

assume major importance and therefore should be upgraded on your own Agency's administrative procedures.

I feel that the research that the Agency will do in coming up with facts and making them available to the Department of Defense, as well as these other agencies, is a civilian approach that is badly needed as an effective weight in the decisionmaking process for the Federal Government to keep proper fair direction in this regard.

Could I comment shortly, Mr. Chairman, on my good friend Mr. Morse's question? It may be of some help. I believe Mr. Morse meant, of course, that this Agency should not be making decisions in the Department of Defense. But there is the function on research of facts. If the research of facts is after the fact of closing, it is then no part of the decisionmaking on the closing by the Department of Defense.

Would it be possible to have the function of this Agency, therefore, made so that it could provide materials and facts before the event of closing? The Defense Department would then have in mind these economic impacts and facts on the civilian economy when making the decision in closing.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Fulton, I think we are beginning to be able to do that through the findings we are making. The Department of Defense is quite receptive to the comments and things we have found in our investigations in California, Colorado, and Connecticut, in various other centers, and in various industries that we have looked at.

Mr. FULTON. Does the Agency have enough personnel so that it has enough contact with the Department of Defense and its many aspects in production to make sure that there is not a tremendous loss and damage to our U.S. economy and likewise to various regions of the country, and to employment and jobs? Are you able to say that the Agency can give complete enough coverage at the present time with your present personnel?

Mr. FOSTER. We are asking for some additional in this bureau.

Mr. FULTON. Will you submit your expansion program and I will go on to another question.

I find trouble when I am speaking around the country on the words "arms control and disarmament." Those words now have an adverse connotation to many people.

My recommendation is that we make some change of dialectics in this field. I think the term or title has outworn its use and function. I believe, for example, everybody is against dangerous weapons and their misuse. But nobody wants control from abroad in this country.

When we speak of arms and armament it is much above the average person and control terms recall the long history of fruitless negotiations. If we put the terms on a mutual basis, calling it something like the "mutual adjustment of dangerous weapons," why then I believe we would find many more people favoring it. But when we speak of terms such as "arms control" and "disarmament," the people feel Congress or the administration is going to throw away all the guns.

Chairman MORGAN. If you remember the debate on the floor in 1961, we went around and around on the title of this act, Mr. Fulton, and finally came up with an agreement on this title.