

ps
'66
'Rt

FOR RELEASE TO MORNING PAPERS OF
Wednesday, May 20, 1953

ADDRESS

BY

HONORABLE HERBERT BROWNELL, JR.
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Prepared for Delivery

at

Stark County Division
Ohio Republican Finance Committee
Dinner

Hotel Onesto

Canton, Ohio

Tuesday, May 19, 1953

There is now pending before Congress legislation which would, if approved, bring into being a major project designed to strengthen the economic and military power of the United States and Canada. I speak of the St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project which now has the full endorsement of the President and his entire Cabinet.

There has been discussion and planning of such a project for more than a hundred years, but it was not until President McKinley was in the White House that the first major step toward the seaway was taken. It was in 1899 that he sent to Congress the report and recommendations of the Deep Waterways Board. This report called for the creation of a deep water route from the Great Lakes along the St. Lawrence to the Atlantic Ocean. In the years that followed, there were some major waterway improvements, but the big project itself remained a matter of discussion within the United States and between the United States and Canada.

Throughout 1922, there was widespread discussion which finally led President Harding to send to Congress a report. In a strongly favorable message, he said that the "feasibility of the project is unquestioned and its cost, compared with some other great engineering works, would be small." The cost, even in the present day, would be small compared to the great benefit which would accrue to the United States as well as to Canada. It would greatly bolster the economic progress of not only the Midwest but also the great industrial Northeast. It means iron ore for the furnaces of Ohio, Pennsylvania and Indiana; and cheap electric energy for the power short factories and mills of the northeast.

Here in Canton, we find ourselves somewhat less than sixty miles from the Great Lake Erie port of Cleveland. Some might ask what advantage would accrue to Canton and to Stark County. It would mean a great deal to this area for we find here forging plants and a basic steel industry among other great industrial enterprises. A major factor under consideration in connection with the seaway is the transportation of iron ore from Labrador to the inland where it can feed the vast steel industry. So, you see, further sources of ore and low cost for transporting it will have a vital effect on the future of not only Canton but Stark County as well as the State of Ohio.

Since 1923, when Presidents Harding and Coolidge recommended construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway, similar recommendations have been made in some form by every President.

For many years there has been a shallow-draft waterway with a fourteen-foot channel on the Canadian side. It constitutes a bottleneck in the International Rapids Section to a through waterway which otherwise would provide a twenty-five-foot channel down river.

The present waterway is inadequate to handle substantial quantities of new tonnage above the approximately ten million tons it now carries.

Regular movement of ore westbound from the new mines in Labrador is scheduled to start next year. Therefore, it is vitally important that means be available to transport this ore inland. Its movement is particularly significant to the defense, industrial and other interests of the United States.

The plan approved by the President and the Cabinet, and which is embodied in pending legislation, would provide for a 27 foot channel linking Lake Erie with the deeper water below Montreal. United States participation would be contingent upon the completion of arrangements for the underlying power project. Both the State of New York Power ~~Authority~~ and Ontario interests are prepared to move forward promptly with this power project.

It is estimated that the seaway phase of the project would cost the United States, including interest during construction, about 96 million dollars. It is proposed to make this a self-liquidating project and it is estimated that this would take only fifty years.

The self-liquidation aspect is especially important because of budgetary implications and because of the very potential effect on the United States' defense and commercial interests, as well as its relation to the transportation policy. President Eisenhower, as do I as a member of the Cabinet which has unanimously approved the project, believes that the interests of the United States, taken as a whole, make participation desirable. We believe that the entire national good must be considered, rather than the effect on small segments of our national economy. Actually, we firmly believe it will enhance all segments of the economy - increase the earnings of all, not cut them.

And the favorable action we have taken is consistent with the Administration policy of considering each major construction project upon its merits. There are six major reasons why we have approved it.

I have already told you that the interests of the nation, taken as a whole, make participation desirable. The other five reasons are:

1. Participation by this country in the construction and operation of a seaway would increase defense advantages and would, in time of emergency, assure it of full benefits of joint participation with Canada.
2. Participation by the United States would strengthen our strategic position at all times respecting use of the seaway for transportation of basic materials.
3. Construction of the International Rapids section on the United States side would be more economical than construction of the necessary canals on the Canadian side. This would result in lower tolls and, because of its design, the American project would constitute a superior navigation facility in certain aspects.
4. The seaway, extending from Lake Erie to Montreal, would be self-liquidating.
5. Early initiation and completion of the project is in the national interest.

The bulk of the commerce moving over the seaway would be American. If we do not participate, Canada plans to go ahead on her own and we, therefore, would not be able to participate in the formulation of policy and the establishment of tolls.

It is important, because of the large amount of United States commerce which will be moving over it, that we have a voice in the tolls. And, there is no doubt but what the construction of the International Rapids canals on the United States side would not only be more economical to construct, but would result in lower tolls.

Taking into consideration all factors, the seaway is something that you and I must support as a means of bettering the economic life of the nation and of strengthening our nation's defenses.

I would like now to discuss the Department of Justice.

There is a story told about Attorney General Frank Murphy which indicates a common public attitude toward the Department.

During Murphy's tenure as Attorney General, he issued a directive barring from the Justice Building any person who failed to show an authorized pass. One Saturday, Mr. Murphy himself attempted to get into the Department of Justice Building and was summarily stopped by a new and over-zealous guard. Mr. Murphy complimented the guard on his attention to security regulations and said, "I've forgotten my identification card but you must recognize me, I'm Frank Murphy." The guard retorted, "Nobody gets in here without a pass. I wouldn't let you in even if you was J. Edgar Hoover himself."

But the activities of the Department of Justice are much more complex than this story would indicate.

I would like to render a somewhat free-style account of my brief stewardship as the 62nd Attorney General of the United States -- and to spell out for you some of my first impressions of the Department of Justice.

The conclusions -- whether you as taxpayers are getting full value for your money -- I will leave to you. But when I have spun my yarn, I hope you will feel that I have spoken with candor and without guile. So even if you feel we are short-changing the taxpayers, you will chalk it up to a difference of opinion and at least not ascribe to us the dubious ethics of that movie cashier who when asked what he did when a customer forgets his change, replied, "I knock on the window with a dollar bill."

It is the intent of my department -- as well as that of the whole administration -- to put before the public at large and before various key groups like this one -- informal reports from time to time, discussing our problems with you and reporting whatever progress we can claim. Because our progress is your progress. At least for the next four years!

Especially important is it that the Department of Justice bare its face. For this once august and respected arm of government has, in recent years, fallen from grace. Public confidence in the Department of Justice has been shaken by scandalous reports of incredible dereliction, shocking malfeasance, and just plain incompetence.

Our first task then, is to restore confidence in the Department of Justice -- confidence in the ability of 30,000 employees to do an honest, resultful job of carrying out the duties assigned.

What are those duties?

The charter of the Justice Department is simply stated.

The Attorney General and his staff act as "the People's Attorney." Our sole client is the United States Government. We are charged with

rendering legal opinion and assistance to the President and to his Cabinet and to the various agencies and departments of the Government. And even though these other branches of the Federal Government employ more than 6,000 attorneys, only a few of these ever appear in court. The Department of Justice represents the Federal Government in practically all cases brought by and against the United States.

However simple such a description may be -- the Department of Justice is in fact an intricate maze of subdivisions and bureaus.

Here is an organization of 30,000 employees dispersed in 11 buildings in Washington and in 500 additional offices throughout the United States and its territories. To carry out the tasks assigned to us we handle over 30 million pieces of mail a year; our 4,781 motor vehicles travel more than 53 million miles; we take in 275 million dollars in revenue and spend 175 million dollars.

Coming from private practice to an organization like this was a somewhat unsettling experience. I felt much like the man who fell out of a fourth story window onto the sidewalk. Quickly a crowd gathered and a policeman pushing his way through to the injured man asked, "What's going on here?" The fellow replied, "I dunno, I just got here myself."

Well, that was almost my reaction. For the size and diversity of the Justice Department has no remote counterpart in private practice of law. Here in the Department we're hard put to keep any kind of touch with our 1,600 lawyers, personal or otherwise -- to say nothing of the other 50 classifications of employees who make up the 30,000 persons on the staff of the Department.

What do they all do -- these lawyers and investigators, librarians, clerks and prison guards?

I'll be able to answer that question more definitively after I've earned my first hash mark in the job. But here are a few examples of the thousands of decisions and actions the Department of Justice may be called to make and take in a single day: to apprehend a pair of spies in Vienna and bring them back to the United States for questioning...to replace a prosecutor stricken with appendicitis midway in a trial against Communist leaders in Honolulu ... to adjudicate claims brought about by a Navy plane ramming a commercial airliner in mid-air...to institute condemnation proceedings against property in Colorado, needed for a new military airfield ... to request a Grand Jury presentment in Florida where KKK terrorisms and bombings endanger civil liberties ... to seek an injunction against a striking labor union in a tiny parts manufacturing plant in Dunkirk, New York, whose product was vital to the atomic energy program ... to initiate deportation proceedings against undesirables like Joseph Accardi ... to testify before a Senate or House Committee on some pending bill, such as, perhaps, justifying our Departmental budget of \$175,000,000 ... to write an opinion for the President on a proposed Executive Order ... to select a new Board of Directors for a \$100,000,000 corporation whose stock is owned by the United States and administered in the Office of Alien Property ... to recommend to the President a new Federal judge or action on a clemency petition.

'Twas not ever thus. The first Attorney General, appointed by George Washington in 1789 was Edmund Randolph. His chores were relatively

simple. He had his office in his hat; he was encumbered by no administrative detail since he was granted no clerical assistance; he spent his time leisurely advising the President and his Secretaries of War, Treasury and State, keeping no record of what was said. And as recently as 1898 the job was relatively sinecure. Blissfully happy was Attorney General John W. Griggs who had no phone in his office. He took his calls at the one telephone in the building -- which was located in the hallway, some 20 yards from his office. Were this the case today, I would travel two miles a day serving that implacable demon created by Alexander Graham Bell. At that, I might stay in better physical shape.

Since those halcyon days, the Department has burgeoned to a sprawling bureaucracy, nurtured by the complexities of modern government in a complex world.

My first thought upon assuming the office of Attorney General was of the enormity of the task to be accomplished. Clearly I felt, the job would require a full measure of everyone's time and effort. Therefore as first order of business I issued a memorandum stipulating that every employee was expected to put in a full day -- beginning at nine and ending at five thirty.

The very next day one secretary showed up a half hour late -- 9:30. Her boss, reproving her, said, "You should have been here at 9:00." The secretary replied, "Why, what happened then?"

Enough similar instances gave me a pretty early clue to what problem would require immediate attention. There was an attorney who had set fire to an apartment six times in a single year -- and still remained on the

payroll of the Justice Department. There was a man who checked out a file in 1934 -- and when he died two months ago the file was still in his desk.

These incidents, of course, don't characterize either the caliber or the attitude of all employees of our Department. But there are certain signs that indicate we have inherited more than our fair share of odd characters, log rollers and misfits -- any and all of whom can impair efficiency and morale of their competent co-workers.

For truly, the morale of the Justice Department was at its nadir only a few months back.

Violations of trust and incompetency on the part of high-placed Justice officials had sundered whatever esprit de corps may have existed.

Replacing the policy-making division heads is, of course, as much a question of ideology as competence. But without making any invidious comparisons with the previous staff of the Justice Department, I can say that we now have in the top echelons a nucleus of hand-picked, qualified men; brilliant lawyers and able administrators of the highest integrity.

At least that is my belief. And after all I am the man who is placing his fate in the hands of these assistants who can spin, weave and cut the thread of my public life. On their ability to serve the public honestly and well, depends my own reputation. I believe in these men. I ask you to. They need your confidence and respect. And they deserve it.

Prior to January 20th, these officials were unknown to each other. Today they enjoy a comraderie that comes only from mutual esteem and trust,

from a common desire to rebuild the reputation of the Department of Justice to its former eminence. This group is already welded into a brisk, businesslike team of executive lawyers, whose broadening perspective makes them increasingly capable of doing an outstanding job themselves and of inspiring others to emulate their zeal and efficiency.

And if the phrase "influence flows from the top down" means anything, this apparently is the way to get at the root cause of our personnel problem. Given dynamic and intelligent leadership, the lower strata of government careerists in our Department can't help but be infected with a new zest for work, a new pride in their accomplishments, a new diligence in their approach to problems.

Perhaps when we have been able to instill in our 30,000 employees an aversion for mediocrity and a desire for concerted excellence, we will be able to operate with almost complete delegation of authority, all down the line.

A major task that lies ahead is to make certain that we maintain clean government. There were many instances under the New and Fair Deals where jobs were bought, promotions obtained through outright purchase.

It was not long after we took office that the Republican leaders of Georgia brought to my attention reports that a job-selling scheme was operating in Georgia. Now perhaps things like that can be covered up and successfully so. But President Eisenhower and his team do not operate that way.

An immediate investigation was ordered by me and then we took the evidence before a grand jury in Savannah. Last week-end six persons in all, including county Republican leaders, were indicted.

This should serve notice to one and all that the Republican administration will not tolerate job selling by anyone anywhere. Throughout the administration we are seeking the best men for the jobs. No one can buy a job and there is no one that can get away with any attempts to sell one.

Within the department we have taken steps designed to prevent any skullduggery such as was possible through the manner in which our Democrat predecessors operated.

Other innovations have been to put an end to secrecy in the granting of pardons and to the names of sponsors for pardons --- to abolish the so-called "health" policy in tax cases, thereby returning to the courts the decision as to whether a taxpayer is well enough to stand trial --- to revise the procedure under which Government employees are tested for security purposes to grant them a fairer hearing --- to give more active cooperation to the FBI in its efforts to guard our internal security.

But all these activities will fail of their central purpose if we do not succeed in instilling in the Bench, the Bar and the public generally a respect for the professional ethics and competence of the Department of Justice. Toward this goal we are working night and day. And in reaching it, we ask for your individual and collective support.