organizations in the United States. The luncheon was in recognition of the great contribution made by Members, Rivers to the security of this Nation. A telegram was read from our colleague Edward Hébert. I hope every Member will read the telegram, written as only Eddie can do. The telegram is included as a part of my remarks.


Col. John T. Carlson, Executive Director, Reserve Officers Association of the United States, Washington, D.C.: I deeply regret my inability to be present to pay tribute to my old friend and colleague, Mr. Carl. I was among the first to read in my book first and last and always a patriot, a statesman, and a friend. I hope that Rivers, like Tennyson's brook, rolls on forever.

F. Edward Hébert.

MEAT AND POULTRY PACKAGING STUDY

HON. PETER N. KYROS OF MAIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1969

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the Record at this time, an interesting report recently brought to my attention by Mr. Joseph Benson of E. J. Benson & Associates, food technology consultants, Berkeley Heights, N.J. Mr. Benson has performed an evaluation of the use of an absorption pad in the packaging of fresh meat and poultry products for the Cellu Products Co. of Patterson, N.C., and the results of his study follow:

USE OF THE CELLU ABSORPTION PAD

E. J. Benson and Associates was retained by Cellu Products Company of Patterson, North Carolina to study the use of an absorption pad in the packaging of fresh meat and poultry products. An absorption pad can be described as a pad consisting of many layers of paper with the capacity of absorbing a large amount of moisture. The pad is manufactured in various thicknesses and dimensions and is placed upon the product being packaged. This pad is normally placed in the bottom of a pulp or foam tray utilized in the packaging of fresh meat and poultry. The complete report as presented by E. J. Benson and Associates is available upon request. The following represents a brief summary:

The legislation being proposed in various cities and states dictates the use of a clear plastic tray with up to 98% visibility. The only allowance is for the label. This, of course, prohibits the use of a meat and poultry absorption pad. It has been found that these products benefit derived when an absorption pad is utilized, especially when used in conjunction with fresh poultry. These benefits are primarily for the consumer. The retailer and processor will also benefit. The obvious benefits are as follows:

1. The product has a better appearance.
2. The package is free from unsightly moisture (blood and water). This moisture when present frequently ends up on the clothes of the consumer or soaks into the paper, causing staining or disintegration of the bag.
3. A package free from leakage when there is an unsatisfactory seal.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

May 21, 1969

HON. SHIRLEY CHISHOLM OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1969

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Speaker, when a young woman graduates from college and starts looking for a job, she is likely to have a frustrating and even demeaning experience ahead of her. If she walks into an office for an interview, the first question she will be asked is, "Do you have children?"

There is a calculated system of prejudice that lies unspoken behind that question. Why is it acceptable for women to be secretaries, librarians, and teachers, but totally unacceptable for them to be managers, administrators, doctors, lawyers, and Members of Congress.

The unspoken assumption is that women are different. They do not have executive ability, orderly minds, stability, leadership skills, and they are too emotional.

It has been observed before, that society for a long time, discriminated against another minority, the blacks, on the same basis—that they were different and inferior. The happy little home-maker and the contented "old dandy" on the plantation were both stereotypes produced by prejudice.

As a black person, I am no stranger to that type of prejudice. But the truth is that in the political world I have been far oftener discriminated against because I am a woman than because I am black. Prejudice against blacks is becoming un-American although it will take years to eliminate it. But it has begun because, slowly, white America is beginning to admit that it exists. Prejudice against women is still acceptable. There is very little understanding yet of the immorality in attitudes held and the classification of most of the better Jobs as "for men only."

More than half of the population of the United States is female. But women occupy only 2 percent of the managerial positions. They have not even reached the level of tokenizers. No women sit on the AFI-CIO council or Senate, or Second Court. There have been only two women who have held Cabinet rank, and at present there are none. Only two women now hold ambassadorial rank in the diplomatic service. But now there is an awareness of this situation particularly among the younger segment of the population.

As in the field of equal rights for blacks, Spanish-Americans, the Indians, and other groups, laws will not solve such deep-seated problems overnight. But they can be used to provide protection for those who are most abused, and to begin the process of evolutionary change by compelling the insensitive majority to re-examine its unconscious attitudes.

It is for this reason that I wish to introduce today a proposal that has been before every Congress for the last 40 years and that sooner or later must become part of the basic law of the land—the equal rights amendment.

Let me note and try to refute two of the commonest arguments that are offered against this amendment. One is that it will protect women's jobs. Some say, but is it not true that women are doing the same thing as men? But now there is an awareness of this situation particularly among the younger segment of the population.

As in the field of equal rights for blacks, Spanish-Americans, the Indians, and other groups, laws will not solve such deep-seated problems overnight. But they can be used to provide protection for those who are most abused, and to begin the process of evolutionary change by compelling the insensitive majority to re-examine its unconscious attitudes.

It is for this reason that I wish to introduce today a proposal that has been before every Congress for the last 40 years and that sooner or later must become part of the basic law of the land—the equal rights amendment.

Let me note and try to refute two of the commonest arguments that are offered against this amendment. One is that it will protect women's jobs. Some say, but is it not true that women are doing the same thing as men? But now there is an awareness of this situation particularly among the younger segment of the population.

As in the field of equal rights for blacks, Spanish-Americans, the Indians, and other groups, laws will not solve such deep-seated problems overnight. But they can be used to provide protection for those who are most abused, and to begin the process of evolutionary change by compelling the insensitive majority to re-examine its unconscious attitudes.

It is for this reason that I wish to introduce today a proposal that has been before every Congress for the last 40 years and that sooner or later must become part of the basic law of the land—the equal rights amendment.

Let me note and try to refute two of the commonest arguments that are offered against this amendment. One is that it will protect women's jobs. Some say, but is it not true that women are doing the same thing as men? But now there is an awareness of this situation particularly among the younger segment of the population.

As in the field of equal rights for blacks, Spanish-Americans, the Indians, and other groups, laws will not solve such deep-seated problems overnight. But they can be used to provide protection for those who are most abused, and to begin the process of evolutionary change by compelling the insensitive majority to re-examine its unconscious attitudes.

It is for this reason that I wish to introduce today a proposal that has been before every Congress for the last 40 years and that sooner or later must become part of the basic law of the land—the equal rights amendment.

Let me note and try to refute two of the commonest arguments that are offered against this amendment. One is that it will protect women's jobs. Some say, but is it not true that women are doing the same thing as men? But now there is an awareness of this situation particularly among the younger segment of the population.

As in the field of equal rights for blacks, Spanish-Americans, the Indians, and other groups, laws will not solve such deep-seated problems overnight. But they can be used to provide protection for those who are most abused, and to begin the process of evolutionary change by compelling the insensitive majority to re-examine its unconscious attitudes.
fair pay, safe working conditions, protection against sickness and layoffs, and provision for dignified, comfortable retirement. Men and women need these things equally. But the one sex needs protection more than the other is a male supremacist myth as ridiculous and un−worthy of respect as the white supremacist myths that society is trying to cure of itself at this time.

A HARD LOOK AT THE U.S. TECHNOCAL POSTURE

HON. DURWARD G. HALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 21, 1969

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, although I am not an advocate of the Members of Congress involving themselves in the commercial affairs of business and industry, and by the same token the Air Force or any other branch of service included, I would like to have the article "A Hard Look at the U.S. Technological Posture," which appeared in the January 1969 issue of Air Force and Space Digest magazine, inserted in the Record for all who are interested, in view of the current trends of discussion of times without full and bilaterally objective information.

The article follows:

A HARD LOOK AT THE U.S. TECHNOLOGICAL POSTURE

(Edward E. Ulssamer, associate editor, Air Force/Space Digest)

Among paramount Air Force technology requirements are comprehensive upgrading of test facilities, which are "stretched to the breaking point at present," an inflation of about $500 million in advanced development work across the R&D spectrum, more modification of existing weapon systems, a hyperopic follow−on to the X−series of test aircraft, and "greater technological togetherness" of all sectors of government.

These views were expressed recently to Air Force officials by,a member of the Air Force Systems Command, General James Ferguson, and some of his principal staff officers.

Basing the national technology posture as "not as good as it should be or could be," General Ferguson said a recent Air Force study of specific areas of laboratory−type technology in are comprehensive exploration showed that $800 million is the sum total—certainly not a staggering amount and only a fraction of what it costs to fight the war in Vietnam for a week—of all the items that we consider productive and worthy of effort over and above what we are accomplishing now."

The Achilles' heel of the U.S. technology effort, in the view of AFSC, however, is the inadequate condition of US test facilities, a matter of concern not only to the Air Force but to all components of the Department of Defense, as well as NASA, other government agencies in this area. "We are literally stretched to the breaking point," General Ferguson said. "We are using facilities that have been ..."

In this area "we are literally stretched to the breaking point. We are using facilities that have been extended by the Peenemunde (the German World War II missile center). We had to put protective barriers around some of the operations so that if they disintegrate, they won't injure anybody in the vicinity," General Ferguson explained.

The current test−facility crisis centers on large and costly aerospace facilities involving test ranges, scientific laboratories, space chambers, wind tunnels, shock tube, instrumented aircraft, computer−aided analysis, advanced research−type test tools, and synthetic battleground environments. Planning and constructing such facilities involve a five−to−ten year lead time. These facilities are the high−ultimate−pace factor of future technological development, with SG prediction, according to General Ferguson, and should be recognized as such by the government as "capital investment." He said this is an "area of continued ability to operate profitably and compete effectively."

What is needed, in General Ferguson's view, is the same kind of schedule and quality as the late Dr. Theodore von Kármán displayed in 1945 when he campaigned for a Mach 3 wind tunnel for the development needs, facilities, which turned out to be the very beginnings of today's technology but which were derailed at the time by the sprints as extravagant and unnecessary.

We need the willingness to support technology by discovering the unknown, to build something that isn't necessarily in direct support of an approved program. We need to do this not only for the sake of progress but because there are other people in this world that will find a way around us.

The need for improved and modernized test facilities, to a large measure, hinges on cost considerations. The inability to test the C−5's engine, the T−38, the LRV of Lear−Jet, the M−1500 performance envelope ranging from sea level to 5,000 feet because existing wind tunnels were inadequate for the airflow requirement, made it necessary to use a modified B−52. This was not only costly but also disadvantageous because a much greater volume of test data could have been achieved in as much as six hours of test cell operation than is generated by days of flight testing. (Similar test restrictions apply to the electric GE 64 one, designed to power the SST.)

The lack of adequate wind−tunnel facilities to test up to Mach 24, for instance, escalates costs of hardware like the Advanced Ballistic Reentry System (ABRES). In place of relatively inexpensive ground simulation, actual test firings are required during the preliminary phase of development.

The absence of wind tunnels capable of testing V/STOL aircraft in all modes of operation, in the high Mach 2−3 region, in which fifty−five different prototypes were built in the past few years, "are without sufficient success to justify production," according to General Ferguson.

A. "In the conceptual design phase, the choice of engine [for the A−12], with regard to WS−190, the proposed advanced ICBM, which is complicated by the absence of adequate rocket test cells."

Breaching the V/STOL technology the test facilities program may well prove penny−wise and pound−foolish. The Air Force believes, for instance, that the gigantic amount of facilities to test landing gear extracts a price substantially higher than the cost of building such an installation.

THE PROBLEM OF NATIONAL TEST FACILITIES

A number of special circumstances complicate, as well as intensify, the problem of national test facilities, according to General Ferguson. That is, the Soviet advancement and sophistication of test facilities are progressing rapidly. The implication is, as he told the Preparedness Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee, that "the Soviets intend to develop new systems advanced enough to require these facilities in a progressive reevaluation." He added, "We must also recognize that Soviet development−to−development lead time will be effectively shortened, [for] facilities in their economy as in ours are long−lead time items, indis−

pendable to the timely development of new systems."

He urged, therefore, an "imaginative, comprehensive strategy for test facilities, development, and acquisition of those facilities that will be needed to provide the critical [sic] reliability, performance, and service life information and time durations for future systems. I feel such a plan is needed, just as surely as such facilities will be needed, and it must be planned in advance, rather than in the absence of others."

"It occurs to me that when the nation has to spend $500 million or more per facility [for massive retesting, extending time and increasing test engines of up to 60,000 pounds of thrust], then we should have a plan that spells out in order of priorities where and when these facilities should be located." General Ferguson said. He added that an integrated facilities program should be formulated for the following reasons: to ensure the government−wide utility and national resource character of advanced test facilities; AFSC presently administers test facilities facilities recently renamed DoD facilities are valued at $2 billion, while the government in 1968 total represents an $11.2 billion investment. General Ferguson advocated expanded the concept of "technological togetherness" to ensure the adequate and timely sharing and development of test facilities. Without question the industry's need for, and substantial investment in, new test facilities is looking for or proposing that "we should confine ourselves to just one facility of a kind in the nation," he said. "It is worthless for the nation, after much research began on a joint test facility, for in the final analysis it is the government which directly or indirectly pays for and builds these facilities."

He, therefore, proposed that more government facilities be made available to adequate government, not just to industry, but rather in effect with regard to some AFSC installations which are industrially funded.

"I can't see any other way of providing these massive facilities which have a primary defense orientation but also furnish invaluable service for the civilian sector," he said.

If you had to test, say, a 100,000−pound−of−thrust jet engine for a future commercial jet transport under ambient conditions, General Ferguson said, "the task would be divided among industry to undertake on its own."

"Yet, if the company with such a need were an AMF, for example, and it were asked to [the Arnold Engineering Development Center in] Tullahoma, Tenn., I would think that we have a situation that is very much more advantageous in national interest," he said. "There are other kinds of sorts—although not with the private sector—because NASA paid $4 million toward extending the AEDC wind tunnel to test the upper stages of Saturn, with the result that both its own and the Air Force's capabilities are enhanced."

Other AFSC test facilities which were also used for non−DoD purposes are, in General Ferguson's words: "the A−12, a new−foot instrumented runway and excellent weight and balance facility at Edwards AFB, Calif., have been made available in support of the DC−8, Do−9, 727, and 737 jetliner certification tests."

At the Inhalation Exposure Facility of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, technicians are studying the implications of long−term exposure to common chemicals threatening pollution to the atmosphere. The findings of these studies will be applied to the federal standard for airborne contaminants. "The inhalation exposure facility is the only of its kind in the world," General Ferguson said. "It is designed to provide scientifically reliable test data on the effects of exposure to common chemicals."

That same lab's Bio−Acoustic Research Facility is testing measuring the effects of the sonic boom of military aircraft for the Department of Defense, Aircraft Branch of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Cold War Group. And the Naval Air Research and Development Command has been used to test commercial communication satellites from launch to orbit.