

11
Transcript of Extemporaneous Remarks
Triangle Chambers of Commerce - High Point, Winston-
Salem, and Greensboro, N. C. - September 2, 1976

Thank you very much, Gene, and ladies and gentlemen. Thank you for extending this opportunity to me. I think it is very valuable to me, or it will be to me, and I hope it will be of interest and of help to you.

I will say this, one of the most difficult problems that I think exists in the United States Senate today is the problem of communications between the members of the Senate and the people back home. If I have one real criticism to make of some of my colleagues - and a good many of my colleagues - it would be that they fail to do that. They fail to go back home often enough.

For instance, I suspect there are as many as 35 members of the United States Senate who do not maintain a home in their home state. When they do go home, they usually live in a hotel or with relatives. I can name you about 10 who did not go home during the one month Christmas recess. I was talking the other day to the Secretary of the Senate, and he told me (he is an employee of Senator Mansfield, who is one of the ablest United States Senators I have ever known) that the Senator tried not to go home more than

two or three times a year. It sorta' floated by me and I begin thinking about it the next night and I went back and said, "Why?" He said that he (Senator Mansfield) thinks the people back home think he should be in Washington.

Well, that might be true, but you can't find out what is happening back home without mingling with the people. And, when you fail to do that, you become distrustful of the people, and just as important, if not more so, you become distrustful of their institutions. For instance, there are a good many members of the Senate who have little confidence in local governments and in state legislatures. They envision the county commissioners and city councilmen as they did 25 or 30 years ago, and they envision state legislatures as being no more responsive to the people than they were 25 years ago.

To illustrate: When I was Clerk of the Court in 1951, the county commissioners in my county met the first Monday in every month. The Register of Deeds presented the bills to be paid, there was a motion that they be approved - maybe if there was a vacancy in the tax office it was filled, and that constituted the official duties of the commissioners.

But, today my county commissioners are involved in laying water lines across the county, they are involved in environmental matters, they are involved in urban and rural development. These are things that many of the members of the Senate don't know. We appreciate these opportunities, and I especially thank you for coming from the entire sixth district. I was saying to Gene that two years when I first went to the Senate after a year-long campaign, traveling back and forth across this State and trying to talk with as many people as I could, and I was tired, and I got up and I thought to myself, well, thank goodness, I am not like the house members who have to run every two years. I am glad I have got six years.

Well, now I think I would reverse that. I would be glad to run every two years if I didn't have to cover but three or four counties, but when you have to cover 100 counties, I believe that the framers of our Constitution pretty well knew what they were doing.

Let me hasten to say just a word or two about what I am doing.

As most of you know, I serve on the Banking,

Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee of the Senate, chaired by Senator Proxmire of Wisconsin, and I told him one day that his committee was the nearest thing to perpetual motion that had ever existed anywhere because he keeps it in session all of the time. We have to sorta' guard the "hen house." Somebody has got to be there with him most of the time. Those of you who are in the financial community know what I am talking about.

That committee handles over 50 percent of the economic matters that come before the Congress. Chairman Sparkman is chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing and he is also chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, which gives him little time for housing. Last year, I was pleased that he asked me to sit in for him for a series of public hearings on housing and I am hoping that this year, I can devote more time to that particular area. I think housing, as well as the automobile industry, probably are the two basic factors in our economy.

I chaired the Small Business Subcommittee, and we had, I think, some very meaningful legislation, and some meaningful hearings.

I am also on the Public Works, chaired by Senator Jennings Randolph, and that committee, as you

well know, has to do with transportation, highway funds, the Corps of Engineers, water and air resources, plus many other things, but primarily, during this Congress, I spent literally months on Senator Muskie's subcommittee rewriting the Clean Air Act of 1970, which was like going to school all over again. I had to go out to a local university and buy me some textbooks and sit down at home, and try to find out what nitrogen oxide was, and what chemical reactions took place when they were emitted into the air, etc. That was a most difficult assignment because there was such intense interest on both sides. You had your environmentalists on one side, and your industry on the other. 6

In addition to that, I was selected without request to serve on the Select Committee of the Senate to study the intelligence gathering agencies of the country. They included the CIA, the FBI, the National Security Administration, the Internal Revenue Service, the Naval Intelligence, all of the intelligence gathering agencies. And, of course, you know the history of that and you know some of my opinions on them. In the interest of time, I will save those for questions, and I welcome any questions on this.

After that committee was concluded, again I was selected to serve on the permanent Intelligence Oversight Committee, which has as its responsibility not the investigation of past activities so much as to assure that we have effective intelligence gathering agencies in the future, and that we have an oversight - a check and balance system, if you will, on the intelligence gathering agencies to prevent such abuses as did take place or has taken place in years past. That is the most frightening assignment that I have and I didn't realize it until I was on the new committee, because in the past on the investigating committee, we were dealing with things that had happened in the past. Now, we are knowledgeable in advance of things that are going to happen in the future. Not that we have any power to stop them, but if the CIA reports to us that they are going to do something in a foreign country covertly, and we think it is either in violation of^{the} intent of Congress or would be outrageous to the people, we have two choices. We can go to the President, who is after all in charge of it, or if he refuses to change it or act and we still think it is that important, then we can go to the Senate in Executive Session.

Now, let me say one other thing, and then I'll go to questions - I could take the whole time. As of yesterday, when I left Washington, we have had in this Congress around 1250 roll call votes in the Senate. That doesn't count the dozens and dozens of roll call votes on controversial issues in the committees, especially the Clean Air Committee, where you had, as I said earlier, intense interest from every point of view. Now this is contrasted from the North Carolina Senate where you had ^{a few} special interest groups, such as your unions, but you did not have your organized business community, but you had your teachers' organizations. Basically, there were not that many lobbying groups in the legislature. When contrasted to Washington, there is at least one if not dozens of organized lobbyist groups for and against every single issue that you can think of. So when you consider that I personally cast over 1,050 votes in the congress that there is an awful lot of disgruntled people in this State about how I voted.

For instance just recently, there was a motion that you couldn't use federal funds for abortion - to pay for abortions. Well if I voted for that as I did in this particular case, the mail began to flow

from the social workers organizations all across the country. If I had voted the other way, then the mail and the roses - they keep your office full of roses - would flow the right-to-life organizations.

The Postal Service Workers Union versus the United Parcel Service owners - in the environmental area there was the coalition to save our national forests and then our Southern Forest Products Institute ^{many of} which/you furniture manufacturers are involved in. You name it, For every group there is another group and usually the group that you vote with doesn't bother to send out any newsletters saying that you voted with them, but those you vote against send theirs out. I am learning, but it is tough.

One other thing, let me say, I have made extensive foreign travels, and I think it is a part of my responsibility, and I hope to make more. And, I told you when I asked you to elect me two years ago that I was going to do it. I assure you that I have not been on any junkets. Unfortunately, that is the way ^{about} Tom Wicker and some of them write/them, but if they would go with us one time, they would see.

For instance, I spent ~~xxx~~ ^{three} days with the Parliamentary Delegation, sitting across the table with 14 members of the Russian Senate, who also happened to be 14 of the 37 member of the Russian Politburo. We

spent two and half hours with Brezhnev himself.

And to give you just one illustration - we saw the country; we went out to a collective farm. I know now what Communism is all about. I know how the people live. I know that they have got to get involved in consumer goods.

To give you one illustration. You know we have restricted our trade with the Jackson amendment. The only threatening word that I heard, other than some harsh language in their opening speeches - Brezhnev said to us - we can get along without you in the United States, but we don't want to. He said we can get your technology from your multi-national corporations around the world. For instance, IBM and Xerox - he named those in France. Now contrast that - later on during the year I had at the Defense Department's invitation - Senator McIntyre and I led a delegation of 12 to the Middle East. We went into Cairo where I have never seen such poverty. We saw the broken down Russian equipment that had been furnished them. See this is Russia's way of controlling them - furnishing the equipment and then, withholding the parts when they don't act right. But to make a long story short - one other thing when I got over into Israel, they took us out to show us the Russian equipment that was captured in the 1973 war. On one of

those Russian tanks there was a infra-red night vision box - one of ours that is so top secret that you have to be classified as top secret to even see it, that was on the Russian tank when they captured it. Which NATO country it came from, we don't know but it gives you a perception that you don't get. Then when I went over to Nationalist China earlier this year with Mike Mann - two of who went with an escort. We heard the Nationalist Chinese say, "what are you doing to us? We're your friends - we let you land your B-52 bombers here during the Vietnamese War ~~which~~ ^{which} your own friends in Japan wouldn't do, wouldn't let you land them to get them out of a storm. We operated a bomber repair base for you. We haven't asked for aid since 1967 - What are ~~you~~ ^{them} you about to kick ~~in~~ ⁱⁿ the teeth for, for an unknown, for Communist China? Its a thought provoking question. Then, when you think about the goods that we sell, the farm products that we sell there in South Korea and Japan you know it gives you another perception. So, I will be doing some more traveling but I assure you that our traveling will be business. On the trip to the Middle East, we had two hours for sightseeing in Jerusalem and they took us around in a bus and didn't let us get out. On the trip to the Far East, we had a Sunday afternoon set aside and the South Koreans said, we'll take you

for two hours and then we got back in time for dinner. Let me say one final thing - The Constitution of the United States places the responsibility of conducting the foreign policy of this country on the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. We have to confirm the treaties - we have to confirm the Ambassadors. Now if we have to consent solely on the basis of what Dr. Kissinger and the President gives to us, then there's not much point in requiring a consent. And with that Gene, let me take questions.

Gene - The first question from Burlington please.

Senator Morgan - I'm Norman Young, chairman of the congressional action committee of Burlington Chamber. We're very much interested in North Carolina in the Right to Work law and wonder if you are for or against the Right to Work law and would you support it if it came up for a vote.

Morgan - The question is whether or not I am for the right to work law - I have been for 20 years since I first served in the State Senate. My position is clear it was made clear in the campaign I am against the repeal of 14D.

The second question from Eden please.

Morgan - The question from Joe is the probability of federal land use laws and what are my views? Yes, Joe it is coming up. It has already come up. I am violently

opposed to it. In the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1975 they tried to come in the back door by saying that the EPA-Environmental Protection Administrator could require in the environmental plans land use controls in the reaching of air quality standards as well as maintaining them. I offered an amendment in the committee which would delete that completely because I said what it was doing was indirectly giving to Russell Train, the EPA Administrator, to require you to adopt land use policies. I was able to dilute that provision a little bit by changing it to say that he couldn't require you to submit land use plans for the purpose of obtaining air quality standards but they can (unfortunately I wasn't able to prevail completely,) require you to submit land use plans for the purpose of maintaining them. In other words if you meet the standards here and your're going to build a shopping center out here - they can require you to say how many cars you're going to let park. Now I realize you got to have some if you're going to maintain air quality standards but I believe very strongly that the people in North Carolina who are closest to the problem can solve it far better than the bureaucracy in Washington. So I tried to get them out - I am violently opposed to federally mandated land use controls. Question from Greensboro please.

Morgan - The question is that we've have problems with short falls of natural gas in North Carolina and that is true although I think each year the threat has been really greater than the actual results. The answer to it is not simple. Is the answer decontrolling of the prices of natural gas completely and where the market would seek its own level where there is a limited supply or is the best policy to regulate prices intra-state as we've done in other cases such as in Louisiana and Texas where they are using it to lure industry or what is the answer. It can only come from a comprehensive energy program and in my opinion the Congress and the President - The Executive Branch and the Congress have totally failed in coming up with a comprehensive program and both are to blame. For instance, in the Senate there are 13 committees that deal in one form or another with energy problems and Senator Mansfield has held us in caucus day after day after day trying to change the rules so that we could agree on one committee handling all energy problems. And if you start trying to get some of my colleagues (I started to say old codge~~rs~~) but I'll say colleagues to give up power its difficult. And that's the reason we haven't been able to come up with one and then too the crisis arose rather quickly after the boycott and even the Executive Branch has not really had a good

comprehensive program but I think that is one of the first priorities of government next year. We know we can't do during the next two months during an election campaign.

Question from High Point please.

Morgan

The question is do I consider it unfair that all federal retired employees receive the one percent kicker in their retirement pay? For those of you who are not familiar with it, when the Congress set up the cost of living increases for retired personnel every three months well, it will take awhile for them to evaluate it and so thus we'll give them an extra one percent to make up for the time lag between the time when the cost of living goes up and the time they get it and its had some catastrophic results and has resulted in astronomical increases and those of you who get my newsletter know that I am opposed to the one percent kicker and have taken that position. Now let me mention one more thing - I have a newsletter that goes out once a week in which we take one issue and just on one page try to explain my position. We've tried not to send that newsletter to those who don't want it. If you are interested, if you would give me your name and address or just drop me a card, we will put you on. That position is explained there and let me add one other thing. Here is a problem we have. I am for a strong defense. You might even say I am pro military but that doesn't mean that I'm blinded

to all of the faults. For instance a Lieutenant Colonel today's outlay is about \$36,000 a year. My son went into the Air Force and stayed three years and he came out making about \$700 a month. When you take all the civil service workers in North Carolina, take all the civil service employees, the civil service retirees, the Postal workers, the Postal retirees, the military, the military retirees and the military wives who are constantly fighting for other additional benefits and let those pressure groups come on me. You can imagine the pressure I'm under to vote always for the highest increase regardless of what the President recommends and the difficulty is when I do when I vote against them, they know it. But those of you who are in industry who are having to meet these wages don't always know what I've done. So you see, I get all the flak and very little of the appreciation. Now, I'm not asking for that except an understanding. For instance, in 1957, the President was talking about this issue, he recommended that we phase out the commissaries. The commissaries on military bases are illegal now. They have never been authorized except in those areas where commercial facilities were not available. That's the present law. It has been the law ever since they were created. There are five commissaries in the District of Columbia area with all of the thousands of supermarkets. They are subsidized to the tune of about two and a half billion dollars a year. Well, I would have gone along

with that back when military pay was low. But now the people living in the Fayetteville area use all the benefits of the taxpayers but they don't trade with the local people so I voted to phase out the commissaries over a six year period of time. The military retirees say well we were promised that when we stayed in service. Well, they weren't really promised - they might have been justified in assuming it. But they weren't promised the cost of living raise, increase in their retirement which they have gotten. If I met the demands of all of the federal employees and retirees in this State, we'd go bankrupt pretty soon and I'll tell you, its not easy to withstand the pressure.

Question from Reidsville please.

Morgan - How do I feel about the Humphrey-Hawkins Bill, government guaranteed jobs for those who can't find them? I think it would be catastrophic - There are too many people on the federal payroll now. We stopped at a convenience market on the way up here and there was a sign on the window "Help Wanted - Good Help Wanted." I talked to the lady and she said they couldn't find help. I just believe that that would take so much more money out of the economy to pay these people, would increase the federal debt so much that it would have the direct opposite effect. For instance, the Federal Reserve Board can only issue about, well they can only issue new money

each year equal to about what the increase in the gross national product is which is about \$200 billion just rounding it off. Well, last year out of that \$200 billion the government had to go out and borrow \$75 billion to begin with so that didn't leave industry the private sector but about \$125 billion to grow to keep up with the gross national product. Last month we had to borrow $7\frac{1}{2}$ billion dollars to make ends meet and they issued bonds in as low a denomination as a thousand dollars paying 8% and there was just an out flow of money from savings institutions in this State which took money away from home building and all its immediate effects. I think we've got to bring the budget in balance and I think the jobs should be created in the private sector and I'm opposed to the Humphrey-Hawkins Bill.

We have now covered the five Chambers of Commerce - WE will entertain questions from the floor.

Morgan - The question is what is my feeling with regard to the efforts being made in Congress to reinstate the Fair Labor Standards Act to state, federal, municipal employees. You know, they had ruled that they did apply and then the Supreme Court said they weren't constitutional. I'm opposed to it - I was at the time they imposed them when I was Attorney General of North Carolina. I didn't think they had the constitutional

right to do it then and you point out one of the great difficulties in the Congress is that many of my colleagues who feel very strongly about certain issues will by-pass the committee system by tacking it on to some other bill. Now revenue sharing bill which I am very strongly for and I'm for it without any strings attached. I'm for it for letting you put it in your general treasurer and let your elected officials run the budget as they normally do is being held up because of all these efforts to solve all of these special problems by attaching it to the revenue bill, revenue sharing bill. Now, some of you are going to say well there was an awful lot of waste in revenue sharing and I'm sure there was I know a lot of projects that I didn't think were justified but can you imagine how much more waste would have taken place if you had let it been administered by a federal bureaucracy. But this is a very real danger. I think the cities and states should be able to regulate their own wages.

Additional questions please.

Morgan - Basically the question was pension reform act resulted in a good many pension plans being dissolved because of the heavy paperwork - I am familiar with the fact that Congressman Goldwater has introduced a bill - I am not familiar with the details of it and this is something that is quite often misunderstood when I write

you back and tell you that but I tell you that because
with
~~is~~ some 20,000 bills pending in the Congress and until
it gets to a committee or until it gets to a place
where I am confronted with it, I cannot make in-depth
studies of every bill that's in the Congress. I would
favor and have stated in my newsletters revision of
those laws that would make the pension plans a lot
easier to operate and at the same time afford the pro-
tection that was intended by the Congress when it was
passed. The difficulty with Congress is that they set
broad general policies which usually have noble goals
and motives but by the time they get down to the bureau-
crats who are removed from the voters, they have little
control over the regulations. Well, what are we doing
about it? We've got two things pending I think you
might be interested in. (1) We have a bill pending and
if it doesn't get through this Congress I think it will
the next, which will say that regulations of regulatory
agencies cannot go into effect until they have been
written, proposed and then submitted to the Congress for
approval. Now, you say, how can you approve all of
them? Well, that's what the congressional staffs are
for. Let me tell you this, the congressional staffs
are the people who are most important in the operation
of this government. That wouldn't solve all of the
problems but it would help some. Another thing is the

"Sunset Law" which some of you have heard about which I co-sponsored along with Senator Muskie and many others which said that every agency would go out of existence I believe every four years unless it was able to come in and re-establish its need for existence. There are literally hundreds of federal agencies that were created years ago carrying on their activities and plaguing the businessman and the consumer that Congress has forgotten all about. I believe this bill has enough support that in the next Congress you'll see it passed.

Question - Senator Morgan, could you give us a rundown on where the lobbying bill stands and whether or not you think the special interest groups such as the Ralph Nader folks will be covered in this bill if and when it get through and how it would effect us individually writing our elected officials such as yourself?

Senator Morgan - I can tell you that its in the House. It passed the Senate by a vote I believe of 89-2. I think it would apply equally to labor, to industry, to the consumer groups. It would not effect people like yourselves, writing to us, coming to see us as chambers of commerce and various groups but to be honest with you I cannot give you the details of it. If you like, I'll look it up. I was familiar with it at the time and participated in some questions on the floor. But it has been six months since it passed the Senate I guess. I doubt it will come out of the Congress this time.

The next question was not audible completely. It referred to the status of federal ^{health} insurance.

Senator Morgan- About where it was when I got there. A lot of talk and not much action. I really think that the present thinking of the vast majority of the members of the Congress is that we can't go much further until we get medicaid and medicare working right. I think probably there is support in the Congress for some type of catastrophic health insurance which would prevent a person from completely going broke, you know, if you had cancer or some prolonged illness and I favor some type like that. But as far as the Kennedy Comprehensive Health Program, I believe that it is a long way off especially in the light of the revelations that have recently taken place with regard to the frauds and abuses in the Medicare and Medicaid programs. Additional questions. Lady in the back. Is it permissible to ask questions about the intelligence?

Senator Morgan - It is as far as I'm concerned.

Question was totally inaudible.

Senator Morgan - That's a very informed question and I am frankly delighted you asked it. First, let me talk for a moment about the Foreign Intelligence and I'll try to be very brief. Let me reassure you that the Central Intelligence Agency in my opinion is the finest Intelligence Agency in the world. First. Second, let

reassure you that it is well disciplined. You need not worry about the Central Intelligence Agency going off assassinating somebody on its own. It is true that we participated in some horrible events which are contrary to the morals of the American people. We were instrumental in bringing about the assassination of ~~Trujillo~~ . We were instrumental in bringing about the assassination of President ~~Dim~~, our friend. I sat there one day and listened to the Colonel who worked with General ~~Bigman~~ and his group tell blow by blow of how it was done and how he left just before the TV cameras got there and I couldn't believe even though I knew what had happened and I was listening to it - I found myself like a kid in the Saturday afternoon serial saying, please don't kill him, please don't kill him. I listened to Roselli who ended up in the bottom of the Biscayne Bay in a barrel testify about how he and Giocanni and Trafacanni (who now is gone and I don't blame him) tried to or were employed by the CIA to assassinate Castro. I listened to the testimony of how we employed on September 5 a high Cuban Army officer whose code name was Amlash to assassinate Castro. How two days later Castro walked into the Foreign Embassy that was having a reception in Havanna and sought out an American newsman and said if the Americans don't quit trying to eliminate our leaders, they may find their own

eliminated and you'll never convince me that Amlash didn't go tell him. There was published in the American Press in Miami and New Orleans two days later on September 9 and the first of October he asked our CIA man in Paris for a meeting with the personal representative of the President or the Attorney General to assure him that the plot to eliminate Castro had their blessings because he said there would be a void if Castro were eliminated and nobody moved in. I listened to the testimony as to how we flew Desmond Fitzgerald, a very high CIA official, to Paris introduced him on October 29, 1963, to Amlash as the personal representative of the Attorney General, whether or not he was I don't know but he was introduced to him as that and assured of the blessings and then of course we know less than a month later, the President was assassinated. Those things should not have happened in peacetime. That is what the Intelligence Oversight Committee that I am now on has the responsibility of preventing. How far do you go in covert activities? How far do we go actually in influencing the opinions of foreign governments or the activities of foreign governments? It is a question I don't have the answer for - I used to have it - I had a very simple answer. That we ought to stay out of the affairs of other

governments except in time of war. But then when you go back and you find that had it not been for assistance to the non-communist political parties in Italy and Greece during President Truman's ~~time~~ after World War II they would have gone communist. Can you now condemn that assistance that we gave to them? Should we not assist anyone else? We know that Russia is doing it - I don't know - This is a debate that's going on within Congress and especially within our Committee. Now, how about the domestic intelligence? The CIA has not been involved with domestic intelligence with the exception of a brief period under Nixon insofar as I know. What about the domestic intelligence of the Federal Bureau of Investigation? The Federal Bureau of Investigation has through years enjoyed the reputation of being the finest law enforcement agency in the country - that is exactly what it ought to be - the finest law enforcement agency in the country. It was dissolved by Attorney General Harlan Stone in 1924 for having involved itself in the political thought of the country. It should not infiltrate the John Birch Society, it should not infiltrate Dr. Carl McIntyre's reformed fundamentalist church. It should not infiltrate - we have a right to be left alone unless there is a reason to believe that crimes are being committed. If they have reason to believe that I am a

communist or belong to the Communist Party which advocates a violent overthrow of the government, then they have a right to investigate me just as if they had a right to investigate me if I were suspected of having robbed a bank. But that was not what has been going on for the last 25 or 30 years from their own testimony - There have been some changes made - In January of this year, I made the statement substantially what I said here today about the CIA. I said the greatest threat to the freedoms of the people of this country came not from the CIA but from the FBI and that it was rotten at the core. That was a strong and harsh statement but I think that it took that to get some action. I don't know what the North Carolina papers have been carrying but you have now seen the number 2 man in the Bureau fired - You have seen Mr. Kelley disband this intelligence organization and put it in the criminal division-that's what it is a criminal agency and you have seen other changes made. It must be returned to the position where public thought, free thought will not be killed in this country. My son who was in Okinawa in '72 and '73 became a MP for the combined Armed Forces there and I was Attorney General and I then was concerned about it. When I took over the SBI, we set a policy and Charlie Dunn will tell you this. We did away with wiretapping equipment because there was no need for it - it was unlawful. President Johnson when he signed the first wiretapping bill in '68

said it would be the first thing he would do would be to repeal it. Hoover said it should never take place. I have his quotations. Anyway, we tried to operate within the law.

My son came up the other night when I came home and he had been cleaning out his old stuff that he had in the service, and he had a little card that I had typed myself when I was Attorney General and sent it to him when he got into law enforcement and I had written on the back of it, read it, reread it, and read it again.

I want to read the statement to you. It is a statement by Justice Brandis made in 1928 immediately following all the purges of the '20s. He said, "Decency, security and liberty of life demand that government officials shall be subjected to the same rules of conduct as the citizens. In a government of laws, existence of the government will be imperiled if it fails to observe the law scrupulously. Our government is a potent and ever present teacher for good or for ill. It teaches the whole people by its example. If the government becomes a law breaker, it breeds contempt for the law. It invites every man to become a law unto himself. It invites anarchy. To declare that in the administration of justice, the end justifies the means would bring terrible retribution.

Against that pernicious doctrine, we resolutely set our face. "

And that is what I firmly believe, and I believe that you will see the Bureau, as it has already started doing, return to being the most prestigious law enforcement agency in the country. But, it has to clean its own house, and they are beginning to do that.

QUESTION: You mentioned that the enactment of the to bring bureaucracy back into control "Sunset Law" would be helpful, would not a "Sunshine Law" also be helpful?

RM: That was already adopted during this past Congress and I think it has been helpful, and if you are not familiar with the Freedom of Information Act, you are entitled to any information the government has on you anywhere, unless it falls into two or three narrowly defined exceptions.

Let me tell you one other thing. Your government has been watching you, and still is watching you, in my opinion. When the 11 of us were appointed on the Church Committee, at the instructions of the Senate, we were asked to request the FBI to give us any dossiers that they had on us. It would not have been right for us to ask for information on you or any other public official. It didn't just happen that they had a dossier on all 11 members of the Church Committee,

They had one on me which went back long before I went into federal government. A complete dossier, the farm I was born on, etc. Through my years as Attorney General, it had documents in there that Morgan had attended a National Attorneys General Conference in New Orleans. He went to the meeting of the Committee on the Office of Attorney General, he said thus and so, which comments appeared favorable to the Bureau or unfavorable to the Bureau. They had it on everyone, and the Bureau in Washington kept an administrative index. Now that sounds like a little set of index cards, but think about computers. They kept the names of Americans who were fed into Washington by the agents around the country as people who might be a security risk in time of national emergency.

How did those names get there? What were the standards for it? I don't know. Nobody else knows. Did you offend the local agent? Did you refuse to cooperate? Mr. Kelley testified before us in November that they had quit keeping a list in October. When he came to see me, to see if I had been misquoted, later in March, he said they had quit keeping it in February. I don't what is there. If your company is going to get a defense contract somewhere, and

you have to get a security clearance in order to perform that contract and these computers in Washington begin to roll, and your name is kicked out as being on the administrative index, and you are then denied a security clearance. Would you have ever known why? The Freedom of Information Act is one of the finest things in the Sunshine Law that I know of.

QUESTION: How about opening some of the non-Congressional meetings in Washington.

RM: Every Congressional meeting that I have been on has been open with the exception of the intelligence committee when we were dealing with sensitive matters of security.

QUESTION: How about non-Congressional?

RM: If I am not mistaken, they should be. I will follow up on that.

#####