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. GURNEY) be added as a cosponsor of the resolution, Senate Resolution 376, authorizing the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to study research activities conducted to ascertain

the causes and develop cures to eliminate cancer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAVEL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS SCHEDULED ON NOMINATION OF EDWARD B. MILLER OF ILLINOIS TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I wish to announce a hearing scheduled by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on May 7 on the nomination of Mr. Edward B. Miller of Illinois to be Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board.

Anyone wishing to testify on this appointment should notify Robert Harris, staff director of the committee, by April 30.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S SUCCESS IN VIETNAMIZATION

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, it seems we are living in an era when good news is no news. And nowhere have I heard over the air or read in any newspaper the fact that the United States for the week ending last Thursday, April 2, withdrew 9,000 of our military personnel from South Vietnam.

This information has been available to anyone who desires it. But it appears now that the President's goal of reducing our forces in South Vietnam to 434,500 by April 15 will be reached several days ahead of schedule.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed for 12 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE RULE OF GERMANENESS—UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that for the remainder of the second session of the 91st Congress, the Pastore rule of germaneness of debate shall not begin to run until the conclusion of routine morning business or until the unfinished business is laid before the Senate, whichever comes later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I withdraw the request.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I reserved the right to object merely to ask if the majority leader would be willing to confine the operation