

organizations in the United States. The luncheon was in recognition of the great contribution made by MENDEL 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.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
May 21, 1969.

Col. JOHN T. CARLTON,
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, truly a great American. MENDEL RIVERS in my book is 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 MAINE

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 evaluate 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 depending 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 there are many benefits derived when an absorption pad is utilized, especially, when used in conjunction with fresh poultry. These benefits are primarily for the consumer. However, 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 shopping bag causing disintegration of the bag.
3. A package free from leakage when there is an unsatisfactory seal.

4. A package that will not have to be re-wrapped by the retailer. The re-wrapping is necessary when loose moisture causes package failure.

The more important benefits are not quite so obvious. These studies have proven that when a pad is utilized with fresh cut-up poultry, it restricts the re-absorption of the juices back into the product. This re-absorption has been associated with spoilage. Under a wide range of storage conditions, shelf life can be extended up to two days. In other words, the poultry will remain edible for an additional two days when stored under proper temperature conditions. The tests run were primarily odor evaluations which have subsequently been substantiated by tests conducted by a government agency. The government agency found that off-odors developed sooner in trays without pads in 19 out of 20 packages. The development of odor also indicates a build-up of bacteria.

There are areas currently being evaluated in an effort to provide the consumer with a better product. The clear plastic legislation is very restrictive and will discourage this type of research.

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR WOMEN

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 type?"

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 homemaker and the contented "old dinky" on the plantation were both stereotypes produced by prejudice.

As a black person, I am no stranger to race 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 unacceptable although it will take years to eliminate it. But it is doomed 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 involved in double pay scales 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 tokenism yet. No women sit on the AFL-CIO council or Supreme 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 corps. In Congress, we are down to one Senator and 10 Representatives.

Considering that there are about 3½ million more women in the United States than men, this situation is outrageous.

It is true that part of the problem has been that women have not been aggressive in demanding their rights. This was also true of the black population for many years. They submitted to oppression and even cooperated with it. Women have done the same thing. 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 change 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 reexamine 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 women are already protected under the law and do not need legislation. Existing laws are not adequate to secure equal rights for women. Sufficient proof of this is the concentration of women in lower paying, menial, unrewarding jobs and their incredible scarcity in the upper level jobs. If women are already equal, why is it such an event whenever one happens to be elected to Congress?

It is obvious that discrimination exists. Women do not have the opportunities that men do. And women that do not conform to the system, who try to break with the accepted patterns, are stigmatized as "odd" and "unfeminine." The fact is that a woman who aspires to be chairman of the board, or a Member of the House, does so for exactly the same reasons as any man. Basically, these are that she thinks she can do the job and she wants to try.

A second argument often heard against the equal rights amendment is that it would eliminate legislation that many States and the Federal Government have enacted giving special protection to women and that it would throw the marriage and divorce laws into chaos.

As for the marriage laws, they are due for a sweeping reform, and an excellent beginning would be to wipe the existing ones off the books. Regarding special protection for working women, I cannot understand why it should be needed. Women need no protection that men do not need. What we need are laws to protect working people, to guarantee them

fair pay, safe working conditions, protection against sickness and layoffs, and provision for dignified, comfortable retirement. Men and women need these things equally. That one sex needs protection more than the other is a male supremacist myth as ridiculous and unworthy of respect as the white supremacist myths that society is trying to cure itself of at this time.

A HARD LOOK AT THE U.S. TECHNOLOGICAL 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 contractual problems 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 appears in the 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

(By Edgar E. Ulsamer, 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 infusion of about \$300 million in advanced development work across the R&D spectrum, more modification of existing weapon systems, a hypersonic 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/Space Digest by the Commander of the Air Force Systems Command, Gen. James Ferguson, and some of his principal staff officers.

Rating 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 need of intensified exploration showed that "\$300 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 according them now."

The Achilles' heel of the US technology effort, in the view of AFSC, however, is the inadequate condition of US test facilities—a matter of concern not merely to the Air Force but to all components of the Department of Defense, as well as NASA, other government agencies, and industry.

In this area "we are literally stretched to the breaking point. We are using facilities that go back to Peenemünde [the German World War II missile center]. We had to put protective barriers around some of the compressors so that if they disintegrate, they won't injure everybody 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 tubes, instrumented aircraft, computerized analysis, advanced reentry vehicle test tools, and synthetic battleground test capabilities. Planning and constructing such facilities involve a five- to ten-year lead time. These facilities are the incubators and the ultimate pacing factor of future technological advance, according to General Ferguson, and should be viewed by the government as "capital investment" to assure this country's "continued ability to operate profitably and compete effectively."

What is needed, in General Ferguson's view, is the same kind of vision and boldness as the late Dr. Theodore von Kármán displayed in 1945 when he campaigned for a Mach 3 wind tunnel and associated test facilities, which turned out to be the very foundations of today's technology but which were derided at the time by the sceptics as extravagant and unnecessary.

"We need the willingness to support technology by exploring 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 who are doing just that. The probability is great that they eventually will force a breakthrough of immense usefulness . . . and we will have to cope with the full lead time to catch up," General Ferguson said.

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 TF39, in that portion of its performance envelope ranging from sea level to 5,000 feet because existing wind tunnels were inadequate for the massive 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 data can be accumulated in a single hour of test cell operation than is generated by days of flight testing. (Similar test restrictions apply to the General Electric GE4 engine, slated 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 the program.

The absence of wind tunnels capable of testing V/STOL aircraft in all modes of operation, in the view of General Ferguson, explains in part why fifty-five different prototypes were built in the past few years, "all without sufficient success to justify production." A similar condition prevails with regard to WS-120, the proposed advanced ICBM, which is complicated by the absence of adequate rocket test cells.

Savings achieved by shortchanging the test facilities program may well prove penny-wise and pound-foolish. The Air Force believes, for instance, that the absence of advanced dynamic simulation facilities to test landing gears 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. There are indications that Soviet efforts in developing sophisticated test facilities are progressing rapidly. The implication is, as he told the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee, that "the Soviets intend to develop new systems advanced enough to require these facilities . . . by itself a provocative realization." 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-

pensable to the timely development of new systems."

He urged, therefore, an "imaginative, comprehensive, long-range plan for the design, development, and acquisition of those facilities that will be needed to provide the critical simulation environments, dimensions, 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 national in scope."

"It occurs to me that when the nation has to spend \$50 million or more per facility [about \$100 million for a wind tunnel to 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 how the nation should allocate these funds," General Ferguson said. He added that an integrated facilities program should be formulated on an interagency basis to reflect the government-wide utility and national resource character of advanced test facilities. AFSC presently administers test facilities and laboratories representing a capital investment of \$1.5 billion. Total DoD facilities are valued at \$2.2 billion, while the government-wide total represents an \$11.2 billion investment.

General Ferguson advocated expansion of the concept of "technological togetherness" to include the aerospace industry in the sharing and development of test facilities. Without questioning industry's need for, and right to have, test facilities of its own, or proposing that "we should confine ourselves to just one facility of a kind in the nation," he suggested that "maybe we have gone too far in building separate facilities [in industry], for in the final analysis it is the government which directly or indirectly pays for them."

He, therefore, proposed that more government facilities be made available to adequate rates to industry, a practice already 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-thrust jet engine for a future commercial jet transport under ambient conditions," General Ferguson said, "the task would be colossal for industry to undertake on its own."

"Yet, if the company with such a need were to participate in extending our facility at [the Arnold Engineering Development Center in] Tullahoma, Tenn., I would think that we have a situation that is very much in the national interest. We have a precedent 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 also were used for non-DoD purposes are, in General Ferguson's words:

The 15,000-foot instrumented runway and excellent weight and balance facility at Edwards AFB, Calif., have been made available in support of the DC-8, DC-9, 727, and 737 jetliner certifications.

At the Inhalation Exposure Facility of our Aero-Med Laboratory, 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 standards being set for "clean air."

That same lab's Bio-Acoustic Research Facility is measuring possible effects of the sonic boom on communities, and collaborating with other federal agencies in auto crash research.

And at the Cape, Air Force tracking equipment has been used to track commercial communication satellites from launch to orbit.