



Property of the Library
INDUSTRIAL COLLEGE OF THE
ARMED FORCES

MILITARY RELATIONS WITH CONGRESS

Brigadier General Charles R. Roderick, USAF

NOTICE

This lecture has not been edited by the speaker. It has been reproduced directly from the reporter's notes for the students and faculty for reference and study purposes.

You have been granted access to this unedited transcript under the same restrictions imposed on lecture attendance namely, no notes or extracts will be made and you will not discuss it other than in the conduct of official business.

No direct quotations are to be made either in written reports or in oral presentations based on this unedited copy.

Reviewed by Col J. Lake, USAF on 20 May 1964.

INDUSTRIAL COLLEGE OF THE ARMED FORCES

WASHINGTON, D. C.

1963 - 1964

MILITARY RELATIONS WITH CONGRESS

24 March 1964

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION--Major General Tom R. Stoughton, USA, Deputy Commandant, ICAF.....	1
SPEAKERS--Brigadier General Charles R. Roderick, USAF, Deputy Assistant to Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Liaison).....	1
Brigadier General Frederick W. Boye, Jr., USA, Deputy Chief of Legislative Liaison, Office, Secretary of the Army.....	7
Rear Admiral Carlton B. Jones, USN, Chief of Legislative Affairs, Department of the Navy.....	13
Major General Perry M. Hoisington, II, USAF, Director, Office of Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force.....	21
GENERAL DISCUSSION.....	29

NOTICE

This lecture has not been edited by the speaker. It has been reproduced directly from the reporter's notes for the students and faculty for reference and study purposes.

You have been granted access to this unedited transcript under the same restrictions imposed on lecture attendance; namely, no notes or extracts will be made and you will not discuss it other than in the conduct of official business.

No direct quotations are to be made either in written reports or in oral presentations based on this unedited copy.

Reviewed by: Col J. Lake, USAF Date: 20 May 1964

Publication No. L64-139

INDUSTRIAL COLLEGE OF THE ARMED FORCES

Washington 25, D. C.

MILITARY RELATIONS WITH CONGRESS

24 March 1964

GENERAL STOUGHTON: Gentlemen: I believe we all have a full appreciation of the relationships between the Department of Defense, the military services, and the Congress, but I don't believe we all appreciate fully the many complexities involved in these relationships.

So we are fortunate this morning to have with us the key individuals who have the direct responsibility for implementing the actions carrying out these relationships.

We have a slight change in the program as far as your written material is concerned. Mr. McGiffert was grabbed by the Secretary at the last moment, as happens many times, as you all well know, in the Pentagon. He is ably represented by his Deputy, Brigadier General Roderick of the Air Force, who will introduce the other members of the team from the services at the appropriate time.

It is a pleasure to welcome the entire group to the Industrial College.

I now present General Roderick.

GENERAL RODERICK: General Stoughton, Students, and Guests of the College: My presence here this morning, I think, is the personification of the way L&L operates, i.e., on the basis of crisis. At five minutes after 8:00 I found that I was to come over here because Mr. McNamara had called Mr. Mc Giffert in. I don't know whether it was on the

helicopter in Key West over the weekend, which I will tell you a little story about, or the Military Assistance Program. Mr. McNamara was over before Mr. Passman yesterday afternoon and, needless to say, had a pretty rough time. He is going back today at 1:00 and he will probably have some more rough time. At this stage of the game he has blisters and not callouses.

The L&L shop of Dave McGiffers, the shop in which I am his Deputy, is a comparatively small shop. We are growing larger, not because we are taking the responsibilities of the three military departments but because of the creation of these Defense agencies, for instance, the Defense Supply Agency, with the many, many thousands of items which they handle which generate Congressional interest. We were in a very good position three years ago to either pass it to the Army, Navy, or the Air Force. It is now our responsibility. Then there is the Defense Intelligence Agency, and Defense Communications. It is necessary for us to be responsive to the Congress. That's the way we view our organization. We are responsive to the Congress.

Our shop is larger today than it was three years ago. We have a total of 31 people. I don't want to bore you with statistics but I do want to mention the numbers, because so often, just as we did yesterday, we have a query from some newspaper chap. This one said he wanted to write a story about the 500 lobbyists that we had over in the Pentagon. We don't have 500. I think we have 38 in the three military departments and OSD, 38 or 39 military officers and about 47 civilians. That's under

the House Appropriations Act, where we have to identify the support personnel, the people actually engaged in liaison.

I'll tell you a little bit about our organization. I think you will find that all three military departments have a comparable organization. Again, it is not an organization which we thought was best or that we came up with. It is one that was dictated by the Congress. As you know, under the Constitution, the Congress, particularly relative to the Armed Forces, has the duty to legislate. So in each shop we have a Legislative Division. General Boye is the Deputy Director of L&L for the Army. He will go into more detail.

To determine the need for remedial legislation or additional legislation, Congress investigates. So each of us has an Investigative Division. Admiral Jones, the Director of Legislative Affairs in the Navy, will handle that.

The Congress is comprised of 545 individuals. Many of them you would refer to as politicians, but, be that as it may, they are human beings. They have the human element of motivation, of concern for themselves in the future. You are not going to be a Senator or a Congressman or a Representative if you don't take care of your constituents. That's the way it should be. So each of our offices has what we call Congressional inquiries. They handle literally thousands of letters and hundreds of thousands of phone calls from the members of their staffs expressing concern about the constituents.

We have another segment of which General Hoisington will cover

constituent inquiries and Congressional travel. We each have a Travel Section. I think that, if there is any one aspect of the legislation and the members that has been abused, it is this thing called Congressional travel. It makes a much better headline and creates a great deal more interest and you can sell more papers if you call it a junket rather than a serious investigation. These same people/^{who}are so often pointing the finger of scorn at the Members of Congress would not say a thing if it happened to be a stockholder of Sears & Roebuck or General Motors or General Electric, or any of the large corporations, or if the Board of Directors would take a field trip to see how the affairs are and how the money of the stockholders is being spent.

That's the way we view Congressional members when they travel. I have had the good fortune of having been on many Congressional trips and in each instance I have come back having lost weight. It's not for the lack of food; it's because of the hours these people put in and the pace at which they move. It's not a junket. It's not a pleasure trip. It's a working trip. I think you and I and the rest of the country, particularly the military, benefit from these people getting out and seeing how your money and my money is being spent.

Each of these representatives represents at least 369,000 people. We never underestimate them. We never treat them like dummies, because they are not dummies. As a result of these trips they come up with some excellent ideas. This has been mutually beneficial to the Congress and to the Department of Defense.

I mentioned a moment ago the helicopter landing in Key West over

the weekend. We were in good shape. We knew that we would probably have some problems after a while. You get a feel for this. Yesterday afternoon Senator Smathers, the Senator from Florida, made a speech on the floor and had a press release questioning our ability in the Department of Defense and asking why we didn't either intercept or escort the helicopter. We have the answer to it, but to get the answer in that big building often takes a little time. A lot of people are working on it to make sure that we are responsive and totally responsive.

Many of you will be going to the Pentagon on the completion of your course here, to either Army, Navy, Air Force, the Joint Staff, or OSD. There is one little thing I'd like to pass on to you that I have learned from this business. Incidentally, I have been in it for 8 years. That's some sort of record, I think. The main reason I have been there so long is that they don't know what to do with me--not that I have been doing a good job.

This is the problem we constantly have, of Congress wanting papers. In the military and the State Department and any government agency, we have our skeletons in the closet, and sometimes we have some dirty linen and we prefer not to air it. What I am getting at is the question of executive privilege. If I haven't learned anything else in these years in L&L, I have come to this conclusion, and perhaps you can pass it on to your people when you get back, or think of it in this direction. When a committee asks for a certain piece of paper and you and your bosses or your subordinates are concerned about passing it to the Congress, go

to your General Counsel, the Secretary, and the Secretary of Defense, and at a very early stage get a resolution about whether you are going to claim executive privilege. If you are not going to claim executive privilege, which has to come from the President, so that you cannot give this piece of paper or the document or the study to the Congress or the committee, give it to them early. I have found that there is nothing that makes these people over on the Hill, these dedicated and sincere people, so mad as to be constantly stalled, stalled, stalled, when you end up eventually giving them a piece of paper one month, two months, or three months later, and in the meantime they are so antagonistic it's like making a dog madder and madder, so that you accomplish nothing by giving them the paper.

So get your people to be in the position to be able to decide at a very early stage whether you are going to claim executive privilege. If necessary, go all the way to the top. If you are not, for goodness' sake, give it to the committee early and don't drag your feet, because, believe you me, talking about dogs, they are like bull dogs. They don't give up. You are not going to talk them out of it. They want the paper. All you've done is antagonize them. In many instances they've already got a copy of it anyway. All they want to do is legitimize the request, because it seems that that Pentagon is sort of like a sieve and an awful lot of things leak out of it.

I think I've talked my allotted quarter. I'll turn you over to General Boye, who will give you the problems, the trials, and the

tribulations, the successes, or the defeats in the legislative area.

General Boye.

GENERAL BOYE: I'm like General Roderick. I really don't feel I have a right to be here. I'm a Deputy dog, sort of, in our shop, and I should really be back signing Congressionals to disgruntled members of Congress. Instead I find myself here before this august group, sort of enjoying the fun and games, getting a free lunch, all in exchange for maybe spilling a little blood on this appropriately colored carpet here during the question period.

It's a real pleasure to be here, gentlemen, and I hope I can add something to it.

On 25 January 1963, last year, the Secretary of Defense sent a letter to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the President of the Senate, urging passage of a military pay bill, and a copy of the proposed legislation was enclosed with this letter. Despite the fact that almost everyone was in complete agreement that this bill was long overdue, it wasn't until the second of October that this proposal was signed into law, one day after it was to be effective.

What happened? Where did the Legislative Liaison Offices in the Pentagon fit into the picture? I think, first of all, to back away a little bit from the trees and take a look at the forest, it is apparent that there is a requirement for a link between the defense establishment and the Congress--a point of contact, if you will. Only through some such link can the requirements of both of those two elements of government

be met. (Chart)

As was mentioned, Congress has the sole authority to raise and support our military forces. It is the Congress which by law authorizes such things as the procurement of ships, missiles, and aircraft. It is the Congress that appropriates practically every dollar of pay and the money for operational requirements and for maintenance that we have.

Thus, the needs of the military depend largely upon legislative action by the Congress. The Congress in turn must base its decisions on the stated requirements and on certain information which is supplied by the military. The Congress must not only be made aware of these requirements but, based on the data furnished, must understand those requirements, in order that they make proper and valid judgments.

I therefore will discuss briefly this aspect of the military departments' liaison with Congress: The introduction of, the processing of, and, we hope, the enactment of legislation.

(Chart) Well in advance of each session of Congress, the Department of Defense prepares a program which incorporates all those legislative proposals decided necessary by the Secretary of Defense or by the Secretaries of each of the services. These usually consider legislation which is considered appropriate to the entire Department or to each individual service. Fortunately, most of them apply across the board.

Once this program is prepared, a particular office in the Office of the Secretary of Defense or a service is assigned monitorship or

responsibility for each one of these proposals.

The 88th Congress, which convened in January of 1963, has received some 58 legislative proposals from the Department of Defense. As of this date 14 have been enacted into law, 7 have been passed by one House, and 24 have been officially introduced as bills. This leaves 13 upon which no action has been taken.

Those proposals which are not enacted into law this session will die with the adjournment of this Congress. This, then, gives you a feel for the batting averages, for the percentages, in this particular ball game.

Now, in discussing the mechanics of the process as it affects military legislation, I'll use the example of our military pay bill. I'll try to point out the difficult course it had before it finally became a fact and appeared in our pay checks. I mentioned that the preparation of proposed legislation could be instituted by either the Secretary of Defense or by one of the services. In the case of our pay raise the draft was prepared in the Office of the Secretary of Defense by the experts there on military personnel and military pay matters. All draft legislation is, of course, coordinated with the other three services, where technical matters or substantive matters can be resolved. So it was with our bill.

I might point out that the Legislative Liaison Offices in each of the services handled this coordination for the services in most cases, the actual comments being prepared by the experts, in this case our personnel and pay experts. Upon approval of our draft bill by the Secretary

of Defense, it is next transmitted to the Bureau of the Budget.

(Chart) A reference to the Bureau of the Budget insures that the proposal will be in consonance with the President's overall program, and it also permits those other agencies of the Executive Branch that are interested an opportunity to comment on the bill.

In the case of the pay bill, with a price tag through FY 65 of about \$2.1 billion, the necessity for this internal coordination is obvious. Also, you must remember that the Public Health Service, the Coast Guard, and the Coast and Geodetic Survey come under the provisions of this pay bill.

The next step is the transmittal of the proposal to the Speaker of the House and to the President of the Senate. As I mentioned, this Speaker letter briefly explains the legislation and, in the case of a bill like this, gives a rough estimate of the cost. When the proposal reaches each of the Houses of Congress, it is referred to a committee and then, we hope, introduced as a bill. As might be expected, most of the legislation involving the military is referred to the House or Senate Armed Services Committee. This was the case with our pay-raise bill.

It is in the committee or the subcommittee that the real liaison between the Executive and the Legislative Branches takes place. It is here for the first time that the requirement is really analyzed and the data and information necessary for a sound legislative decision are finally produced. Thus it is at this point that our mission vis-a-vis that of the Congress becomes a much more personal one.

First we assign a project officer to supervise and to coordinate our efforts. His job is to urge prompt hearings, to respond to all requests from the members of the committee, or the committee staff members, and, finally, to arrange for and to counsel Defense Department witnesses.

Obviously, he can do little with regard to scheduling the hearing, except to coordinate the plans of the committee with those of his prospective witnesses. He can and does help the staff personnel as they study the bill, mainly by furnishing experts from the Pentagon. He is a great help to witnesses due to his experience in previous hearings and his knowledge and familiarity with the committee members and the staff personnel. Obviously, he does help in preparing their prepared statements and getting them cleared.

I would like to pause here for a moment to pay tribute to the committee staff personnel on the Hill. Without the assistance of these truly dedicated and profession personnel, the committees and even the Congress itself would have trouble operating. For example, Mr. Russ Blanford on the House side and Mr. Ed Brazwell on the Senate side are two of the best qualified experts in Washington on military personnel and pay matters.

When our hearing is finally scheduled, the project officer produces the witnesses and continues to help wherever he can. Of course you realize that in committee any number of things can happen to a specific piece of legislation. In fact, on the pay bill all kinds of things happened.

After all the ground work done ahead of time by all the interested agencies, after all of the expert testimony by the witnesses, the House Subcommittee rejected our pay bill and elected to write their own. I think it is particularly pertinent to note that, during this rewrite, our experts in the Pentagon were very active in assisting the staff personnel and the committee members.

The Senate Committee also made considerable modification on our bill. When the new or modified bill is finally agreed upon by the subcommittee, it is referred to the full committee and, on their approval, it is, of course, reported out by that committee to the floor of the House or the Senate.

Actually, in the House Armed Services Committee, our pay bill was again modified. Now, despite all of the detailed study that our bill has had, it is still not safe, because, once it gets to the floor of either House it may be amended again, and in fact our bill was amended on the floor of the House.

The next step is, of course, passage by either the House or the Senate. If it is passed it goes on for further consideration. If it is rejected by both houses the bill is dead. If it is passed by both Houses in identical form it can go on to the President for signature. However, if the two Houses pass a measure in different form, these differences must somehow be resolved. This is done by means of a conference in which each of the Houses appoints certain conferees to resolve the

differences.

(Chart) If the conferees agree again approval of each of the Houses is necessary before it can go to the President. If they can't agree the legislation dies. The pay bill, as amended, did pass each House in a different form. A conference was held and agreement was reached. The final step in this process is the forwarding of the bill from the Congress to the President. Actually, again, this is a job of the Bureau of the Budget to recommend to the President whether the bill should be signed. As a final check the Bureau gives each of us in the Department of Defense about 48 hours to comment on this bill as it now stands. Finally, upon receiving the President's signature, the bill becomes law.

You realize, of course, that not all legislation affecting the military originates in the military departments. It can originate in the Congress. Current examples of this include a proposal to promote General MacArthur to General of the Armies. Another is to direct a four-year term for all of the Chiefs of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. In addition, there are some 18 bills which have been submitted by Senator Ervin to modify or to amend certain provisions of our Uniform Code of Military Justice. Regardless of where this legislation originates, it is handled in generally the same way.

Gentlemen, although I have been sketchy, I think that you can appreciate that this legislative process is lengthy and it is somewhat involved. There are many traps where legislative measures may be stopped,

modified, or even killed. My figures on the DOD batting average attest to that. However, this is normal for the Congress, and we should not grow discouraged should it appear that the members of Congress are not moving on legislation as fast as we think they should move. These are busy people. They cannot get around to all legislative items that are proposed to them. However, you may be assured that any recommendations for legislation from the Department of Defense will receive appropriate consideration.

Gentlemen, I'll be followed by Captain Jones who will discuss the investigative functions of our Legislative Liaison Office.

ADMIRAL JONES: I am sure my good friend, General Boye, didn't mean to demote me when he called me Captain. This does give me a good opening remark. I am sorry also that I don't have as fascinating an example as the pay legislation to hold my audience, although I can assure you that my subject of investigations, if you get involved in one, will hold your individual interest at best.

Now, fortunately, this topic, Congressional Investigations, can be treated briefly. No cheers, gentlemen. I don't intend to be as brief as several convivial spirits suggested at a recent St. Patrick's Day banquet, when they answered the speaker's query as to what he could say on the occasion with a chorus of "Nothing!"

As you know perhaps, from a bloody personal experience, Congressional investigations are a most contentious field. Literally anything or anyone can be the subject of a Congressional investigation. However, as I'll

bring out later, the point is to avoid investigation if it is at all possible.

There are four committees in the Congress that spark most but not all of the investigations that involve the Armed Forces. They are the House and Senate Armed Services Committees and the House and Senate Committees on Government Operations. The latter deals with contracts, procurement, and the like, so they naturally get into some pretty sticky areas.

Insofar as the Armed Forces are concerned, this past year, as you will recall, Congressional investigations could well have been spelled with three letters--TFX. As you recall, Senator McClellan's Committee held about 75 sessions and heard scores of witnesses from the Secretary of Defense on down. These hearings on the TFX are typical of the most exhaustive and, I might say, exhausting type of hearings in which we get involved.

As a matter of fact they practically stop or impede the top business or the top people in the Department of Defense, in that the hearings and the preparations thereof take full time. By that I mean about from 8:00 to 8:00, to be precise. Fortunately, there is another end to the investigative spectrum. For example, some weeks ago Congressional investigative hearings were conducted on the Navy-Marine Short Airfield Tactical Support Program, that is, the SATS, as it is called.

Chairman Holifield of the Military Operations Subcommittee for Government Operations had heard that the program was in trouble because

of differences between the Navy and the Marines and various laboratories and, as usual, the contractors. In short, SATS was snarled and things on the surface looked bad. Well, after just two sessions, during which only a handful of witnesses appeared, the heat was turned off and the committee concluded that the SATS Program is OK and is being handled about as well as the circumstances permit. That's quite a difference, as you can see, from the contentious TFX.

In between those extremes there have been a host of other investigations during the past year, like the Thresher, the Nuclear Carrier, VSTOL, and so on. As far as the Navy is concerned I must say that during the past year the Navy has certainly had its day in court.

Insofar as the Legislative Offices are concerned, what goes on in the hearings is only the foam on the beer. Foam is decorative and may be even essential to the taste, but it should not blind you to what you are really paying for, that is, the beer.

In an investigation that proceeds satisfactorily, the hearings themselves are essential, but most of the most important and hardest work is unseen. It is much like the successful conduct of a debate, an important briefing, or a presentation. Sometimes it resembles the performance of a play. What all this means is that there are many hours of preparation for each hour spent in the committee room. To coin a phrase with which all of you gentlemen are familiar, lots of homework must be done.

In general, you could usefully divide all the work into four phases.

The first is the investigative phase. During this period the OLA-- I use OLA, because we have Affairs and the Army and the Air Force have Liaisons; we call them Legislative Affairs and we call ourselves OLA-- or the LL staff lawyers are in constant liaison with the investigative committee staff, getting the facts they demand and in general trying to get the drift or focus of their interest. Sometimes this latter is not easy, because their ulterior motives may not be self-evident in every case.

The second phase is the prehearing phase. During this period the selection of the witnesses is made, that is, those who are to present the case, and we in OLA begin to assist them, that is, the witnesses, in preparing their presentations. Once the statements are prepared the Murder Board sessions are held, and then the final product is approved and polished. Then we stand by to await the summons from the Hill.

Then, of course, in the third phase there are the hearings themselves. I need not dwell on those, because we have all watched TV, particularly of late, when we have been given some rather pleasant views of Carol Tyler and others in the Bobby Baker Case. Of course, that is the final test. All your hard work has gone on beforehand.

After that, of course, it is necessary to sanitize and review the transcript, and then to await the brickbats or the bouquets. We inevitably get a few of each.

For an example I guess you could say that a hearing investigation is sort of like matching through a swamp. Not all of it is exactly

pleasant, and there are little bites being taken out of you every foot of the way. Your chances of getting home free are hazarded two ways: You can die of eventual blood poisoning due to the cumulative effects of the little bites or you can make one big, fatal mistake that puts you smack into the quicksand. In short, everything big and seemingly little is important. Sometimes the little things are more important.

Now, as I mentioned at the beginning, we have involved a philosophy about investigations, and it's a simple one: Prevent them if at all possible. Now, if those of us in the legislative business can prevent formal investigations from developing, we have earned our keep. As a matter of fact, many sensitive inquiries are quietly reconciled between our investigative divisions and the committees' staffs by an astute, responsive gathering of facts. However, if investigations do develop, our function is to assist in every way possible in presenting a strong position during the committee hearings.

I might add at this point for your benefit that the OLA staff members never testify. Once they have helped prepare the witnesses they can only stand by in the wings and watch you bleed.

Now, it almost goes without saying that the keel upon which you build your presentation must be made of pure facts, case hardened by integrity. To accept less than this standard is to invite disaster. As you well know, the service witness who goes before a committee cannot hide or find refuge behind the Fifth Amendment. His statement and his answers to questions must withstand the closest scrutiny.

Further, if there is any possibility of a misinterpretation of the witness's remarks, and if he does not say precisely what he means, he has opened the door to trouble. Nor can the witness be an unsophisticated, Fearless Fosdick type of character, that is, chock full of goodness, brimming with naivete, and oblivious to the pitfalls before him.

So, for a successful presentation, the service must have a factual case, carefully prepared, honestly presented, by knowledgeable witnesses. The witness must be alert to the traps. This should be of great import to you gentlemen who, sooner or later--and of course the later the better--may be a witnesses.

These following little remarks I am going to make were pointed out to me by a quite senior Congressman in a conversation of recent date, in talking about who makes a good witness and who makes a bad witness. I am more or less quoting him in what I am saying here.

He says: The witness must know when to reply, when to hesitate, and, if possible, when not to reply. Don't think you can refuse to reply, but maybe you can get by without replying. That's where the witness comes in, the good one. Not infrequently a short hesitation may preclude an answer because the inquisitor has gone on to another question or supplied his own answer. This may seem strange, but oftentimes some one of the Congressmen--and they are all good friends--is getting something into the record that he wants to get into the record. You might say he is sounding off. If you think he is browbeating you, asking you

questions and everything, and if he gives you about six questions before you can answer any of them, the best thing to do then is just go on, unless they come back and hammer at you and ask you for a specific answer. So, as I say, a short hesitation may preclude an answer because the inquisitor has gone on to another question or has even supplied his own answer.

So you must be alert and, as this Congressman said, if I may use his words, you must be clever, not devious, and above all do not be or seem to be evasive. Never try to evade an answer or be evasive. They will take right off on you, and rightly so. Being clever is trying to pace yourself and hesitating at the right time. You might get by with evasiveness, but the chances are you won't.

With these words of wisdom, which come, as I say, from a very senior and knowledgeable Congressman, I will conclude, gentlemen.

When you leave these cloistered halls--and this is certainly a beautiful hall and a beautiful building, and I can see now that you don't dare have a lecture after lunch, because, with these nice, comfortable seats, the speaker wouldn't have a person in this very lovely auditorium--to return, as we say, to the embattled Pentagon, I wish you luck. But, seriously, it is not really so bad.

The other day I saw a fellow and he asked me, "How are you doing?" I said, "Not very well." He said, "Oh, you're right in step."

The Congressmen and their staffs have a tough job to do and they must schedule and conduct investigations. They look to us--and they will

look to you as time goes on--to help them, and they are truly appreciative of our endeavors. I can say this to other staffs who are very knowledgeable, expert people: They need us and we need them. We have worked together and it is a very, very fine relationship.

This is the first time I have been in the legislative game. I was in the constituent-query game years ago, after the war. This was really my first contact with the committee staffs per se. I know that they are helpful all the way across the board. They look to us because they couldn't do the work without us. We have to give them responsive, fast answers and the statements that they need, and we have to get them to help us in getting our work done.

Now you are going to have the next speaker, who is Major General Hoisington of the Air Force, who will speak to you on a very important aspect of this, which is the payoff, you might say, on the constituent inquiries and travel.

General Hoisington.

GENERAL HOISINGTON: Gentlemen: When the good Admiral referred to the fact that the Army and the Air Force have liaison and they have affairs, Fred Boye and I thought he was bragging a little bit.

General Roderick did such a good job of covering the greater portion of my travel speech that I am reminded of a story of this big Texan who came up here to see his Congressman. He spent the weekend here and decided to go to church. He went to church, and after the service was over he went out in front of the church, and there the preacher was. He

went up and slammed him on the back, and in a loud voice he said, "That was a damn fine sermon. I'll tell you, that was a damn fine sermon." The preacher tried to calm him down a little bit because he was sounding off in front of the parishioners there. Finally it just got to the point where the preacher said, "Look. Just keep that to yourself." "Keep it to myself?" he asked. "You just rose me up so high in that sermon that when you passed the collection plate I put a \$100 bill in it." The preacher said, "The hell you did."

Everything isn't glamorous in this business of legislative liaison. It's good, hard work, as you can see from hearing my colleagues talk about aspects of it. There's a lot of just plain, old, coal-shoveling that goes with this business. One of the most terrible things, or the worst ordeals, that we face every day is going in and seeing thousands of pieces of correspondence from constituents who write in to their Congressmen, to the President, and to the Vice President.

You remember that the late President took office and he gave a speech when he was inaugurated, and he said, "If you have any problems, write me." Well, they did. We started to get as much volume in one month as we would get in one year previously. Our Presidential inquiries went from 1,000 to 13,000. We've had a very large growth in this business of constituent inquiries--I'll give you a feel for it--since, say, 1955. Incidentally, the numbers are about the same in all the services. In 1955 we were getting about 22,000 a year from the Congress. Two years ago that was 72,000. Last year we had a 14 percent increase to

88,000, and the way things are going the first part of this year, w'll hit over 90,000 Congressional inquiries.

Now, these run the gamut of subjects. They can be about a contract. Joe Blow owns a manufacturing company out in somebody's district and he didn't get the contract. So he is irate and he goes in to see his Congressman and says that the thing wasn't conducted properly and his firm didn't get the bid. So the next thing you know we are all over there trying to find out why the Blow manufacturing company didn't get the contract. We finally get down into it and we find that his company is in an old barn or something like that, and they haven't got any money and the machinery is all rusted, after the Congressman has told us that this is a great concern.

We are constantly chasing all these things down. I remember when I got ordered into this job everybody out in the field said, "Well, Perry, this is wonderful. When you get in there you can stop all this business." There is no way to stop it. It's a fundamental part of our system of government, and everybody has the right to contact the Congress.

Every time that we have a case where somebody gets involved with the fact that the man did contact the Congressman, we lose the case, every time, regardless of how good it is. We have to get out of there, and pop out of the swamp about as fast as we can get out of it, because you can't win on that basis. You have to recognize the fact that the constituent has the right to write to his Congressman.

They write. Even a mother will write, and say, "Every time I see my boy he has a cold. You're not feeding him enough orange juice." So we've got to go and find out about this, because she's given us about a page on that, and about five pages on how she raised this little bastard.

Then the enlisted men will write in. We had one write in and say how lousy the food was and all about the mess hall. In the last paragraph he said, "And besides, I can't get seconds."

The officers also write. I'll give you a good example of that. This is a First Lieutenant fighter pilot. He wrote:

"Dear Sir:

I would like to call your attention to page 21 of the enclosed Air Defense Command 'Interceptor' Magazine. You will notice the letters FCSRTEFM. These letters, according to members of the operational readiness inspection team, stand for the words, 'For Christ's Sake Read This -----Magazine.' Admittedly, we can no longer expect our military officers to heed the words of George Washington and refrain from swearing altogether. But why must the services be inflicted with so much filth?

This example only provides part of the answer. I have previously voiced my objection to this practice through military channels. As no action has been taken to prevent the misuse of appropriated funds for printing such trash, I respectfully solicit your aid in bringing this matter to the attention of the appropriate agency or individuals."

So we got into the act. After we looked into this we had to reply to the Senator. We wrote:

"Dear Senator:

This is in response to your recent inquiry in behalf of First Lieutenant So and So, concerning the usage of FCSRTFM in the Air Defense Command 'Interceptor' Magazine. In view of your expression of personal interest we asked the Field Commander for a report.

We have been informed that there is no official definition for FCSRTFM. However, the author of the article states that the intent of the initials was: 'For Combat Superiority Read The Fighter Manuals.'

To preclude further misunderstanding future publications will contain the entire phrase rather than just the initials.

Your interest in Air Force matters is appreciated."

Believe me, these cases are over there in the various departments by the thousands. In most instances the answer is no.

When I first got there, for two weeks I kept signing these stacks and stacks of these things, "No! 'No!' 'No.'" I finally called the folks in and I said, "Look I have always prided myself on being a rather positive individual and you've made a complete negative person out of me. I'm signing *No' all the time." About three days later they were able to find one "Yes," and brought it in, all wrapped up, actually, in a ribbon, and I signed this "Yes." We most of the time say no, but the important thing is how you say no. You have to get into the matter in

great detail. You just can't be indifferent about it and say, "The hell with him," and send him just any kind of answer. You have to send a good, complete, responsive answer, and it's got to be sent very quickly.

We also have problems such as being besieged by people when you are going to close something down or change it. As you know, we have just gone through a rigamarole on changing part of the Rome Air Materiel Area up there. We are going to close part of that down. We've gotten 131,000 pieces of correspondence that were sent to the White House. The White House just bundled them up and sent them to my office. We've been trying to open them up and find out what's in them. A lot of them don't even pertain to ROAMA. In some of them people are sending in a check to some department or something. It has been quite a mess up there, as you can imagine, sitting there working on a pile of 130,000 and some of these things.

I brought along a couple of them. Here's one that says:

"Dear Mr. McNamara:

If you can ignore this plea to save ROAMA, then I will believe everything that has been said about you. "

This was from So and So, and here's a picture of a little child beseeching the Secretary. They made up valentines. Here's one:

"ROAMA, heart of our economy," with all kinds of junk in the middle, here.

Some of the people even sent the instructions in that told them to write us.

Now, in addition to the problem of constituent inquiries, which is going to be with us, I am sure, for the rest of time, I think that General Roderick did express very well the fact that unless these people get out and visit these Army, Navy, Marine, and Air Force installations to see the equipment they have no idea what they are concerned with. Consequently, they do travel. They travel here and they travel abroad. And we do a very good job, all the services, in taking care of them. We are very careful in selecting the escort people who are trained to handle these folks.

Now, then, we honor about half of the requests that are made. There are a number of different ways that a person on the Hill can travel. The committee chairman will write a letter to the Department of Defense and say he wants his committee to travel or he wants some specific member of his committee to travel. The Department of Defense will receive that request and they'll make a decision as to whether they'll pass it to the Army or the Navy or the Air Force.

We'll get the request--one of the services--and we'll go to work to set the thing up and maintain liaison between the individual members and our various departments. We'll usually run a very good trip and this will be done in every minute detail.

Also, the services may invite members. Let's say that you are having some sort of a big shindig at one of your installations and you would like to have members of Congress present. You can write in and we can have the departments invite people to attend that.

Then we have the business of a person being a member of a Reserve and he is qualified to ride, if there is space available. So we get a request to ride, space available. We have to be very careful in this operation, this travel business, so that we do not find ourselves riding someone out to participate in some big political affair. This is a thing that bothers all of us, not just the people in L&L but everyone else in the services as well. We have to be careful about that.

I remember, just before Christmas, a lot of people went home and the President kept everyone here, to vote, and a lot of them were trying to hop a military aircraft back to Washington, because, right around Christmas, all the youngsters are going home from college. They couldn't get seats. I had one Congressman call me, and I said, "No, sir, we can't take care of you." Within about 50 miles of him this one Congressman went into Wright-Patterson Air Force Base and rushed up to the desk. There was a civilian on duty there, and he said to him: "I've got to get to Washington right now." The man said, "There's an airplane out there cranked up, ready to go." He jumped in and came in here. He was the only man who rode military air, that I know of, during this particular time. Of course there was a great deal of criticism about it, but we in the military didn't make the mistake. It was some civilian employee who just didn't know any better.

So, when you find yourself up against the problem of military travel, be sure that you know what you are doing, and just don't provide an airplane yourself, or any other kind of transportation, until you clear it. He

may or may not be eligible to travel under the circumstances.

I think this concludes our program. We have been most happy to come over here again this year and talk with you. We invite any of you, when you visit the Pentagon, to call and visit the Offices of Legislative Affairs of the Offices of Legislative Liaison in DOD or in the three services.

Thank you, kindly.

COLONEL LAKE: Gentlemen, You may direct your questions to a particular speaker. If you are not sure who should answer a question, we will have General Roderick decide who should answer it.

QUESTION: General Hoisington, you mentioned a four-fold increase in these constituent inquiries. What is the main category covered by most of these inquiries, and what is the reason for them?

GENERAL HOISINGTON: I think that you will find that it is just an increase across the board. People have become more familiar with the fact that they can write to their Congressmen. Away back in the old days when most of us came into the services, you never heard of anybody doing a thing like this. It has just gone gradually from zero to 22,000 in 1955, and the curve since then is constantly going up.

I don't think that I could put my finger on any one thing, except that we have had a bunch of wars. We've had World War II and the Korean thing, and now we've got this hot thing down there in Viet Nam. People just have gotten around more. When we were youngsters, remember, people had hardly been out of their own backyards. Now, with communication

the way it is, people move around and they just know a lot more, and they sit down and write to their Congressmen. I think maybe my colleagues can add something to that. Maybe they have the answer. All I see is that that curve is going up.

GENERAL BOYE: I don't think there is any particular answer. I might add that it will go on when events occur in a given period. When we had the Berlin build-up, you will recall that we had problems in calling up Reserve units and individuals. With this our inquiries went away up, completely over the top. They had a subject.

We had an exercise, a special forces exercise, down in Georgia last year, which got some unfortunate and unbelievable publicity, called Water Moccasin II, and we had a surge of inquiries from indignant people concerned about training NATO troops in Georgia and involving civilians.

You may have read in the papers here the other day that the Army rejected Cassius Clay. We've gotten letters. Oh, Boy! It's incidents, as well as as well as probably what General Hoisington said, that people have found out that they can write and get answers, and sometimes they get results this way. It's authorized; it's legal, and they do it.

GENERAL RODERICK: I can't stand mute about this. I think the thing to get across to you gentlemen is that you are going to be in command and you are going to be in the senior jobs. The thing is, don't get frustrated by these letters. A lot of people get mad and won't answer them. They say, "Why should I spend my time just for Seaman

Joe Gilch or Private So and So? Here I am, a Colonel, a Captain, a General, an Admiral, and why should I waste my time ?" That's a great mistake.

They have the right now to write. In the early days it would perhaps be a court-martial offense if you did write to a Congressman. You weren't supposed to go to see a Congressman. You weren't supposed to go near them. Now we encourage everybody to go to see his Congressman when he is here. I'd like to leave that thought. You go to see your Congressman and your two Senators, when you are in town.

The point is, people have the right to write. They write and the Congressman must have an answer. There is only one way to get an answer. That is to go to an agency that can supply it. In our case it's our services. If it comes to us we have to give it an answer. They are expensive answers. The last cost index I saw, several years ago, was \$2.50. I imagine it's \$3.50 a letter today.

You say, "Why am I spending this money? I have to staff up for it." All right. People have the right to do it. They expect an answer and they are going to get an answer. The cost of defense and the cost of government is going up. It's going to be reflected in their taxes. It's that simple.

You've got to answer it. Don't let it get you down. You can't get away from it. You have to do it. I think that the increase, as my colleagues have said, is due to the fact that people now know that they can write and get an answer, and they are going to write. I think it's

just that simple. And, of course, people are better educated now and there are more of them. That's all.

QUESTION: General Roderick, from time to time there are charges that Congressmen who hold a Reserve commission are involved in a conflict of interest when they get into legislative matters or investigative matters, regarding the military. Is this a valid premise?

GENERAL RODERICK: Instead of calling it a conflict of interest, I am more concerned about discrimination--not in the debates going on over at the Senate now. A person, because he is elected to the House or the Senate, and who was active in the Reserve, should he be deprived of that Reserve capacity? Maybe he is working toward his retirement and he has a bona fide and a genuine interest in it. I am not going to be so naive nor am I going to insult your intelligence and tell you that, if you have a Major General in the Army who hears something about the Army, because he is a Reserve officer, he is not interested in the Army aspect. We have Air Force officers over there and we have Navy officers, and we've got a lot of Marines, even though none of them are representatives here today. Don't think for one minute that they are not a potent force over there.

I think, as human beings, they may, yes, perhaps prick up their ears a little more when they hear of a particular service problem, but you've got a great leveling factor there. In the Armed Services Committee, where a lot of them are, some of these chaps are Agriculture, Post Office, Civil Service, Commerce oriented. I don't think there is a conflict of

interest there per se, as we ordinarily use the term. I don't think this is hurting the military and it is surely not hurting the individuals, and it is not hurting the Government.

Again, I think it's a case of making good publicity for some of these people to harp on the subject of their having Reserve commissions. If we tried to take their commissions away from them, I think that would be discrimination.

GENERAL HOISINGTON: We've got quite a few Reservists on the Hill like the other services have. I'd just like to tell you that I have never, in the 2½-plus years that I have been with this business now, heard a single Air Force Reservist who is a Congressman or a Senator say he believes in something or he is voting on something or he is against something because he is an Air Force Reservist. Nor have we ever gone to anybody, to my knowledge, and said, "Because you belong to the Air Force Reserve you should report a certain thing a certain way." I feel sure that the other services are very much like we are in the Air Force. We are not lobbyists in the sense that you find a lot of representatives from big business here in Washington, with big expense accounts, taking these folks around and influencing them. We merely provide the materials and the stuff that they need when they ask for it. They ask for it through DOD, or if they ask for it direct we go down to DOD and coordinate it.

There is a lot less finagling and back-door operation in this business than any of you people would believe. As a matter of fact

it's damn difficult to find any of it at all.

QUESTION: A couple years ago Congressmen Hardy and Bates, I believe, had a hearing on defense agencies. They were quite exercised about and involved in deliberation on defense agencies. A proposal that came out of that had to do with legalizing the current defense agencies. That was the expression used, I believe. It proposed that any further expansion of defense agencies be limited. What happened to that proposed legislation? What to you think will develop from it?

GENERAL RODERICK: Well, in OSD we are not pushing it, so, therefore, I don't know. We've got enough that we are concerned about. I am glad you brought that up. I think this is a typical example, perhaps, of not handling a Congressional committee properly. Admiral Jones was talking about investigations. We sort of feel that, every time we have an investigative hearing, using hindsight which you all know is a very cheap commodity, somewhere along the line we perhaps could have established a rapport or provided information, or we could have precluded it.

In this case of Hardy and Bates on those defense agencies, these people are really dedicated men and very intelligent people. All of a sudden they were confronted with this knowledge that this Defense Supply Agency had been formed. Fortunately, we had a leveling factor on the other side--Douglas and Curtis, who felt that this was something very good and went to a floor debate, as you know. Curtis from Missouri and Senator Douglas of Illinois, on the Joint Economic Committee, defended what we were doing because of the efficiency and economy aspect which meant a great deal.

I think if we had briefed Mr. Hardy and Mr. Bates and the other members of that committee early and explained to them what we were doing and what we were trying to do, and the reason for it, that perhaps we wouldn't have had the hearings or these emotional aspects.

We felt and do feel that under the 1958 Reorganization Act the Secretary had authority to go ahead and do this. Mr. Hardy had a different idea. There is nothing to preclude Mr. Hardy from introducing legislation, which of course would have hearings. We would have our day in court to explain how we felt about it.

As I said, and I wasn't being facetious, we are not pushing the legislation. I don't know where it stands, honestly, right now, but I know it's not a bill.

That's the background on it. I think again it's a case of a problem which is so often our problem with the people on the Hill-- there was a lack of communication. It's pretty much like something happening around your household. All of a sudden they are putting a sewer through your backyard. You may appreciate the necessity for the sewer, but you sure as hell would have liked to have been told about it before they did it, because you've got an interest in your backyard.

These committees have a very, very dedicated and burning interest in the Department of Defense. I am not talking about the political aspect as it affects their constituents. This is just pure dedication. Perhaps if we told them earlier we wouldn't have had this problem.

I hope that answers your question.

QUESTION: General Roderick, I read that Congressman Vinson is perhaps going to retire at the end of this year. Do you expect any change in relations or affairs with the House Armed Services Committee next year?

GENERAL RODERICK: That's pretty hard to predict, as you know. As it stands now, Mr. Rivers is the senior member and he will receive the chairmanship. There is only one Mr. Vinson. And one of these days when Mr. Rivers leaves, there will be only one Mr. Rivers. We don't anticipate a great deal of difference. It's pretty hard to predict what will be the difference, if any. Of course Mr. Vinson has been around a very long time. He has been very tolerant. As you know, he runs that committee with an iron hand.

It's pretty hard to tell how a man is going to function once he gets into it. You remember back when President Roosevelt died, people had a lot of apprehension as to the way the then Vice-President, Mr. Truman, would function. Overnight or within about a month he became a different man--I saw in a book I was reading recently. His attitudes changed and the control of his grasp of the situation.

So we are getting into pretty nebulous things in dealing with personalities, hopes, ambitions, fears, and frustrations of a human being. It would be difficult to answer your question precisely. I don't think there will be a whole lot of difference. Next year you will know whether I was right or wrong.

QUESTION: General Roderick, first of all, you may be interested

in knowing that the lead article in a popular magazine uses a figure of 500 in comparing the Legislative Liaison Outfit in the Pentagon with the figure of 505 which it was right after the war. You have already laid this one to rest, but I would be interested in your comments on the implications of this. While the Congress depends on the Pentagon for answers to questions, which they get with a great deal of effort on your part, the direction of the questions may not be in the public interest but may be predominantly in the interest of private contractors or business organizations from which Congress is no doubt under pressure today. Will you comment on that?

GENERAL RODERICK: Yes. I think there are a lot of factors involved. First let me give you a little story. We were working on a lousy case and spending a lot of time on it. We have the same problems, all of us, that General Hoisington mentioned. They say that you can't get much in the United States any more for a nickel, that even candy bars are getting awfully small, and they are charging a dime for them. But, believe you me, you can get a heck of a lot for a nickel, for that five-cent stamp. You can get a lot of people working on it when you write your Congressman.

I attribute it to several things. One, the Congress consists of 100 Senators. We have added 4 Senators in the last 3 or 4 years. We've got a new Senate Office Building. The House is comprised of 435 members. The size of the House hasn't increased for a good many years, but now we have three House Office Buildings. I think that is evidence of the

interest of the Federal Government. The Defense Department spends \$50 billion. On the contractor aspect of it, the letters are very, very small in number. We could cut our staffs 80 percent if all we had to worry about was contractor inquiries. Those are not difficult. You can't blame these people for writing in and defending their own contract. They don't know. They hear that some man has got a fine plant, as General Hoisington said, and this and that, and he wants to know why he didn't get the contract. All they can do is come to us. They don't know that it's in the back end of a garage with a broken down lathe. This man aspires to be a big businessman. That's our problem. All small business people want to become big business, and then when they become big business they get mad because they don't have the privileges of the small business, with all the setasides.

Really, there is nothing to be concerned about. The contractor aspect is minutia, compared with the other Congressional inquiries. They are bona fide, and in our form of government I think they are healthy.

COLONEL LAKE: Gentlemen, on behalf of all of us here, thank you very much for taking the time to be with us this morning and for the fine presentations.