

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Agriculture Loses a Great Pioneer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have long been involved in the field of agriculture have suffered the loss of one of the men responsible for the abundant capabilities of the American farmer. Prof. Lloyd W. Hurlbut died after serving many years as a leader in agricultural engineering.

Professor Hurlbut served as president of the American Society of Agricultural Engineers from 1960 to 1961, and was an international authority on tractor testing. He was chairman of the University of Nebraska Department of Agricultural Engineering.

Dean E. F. Frolik, of the University of Nebraska College of Agriculture and Home Economics, said:

Professor Hurlbut's untimely death comes as a shock to thousands of friends in Nebraska, the Nation, and numerous foreign countries. He made outstanding contributions professionally and was a dynamic leader.

Dean Frolik termed Professor Hurlbut "one of the most forward looking persons I have ever known." Nebraska's agriculture—in fact the agriculture of the world—has suffered a great loss in the death of Lloyd Hurlbut.

Professor Hurlbut was a pioneer in development of pneumatic tires for farm tractors in the 1930's. More recently, he was a moving force behind the development and widespread use of the combine for harvesting corn, artificial drying of corn, and the minimum tillage system for raising corn and other row crops. He was granted patents on several devices, including a pneumatic seeder which uses air to meter and deposit seed in a seed-bed.

At the time of his death, Professor Hurlbut was chairman of the Nebraska Tractor Test Board, which supervises operation of the tractor testing laboratory, established in 1921 under law of the State of Nebraska.

Professor Hurlbut was the leader of a research project which showed that unheated, forced air could be used effectively for drying high-moisture grain in bulk storage.

In cooperation with other engineers, Professor Hurlbut developed the V-type tillage blades now widely used to work soil and leave crop residues on the surface.

In the early 1950's Professor Hurlbut was instrumental in construction and testing of the first mechanical harvester of castor bean seeds. A patent was issued on the harvester and assigned to the University of Nebraska.

Professor Hurlbut was a native of Kansas, received his B.S. degree in engineer-

ing from Kansas State College in 1932. He received his M.S. from the University of Nebraska in 1934.

He joined the University of Nebraska staff as an assistant in agricultural engineering in 1934, was appointed an instructor in 1936, and promoted to assistant professor in 1938.

He served with the U.S. Navy on active duty from 1943 to 1945 in the Pacific theater, becoming a lieutenant commander in the U.S. Naval Reserve in 1946. In the same year he joined the staff of Purdue University at Lafayette, Ind. In 1947, he returned to the University of Nebraska as professor and chairman of the department of agricultural engineering.

Self-Help for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD H. POFF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, at the age of 13, it was necessary for me to begin work to help finance my education. After school, on Saturdays, and through the summer vacations, I worked as a store clerk, a laborer, a farmhand, truckdriver, and carpenter's helper. When I enrolled in college, I continued to earn my way until I entered the military service in World War II, and when I returned and married, both my young wife and I worked so that I might complete my education.

It was apparent to me then that one of the best forms of aid to education would have been a tax deduction for at least part of the income I earned from extracurricular work and applied toward educational expenses. Yet, then and now, when a boy and girl has to work full time during the summer and part time during the school year to pay for his or her books and tuition, the Federal Government taxes their meager income without consideration that most of it is being used for an educational purpose. On the other hand, the affluent philanthropist who makes a financial contribution to an educational institution is allowed a tax deduction.

Feeling that the Federal Government has an obligation to encourage our young people to secure an education, and recognizing that many other approaches to Federal financial aid involve the inherent danger of Federal control, I have introduced a package of three education bills, one of which would allow students who are working to pay their way through college to deduct for tax purposes certain expenses incurred in obtaining a higher education. The deduction to be allowed is only for books, tuition, fees, and supplies and does not apply to such things as expense of room and board. My bill would allow an un-

dergraduate student to deduct up to \$1,500 per taxable year. To be eligible the student must be enrolled in an accredited institution pursuing a baccalaureate or graduate degree.

I sincerely hope the committee which has jurisdiction over this field will act favorably early in this session of Congress. One who has worked hard to pay for his or her education appreciates it all the more, and the Nation's policy should be to foster self-help in this endeavor.

Independence Day of Chad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, today marks the fifth anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Chad. On this memorable occasion, we wish to extend farm felicitations to His Excellency Francois Tombalbay, President of Chad; and to His Excellency Boukar Abdoul, the Chad Ambassador to the United States.

The Republic of Chad came into being very early in 1960. Thus as an independent and sovereign entity it is less than 5 years old. It has an area of some 450,000 square miles with a population just under 3 million. For a long time part of French Equatorial Africa, it became a member of the French community as a state late in 1958, and a few months later it formed an economic union with the three other territories of French Equatorial Africa. All these successive steps represented carefully planned preliminaries to the proclamation of Chad's independence on January 11, 1960, and the founding of the Chad Republic.

The people of the Republic of Chad have done well in keeping the vast expanse of their country in relative peace and quiet. It is one of the few countries in Africa, and certainly one of the few among the newly created independent states on that continent, in which there is little internal disturbance, and in which the republican form of government has had fair success. The people of Chad, who are hard workers and quite jealous of the freedom they have acquired, seem determined to maintain it at any cost. In many ways the people of the Republic of Chad, with their democratic institutions and their zeal to improve their economy through sheer hard work, have set a fine example to their immediate neighbors and other states in Africa.

The country is not abundantly rich with resources. Cotton cultivation and animal husbandry are the most important activities in the country. There are certain potential possibilities for some extractive industries, and in the develop-

mental budget, with French financial aid, some definite improvements are envisaged. The Republic of Chad is part of the French community of states, and it is also a member of the United Nations. On the fifth anniversary of their Independence Day we wish success to the people of the Republic of Chad in all their worthwhile endeavors.

Hospitalization Care of the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I see on today's UPI news ticker that the American Medical Association is calling its house of delegates together to approve a new alternative plan to medicare. Much as many of us know and respect members of the medical profession, I must say I anticipate that any such action by the American Medical Association is going to be a case of too little or too late. Only a few days ago, we read that the American Medical Association would not compromise; it was against any plan. Now, I gather there has been a change of mind. All of this gives the public more of the same old negative, regressive image that unfortunately has become associated with membership in the great medical profession.

Let us face it, Mr. Speaker; the doctors have been fearful—and rightly so—of steps that would eventually lead to government medicine. There are so-called liberal organizations, like the Americans For Democratic Action, that honestly believe—I am sure—that socialization of the medical profession would benefit suffering humanity. However, I think the American people and most Members of Congress want free choice of hospital and doctor. At the same time, a great many persons, recognizing the need of a plan to underwrite the high cost of multiservice health and medical needs of older citizens, favor a nationwide program along the lines of medicare. They feel the need and importance of the program transcends any danger of socialization.

Like other Members of the House, Mr. Speaker, I admire and respect the chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means—our colleague the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]. We know how conscientiously he has guarded the financial health of the social security system. In this connection, after I read last fall that Chairman MILLS had said he would support a payroll tax to finance health benefits for the aged, I immediately wrote him a letter saying I was anxious to learn the details of his proposal—that I wanted and was seeking a plan that was fiscally sound and would provide protection for the elderly, with guarantees against unwarranted medical control in the lives of private citizens, because I think it could

be provided by permitting an individual the choice of cash benefits or medical care.

Mr. Speaker, I go along with our colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], when he suggests a payroll tax calculated separately from old age, survivors, and disability insurance. Also, I reserve the right to support any other suggestion which may be made by the American Medical Association to improve existing proposals. But, meanwhile, I want to make my position clear; namely, that I believe there is a real need for such legislation. The time has come, it seems to me, to act, and with an open mind I intend to examine the administration's proposal and others similar to the suggestions of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]. As I understand, one of these latter suggestions would be to gear Government health-care benefits to the income levels of recipients, which makes sense to me, because the wealthy can afford hospital care where the modest-income person cannot.

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, I intend to testify in person when committee hearings are held, because I want the record of medicare hearings to show that in States like my own State of Washington, the Kerr-Mills Act has not filled the need.

The Partners of Alliance Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I deem it timely and significant to inform my colleagues that a distinguished team from my State has arrived today in the state of Parana, Brazil, to develop a partnership program between the private sectors of the two States. The team, headed by Dr. Paul L. Noble, dean of the College of Business Administration at Ohio University, represents the Ohio Partners of the Alliance Committee.

Now operating in 22 American States, this partners program, under the Alliance for Progress and the Agency for International Development, serves to establish contact between private groups and organizations in the United States and Latin America. It is fulfilling a need for establishing closer bonds between all the peoples of the American Republics. The basic objective of the partners effort is to help Latin groups who measure up to the self-help principle. It seeks to improve health, education, and general living conditions by helping provide basic items for the completion of small projects in Latin rural and slum areas.

Other members of the Ohio team are Mr. Lynn A. Brua, private housing expert; Mr. Don Newkirk, of the Ohio Hospital Association; and Dr. Mervin Smith, agriculturalist at Ohio University. Also accompanying the team is Mr. James H. Boren, director of the partners of the

Alliance programs in Washington, D.C. Mr. Boren will be meeting with U.S. AID mission officials in Brazil and private sector leaders for the purpose of discussing the development of specific activities in regard to the partners program. He will be meeting with leaders in both south and northeast Brazil. He is also scheduled to visit with a number of State Governors and leaders of local committees to discuss the partners program.

I know that the people of Ohio are participating in the partners of the Alliance program with an eagerness to accept the responsibility for a fruitful citizens' program in concert with their counterparts in Brazil. I am pleased to associate myself with these timely and worthy objectives of my constituents.

Local Public Works Act of 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill, the Local Public Works Act of 1965, to provide Federal grants-in-aid for towns and cities of all sizes to help them finance virtually the whole range of needed local public works—water and sewer systems, hospitals, public buildings, community centers, parks and playgrounds, and the like. This will help to meet one of the most urgent needs now facing us, the need for increased public investment.

No one can deny that public facilities are essential to community life. They are a prerequisite to public investment and economic growth. They are also necessary to the livability of our towns and cities and the achievement of President Johnson's "Great Society."

It is equally undeniable that State and local governments today face a financial crisis. The rapid urbanization of our people and the rising standards of services and facilities demanded by our citizens have placed impossible burdens on the limited tax bases of State and local governments. No local government can continue to raise its taxes indefinitely without the danger of driving industry and employment elsewhere. No local tax base enjoys the diversity or the strength of the Federal Government which rightly or wrongly has largely preempted the most fruitful source of revenues through the Federal income tax. By far the largest part of these Federal revenues comes from the people and business firms in our towns and cities and it is only right that we should reinvest those funds to help meet urgent local needs.

State and local governments have struggled valiantly to meet their responsibilities. Their taxes have risen more rapidly than Federal taxes and their debt has risen more rapidly than Federal debt. In spite of this, a backlog of needed improvements and additions to our inventory of community facilities has built up

running into billions of dollars. Even in our most prosperous years public investment has been an economic stepchild and had to step aside for the satisfaction of other wants. Given the tremendous annual increase in our needs in this field to serve our rapidly growing urban population, we cannot expect to eliminate this backlog overnight. It will require a continuing effort and one which will grow larger and more costly every year that we delay. Meanwhile, the quality of life in our cities suffers in ways ranging from threats to health from polluted water to threats to economic growth from overcrowded traffic and other facilities.

There is also a growing recognition among economists that expanded public investment is essential to continued prosperity. The current uptrend has lasted far longer than most analysts had expected and now there is almost a chorus of prediction that the economy will level off or perhaps even dip in the second half of this year. Given our ever expanding labor force, even a leveling off is a critical problem which can add heavily to the millions of American men and women now out of work.

Just yesterday I read in the Washington Post of an interview with Gardner Ackley, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, in which he expressed concern for the latter part of 1965. He stated, and I quote: "on balance I would expect a somewhat faster expansion in the first part of the year and some slowing down in the latter half." He went on to say that "if there is cause for disappointment about the 1965 outlook it is that the foreseeable gains in output are not sufficiently large to sustain our recent progress in reducing unemployment." Many economists express even deeper concern over the outlook and a recent analysis in the U.S. News & World Report suggested that unemployment by the end of 1965 might be one million higher than our present intolerable level. I believe this clearly indicates that now is the time to launch a program to step up local public construction activity.

There is growing recognition of the fact that only a Federal grant program has the power to stimulate local public works investment to the extent needed. Such a program was strongly endorsed by the AFL-CIO last November and it has the warmest endorsement of the mayors of our towns and cities. It is also endorsed by the National Association of Home Builders who know from first-hand experience how the shortage of community facilities inflates land prices by creating an artificial shortage of land available for development and adds to the burden of local real estate taxes. These factors have the effect of pricing many middle income families out of the market for new homes.

Mr. Speaker, my bill would authorize \$2 billion annually to cover up to two-thirds of the cost of nearly the whole range of local public works—schools, which will be treated under separate legislation, would not be covered by my bill. These grants would be available to every

town and city without regard to size and there would be the further provision that economically depressed areas would receive grants up to 75 percent. I believe that this bill is urgently needed and I anticipate that the Committee on Public Works will place it high on its agenda and begin action on it in the near future.

Congress and the Military

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina and the new chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, came into the Congress at the same time I did, in 1941. He has not only been my colleague but also my close personal friend.

I anticipate serving under his leadership on the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. RIVERS has the ability, diligence, and desire to make an outstanding chairman. The challenge is great when it is realized that he follows the great Carl Vinson, at whose feet both Mr. RIVERS and I sat for 25 years.

I believe Mr. RIVERS admirably stated his philosophy on "Congress and the Military" in the interview which appeared in the January edition of Air Force and Space Digest magazine.

It is a pleasure to include this definitive article into the RECORD, and I suggest that each Member, especially each new Member, read it closely:

CONGRESS AND THE MILITARY

(An exclusive interview with the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, U.S. Representative from South Carolina)

(Everything that affects members of the Armed Forces—food, pay, clothing, shelter, medical care, promotions, equipment, bases, and missions—is the concern of the House Committee on Armed Services. In the 89th Cong., for the first time in 10 years, a new chairman takes over that committee. To find out how he looks at his job and current military problems, the editors of Air Force/Space Digest interviewed him recently in his Washington office. Here is a transcript of that exclusive interview.—THE EDITORS.)

(L. (for LUCIUS) MENDEL RIVERS has represented the First Congressional District of South Carolina, embracing nine counties in the southeastern section of the State, since 1940. Born in 1905 in Gumville, Berkeley County, part of his district just upriver from Charleston, he attended the College of Charleston and the University of South Carolina, earning a law degree in 1931. After serving in the South Carolina Legislature from 1933 to 1936 and 4 years as a special U.S. attorney, he was elected to the 77th Cong. in 1940 and has been there ever since. Coming from a seacoast district which includes the Charleston Navy Yard, he requested and got an appointment to the House Naval Affairs Committee, then led by Representative Carl Vinson of Georgia. In

1948, when the House Military and Naval Affairs Committees were merged to form the Armed Services Committee, Mr. Vinson became its chairman and headed it for all but 2 years (1952-54, when the Republicans controlled the House), until his retirement this year. "I have been in Mr. Vinson's university ever since I got here," says Mr. RIVERS. "If anyone has ever had on-the-job training, that fellow is RIVERS.")

Question. Congressman RIVERS, how do you see the role of the legislative in dealing with the executive branch on defense matters?

Answer. I am on a committee whose members are quite sensitive about that section of the Constitution which deals with the role that Congress plays in governing the military.

To explain how I feel about it, I want to read you what the Constitution says. Article I, section 8, of the Constitution sets forth the powers of the legislative branch of the Government. It says the Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States, to declare war, and so on.

In that same article, it says this: "To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use be for a longer term than 2 years." This is so that we can reappraise what we have done. "To provide and maintain a Navy. To make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces. To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia."

I take this to mean that, of all the branches of the Government, there is vested in the Congress the exclusive right to deal with the military. I don't mean a quasi-right. I mean the exclusive right.

That is the base from which I proceed. I think that the proper committee—which is ours—should have access to all information dealing with the military. It is as simple as that. I don't know why we should always wait for proposals to emanate from the Executive. I am not implying that I don't plan to cooperate fully with the President and Secretary of Defense, but there should be a mutuality.

I am going to head my own committee, and I am going to get along with my committee and the Pentagon, but I have my ideas and I will insist on them.

Question. We understand it is unlikely that the administration will propose a military pay bill, other than possibly another cost-of-living adjustment. What are your views on military pay?

Answer. We should very definitely consider a new pay bill for the military this year, because they have not been treated fairly. The bill passed last year was little more than a gesture. It was not exactly an insult, but it certainly was no compliment.

Question. The Air Force, after long study, is supposed to have come up with a pay package for all services which totals between \$800 and \$900 million to bring the military up to some parity with the civilian economy. Do you envision that the Congress might act favorably on a bill of that scope in this session?

Answer. I haven't seen the Air Force study, but I have already drafted a pay bill.

Question. Of this magnitude?

Answer. It would be about that size. With a \$630 billion gross national product, I say we can afford to give the military a pay raise of this size.

Question. Mr. Chairman do you think there will be any chance of writing into this law a provision for annual review such as is in the law for civil service employees?

Answer. I think a review, possibly annually, should be provided by law.

Question. What about housing?

Answer. We have a great shortage of housing. Mind you, I used to handle housing. I think it is one of the most vital areas. Let me answer your question like this: Housing, pay, food, commissaries, overseas expenses in highly inflated cost areas—all of these things will be reviewed very carefully.

Wherever we can, we are going to write these benefits into law rather than leave it to the discretion of some transitory Secretary. This is no reflection on Mr. McNamara. He has done a lot of things I approve of, and he and I, I am sure, will get along very well.

I have always favored appropriated housing but when you have to pay the money on the barrelhead to build houses, you don't get as many as you did under the Capehart Act. We cut off Capehart just about the time it was beginning to do a pretty good job.

Question. Can we assume you intend also to look into hospitalization—medical care and dental care?

Answer. Of course. I have a report on medical care. This is one area we are really going to watch. Hospitalization is a vested right. I don't like the term benefits. Hospitalization is as much a right for the serviceman and his dependents as a pair of shoes. Our report gives my view on hospitals.

Over the years the recruiters have told those whom they recruited: "Your dependents and you will have hospitalization and when you retire you will get it." I think that is a contract, and I think it is an obligation.

Unless we change the law, that is still my view—that they are entitled to it. The Congress has passed a medicare bill and all of these things, and they have only scratched the surface because these things have never been fully implemented. I don't know why we can't do something about it.

Question. Do you see any chance to add dental care along with medicare?

Answer. It all gets down to morale. I wrote the Navy dental bill, you know. Are you asking me if dependents should have dental care?

Question. Yes.

Answer. Why not? Have you ever tried to do a job with a toothache or gone home and held your wife's hand when she has a toothache? What I am trying to get over is that we are going to try to do everything we can to give the serviceman a well-rounded set of rights—benefits, prerogatives, privileges, and emoluments, so whenever he is called to fight or go on long patrols he won't have to be worried about his folks back home. We want to do something about whatever affects his morale. If denture care is one of them, we want to do something about that.

Question. And the same for retirees?

Answer. My report speaks about that. Let me quote it: "The subcommittee is convinced * * * that the traditional benefit of hospital care to military retirees and their dependents must be continued." It goes back to what I said. Congress has let somebody else handle these decisions so long that they wait for the decisions to come up from downtown. I think that is a mistake.

Question. We have been talking about money and its relationship to morale. There's also another side to it, isn't there—the regard in which the military is held by the public and by the people in the Pentagon?

Answer. Absolutely. When I was a boy, people used to join the Navy and the Army just to get the pay. That day is gone. We've got to pay them adequately, yes—but we've got to do more.

I don't believe for a minute that, as some say, our young people are delinquents. I

don't assume that any of them are. Neither do I agree that they're unpatriotic. The people I talk to don't think the man in uniform alone should be saddled with all the patriotism. Why shouldn't others be patriotic, too?

These men are putting in long, tedious hours away from their families, often in remote, isolated areas. If they don't get paid enough money to pay their bills, if they aren't confident their families are being looked after while they're away, they're not going to stay.

There is only one way to keep them—to make them know that their country wants them, to pay them what we pay our civil servants; to help them in looking after their families. We are not doing these things, because we try to cut corners. So we lose them, but we spend time and money to train replacements. It doesn't make sense.

Question. What do you think has been the effect of the new DOD directive on standards of conduct—the one that says military personnel cannot eat lunch at someone else's expense, or if they do, they have to report it within 48 hours?

Answer. I think it is too strict. I am sure it will be modified. Either a fellow is honest or he is not honest. If suspicion has to surround everybody who is in the military, this, too, will cause a lot to leave.

Question. Do you anticipate any changes in the existing retirement system—since the money involved has now reached a billion dollars a year for military retirement pay?

Answer. I think we should look into the subject. We might have a lot of people we want to keep longer. I don't know why we should give the military the privilege to retire after 20 years. I have always felt that way.

Question. You have been very much interested in the Reserve and Guard programs over the years. What is your view toward DOD plans to transfer Reserve units to the National Guard?

Answer. I don't know why things like this should not be thoroughly reviewed by the proper committee. I hate to see these drastic changes being proposed when the Congress is out of session. Such proposals should be made when we are in session so that we can go into them.

Question. Another subject DOD is studying is the draft. How does that look to you?

Answer. I won't know until we go into it. At this point I can only give you a curbstone opinion. As of this date (December 9), I don't favor terminating the draft.

Question. Congressman, you have had extensive experience with sealift and airlift. How do you evaluate the relative merits of rapid deployment of forces by sea versus air?

Answer. One should complement the other, and implement the other. One service can't do the whole business. I saw that on Steelpike in Spain in November. Exercise Big Lift (in 1963) demonstrated a capability of reinforcing our European allies fast. In that one, the ground forces used prepositioned equipment. In Steelpike the Navy demonstrated it can deliver the equipment as well as the manpower. We need both sealift and airlift.

Question. Do you feel we have enough airlift now to meet the requirements of the military, particularly the Army?

Answer. No, sir, not to meet our commitments. We have more commitments than we have airlift. New equipment is coming in, but it is not inclusive enough. We should immediately go ahead with the CX-HLS (cargo experimental, heavy logistic system) transport plane.

Question. What do you think of the C-141A?

Answer. It's a wonderful plane. When we created that—I headed the subcommittee—the Air Staff put out the guidelines, and the

C-141 has met every requirement they asked for. But it is not big enough.

Question. Are you satisfied generally with the structuring of our forces? Are we pressing technology hard enough or translating technology into new weapons quickly enough?

Answer. No. I am positive we are not.

Question. In what specific areas are we standing short?

Answer. I think we have made a mistake in the Defense Department by not pressing to get enough performance out of conventional systems and by jumping headlong into the unmanned systems. We have become overbalanced in unmanned systems and have not achieved the ultimate in what conventional systems can do. To add to our problem, we may be saddled with only conventional war for the foreseeable future, as in Vietnam and some other places.

You know and I know we don't have a follow-on for the B-52. We don't have, in my opinion, a modern interceptor. In these areas we have not done what I would like to see done.

Question. Do you include the YF-12A in that?

Answer. Is that an interceptor?

Question. The Pentagon said it is an interceptor.

Answer. Is that an interceptor? I stand on what I say. I don't think we have an all-purpose plane yet. The nearest thing we have to a versatile plane is the McDonnell F-4 series. But I just don't believe we have an all-purpose plane.

Question. There is some talk that a version of the YF-12A is also being considered for a bomber role. Do you think this kind of approach is going to meet the needs for a follow-on to the B-52?

Answer. That aircraft has been developed in secret. We will have to go into that and question the people who are in the business of strategic bombing. The only people who can advise us on that are people like Generals LeMay and Power, the authorities on what these planes can do. I don't think it is big enough to do the B-52's job. But we will go into it and see.

Question. Is there any way of getting at this problem of Congress and the executive branch, particularly with hardware systems?

Answer. In what respect?

Question. We have been through it with the B-70 and so on, where the Congress asserts its will and interest through making money available, and in one case even directing that it be spent. But when it comes right down to it, the Executive can spend it or not as it sees fit. Isn't this a pretty severe limiting factor on any kind of coequal arrangement?

Answer. You can't make the man spend the money. But I believe that with my friendship with the President, we won't have any impasse.

I have had a lot of service with President Johnson, an awful lot. I think where we have problems, he will want to get along with us. I wouldn't have any hesitancy at all urging that he listen to the congressional viewpoint.

Question. All in all, it looks as though you're heading into a very eventful session.

Answer. The point I want to get over to you—this is my own viewpoint—is that I know good and well this country can afford the best military on earth. We have the best, but we cannot rest and still keep the best. The best thing we have going for us is 190 million people behind us. If there is anything the American people want, it is a first-class military man, well dressed, well housed, well fed, well paid, with the best equipment. If the Congress does not provide these things, we are out of step with the grassroots and the city roots. It is as simple as that. That is my position.