

THE WASHINGTON POST
Saturday, February 18, 1964
A 9

Smith Has New News, All Bad, for Rayburn

Chairman Howard W. Smith, whose Rules Committee was enlarged because of liberal complaints that it moved too slowly, continued his new burst of activity yesterday and came up with more bad news for Speaker Sam Rayburn.

This time it was a pair of resolutions to ban "back door" Government spending and to let Congress ride herd on the Central Intelligence Agency.

The Virginian already had discovered, and ordered for hearings next week, long-pending resolutions to open the House and its committees to radio and television broadcasts and to order a congressional study of a national policy on fuels.

Rayburn, who engineered the fight to break Smith's grip of the Rules group,

dead set against the TV proposal and is reported not to be keen for the fuel policy measure.

Yesterday, Smith ferreted out of the files dust-laden proposals to halt spending without specific congressional appropriations and to set up a joint House-Senate committee to keep watch on the Central Intelligence Agency.

He set them also for hearing next week, despite the fact that Rayburn is known to oppose both of them.

D90

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — DAILY DIGEST

February 23

Committee Investigations: By voice votes the House adopted H. Res. 92, 55, 98, and 141, which authorized studies and investigations by the following standing committees of the House, respectively: Interior and Insular Affairs, Science and Astronautics, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and Education and Labor.

Pages 2420-2421

Meteorology: The House complied with request of the Senate for the return of S. 681, authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to enter into contracts for the conduct of research in the field of meteorology.

Page 2424

Calendar Wednesday: Pursuant to a unanimous-consent request the House agreed to dispense with Calendar Wednesday business of March 1.

Pages 2424-2425

Legislative Program: The legislative program for the week of February 27-March 4 was announced by the majority leader.

Pages 2424-2425

Program for Monday: Adjourned at 3:53 p.m. until Monday, February 27, at 12 o'clock noon, when the House will act on 16 resolutions providing funds for the expenses of committee studies and investigations which have been authorized by the House.

Committee Meetings

FEED GRAIN

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on Livestock and Feed Grains met in executive session on H.R. 4510, to provide a special program for feed grains for 1961. No announcement was made and the subcommittee will continue on this subject Friday, February 24.

MILITARY POSTURE

Committee on Armed Services: Heard a briefing by Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense, and Gen. L. L. Lemnitzer, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, in an executive meeting on military posture. The committee will continue in executive session on Friday, February 24, on this subject.

ORGANIZATION

Committee on Banking and Currency: Held an executive organizational meeting. The subcommittees were appointed.

MINIMUM WAGE

Committee on Education and Labor: Special Subcommittee on Labor began executive consideration of H.R. 3935, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 in regard to increasing the Federal minimum wage to \$1.25 an hour. No final action was taken on the bill. The committee will continue on this subject Friday, February 24.

COMMITTEE EXPENSES

Committee on House Administration: Ordered favorably reported to the House the following resolutions providing funds for expenses of the following committees:

H. Res. 94, Agriculture, \$50,000;
 H. Res. 79, Armed Services, \$150,000;
 H. Res. 144, Banking and Currency, \$100,000;
 H. Res. 149, Education and Labor, \$63,000;
 H. Res. 61, Foreign Affairs, \$150,000;
 H. Res. 70, Government Operations, \$40,000;
 H. Res. 158, House Administration, \$20,000;
 H. Res. 128, Interior and Insular Affairs, \$60,000;
 H. Res. 165, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, \$435,000;
 H. Res. 68, Judiciary, \$200,000;
 H. Res. 99, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, \$75,000;
 H. Res. 76, Post Office and Civil Service, \$100,000;
 H. Res. 136, Public Works, \$950,000;
 H. Res. 85, Science and Astronautics, \$300,000;
 H. Res. 148, Small Business, \$580,000;
 H. Res. 167, Un-American Activities, \$331,000; and
 H. Res. 50, Veterans' Affairs, \$50,000.

TERRITORIAL—INSULAR AFFAIRS

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs heard testimony from Interior Department officials regarding activities, programs, and problems of the Office of Territories.

Heard were John A. Carver, Jr., Assistant Secretary of Interior for Public Lands; Peter Coleman, Governor of American Samoa; and D. H. Nuber, High Commissioner of the Trust Territories Office, Department of Interior. Adjourned subject to call of the Chair.

ANNOUNCEMENT—LOAN GUARANTY

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: The chairman announced that the committee will hold a public hearing March 1, at 10 a.m., on H.R. 1163, to extend for 1 year the loan guaranty authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

NATIONAL FUELS STUDY—CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

Committee on Rules: Ordered reported favorably to the House H. Res. 183, to create a Select Committee on a National Fuels Study.

The committee deferred action on H.J. Res. 2 and H. Con. Res. 2, to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence.

Witnesses heard were Representatives Aspinall (H. Res. 183) and Zablocki (H.J. Res. 2 and H. Con. Res. 2).

Thursday, February 23, 1961

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

House received President's message on conservation of natural resources.

Senate

Chamber Action

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held Friday, February 24, at noon.

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

FEED GRAIN

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry: Committee held hearings on the President's proposed special feed grain program for 1961, receiving testimony from Orville Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, who was accompanied by Dr. William W. Cochrane, Economic Adviser to the Secretary; Charles B. Shuman, American Farm Bureau Federation; Frederick V. Heinkel, Missouri Farmers Association; Herschel D. Newsom, the National Grange; Walter B. Garver, U.S. Chamber of Commerce; Reubin L. Johnson, National Farmers Union; and Roger Fleming, American Farm Bureau Federation. Hearings were adjourned subject to call of the Chair.

In executive session, the committee approved for reporting the nominations of John P. Duncan, Jr., and Frank J. Welch, to be Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Armed Services: Committee in executive session, ordered favorably reported the nominations of Stephen Ailes, to be Under Secretary of the Army; Richard S. Morse and William F. Schaub, both to be Assistant Secretaries of the Army; Herbert F. York, to be Director of Defense Research and Engineering; and 6,230 nominations in the Army and Air Force.

Prior to this action, in open session, Messrs. Ailes, Morse, and Schaub testified and answered questions in behalf of their own nominations.

AIR SAFETY

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Continuing its air safety hearings, the Aviation Subcommittee received testimony from James T. Pyle, Acting Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, who was accompanied and assisted by other FAA officials.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 58 public bills, H.R. 4806-4863; 20 private bills, H.R. 4864-4883; and 13 resolutions, H.J. Res. 253-260, H. Con. Res. 169-171, and H. Res. 186 and 187, were introduced.

Pages 2450-2453

Bills Reported: Reports were filed as follows:

H.R. 4469, proposed U.S. Merchant Vessel and Waterfront Security Act of 1960 (H. Rept. 25); and

H. Res. 183, to create a select committee on a national fuels study (H. Rept. 26).

Page 2450

Unemployment Compensation Extension: The Committee on Ways and Means was granted authority to file a report by midnight Saturday on H.R. 4806, to provide for the establishment of a temporary program of ex-

tended unemployment compensation and to provide for a temporary increase in the rate of the Federal unemployment tax.

Pages 2413-2414

President's Message—Natural Resources: Received and read a message from the President relative to consolidations and improvement of resource conservation policies of the Federal Government. The message was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered printed as a House document (H. Doc. 94).

Pages 2414-2416

Lincoln Inaugural: After adoption of several committee amendments the House passed H.J. Res. 155, to create a joint committee to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the first inaugural of Abraham Lincoln.

Pages 2416-2420

D89

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.R. 4849. A bill to provide that certain aircraft may travel between the United States and Canada without requiring the owners or operators thereof to reimburse the United States for extra compensation paid customs officers and employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana:

H.R. 4850. A bill to encourage liquidation of frozen capital assets and reinvestment of a substantial portion thereof in medium term Government bonds bearing a low rate of interest by amending subchapter of title I of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALBERT:

H.R. 4851. A bill to provide for a comprehensive study of compensation to persons affected by the acquisition of property under the Federal or federally assisted programs, through condemnation proceedings or otherwise; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 4852. A bill to place certain submerged lands within the jurisdiction of the governments of Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 4853. A bill relating to documentation and inspection of vessels of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BRADEMANS:

H.R. 4854. A bill to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the northern district of Indiana and one additional judge for the southern district of Indiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 4855. A bill to amend subsection (b) of Section 60—Preferred Creditors; subsection (e) of Section 67—Liens and Fraudulent Transfers; and subsection (e) of Section 70—Title to Property; of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 96b, 107e, and 110e); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4856. A bill to amend sections 334, 367, and 369 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 734, 767, 769) and to add a new section 355 so as to require claims to be filed and to limit the time within which claims may be filed in chapter XI (arrangement) proceedings to the time prescribed by section 57n of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 93n); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 4857. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that certain tuition payments be treated as charitable contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 4858. A bill to place certain submerged lands within the jurisdiction of the governments of Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 4859. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to halt the serious slump in residential construction, to increase both on-site and off-site job opportunities, to help achieve an expanding full employment economy, and to broaden home ownership opportunities for the American people; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H.R. 4860. A bill to place certain submerged lands within the jurisdiction of the governments of Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 4861. A bill to place certain submerged lands within the jurisdiction of the governments of Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHERER:

H.R. 4862. A bill to amend section 11 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. WESTLAND (by request):

H.R. 4863. A bill to place certain submerged lands within the jurisdiction of the governments of Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.J. Res. 253. Joint resolution establishing a national shrine commission to select and procure a site and formulate plans for the construction of a permanent memorial building in memory of the veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 254. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.J. Res. 255. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.J. Res. 256. Joint resolution designating the week of October 9-15, 1961, as National American Guild of Variety Artists Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSBURN:

H.J. Res. 257. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to designate a week in August each year as National Food Service Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 258. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.J. Res. 259. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States concerning residence requirement for voting for President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. Con. Res. 169. Concurrent resolution relating to the subject of Federal policy in the field of American Indian Affairs; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. Con. Res. 170. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H. Con. Res. 171. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that no further reductions in tariffs be made during the life of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. Res. 186. Resolution amending clause 2(a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. EVERETT:

H. Res. 187. Resolution increasing the clerk hire allowance of Members of the House, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the ratification of a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting representation in the electoral college to the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BASS of New Hampshire:

H.R. 4864. A bill for the relief of Hsien-Chi Tseng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 4865. A bill for the relief of Barbara Mlynarczykowska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOK:

H.R. 4866. A bill for the relief of Vassilios Hilas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4867. A bill for the relief of Rudolf Batista; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 4868. A bill for the relief of William J. Hill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 4869. A bill for the relief of Sebastiano Palmigiani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4870. A bill for the relief of Pietro D'Onofrio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4871. A bill for the relief of Francesco Di Giacomo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 4872. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. James H. McMurtry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 4873. A bill for the relief of Helene Papadopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 4874. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ernest P. Imie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTANA:

H.R. 4875. A bill to authorize the disposal of surplus equipment, materials, books, and supplies under section 203(j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to the New Mexico Boys' Ranch; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. POFF:

H.R. 4876. A bill for the relief of Mary C. Atkinson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUS:

H.R. 4877. A bill for the relief of Rosario Ferrante; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 4878. A bill for the relief of Kiyoko Kawano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4879. A bill for the relief of Lillian E. Gonzalez (Roya); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4880. A bill to authorize the revestment of certain interests in land at the U.S. Naval Ammunition and Net Depot, Seal Beach, Calif.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H.R. 4881. A bill for the relief of Santina Cuzzupoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Jul 23

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 4807. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual's entitlement to child's insurance benefits shall continue, after he attains age 18, for so long as he is regularly attending high school or college; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 4808. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 4809. A bill to provide for a study by the Secretary of the Interior of the feasibility of developing pumped storage in connection with Federal reservoir projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 4810. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to relax the severity of existing provisions with respect to deductions from benefits on account of earnings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 4811. A bill to establish a cropland adjustment program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 4812. A bill to prohibit the using of improper methods of influence the acts or decisions of certain Federal regulatory agencies engaged in regulating activities or transactions in or related to interstate or foreign commerce and to repeal authority of the Federal Communications Commission members to receive certain fees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4813. A bill to provide that the highway running from Tampa, Fla., through Bradenton, Fla., Punta Gorda, Fla., Fort Myers, Fla., Naples, Fla., and Miami, Fla., to Homestead Fla., shall be a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 4814. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H.R. 4815. A bill for the recovery of costs, expenditures, and financial obligations of the United States arising from circumstances creating a liability upon some person other than the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4816. A bill to provide for an averaging taxable income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4817. A bill to encourage the use of private benefit plans in lieu of social security by providing that individuals who are eligible for certain benefits under such plans shall not be entitled to social security benefits or subject to social security taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H.R. 4818. A bill to establish a cropland adjustment program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 4819. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the age requirements for entitlement to wife's insurance benefits and widow's insurance benefits, and to eliminate the provisions which reduce a woman's benefits in certain cases where she becomes entitled thereto before attaining age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H.R. 4820. A bill to promote greater equity in the administration of the pay systems of employees in the Veterans' Administration

under prevailing rate schedules by providing for certain adjustments in the compensation of such employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

H.R. 4821. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey a certain parcel of land to the town of Tellico Plains, Tenn.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4822. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 4823. A bill to amend the Shipping Act, 1916, to provide for licensing independent ocean freight forwarders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 4824. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to assist State and local governments and their public instrumentalities in planning and providing for necessary community facilities to preserve and improve essential mass transportation services in urban and metropolitan areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 4825. A bill to provide direct aid to the States and territories for educational purposes only for the benefit of the taxpayers and local governments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4826. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide coverage for housekeepers and other individuals performing domestic service who are compensated for such service in media other than cash; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. HANSEN:

H.R. 4827. A bill to establish a Federal Regional Water Pollution Control Research Laboratory in the Pacific Northwest and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARDING:

H.R. 4828. A bill to extend the operation of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HORAN:

H.R. 4829. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Oroville-Tonasket unit of the Okanogan Similkameen division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. IKARD of Texas:

H.R. 4830. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the hours of operation of certain broadcasting stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 4831. A bill to clarify the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to require reasonable bonds from packers in connection with their livestock purchasing operations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 4832. A bill to amend section 3 of title 4, United States Code, relating to use of the flag of the United States; to prohibit the use, in advertising for a commercial purpose, of a uniform of any of the Armed Forces of the United States; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCORMACK:

H.R. 4833. A bill to amend section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 to increase the project cost limitation for small flood control projects constructed under general authorization; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 4834. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act relative to employment for certain adult Indians on or near Indian reserva-

tions," approved August 3, 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4835. A bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H.R. 4836. A bill to provide for a study and investigation by the Commissioner of Education of ways and means of providing improved educational opportunities for children of migrant agricultural employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 4837. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit certain tax-exempt organizations to engage in certain activities for the purpose of influencing legislation directly relevant to the purposes which qualify such organizations for tax exemption, without losing certain benefits under that code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 4838. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4839. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H.R. 4840. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to assist small and independent business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 4841. A bill to amend section 106 of title 38, United States Code, to provide veterans' benefits for female members of telephone operating units, Signal Corps, who served overseas during World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4842. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit, for purposes of the depreciation deduction, taxpayers to specify, under certain conditions, the useful life of tangible personal property acquired after December 31, 1960, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H.R. 4843. A bill to provide for a study by the Secretary of the Interior of the feasibility of developing pumped storage in connection with Federal reservoir projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H.R. 4844. A bill to amend section 9(e) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 4845. A bill relating to documentation and inspection of vessels of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 4846. A bill to amend section 3568, title 18, United States Code, to provide for reducing sentences of imprisonment imposed upon persons held in custody for want of bail while awaiting trial by the time so spent in custody; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 4847. A bill to amend section 314 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that an aid and attendance allowance of \$150 per month shall be paid to certain paraplegic veterans during periods in which they are not hospitalized at Government expense; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4848. A bill to provide for loans to veterans when housing credit is otherwise not generally available; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

D116

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — DAILY DIGEST

March 2

guaranty for 1 year. The committee will consider this measure, along with others, in executive session, Friday, March 3.

ADDITIONAL FEDERAL JUDGESHIPS

Committee on the Judiciary: Concluded hearings on bills to create additional Federal judgeships, and heard testimony from Senator Hartke; and Representatives Denton, Madden, Monagan, Cramer, Fascell, Whitener, Lennon, Fountain, Alexander, George P. Miller, Wilson of California, Johansen, Saund, Smith of California, Price, Baring, Ashley, and Schwengel.

PANAMA LINES

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Subcommittee on Panama Canal heard William A. Carter, Governor, Canal Zone, regarding operation of the Panama Steamship Lines. Hearings continue Friday, March 3.

FLORIDA ROADS

Committee on Public Works: The Special Subcommittee on Federal-Aid Highway Program heard various public witnesses regarding disposition of improvements on rights-of-way in Florida. Hearings continue Friday, March 3.

FEED GRAINS

Committee on Rules: Held a hearing in regard to granting a rule on H.R. 4510, to provide a special program for feed grains for 1961, and heard testimony from Representatives Cooley and Poage. Hearings will continue Monday, March 6.

INTELLIGENCE MATTERS

Committee on Rules: Held a hearing on H. Con. Res. 3 and 9, to establish a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters. Testimony was given by Representative McDowell.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, MARCH 3

(All meetings are open unless otherwise designated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services, to continue its hearings on military construction authorizations for fiscal 1962, 10 a.m., 212 Old Senate Office Building.

Committee on Foreign Relations, to hold hearings on study entitled "U.S. Foreign Policy—Western Europe", 10:30 a.m., 4221 New Senate Office Building.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Aviation Subcommittee, to resume its air safety hearings, 10 a.m., 5110 New Senate Office Building.

PANEL ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Committee on Science and Astronautics: Heard the committee's panel on science and technology. The group will continue Friday, March 3.

INTERNAL REVENUE CODE—TARIFF ACT

Committee on Ways and Means: Met in executive session to consider the President's proposal to amend the Internal Revenue Code so that foreign control banks would be exempt from tax on interest they derive from holding obligations issued by the U.S. Government, if such obligations are held in connection with noncommercial activities of the central bank, and the President's proposal to amend the Tariff Act to reduce temporarily the exemption from duty enjoyed by returning residents, from \$500 to \$100. The committee will continue on these subjects, in executive session, Monday, March 6.

Joint Committee Meetings**STATE OF ATOMIC ENERGY INDUSTRY**

Joint Committee on Atomic Energy: Continuing its hearings on the state of the atomic energy industry, committee received testimony from the following witnesses: L. Reiffel, Armour Research Foundation; W. J. Clapp, Edison Electric Institute; R. L. Schacht, Consumers Public Power District; C. H. Weaver, Westinghouse Astronuclear Laboratory; G. S. Mikhailapov, Brush Beryllium Co.; L. M. Currie, Babcock & Wilcox Co.; Andrew J. Biemiller, AFL-CIO; J. Pratt, Pratt & Whitney Aircraft; and Gordon Weller, Uranium Institute of America.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

BILL SIGNED BY THE PRESIDENT

H.J. Res. 155, to create a joint committee to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the first inauguration of Abraham Lincoln. Signed March 1, 1961 (P.L. 87-1).

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Subcommittee on Labor, to continue its hearings on pending minimum wage legislation, 9:30 a.m., 4232 New Senate Office Building.

House

Committee on Armed Services, on H.R. 5174, restoration of military rank of General of the Army to former President Eisenhower, 10 a.m., 313-A Old House Office Building.

Committee on Banking and Currency, Subcommittee No. 2, on H.R. 4569, to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically distressed areas, to hear Arthur Goldberg, Secretary of Labor, 10 a.m. and 2 p.m., 1301 New House Office Building.

1961

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD -- DAILY DIGEST

D115

NOMINATIONS, AND BEACH EROSION

Committee on Public Works: Committee, in executive session, ordered favorably reported the nominations of Aubrey J. Wagner, of Tennessee, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the TVA, and Brig. Gen. Jackson Graham, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission; and with amendment S. 307, authorizing cer-

tain beach erosion control at Oceanside, San Diego County, Calif.

Prior to this action, in open session, testimony on the nomination of Mr. Wagner was received from Senators Gore and Kefauver, and the nominee. Testimony favoring enactment of S. 307 was received from Senator Kuchel; Erwin Sklar, mayor of Oceanside, Calif.; and Col. Robert Tarbox, Corps of Army Engineers.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 31 public bills, H.R. 5143-5173; 14 private bills, H.R. 5174-5187; and 3 resolutions, H.J. Res. 281, H. Con. Res. 183, and H. Res. 204, were introduced.

Pages 2914-2916

Bills Reported: Reports were filed as follows:

Disposition of Executive Papers (H. Rept. 49); and H.R. 2204, to extend the time in which the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission shall submit its final report (H. Rept. 50).

Page 2914

Madison Memorial Commission: The Speaker announced the appointment, on the part of the House, of the following Members to membership on the James Madison Memorial Commission: Representatives Smith of Virginia, Slack, Poff, and Moore.

Page 2900

Late Reports: The Committee on Appropriations was granted permission to file by midnight Friday reports on "Air Force Intercontinental Ballistic Missile Base Construction Program," and the third supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal year 1961.

Similar permission was granted the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for filing sundry reports by midnight Saturday.

Page 2900

Order of Business: Agreed to dispense with Calendar Wednesday business of March 8. Also agreed to dispense with the call of the Private Calendar on March 7.

Pages 2900-2901, 2903

Official Objectors: Announcement was made by the minority leader of the selection of official objectors for the minority party, as follows:

Consent Calendar: Representatives Ford, Weaver, and Pelly; and

Private Calendar: Representatives Avery, Conte, and Anderson of Illinois.

Page 2900

Legislative Program: The majority leader announced the legislative program for the week of March 6.

Page 2903

Program for Monday: Adjourned at 1:16 p.m. until Monday, March 6, at 12 o'clock noon, when the House will call the Consent Calendar and consider, under suspension of the rules, five bills from the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Committee Meetings

MILITARY POSTURE

Committee on Armed Services: Heard a continued briefing on the national military posture. Witnesses were Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Chief, Research and Development; and Lt. Gen. R. W. Colglazier, Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics.

DISTRESSED AREAS

Committee on Banking and Currency: Subcommittee No. 2 continued hearings on H.R. 4569, to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically distressed areas. Witnesses heard were Representatives Morgan, Bailey, Saylor, and Seely-Brown; and an official of the State of Rhode Island Employment Security Office. Hearings continue Friday, March 3.

MINIMUM WAGE

Committee on Education and Labor: Met in executive session and ordered reported to the House H.R. 1258 (amended), to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, to provide increased benefits in case of disabling injuries.

Also considered in executive session H.R. 3935, to increase the Federal minimum wage. Executive consideration of the bill will continue, Monday, March 6.

PUBLIC LANDS

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Subcommittee on Public Lands held a hearing on bills concerning withdrawal of public lands in Alaska, and heard testimony from Representative Rivers of Alaska; the Director of Installations, Office of Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, Army, accompanied by other Army personnel; and the Director, Bureau of Land Management. Hearings continue Friday, March 3.

LOAN GUARANTY

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Concluded public hearings on H.R. 1163, to amend section 510 of the Interstate Commerce Act, to extend loan

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP71B00364R000600070001-4

Kilday Vs. Kelly

CIA's Functions Bring Sharp Clash

By JIM G. LUCAS
Scripps-Howard Staff Writer

Is the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) doing its job?

Rules Committee, "it is very dangerous. If CIA were on the ball," Mrs. Kelly demanded, "why was the American ambassador on vacation when the Hungarian Revolution broke out?"

No, says Rep. Edna Kelly (D., N. Y.), chairman of a Foreign Relations sub-committee on intelligence activities. Mrs. Kelly is author of a bill to create a joint Senate-House committee on intelligence. She compared it to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Yes, says Rep. Paul Kilday (D., Tex.), ranking member of the House Armed Services Committee and chairman of its sub-committee on intelligence. Rep. Kilday opposed Mrs. Kelly's bill before the Rules Committee yesterday.

Mrs. Kelly argued all intelligence work should be coordinated. She cited the last Hoover Commission report recommending a congressional "watchdog" committee. She complained her sub-committee has no contact with CIA, which, she said, maintains no congressional liaison and makes no formal reports.

Rep. Kilday testified CIA has always "responded freely" to his sub-committee. He said CIA Chief Allen Dulles or a spokesman made 46 appearances before congressional committees last year.

"It has been recognized from the beginning," Rep. Kilday said, "that spying is an operation which cannot be conducted in public. I doubt we could conduct an intelligence agency which was required to keep Congress fully . . . informed."

SHIRKING DUTIES

Mrs. Kelly said the President has a civilian committee to check on CIA, and that Congress is "shirking its responsibility." She cited the Geneva disarmament collapse, the Suez War, Hungary, the downgrading of Stalin, the Russian sputniks and Cuba as examples of CIA "failures."

Mrs. Kelly said she learned about a "shocking" matter on a recent trip to Europe, and told Secretary of State Dean Rusk about it. Only yesterday, she said, she got a letter from CIA "in the dark," but acknowledging the matter was "more serious than we ever dreamed of."

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP71B00364R000600070001-4

INTELLIGENCE MATTERS

Committee on Rules: Tabled H. Con. Res. 3 and 9, and similar measures, to establish a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters.

SPACE PROPULSION

Committee on Science and Astronautics: Held a hearing regarding space propulsion technology and heard various public witnesses. Hearings continue Tuesday, March 7.

PROJECT ROVER

Committee on Science and Astronautics: Continued hearings on Project Rover, the U.S. nuclear space engine project. Testimony was heard from various public witnesses. Hearings continue Tuesday, March 7.

INTERNAL REVENUE—TARIFF ACT

Committee on Ways and Means: Met in executive session and ordered reported to the House H.R. 5189, to amend the Internal Revenue Code so that foreign central banks would be exempt from tax on interest they derive from holding obligations issued by the U.S. Government, if such obligations are held in connection with noncommercial activities of the central bank.

Action was deferred on H.R. 5191, to amend the Tariff Act to reduce temporarily the exemption from duty enjoyed by returning residents, from \$500 to \$100.

Joint Committee Meetings

WEAPONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Joint Committee on Atomic Energy: Committee met in executive session to receive an annual briefing on the current status of our weapons development program. Witnesses heard were Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman, and other members of the Atomic Energy Commission; Dr. Norris Bradbury, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, New Mexico; and Harold Brown, Livermore Radiation Laboratory, California.

PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC REPORT

Joint Economic Committee: Committee resumed its hearings on the President's Economic Report and the economic situation and outlook, having as its witnesses Walter W. Heller, Chairman, and James Tobin and Kermit Gordon, members, all of the Council of Economic Advisers.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR TUESDAY, MARCH 7

(All meetings are open unless otherwise designated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services, to continue its hearings on military construction authorizations for fiscal 1962, to hear Army and Navy witnesses, 10 a.m., 212 Old Senate Office Building.

Committee on Foreign Relations, executive to continue its consideration of the Convention for Economic Cooperation and Development (Ex. E, 87th Cong., 1st sess.), 10:30 a.m., room F-53, Capitol.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee, to continue its hearings on offshore trade, 10 a.m., 5110 New Senate Office Building.

Committee on the Judiciary, on the nomination of Lee Loevinger, to be an Assistant Attorney General (Antitrust Division), 10:30 a.m., 2228 New Senate Office Building.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, to resume its hearings on S. 349, to provide readjustment assistance to post-Korean conflict veterans, 10 a.m., 4232 New Senate Office Building.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Subcommittee on Equipment, Supplies, and Manpower, on H.R. 2010, regarding farm labor and related bills, 10 a.m., 1310 New House Office Building.

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee No. 1, on H.R. 4329, to amend Contingency Option Act, 10 a.m., 313-A Old House Office Building.

Committee on Education and Labor, on H.R. 3935, to increase the Federal Minimum Wage Act, executive, 9:45 a.m., 429 Old House Office Building.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Subcommittee on National Parks, on H.R. 66 and related bills, establishing Cape Cod National Seashore Park, 9:45 a.m., 314 New House Office Building.

Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs, on H.R. 4471, to provide that the unincorporated territories of the Virgin Islands and Guam be represented in Congress by a Territorial Deputy to the House of Representatives; H.R. 545, to provide the people of the Virgin Islands with representation by a Delegate to the House of Representatives; H.R. 1784, to provide that the people of Guam be represented by a Resident Commissioner in the House of Representatives; H.R. 5122, to provide that the unincorporated territory of American Samoa be represented in Congress by a Deputy to the House of Representatives, 9:45 a.m., 112 Old House Office Building.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Antitrusts, on antitrust problems in the ocean freight industry, 10 a.m., 346 Old House Office Building.

Subcommittee No. 2, on pending legislation, executive, 10 a.m., 329 Old House Office Building.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Subcommittee on Merchant Marine, on H.R. 3160, to authorize the payment of operating differential subsidy for cruises, and H.R. 2457, to clarify the construction subsidy provisions of the Merchant Marine Act with respect to reconstruction, reconditioning, and conversion, 10 a.m., 219 Old House Office Building.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, organizational meeting, executive, 10 a.m., 213 Old House Office Building.

Committee on Public Works, Special Subcommittee on Federal-Aid Highway Program, on disposition of improvements on rights-of-way in Florida, 10 a.m., 1302 New House Office Building.

Committee on Science and Astronautics, on space propulsion technology, 10 a.m., 214-B New House Office Building.

On project Rover, 2:30 p.m., 214-B New House Office Building.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, on pending legislation, executive, 10 a.m., 356 Old House Office Building.

Joint Committee

Joint Economic Committee, to continue hearings on the President's economic report and economic situation and outlook, 10 a.m. and 2:30 p.m., room P-63, Capitol.

Railroad Unemployment Insurance: Considered and by a voice vote passed H.R. 5075, to provide temporary extended railroad unemployment insurance benefits.

Pages 3036-3039

Bills Referred: Four Senate-passed bills were referred to appropriate committees.

Page 3059

Subcommittee To Sit: Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to sit during the sessions of the House on Tuesday and the balance of the week.

Program for Tuesday: Adjourned at 1:47 p.m. until Tuesday, March 7, at 12 o'clock noon, when the House will consider H.R. 5188, the third supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal year 1961, also will act on H.R. 4510, to provide a special program for feed grains for 1961 (4 hours of debate).

Committee Meetings

SUGAR ACT

Committee on Agriculture: Met in executive session on H.R. 3738, to extend the Sugar Act. The committee will continue on this subject, in executive session, Wednesday, March 8.

Also ordered reported to the House H.R. 4662 (amended), to amend the transitional provision of the act entitled "Nematocide, Plant Regulator, Defoliant, and Desiccant Amendment of 1959."

FARM LABOR

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on Equipment, Supplies, and Manpower, held a hearing on H.R. 2010, to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, regarding Mexican farm labor. Public witnesses testified on the measure. Hearings continue Tuesday, March 7.

RETIRED-RETAINER PAY

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee No. 1 held a hearing on H.R. 4329, to amend the U.S. Code with respect to annuities based on retired or retainer pay and heard various departmental witnesses. Hearings continue Tuesday, March 7.

ARMED SERVICE MISCELLANY

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee No. 2, ordered favorably reported to the full committee H.R. 4349, to place Naval Reserve training graduates (regulars) in a status comparable with U.S. Naval graduates. Also ordered a clean bill introduced, for reporting to the House, in lieu of H.R. 4350, providing for more effective participation in the Reserve components of the Armed Forces.

MINIMUM WAGE

Committee on Education and Labor: Continued executive consideration of H.R. 3935, to increase the Federal minimum wage. The committee will continue on this subject, in executive session, Tuesday, March 7.

PUERTO RICAN DEBT—DELEGATE TO CONGRESS

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs ordered favorably reported to the full committee H.J. Res. 124, to permit the debt-incurring capacity of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and its municipality to be determined by the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico instead of the Puerto Rican Federal Relations Act.

Also heard testimony from John A. Carver, Jr., Assistant Secretary of Interior for Public Land Management on several bills providing for delegates to the U.S. Congress from various U.S. Territories.

CAPE COD NATIONAL SEASHORE PARK

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Subcommittee on National Parks heard Stewart Udall, Secretary of Interior, and Representatives Keith and Lane on H.R. 66, 711, 989, 4686, and 5083, to provide for the establishment of Cape Cod National Seashore Park. Hearings continue Tuesday, March 7.

IMMIGRATION

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee No. 1, took testimony and then acted on several private immigration bills.

PANAMA LINE

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: The Subcommittee on Panama Canal met in executive session with representatives of the Maritime Administration and the State Department, regarding the operation of the Panama Steamship Lines. Adjourned subject to call of the Chair.

FEED GRAINS

Committee on Rules: Granted an open rule, waiving points of order, with 4 hours' debate, on H.R. 4510, to provide a special program for feed grains for 1961.

Witnesses testifying on granting of a rule were Representatives Hoeven, Beermann, and McSween.

AID TO CHILDREN

Committee on Rules: Granted a closed rule, waiving points of order, with 3 hours' debate on H.R. 4884, to authorize Federal financial participation in aid to dependent children of unemployed parents. Testimony was given on granting of a rule by Representatives Mills and Mason.

MAR 2 1960

Kilday Vs. Kelly

CIA's Functions Bring Sharp Clash

By JIM G. LUCAS

Scripps-Howard Staff Writer

Is the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) doing its job?

No, says Rep. Edna Kelly (D., N. Y.), chairman of a Foreign Relations sub-committee on intelligence activities. Mrs. Kelly is author of a bill to create a joint Senate-House committee on intelligence. She compared it to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Yes, says Rep. Paul Kilday (D., Tex.), ranking member of the House Armed Services Committee and chairman of its sub-committee on intelligence. Rep. Kilday opposed Mrs. Kelly's bill before the Rules Committee yesterday.

Mrs. Kelly argued all intelligence work should be coordinated. She cited the last Hoover Commission report recommending a congressional "watchdog" committee. She complained her sub-committee has no contact with CIA, which, she said, maintains no congressional liaison and makes no formal reports.

Rep. Kilday testified CIA has always "responded freely" to his sub-committee. He said CIA Chief Allen Dulles or a spokesman made 46 appearances before congressional committees last year.

"It has been recognized from the beginning," Rep. Kilday said, "that spying is an operation which cannot be conducted in public. I doubt we could conduct an intelligence agency which was required to keep Congress fully . . . informed."

SHIRKING DUTIES

Mrs. Kelly said the President has a civilian committee to check on CIA, and that Congress is "shirking its responsibility." She cited the Geneva disarmament collapse, the Suez War, Hungary, the downgrading of Stalin, the Russian sputniks and Cuba as examples of CIA "failures."

Mrs. Kelly said she learned about a "shocking" matter on a recent trip to Europe, and told Secretary of State Dean Rusk about it. Only yesterday, she said, she got a letter from CIA admitting it was in the dark, but acknowledging the matter was "more serious than we ever knew of."

"Believe me," she told the

Rules Committee, "it is very dangerous. If CIA were on the ball," Mrs. Kelly demanded, "why was the American ambassador on vacation when the Hungarian Revolution broke out?"

Navy Band Plays Tomorrow

Solos by
Finlay and
Richard
in a
Navy
morning
Auditorium

March 1961

Rules Unit Pigeonholes CIA Watchdog Bill

By Richard L. Lyons
Staff Reporter

The perennial effort to set up a congressional watchdog over Government intelligence work was pigeonholed yesterday and thus presumably was killed for this Congress by the House Rules Committee.

The proposal to create a joint House-Senate committee to oversee the Central Intelligence Agency and other services whose job is to alert this Government to what others are up to was made by Rep. Edna F. Kelly (D-N. Y.) and several other members.

Mrs. Kelly recited a long list of crises which she said seemed to catch this country by surprise—such as Sputnik, Castro, the Hungarian revolt, Russian arms to the Mideast—as indication that CIA and the other cloak-and-dagger agencies either aren't getting the needed information or aren't getting it to the people who need it.

Her resolution would require CIA, military intelligence and other Government intelligence agencies to keep the joint committee "fully and currently informed with respect to their activities."

Mrs. Kelly serves on the House Foreign Affairs Committee where she said she has recently noticed that the Government's intelligence work seems deficient.

"I'm not worried about the money they spend," she said. "I want to evaluate information they obtain and make sure that it is utilized properly."

The problem of how to reconcile the congressional need to know with the need

for security—how to guard the guards without the risk of leaking vital secrets—has always been a touchy one. The Second Hoover Commission recommended that an overseeing joint committee be set up six years ago, but neither house has agreed to it.

CIA doesn't even tell Congress about its budget, except for some discussions in super-secret with an appropriations subcommittee. Its funds are hidden somewhere, presumably in the big defense budget figures.

The House Armed Services Committee claims whatever jurisdiction Congress has over CIA and military intelligence. Rep. Paul J. Kilday (D-Tex.) assured the Rules Committee at hearings last week that his seven-member Armed Services Oversight Subcommittee on CIA is "adequate."

Kilday expressed a widely held House opposition to joint committees and made the point that "you can't conduct spy operations and tell Congress everything."

The Rules Committee, which spends much time fighting itself, was united against the proposal. A spokesman said no vote was cast against the motion to table it.

May 4

Most of all, proper, informed and enlightened administration must accompany any program we operate because unless we have people handling this work who know their job, who are trained for their job, who adequately understand the mind, the nature and the problems of our good friends of Latin America, the ground cannot be properly covered. In fact, additional misunderstandings might arise that could conceivably nullify many of the good effects that would come from a well conceived and efficiently managed aid program.

I urge the President, his advisers and the departments concerned with this matter to give the most careful consideration to the selection of leaders and personnel for this most important program, and to inaugurate without delay the measures I have mentioned, which would seem to me to be an irreducible minimum in the first approach to the solution of these problems, and other measures that may be pertinent and related to the program.

Above all, it must be remembered that pride, arrogance, superiority complexes, do-gooder and busybody fixations, and the presence of visionary administrators and personnel must be scrupulously avoided.

Our Latin American friends for the most part have great heritage in freedom, culture and spiritual devotion and any assistance we render them must be predicated on a true understanding of their natures, their problems, their pride in their own origins, institutions and loyalties and their willingness to champion and defend the cause of freedom.

In a word, heart service must be the inspiration and dedicated method of our Latin American aid program, and we must make sure that no pernicious or vapid, ideological pressures are allowed to distort our great objectives.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE

(Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (at the request of Mr. SHORT) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, the ill-fated landing of anti-Castro forces in Cuba has had widespread and serious consequences. It is obvious that this operation must have been badly planned, and that there was a disastrous miscalculation of the forces available to Castro.

Under such circumstances, it may seem unusual that there has been no pressure for a public investigation of this matter. That this has not developed is fortunate, in my opinion. Apparently it is tacitly recognized that further publicity of this kind would not be helpful. We are demonstrating, quite properly and wisely, that the Nation stands behind President Kennedy at this moment. Disunity now would only compound our difficulties.

Nevertheless, we must try to learn some lessons from this setback. The

executive branch, where the primary responsibility rests, is already undertaking several evaluations. From these may well develop major changes in the ways in which this Nation fights the cold war.

The question then arises, What, if anything, should Congress do? It seems to me that Congress also bears responsibility in this field. Now might well be an appropriate time for us to develop a more direct interest in this country's intelligence activities.

I have today introduced House Joint Resolution 400 to set up a Joint Committee on Foreign Intelligence. Back in 1955 I first advocated such a committee and I have no doubt that others introduced legislation before that time. In May of 1958 I reintroduced my measure. This joint committee composed of House and Senate Members, would be charged with direct responsibility over intelligence activities and would provide a focal point for matters which now, in part at least, are of interest to several committees.

In times like these, ineffective intelligence may prove our undoing. Now is the time for Congress to establish a watchdog committee over our intelligence operations.

(Mr. ROUSSELOT (at the request of Mr. SHORT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. ROUSSELOT'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

CIVIL DEFENSE SHOULD BE RESPONSIBILITY OF DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

(Mr. RIEHLMAN (at the request of Mr. SHORT) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time I have felt compelled to urge this body to come to grips with the pressing problem presented by the inadequacy of our present civil defense system to cope with the problems that would immediately arise in the event of an all-out nuclear attack on this country. I do hope this will be the last time that I shall have reason to feel such a compulsion.

We need, as never before, to make a reappraisal of the legislative foundations on which our civil defense program rests. It should be apparent to anyone who takes a careful look that our present civil defense program is not sufficiently geared to the requirements of the nuclear age.

It is not a question of whether our civil defense officials have succeeded or failed in their assigned tasks. The problem is not one of performance. In this regard I pay tribute to the persons who administer and participate in our civil defense program, from the highest to the lowest levels. They are, for the most part, doing the very best they can with the tools at hand.

It is, rather, a matter of lifting our conception of civil defense out of the framework of pre-atomic-hydrogen days. It is a matter of carefully examining the realities of defense requirements in a completely new and modern setting. It is a matter of considering, in the light of present realities, the problem of constructing a rational national program for civil defense.

We can no longer depend upon the dual system of charging the Department of Defense with the responsibility for a military defense of our people from enemy action and charging the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, through a loose confederation of State civil defense agencies, with the responsibility for passive civil defense of our citizens in the event of military attack upon our homeland.

The time has come to face the fact that military defense and civil defense cannot be separated. They are highly interdependent. A weakness in one is a weakness in the other; a failure in one may lead to a failure in the other. Just as we could not afford to base today's offensive strength on the weapons of a decade ago, we cannot afford to base our vital civil defense program on the requirements of a decade ago. We must develop an entirely new concept of civil defense, based on its inclusion as an integral part of our total military-defense planning. Our survival could well be at stake, and it is imperative that we think and act accordingly.

I have been convinced for several years now that the civil-defense functions formerly administered by the Federal Civil Defense Administration and now by the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization can only be effectively carried out within the framework of our Defense Establishment. I have been convinced that many of the tasks presently to be performed by individuals on an essentially voluntary basis can only be carried out effectively by trained military personnel with a predetermined and primary civil-defense mission.

Voluntary participation in civil defense is, like voluntary armies, largely a phenomenon of the past. We are being faced with the possibility of total war. Civil defense now requires an effective corps of trained personnel. In terms of importance, it is no longer possible to distinguish this type of service from purely military service.

In 1954 I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 233, expressing the sense of the Congress that, in accordance with the Reorganization Act of 1949, the President should prepare and submit to the Congress a reorganization plan to establish within the Department of Defense the responsibility for administering all the functions of the then-existing Federal Civil Defense Administration.

In 1955 I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 108 which was in substantially the same form as its predecessor.

In 1956 the Military Operations Subcommittee, chaired by my colleague from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] again became alarmed at the advent of megaton-range weapons and the possibility of lethal radioactive fallout together with

1961

ent with the tribute, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant of the Lord."

As Father Andolfi looked out upon the large assembly, he saw in their happy faces the fruits of his labors in sowing and cultivating the seeds of faith for many, many years.

Years that he had been the guide, the counsellor, the friend by their side; bringing divine grace to bless them through all the stages of their lives on this earth.

From the album of personal memories, each person who was there silently recalled the relief he had experienced in talking out his troubles with Father Andolfi. The pastor had listened patiently, and then, with the kindness and the wisdom of one who has learned the secrets of the human heart, he had said:

Do not be afraid. Beyond the darkness of failure and anxiety, God welcomes you with the light of His redeeming love.

The memories of Father Andolfi embraced all who were present and some who had passed on.

The ones that gave him the greatest satisfaction were the sweet innocence of a child receiving first communion; the glowing happiness of a man and woman united by the sacrament of holy matrimony; and the quiet devotion of a grandmother, bent by the toil of years, following in the footsteps of Christ as she makes the stations of the cross.

When Father Andolfi arrived in Lawrence, Holy Rosary was not a prosperous parish. And there was the further handicap of the depression. Collections for the support of the church could not be substantial when many of the parishioners were unemployed.

The good father did not ask them for the impossible.

By prudent management of the church income, and by his own hard work, he succeeded in strengthening the position of Holy Rosary during those lean years.

Under his guidance, the parish societies became more active, and as Father Andolfi spoke from the pulpit on Sundays, his heart was warmed by the sight of whole families that had come to worship in Catholic unity.

"My, how the children are growing up," he thought before he began his sermon.

In addition to his priestly duties, he found time to drop in at the homes of parishioners for what seemed like a casual social chat. Somewhere in the conversation he would ask the youngsters what they wanted to become in life. After they had left, he would urge the parents to make plans for the education, and the future of their children.

This extra missionary work reaped material as well as spiritual benefits.

The bright and friendly children have grown up to become fine citizens who enrich the life of the community and the Nation with their character and their ability.

Lawrencians of Italian ancestry found happiness and fulfillment during the years that the pastor of their home church worked with them and for them, inspiring them by his saintly example.

With gratitude, respect and affection, they gathered by the hundreds to honor him on his golden jubilee.

It was my privilege to be there, and to join with so many others in expressing our esteem for the priest who is a joy to God—Father Lorenzo Andolfi.

AID PROGRAM FOR LATIN AMERICA

(Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to note that we are making progress in shaping a suitable assistance program for our neighbors in Latin America. There is no objective presently confronting us in this field that has greater claim upon our affections, our interests, and our careful attention.

The Latin American nations are part of our hemisphere, but they are something more than that. They are our warm friends and neighbors and the American people cherish them with exceptional devotion.

There have been misunderstandings and problems in our Latin American relationships to be sure. Some of them have been extremely unfortunate, because they have been needlessly generated by unsound policies and the actions and attitudes of some of our American business people as well as some high-ranking diplomatic and Government officials.

However, it must be noted, and the American people must keep in mind, that the areas of disagreement as well as episodes of unpleasantness, though they exist, are minimum as compared with the vast amount of good will, wholehearted neighborliness, true friendly feelings, and deep affection that usually exists between the peoples of Latin America and our own people.

There is a vast, immeasurable reservoir of true loyal friendship existing between our countries that must be recognized by all our leaders just as it is sincerely felt by the American people. Of course, since these feelings are shared by our Latin American neighbors, their inspired presence must be recognized in Latin American countries too.

Our Latin American friends have not come to us making heavy demands. Indeed, they are frequently embarrassed by our overtures of help and the shape and features it sometimes takes. It is only natural they should be offended, as they are painfully affected, by various forms of dollar diplomacy and shoddy, unrepresentative cultural and other programs that have sometimes been pressed upon them.

As friendly nations, they rightfully desire that their sovereignties and self-respect, their dignity and interests be observed, not only by our Nation but by all other nations.

The Organization of American States has given us all a great opportunity to work in harmony and in cooperation for furthering our legitimate, mutual interests and the security, well-being, order, prosperity, and peace of the Western Hemisphere. In my opinion, this great Organization, if it is wisely guided and implemented, could be an incredibly valuable and effective force in dissipating many existing misunderstandings,

in keeping communism and subversion out of our hemisphere, and strengthening the political, economic, and social, free institutions which are common to the participating nations.

From our standpoint, no greater disservice could be rendered the most important work of hemispheric cooperation than for us to send leaders, officials, and workers, who do not basically understand Latin America, to represent our Nation in any way among our beloved neighbors to the south.

Both the American and Latin American peoples have a right to expect that our representatives there, as well as their representatives here, share a deep interest and unwavering loyalty in the cause of harmonious, hemispheric relations, and that they are well equipped by virtue of background, training, character, experience, point of view, and understanding of common problems to carry out their vital work of keeping our peoples close together promoting their mutual interests and protecting our respective territories, sovereignties, and liberties.

It would be a great mistake to think that Latin American problems can be solved by financial grants alone. What is needed is the kind of assistance that comes from the heart, as one friend and neighbor to another. This heart service should be predicated on a real desire to foster even closer relations, mutual trust, and the fostering of standards and conditions under the sound guidance of those who understand the problems of the respective countries—the psychology and the spiritual perspectives of the people.

While I would not here present a complete plan for the extension of Latin American aid, I desire to mention a few of the subject matters which I think should be included.

First. Housing: I think it is of utmost importance to assist our Latin American neighbors in providing very many additional units of suitable, modern housing for their peoples in remote as well as urban areas.

Second. Schools: Few things could be more important than helping our friends to very materially extend their present educational facilities across a very broad front.

Third. Water: Assistance in developing in areas and localities adequate supplies of clean, fresh water, and this is of extreme importance.

Fourth. Health and medical facilities: This is obviously a must in any program of aid to Latin America and any thing we do along these lines should be pressed into local and remote areas where there are large numbers of people who seldom, if ever, have the services of a doctor or a nurse or a hygienic adviser, and who do not know the meaning of modern miracle drugs or other medicines of common usage that would be of valuable aid and relief to them.

These are not all the things that should be done to try to assist our Latin American friends, but to me they embody a few measures that must be a basic part of any really worthwhile program of assistance.

EDUCATIONAL—CULTURAL EXCHANGE

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Foreign Operations held a hearing on H.R. 5203 and 5204, the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, and heard testimony from public witnesses.

URBAN AFFAIRS—HOUSING

Committee on Government Operations: Held a hearing on H.R. 6433, to create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. Heard Representatives Bennett of Florida, Lindsay, Cunningham, and Patman. Hearings continue Wednesday, June 7.

PUBLIC LANDS

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Subcommittee on Public Lands ordered reported favorably to the full committee H.R. 6849 (amended), to provide for the restriction of certain areas in the outer Continental Shelf, known as the Corpus Christi Offshore Warning Area; and H.R. 6745 (amended), to provide for the restriction of certain areas in the outer Continental Shelf (Matagorda Water Range).

Prior to taking action on the measures, the subcommittee heard testimony from Karl S. Landstrom, Director, Bureau of Land Management, Interior Department, and Navy Department witnesses on H.R. 6849.

Also held a hearing on H.R. 4060, and related bills, to provide that withdrawals and reservations of public lands for nondefense uses shall take effect only upon certain conditions, and heard testimony from Representatives Baring, Rivers of Alaska, Inouye, Aspinall, and Saylor; also Karl S. Landstrom (title above).

REGULATORY AGENCIES

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: The committee heard Alan S. Boyd, Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board; and Jerome K. Kuykendall, Chairman, Federal Power Commission on H.R. 14, to increase the effectiveness of the regulatory agencies. Hearings continue Wednesday, June 7.

ANNOUNCEMENT—FCC REORGANIZATION

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Subcommittee on Regulatory Agencies will conduct public hearings on H.R. 7333, to amend the Communications Act of 1934, for the purpose of facilitating the prompt and orderly conduct of the business of the Federal Communications Commission, June 13, 14, and 15.

JUDICIAL MISCELLANY

Committee on the Judiciary: Met in executive session and ordered reported favorably to the House the following measures:

H.R. 2730, relating to espionage and censorship;

H.R. 7099, to validate payments of certain per diem allowances made to members and former members of the U.S. Coast Guard while serving in special programs overseas;

H.R. 4528, for the relief of certain persons involved in the negotiation of forged or fraudulent Government checks issued at Parks Air Force Base, Calif.;

H.R. 74, to reimburse the city of New York for expenditure of funds to rehabilitate slip in the city of New York for use by the U.S.; and

Several private immigration and private claim bills.

POSTAL RATES

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Continued hearings on H.R. 6418, to adjust postal rates, and heard testimony from Robert V. Roosa, Under Secretary for Monetary Affairs, Treasury Department, and Hickman Price, Jr., Assistant Secretary for Domestic Affairs, Commerce Department. Hearings continue Wednesday, June 7.

INTELLIGENCE RESOLUTIONS *J.P. file*

Committee on Rules: Special Subcommittee met in executive session to study intelligence resolutions. No announcements were made.

SPACE ACT AMENDMENTS

Committee on Science and Astronautics: The committee held a hearing on H.R. 7115, to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958. Witnesses heard were John A. Johnson, General Counsel, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and Robert Keller, General Counsel, General Accounting Office.

TAXES

Committee on Ways and Means: Continued hearings regarding the President's tax message recommendations relative to foreign income. Heard public witnesses. Hearings continue Wednesday, June 7.

Joint Committee Meetings

AEC AUTHORIZATIONS

Joint Committee on Atomic Energy: Subcommittee on Legislation resumed its hearings on H.R. 6744, and S. 1774, fiscal 1962 authorizations for the Atomic Energy Commission, with testimony from Robert Wilson, Commissioner, and Frank K. Pittman, Director, Division of Reactor Development, both of the AEC; Norman W. Moser, Dairyland Power Cooperative, Wisconsin; and Henry Nichol, Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. The witnesses directed their remarks to the construction of a cooperative power demonstration project near Genoa, Wis.

Hearings continue tomorrow in executive session.

on renegotiation by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. Page 8904

Providence Hospital: Adopted H. Res. 325, extending the greetings and felicitations of the House of Representatives on the centennial of the founding of Providence Hospital in the D.C. Page 8904

Canadian-U.S. Interparliamentary Group: Heard the reading of communications from Representatives Yates and Harvey of Michigan stating their inability to serve as U.S. delegates of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, after which Representatives Murphy and Robison were appointed by the Speaker to fill the vacancies. Pages 8908, 8961

Private Calendar: Passed the following bills on the call of the Private Calendar:

Cleared for the President: S. 215, 546, 949, and 1064.

Sent to the Senate without amendment: H.R. 1353, 1399, 1477, 1620, 1687, 1911, 2360, 2686, 4557, 4565, 4639, 4872, 6224, and 6452.

Sent to the Senate, amended: S. 277, H.R. 1399, 1626, 1891, 1915, 2973, 3101, 6453, and 6767.

Passed over without prejudice: H.R. 1414 and 3843. Pages 8908-8912

Committees To Sit: The Committee on Education and Labor and all subcommittees thereof were granted permission to sit during the sessions of the House for the balance of the week. Similar authority was granted the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for Tuesday and Wednesday. Page 8912

Agriculture Appropriations: By a record vote of 318 yeas to 65 nays the House passed H.R. 7444, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for fiscal year 1962, after rejecting a recommittal motion by a voice vote.

Adopted an amendment to authorize a donation of 35 acres for research purposes at Kerrville, Tex.

By a record vote of 184 yeas to 196 nays the House rejected an amendment that would have cut \$100 million from the funds for agricultural conservation program, which had been adopted previously while in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union by a division vote of 107 yeas to 65 nays.

The bill provides appropriations totaling \$5,948,566,000, which amount is \$140,678,000 under the budget request. Pages 8912-8961

Aircraft-Missile-Vessel Procurement Authorization: Insisted on the House amendment to S. 1852, to authorize appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Services; agreed to a conference requested by the Senate; and appointed as conferees Representatives Vinson, Kilday, Rivers of South Carolina, Philbin, Hébert, Arends, Gavin, Van Zandt, and Bates. Page 8961

Quorum Calls and Record Votes: During the proceedings of the House today two quorum calls and two record votes developed and they appear on pages 8912, 8952, 8959-8960, and 8960-8961.

Program for Wednesday: Adjourned at 6:17 p.m. until Wednesday, June 7, at 12 o'clock noon, when the House will consider H.R. 7445, the independent offices appropriation bill for fiscal year 1962.

Committee Meetings

GENERAL FARM BILL

Committee on Agriculture: Continued to mark up, in executive session, H.R. 6400 (title III), to improve and protect farm prices and farm income, to increase farmer participation in the development of farm programs, to adjust supplies of agricultural commodities in line with the requirements therefor, to improve distribution and expand exports of agricultural commodities, to liberalize and extend farm credit services, to protect the interest of consumers.

WOOL ACT

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on Livestock and Feed Grains met in executive session and ordered reported favorably to the full committee H.R. 3680, to extend the operation of the National Wool Act of 1954.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Committee on Education and Labor: Subcommittee on National Labor Relations Board met in executive session on pending business.

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

Committee on Education and Labor: General Subcommittee on Education heard Representatives Zelenko and Pucinski; and public witnesses on H.R. 6774, to extend and improve the National Defense Education Act. Hearings continue Wednesday, June 7.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Committee on Education and Labor: Subcommittee on Unemployment and Impact of Automation held hearings on unemployment. Testimony was given by Arthur J. Goldberg, Secretary of Labor; Wilbur J. Cohen, Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and various public witnesses.

SCHOLARSHIPS

Committee on Education and Labor: Select Subcommittee on Education heard public witnesses on H.R. 6762, to award undergraduate scholarships in American institutions of higher education to certain students from Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Hearings continue Wednesday, June 7.

J. Brown

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I read as best I could the hearings on this bill, and nowhere did I find any reference to the cultural officers in the USIA, and there are a number of them. I remember one in London who is being paid \$18,000 or \$19,000 a year, plus, of course, an allowance, which is tax free. Does the gentleman know how many cultural officers they have in the USIA and what contribution they make to any cause?

Mr. BOW. I may say to the gentleman I do not know how many we have, but I remember one very interesting thing I might point out to the gentleman about cultural officers. I found in Paris a cultural officer or employee. I asked about this fellow, and they said, "You do not have to worry about him; he is being paid by the Ambassador." "What does he do?" "He advises the Ambassador on cultural affairs." I asked, "Do you mean to tell me that the Ambassador over there has to hire his own man when we are spending millions of dollars on these cultural officers all over the world?"

But here this ambassador was not able to depend on the man that we have over there and he went out and hired his own cultural affairs officer.

Mr. GROSS. This is on a par with the cultural officer situation in Iceland a couple of years ago.

Mr. BOW. Yes. The gentleman from New York did an excellent job on that. He found a very fine young cultural officer there.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, one who was paid \$3,000 a year, and they put in a \$13,000 woman, if my memory serves me correctly.

Mr. BOW. They sent another person in place and sent him down to do the other job. Those are the things we found, and those are the things I should say that disturb us.

Those are a few of the things in this bill that I felt should be pointed out to the committee today. Again, I say the bill has the support of the committee. In some places I would have cut it more; in some places the gentleman from New York would have increased it. But, the bill has the unanimous agreement of the members of the committee.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to my colleague from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. I want to congratulate my colleague from Ohio for the work he has done on this legislation, especially as a member of the House Committee on Appropriations and as a member of the subcommittee having charge of this bill. I rise, however, to ask him for some information if he can give it. As perhaps he knows, I have been named as a member of the special subcommittee of the Committee on Rules charged with the responsibility of endeavoring to determine and to recommend to the full committee and perhaps later to the House as to what type of action the House, or the House and the Senate jointly, should take in connection with the supervision of the activities of the Central Intelli-

gence Agency and of the intelligence agency or department or division within the State Department. Our committee is getting ready to meet in the next few days. I wonder if the gentleman from Ohio can give me or give the House any idea as to how much in the way of funds this bill carries for the use of intelligence work within the State Department; and, I mean by that, the same type of work that the Central Intelligence Agency, the G-2 division of the Army, the Office of Naval Intelligence, and so forth, do in their own respective fields.

Mr. BOW. I cannot give you offhand the figures that are used for intelligence in the State Department. There is a division there. Do we have that at the desk, the amount that is being used? I would yield to the gentleman from New York, if he can answer that question. I do not have the figures in front of me. These are not funds now appropriated to the CIA. These are funds appropriated for the intelligence division of the State Department.

Mr. BROWN. That is right. Mr. ROONEY. There is an Office of Research and Intelligence in the State Department, as the gentleman from Ohio very well knows, and the people employed in that area are paid partly by the Department of State and previously partly by the so-called other agencies. The amount involved in fiscal 1962 was a request of \$2,828,410.

Mr. BROWN. Does the gentleman believe that that actually covers the cost of all the intelligence work being done by the State Department?

Mr. ROONEY. Oh, not at all. This is only a small area of intelligence to which we are referring, and performed for other agencies of Government.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, the committee went down and reviewed some of the work being done by this group in the State Department and some of the things on which they were working. Then we went over to the FBI and made an investigation there and I believe the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] will agree with me that we were inclined to believe the progress made by the FBI was excellent.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I believe an hour and 15 minutes is enough for lunch. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. (After counting) 41 Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 66]		
Abernethy	Celler	Fulton
Addonizio	Coilier	Garland
Alexander	Conte	Gary
Ashley	Cooley	Grant
Auchincloss	Dawson	Gray
Ayres	DeLauey	Green, Oreg.
Barrett, Pa.	Diggs	Green, Pa.
Barry, N.Y.	Donohue	Gubser
Beermann	Dooley	Hansen
Blicht	Dulaki	Harding
Bolling, Mo.	Dwyer	Harris
Bonner	Fascell	Harsha
Brooks, La.	Fino	Hébert
Bruce	Fogarty	Hiestand
Buckley	Ford	Hoffman, Ill.
Burke, Ky.	Fountain	Hollfield

Hull	Marshall	Rousselot
Inouye	Marlin, Neb.	St. Germain
Jones, Ala.	May	Schwengel
Karsh, Minn.	Meader	Scott
Kearns	Morrow	Seely-Brown
Kee	Miller, N.Y.	Shelley
Kelly	Milliken	Smith, Calif.
Kilburn	Moeller	Spence
Kirwan	Morrison	Springer
Kitchin	Moulder	Staggers
Kluczynski	Nelsen	Thompson, La.
Knox	O'Brien, N.Y.	Thompson, N.J.
Kornegay	O'Konski	Tupper
Kowalski	O'Neill	Udall
Landrum	Passman	Vanik
Latta	Philbin	Vinson
Lennon	Pilcher	Watts
Lesinski	Powell	Whalley
Libonati	Price	Wharton
Lindsay	Randall	Whitten
McCulloch	Riehlman	Young
McSween	Rivers, S.C.	Zelenko
MacGregor	Roberts	
Madden	Rostenkowski	

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 7371, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 317 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting. The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield further to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown].

Mr. BROWN. To continue my interrogation which was under way at the time the point of no quorum was made, we were discussing the intelligence activities within the Department of State, and were being given some information on it. I should like to ask the gentleman further if the investigation that he and his committee and other Members have made as to the intelligence activities of the State Department indicated that those activities were effective and efficient and worthwhile, or whether they found weaknesses therein.

Mr. BOW. I would say that I think some of the activities were worthwhile and there were some in which we found weaknesses. Again let me say that we later checked the FBI and found there was some apparent duplication there, but we felt that they were further advanced and doing some things, perhaps, that were more in their field than in the field of the Department of State.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. It may be that the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown] has the idea that the Department of State and the Foreign Service have an intelligence activity as such. That is so insofar as it refers to a foreign officer reporting on intelligence in the ordinary course of his duties, as does the Army attaché, or Air Force attaché, or Naval attaché. But there is not in the Department of State a separate organization engaged in all fields of intelligence.

Mr. BROWN. We understand that they do not investigate muggings in Washington, but the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] is aware of the fact that they do engage in certain intelligence activities, one way or another. I may add for the gentleman's benefit that if his committee has not studied the problem perhaps our subcommittee will.

Mr. BOW. When any Foreign Service officer makes a report to the Secretary of State he is indulging in intelligence work. He reports as to the conditions in the country. But as far as other types of intelligence such as we have heard about recently are concerned, they are not a part of the functions of the State Department.

Mr. BROWN. Let me ask the gentleman this direct question, if I may: Has the gentleman's committee found any indication that any so-called intelligence agent or any person engaged in intelligence activities, that is, in the State Department, has taken any action or had taken any action in connection with the situation in Cuba?

Mr. BOW. None that I know of.

Mr. BROWN. Prior to this time?

Mr. BOW. Not that I recall.

I should like to point out before closing, and I am about to close, one other area that has disturbed me somewhat and that is the contributions being made by agencies of the United Nations to some of the countries of the world through some of the organizations. Perhaps we can go into all of these later on more in detail. I am using figures now from memory and not with the facts before me, but I am pretty close to them, I am quite sure.

There are, as you know, certain agencies of the United Nations where we make very substantial contributions to these agencies and have no control over the manner in which the money is being used. This is a matter I think the proper committees of the House should go into, and our committee perhaps at some time will go into it. I have in mind the Pan American Health Organization. We know that the United States is now contributing about 66 percent of the funds for Pan American Health. We also know that since the advent of Castro in Cuba, and particularly within the last year, they have about tripled the amount of funds going into Communist Cuba. Here we have the strange situation of 66 percent of these funds being contributed by the United States to the United Nations in connection with the Pan American Organization, and then they use these funds to further the efforts of Mr. Castro in Cuba. This is a story that I think will unfold later on and be of great interest to the members of the committee.

You also have the so-called Hoffman project. The funds there are being diverted for the use of Communist countries. We are therefore making contributions to Communist projects.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Not only that, but apparently we have no control over the assessments placed on the taxpayers of

this country by the United Nations. I might also point out the uncollected assessments of practically all these organizations. Your hearings show that there is owing to the United Nations by the member nations almost \$10 million, \$9,500,000. In connection with the United Nations Emergency Force the unpaid assessments total \$22,714,000, UNESCO, \$2,208,000, and so on down the line. I do not think there is a single organization connected with that Tower of Babel in New York that does not owe a substantial amount of money in unpaid assessments. But the taxpayers of this country pay promptly and right through the nose.

Mr. BOW. There are a large number of delinquencies in the United Nations. It should be insisted that they be collected, because these amounts are being paid by the taxpayers of the United States and they are being diverted in many instances to the Communist Party. This should be checked on carefully. When we say, "Why should we continue to contribute?" we are told we might be thrown out of these organizations. It might be good to do that in some of these organizations. It might be just as well to withdraw from some of them.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. One Government official, and I cannot recall his name, who came before your committee, said it is the natural thing for the United States to put up the bulk of the money for these organizations—the natural thing for us to do.

Mr. BOW. Well, we have been doing it and it is about time we stopped it or we are going to go broke, if we do not stop.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] has consumed 34 minutes.

(Mr. MARSHALL (at the request of Mr. ROONEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point.)

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, my work on the subcommittee on State, Justice, and Judiciary appropriations has been a satisfying experience. It is not a new experience since it was my privilege to serve on this important subcommittee in the 82d Congress during the troubled days of the Korean conflict.

President Kennedy has called this "an hour of national peril and national opportunity." He has also described for us his personal reactions upon assuming the Presidency:

No man entering upon this office, regardless of his party, regardless of his previous service in Washington, could fail to be staggered upon learning—the harsh enormity of the trials through which we must pass in the next 4 years—each day we draw nearer the hour of maximum danger.

Responsibility for our posture in the face of this threat falls upon all of us. As elected Members of the Congress, this responsibility falls upon us in a special measure.

POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION

The very urgency that the President has continued to express concerning the role of our Government involves not only

questions of policy, but questions of administration as well. Policy is not self-executing; it requires administrators and techniques of administration capable of achieving its goals.

In his first appearance before our subcommittee, Secretary of State Dean Rusk spoke this truth with admirable clarity:

Administration must know what ends it is expected to serve; public administration, especially, must concern itself with effectiveness and efficiency, for it uses public funds and must do so in the spirit of a trust. Policy, on the other hand, cannot be successful unless the tools of policy are well designed and capable of carrying it out. Administration is the handmaiden of policy; it is not its own justification; it serves to accomplish the great national purpose we have in view. This requires that the structure and procedures of the Department of State be attuned to the central tasks of our Nation in the foreign policy field. It also means that deficiencies, waste, or failures ought not to be accepted. In critical times such as these, we cannot afford the little mistakes which impede our effort; indeed, the impact of what some might call little things can be decisive as to our success in getting on with our great national policies.

Anyone who has worked with appropriations for various agencies of government has encountered policymakers who regard administration as beneath their dignity and outside their ken. They are impatient with questions of detail and prefer to deal in the generalities of high strategy. It is refreshing, therefore, to have the Secretary of State admit to a working interest in the operations of his Department. His candor and frankness have helped to make our work less arduous and more meaningful.

TRIBUTE TO CHAIRMAN

By the same token, no man is more respected for his candor and frankness than our chairman, JOHN ROONEY. His careful and searching examination of every witness and every program is an indication both of his personal knowledge of all phases of each agency's work and his personal interest in their success. His discontent with evasion and his profound respect for ability help to make our hearings informative and useful. He is successful in eliciting the facts upon which we can make reasonable judgments in terms of both policy and administration. I know of no higher tribute to a hard-working chairman.

The courtesy shown me by the other members of the subcommittee and by our able and experienced clerk, Jay B. Howe, has made my return enjoyable and rewarding.

FACE HARD CHOICES

To realize the importance of the bill before us, we need only look to the world around us. The implementation and administration of our relations with the other nations of the world are an awesome task in these critical times. In every crisis, men have thought their own time to be a turning point in history. They have been justified, just as we are justified, in recognizing contemporary events as signposts to the future marking alternate roads. We are constantly faced with hard choices and the discouragement and frustration which must follow even temporary failures.

20136

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

September 26, 1961

who are about to lose their jobs. They are about to be thrown on the unemployment rolls. There will be great loss to businessmen and merchants in the area, to landlords, and to banks that are waiting for payments to be made on mortgaged homes. It will cause undue hardship in an area that has already been suffering from the impact of adjoining depressed areas. It is unbelievable to me, Mr. Speaker, that the Secretary of Commerce cannot recognize the facts and approve this petition so that these ships can be built here in the United States so as to protect the jobs of the 3,000 persons who would be employed in such shipbuilding.

(Mr. O'NEILL asked and was given permission to revise and to extend his remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

(Mr. CONTE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. CONTE'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

GOVERNMENT SPENDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 3 minutes.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, ever-increasing Government spending is not a budget problem or a bank-statement type of problem alone. It is a constitutional issue.

Every addition to the spending power of the executive branch alters the Constitution because it affects the separation of powers which the Constitution set up among the three branches, and it alters the checks and balances by which each branch was kept in place.

Big spending inevitably swells the executive power while it diminishes the legislative and judicial branches. Inevitably the executive wields such power over Congress and the courts, as to make restraints from the other branches virtually impossible.

The executive with large spending powers is cumulatively assuming the legislative function, because under congressionally delegated power and in too many instances he has been given the right to decide policy issues and the size and shape of the executive agencies.

With the growth of delegated power to the executive the courts become the mouthpiece of the executive because dissenting judges are no longer appointed. Judges who will change judicial precedents most radically are favored over those who hold to the historic interpretation of the Constitution.

Historically the great threat to freedom has been the use of armed forces by those who aspire to dictatorship. In the industrial-money economy the same end can be achieved by those who assemble vast pools of spending money to buy

obedient "armies" who carry out their directives in politics, business, and the press.

Hitler demonstrated, 1932-36, that the unlimited spending power is as useful in establishing dictatorship today as armed uprising was in earlier times.

The spenders would like to build up the myth that opponents of spending are pennypinchers, who care nothing for people, and never see any issue in larger terms than balance sheets.

We take our stand on the ground that the executive power must be limited. When we add vast spending powers to its administrative and police powers, it becomes unlimited government, going down the steep slope to tyranny and dictatorship, however cleverly veiled.

We take the position taken by the American colonists that we want no unlimited Executive power in this country, whether it is the Royal Governors and the Redcoat armies of George III, or the welfare State with its spending bureaucracy of the New Deal, Fair Deal, and New Frontier.

We say that the Republican Party has missed a great historic opportunity. It has been satisfied only to cut Executive spending a little here and a little there. The Republican Party has signally failed to point out that excessive Executive spending is usurpation, and an erosion of the Constitution as effective as an attack upon it.

When will the Republican Party wake up and take up its task to cut down every spending avenue through which the spenders have worked systematically to erode the Constitution piece by piece without a sound?

True Republicans in cooperation with constitutional Democrats have only one task—to make war on the destruction of our Constitution at every point where the new absolutism is at work.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

(Mr. EDMONDSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. EDMONDSON'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

(Mr. RANDALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. RANDALL'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO] is recognized for 1 hour.

(Mr. DADDARIO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his re-

marks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, it is my purpose to use this time to initiate a discussion on what I believe to be one of the most vital issues of American government today: the role and organization of intelligence.

The collection and processing of information by all agencies of the Government is a continuing process. It is vital to the success of any government that all sources be exploited to the maximum degree, and that such information be weighed and processed with calm judgment so that the facts and estimates on which decisions may be taken—decisions that affect the survival of us all—will be as complete and sound as man can assure.

It has been almost 20 years since Pearl Harbor—but that disaster showed how scattered our intelligence activities were. Congress insisted, after the war, on a more unified approach. The success of the Office of Strategic Services, during World War II, proved the necessity for an instrument of special capabilities to assist in this effort. As time has passed and the need for a superior intelligence capacity has grown, worries have been aroused over just how efficient our intelligence community may be, and whether we do, indeed, have the best coordination of such activities that could exist.

It is apparent that Congress needs to exercise and must exercise more supervision and surveillance over this effort. We see and hear charges in the existing establishment, some excuses for past mistakes, promise of better things, but we do not have sufficient information on which to base our own judgment of these matters, so long as no committee exists to oversee the entire intelligence community.

Many Members of Congress have spoken frankly to me of their concern about this arm of executive government. They recognize, as many have said, that intelligence is the foremost line, the outpost line of our defense. It is needed, and must be organized, to provide guidance to the policy, to the economic defense, as well as to the military defense of the United States.

It has been said that it is common knowledge the Central Intelligence Agency will soon lose its present Director, who has intentions of retiring soon. Another will be chosen to succeed him. The present Director has enjoyed the full support of the Congress. What guidelines are being followed—and should be followed—in the search for a successor? This question, too, is a matter of concern to the Congress.

Congress, therefore, should consider seriously the establishment of a watchdog committee on the intelligence community. In a time of particular tension, all Members have a right to be assured that every step is being taken to secure the information necessary in connection with their ultimate responsibility under the Constitution in matters affecting war. The Members have a right to be aware of matters pertaining to the national interest arising from covert intelligence operations. They have a responsibility and a right to exercise close su-

1961

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

20135

Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. CRAMER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

[Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

THE NEED FOR ORE CARRIERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore: Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mr. O'NEILL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I read in the Washington Post of Monday, September 25, in Drew Pearson's column, how he gave praise to Representative CARL VINSON and also to Congressman HÉBERT of Louisiana because of the great interest that that committee has shown in the program of the U.S. Government concerning property of defense contractors that the United States built or installed on their property. I certainly hope Mr. VINSON and Mr. HÉBERT look into this matter thoroughly. I certainly hope that the U.S. Government gets its full return; none of us have any great sympathy for the big defense contractors of the Nation who have done exceptionally well.

Mr. Speaker, also in the article he mentions that Bethlehem Steel Co. is trying to get a \$15 million Government subsidy for two ore carriers, but they were stopped by the alert Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges. Some 4 or 5 months ago, the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. McCORMACK, Congressman JAMES BURKE who represents the Quincy area of Massachusetts where the huge Bethlehem Shipbuilding concern is located and myself—and I have the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Repair Division in my East Boston District—went over to see Mr. Hodges with regard to getting a subsidy for ore carriers for the Bethlehem Shipyard.

We are interested in the welfare of 5,000 men that are going to be laid off within a month in the Bethlehem Shipyard in Quincy. We are interested in the welfare and the economy of the area of our locale. We are interested in the defense of the Nation. We are interested in the problem of the ships. We have a great port up in our area. We have great shipyards up there. A quarter of the economy of the south shore area depends on the shipyards, and depends on the great Boston Harbor.

There has not been an ore carrier built in the United States since 1946. At that time Bethlehem Steel built two ore carriers. The construction of these two ships would mean employment of 3,000 men, who are due to be laid off in a short time for a period of a year and a half to 2 years.

We were asking for \$14 million as a subsidy. Bethlehem Steel intends to build two ore carriers. If we do not get this subsidy, what is the Bethlehem Ship Co. going to do? It is going to go to

Holland, where it can build those two ships at the price it would normally spend without the subsidy.

It is interesting to note that there are at the present time only four American-flag ore carriers in existence, the ones built by Bethlehem under a construction subsidy in 1946, and these are now obsolete. There are 146 ore carriers built abroad since 1946.

On August 17, Mr. BURKE, and Mr. McCORMACK and I wrote a joint letter to Secretary Hodges asking him under the act of 1946 if he would again consider and give to the Bethlehem Shipyard in Quincy, Mass., a subsidy. This is the telegram we received on September 11, 1961:

I have held up replying to your letter of August 17 on the subject of Bethlehem Steel Corp.'s application for construction differential subsidy on the building of two ore carriers pending a thorough review of the entire matter. I have now reached the conclusion that it would not be feasible to approve Bethlehem Steel's application as a matter of policy until: (1) the Secretary of Defense determines that the construction of the two ore carriers proposed takes priority over the construction of liner-type vessels in our regular ship replacement program.

Mr. Hodges, in answer to that part of your telegram stating that "the Secretary of Defense determines that the construction of the two ore carriers proposed takes priority over the construction of liner-type vessels in our regular ship replacement program," let me say that the only four American-flag ore carriers in existence today are the ones built by Bethlehem under a construction subsidy in 1946 and these are now obsolete. It is their present intention to replace these with two 51,000-ton American-flag ore carriers. For your information there have been 146 ore carriers built abroad since 1946. None have been built in the United States with the exception of the four mentioned. I have been informed by good sources from the Navy Department that even though they could be converted into two transports they would be of utmost importance for the purposes for which they are designed—to carry ore.

Second, he says in the telegram:

The chairmen of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees advise this Department that funds allocated for the construction of liner-type vessels may be diverted to the construction of the ore carriers under consideration.

Well, Mr. Secretary Hodges, with reference to that part of the telegram, there are funds in existence from the low bids received in connection with the ship replacement program of the last year. It is my understanding there was \$18 million available. Therefore, it is not necessary and it has never been necessary to obtain permission from the chairmen of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

This has always been done at the discretion of the Maritime Administrator in the past. A simple notification to the chairman has always made it acceptable. I understand Secretary Hodges, from my conversation with him in the presence of Speaker pro tempore McCORMACK and Mr. BURKE, said he was opposed to subsidies. It is all right to

be opposed to subsidies, if you are opposed to subsidies in the whole program. But, I wonder where North Carolina and South Carolina would be today if they did not have the subsidies on cotton and if they did not have the subsidies on peanuts. It is all right to be against subsidies when you are against subsidies in the other fellow's backyard, but I wonder what the economy of the Carolinas would be today if they did not have these subsidies. Their very economy depends upon these subsidies, and yet the Secretary of Commerce is hiding behind this telegram which was sent to Mr. McCORMACK, Mr. BURKE and myself. This is the law of the land. This law was passed in 1946. It was the will of the Congress that we subsidize shipbuilding in this country and, yet, the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Hodges, hides behind a telegram of this nature.

Here we have been during the last 3 weeks pondering and delaying, and today they came in with a compromise bill adding another \$187 million to a bill that carries close to \$4 billion in it that we are giving away to the nations of the world. Yet, in our area we have 5,000 people who are about to be unemployed, and we are asking for \$14 million out of the \$18 million that they have of surplus funds. I appeal to Mr. Hodges, the Secretary of Commerce. I appeal to Mr. Martin of the Maritime Commission to reconsider this matter. Think of the welfare of our area. Think of the economy of the area. Think of the dark and gloomy Christmas and Thanksgiving holidays that are going to come for the families of these men whom it is our duty to try to help. Yes, we should help the underprivileged nations of the world, but let us help those at home too.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I desire to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts. I concur in every statement that he has made here today. In Quincy, Mass., and in the East Boston section, we have approximately 5,000 men who are about to lose their jobs. These conditions are especially to be deplored when we realize that merely by a stroke of the pen, the Secretary of Commerce, Luther Hodges, could approve this subsidy, and I remind my colleagues he would be approving this subsidy under the law of the land, the law that provides that these ships should be built here in the United States. The employment that would be afforded by the building by these ships would take care of 3,000 men. The drain on the unemployment compensation funds alone, if these 3,000 men lose their jobs, will approximate close to \$6 million, and it will mean a loss of over \$27 million in salaries to these workers. It also means a loss in corporation taxes to the State and the Nation. And, of course, a loss in individual income taxes to the U.S. Treasury. Yet, we find Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges sitting down there quietly, unconcerned about the plight of these men, heads of families

pervision over the use of public funds. And they have a constitutional responsibility, above all, to define the limits of Executive power.

I do not propose to discuss any information based on classified matters. I do not intend to venture in my prepared remarks toward the brink of classified information, and I will not refer to published information regarding intelligence activities of this country which is founded on speculation—even where that speculation may be, to my personal knowledge, well founded.

I will offer, at the conclusion of my remarks, a resolution for the establishment of the type of committee I have in mind.

INTELLIGENCE: WHAT IS IT?

Basic to any discussion of this problem is an agreed interpretation of the word "intelligence." The best definition that I have encountered is that used by the Clark Task Force of the Hoover Commission, which defined intelligence in these terms:

Intelligence deals with all the things which should be known in advance of initiating a course of action.

It follows that intelligence, then, is not restricted to the glamorous work of cloak-and-dagger operators. The military definition strips it further of any idea of glamour. According to military definitions, intelligence is a product resulting from the collection, evaluation, analysis, integration, and interpretation of all information which concerns one or more aspects of foreign nations or of areas of operations and which is immediately or potentially significant to planning.

Basically, intelligence is hard work, often tedious work, well planned, systematically organized, and carefully supervised. It seeks facts concerning men, situations, and conditions and is ruthless in its evaluation of those facts and verification of them. Intelligence is carefully produced information to make sure that an executive decision—and it matters not whether it is in business, industry, or Government—is made with due regard to existing circumstances. It has been estimated that upward of 98 percent of intelligence needed is available through completely open sources if one knows what he needs and where to get it. Roger Hillsman, State Department Director of Intelligence and Research, estimated that 40 to 60 percent of the information the United States needs about the world comes from the normal processes of diplomatic reporting, when he testified before the Rooney subcommittee this year.

To those who believe that intelligence always refers to military intelligence, I would point out that military intelligence, in specific applications, may embrace the whole range of information about a foreign country or area of operations. What about the weather? What about the government? What are the people like? What are the facts about its geography, its industry, its economy, its health and disease problems? The National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Health, Education,

and Welfare, the Department of Agriculture—all the large departments and many of the smaller ones not only have special needs for intelligence, but capabilities for producing it as well.

In short, intelligence is not just a source of concern to the Department of Defense. Virtually every department or agency has some interest in collecting information which may be of use in guiding its daily actions. And, further, just about everyone is a potential producer of intelligence. In the private sector, business and industry energetically collects information and processes it to bear on economic decisions. The major task that faces this Government, if it is to have the best intelligence product, is to coordinate all sources and agencies.

For some years prior to World War II, the major weakness in our national intelligence situation concerned the failure to coordinate the information-gathering activities of the different agencies, to plan and exercise surveillance over the requirements of intelligence for national decisions, and to institute aggressive programs to fill in the gaps which would have been disclosed by such correlation and comparative analysis. It was to rectify this error, so sharply underscored in later years by disclosure that the necessary information to evaluate Japanese intentions at Pearl Harbor was contained in various files, that the President, in 1941, created the Office of Coordinator of Information.

Its mission was made clear to Maj. Gen. William J. Donovan: To try to bring together all information and intelligence bearing on national policy and decisions and to provide such information quickly and speedily to the decision-maker—the President of the United States.

I can well remember the circumstances in which this office developed into the Office of Strategic Services during World War II. I knew General Donovan and cannot pay too high a tribute to his ability, dedication and foresight in the work which he performed as head of that organization and in behalf of the United States.

From this office, our Government began to develop a much strengthened intelligence capability which, in the brief span of the war years, clearly demonstrated the necessity for a continuation of this type of work. Following the war, considerable time and discussion went into preserving as much of this capability as possible and in forging a peacetime instrument which could secure the necessary information for our policymakers.

What is the process whereby information is gathered and turned into intelligence? It is axiomatic that the intelligence effort is never fully a successful one, for the intelligence cycle is an endless one, going from one phase to another and changing with the changing circumstances and conditions. To these ever-shifting problems must be added the difficulties presented by the secretive nature of governments which are anxious to deny information to their rivals. Such actions take the form of great effort to obscure and camouflage techno-

logical advances as well as political intentions, thus creating major obstacles in the field of evaluation and judgment. Judge Learned Hand could well have been talking about intelligence and policymaking when he observed:

Life is a series of judgments based on insufficient evidence.

So is policymaking.

The purpose of an intelligence organization is to make the evidence as complete as possible—and this should be the aim of our intelligence community at all times, and especially in days of tension and global peril.

Accepting the analogy of the wheel, or cycle, let us begin a description of the intelligence process with the collection of information. As I have noted, information is collected by anyone who needs to make a decision. The businessman collects information on which to plan his sales program—market data. To some extent, businessmen have sought information of vital importance without regard to law, as in pricing matters, or in the search for valuable resources. The House will recall a theft of maps of potential oil fields, which took place some years ago. That crime disclosed that there is a very vigorous interest on the part of competing oil companies and oil men in the knowledge of regions where oil may exist. Or take the aviation industry. The competition for a successful design in government defense procurement is vigorous, as we all know. Some years ago, one company took elaborate precautions to safeguard its proposal and the technical data pertaining to it—but the day bids were opened, a gift box was delivered containing an exact duplicate mock-up and a chiding note as well.

Consider the question of collecting information about the United States. There are libraries, with encyclopedias covering every subject. There are geographies for terrain studies. There are industrial publications. Our Government Printing Office provides a prepaid deposit account service through which one depositor in Moscow alone ordered \$5,721 worth of publications last year—after discount—that were undoubtedly intended for use in Russia. None of these were classified publications.

Most of the information which is available concerning the United States is available from the other developed countries of the world as well. It is, of course, subject to discount by the different countries according to the degree of censorship which may exist and the control exercised over contents of these publications. But we subscribe to journals and publications of foreign nations just as they subscribe to ours. We would do so even if there were no national policy needs—we have a continual need to be informed of what is happening in fields of common interest.

Most of this type of gathering information is rather prosaic and, as a matter of fact, is producing a veritable torrent of information from some sources. This does not necessarily mean that we are securing the right kind of information, or useful information, or processing

it so that it gets to the right place at the right time. The mere digestion of foreign language publications is a massive job in itself, perhaps requiring computers that will memorize the facts and store them for immediate reference when they are needed.

The second phase of production of intelligence, then, is the processing, or distilling of information into intelligence. At each level, or in each department, reports must be weighed, verified according to the facilities available at that center and under the circumstances in which the collection center is operating. This is the phase that begins the separation of rumor and fact and, in essence, evaluation.

A raw report coming from the field is put through a series of tests for reliability and accuracy. Both qualities are defined from experience gathered over a period of time and taking into consideration the measure of actual organizational control exercised over the source and agency. A source having established its reliability over a period of time is assigned greater credibility. As such information may be verified by other independent sources, the original source would attain a greater degree of credibility.

At the central collector point, where other facts and figures are available, the intelligence expert seeks to fit this piece into the puzzle, a composite picture in which the information of various independent agencies and sources has blended to produce an accurate portrait of the subject matter. The intelligence specialist then analyzes the portrait in relation to the questions he must answer. His analysis must be as objective in character as it is possible to obtain, for upon it the intelligence consumer will be expected to make his conclusions as they affect his courses of action.

The ultimate obligation of the intelligence agency is to the policymaker, who must be provided with all facts and figures pertinent to the situation and must be made to take notice of them—in short, to receive a report dealing with all things that should be known in advance of initiating a course of action. But while such a report may be provided, there is a grave question of how many times policymakers may have had facts within their grasp and have disregarded them.

Now how do the facts get to the policymakers? This is the next step in the intelligence cycle—dissemination. When the raw information has been carefully processed and intelligence has been produced, it must be gotten to those who need it and can use it. This phase is both vertical and lateral. It must be rushed to the forward outposts where it may help bring new facts into perspective. It must be distributed widely to agencies working on parallel problems, so that they, too, may use it to bring their work into new perspective. And it must, of course, go to the top to guide the policymaker.

The problem of dissemination of processed information is a grave one. For one thing, this is an area in which problems of counterintelligence become acute. If finished intelligence is dis-

closed to the public gaze, it may betray the sources and methods used to obtain such intelligence, or the information that underlies it. Obviously, then, the antagonist would move to dry up those sources or to achieve control over them.

Let us take a case that has been current in the press this year. It is a case which occurred in Great Britain, a nation extremely security conscious in these matters. But early this year, a foreign office official was arrested and given an unusually heavy sentence. Little about his case was made known. Only the charge, and the severe sentence, indicated to the general public that the Government had felt much was at stake. At the same time, another British official was killed in a distant country. One newspaper theorized that the cases were related—there was evidence to substantiate it—and that the real charge against the first official was that information had been betrayed which led to the compromise of the other official and his death at enemy hands.

It is vital that the most effective secrecy be maintained in the areas of operations, sources, and methods. This is one reason why the act which established CIA laid a heavy responsibility upon the Director of Central Intelligence to protect intelligence sources and methods from unauthorized disclosure.

Yet a balance must be struck with respect to dissemination. Intelligence is of no use unless it gets where it is needed in time for its use. Any doubt as to whether outposts should be alerted should always be resolved in favor of supplying the information—that was a lesson of Pearl Harbor. It is better to err on the side of making too much information available than too little. But while the information or the intelligence may be given, the security of the source may remain guarded.

Collection—processing, or evaluation, and then dissemination. What is the next step? It is to identify the gaps in this intelligence and to plan a systematic collection effort to fill in the gaps. Basically, it begins with reference to what we need to know, for we cannot concentrate on a narrow set of facts and assume that we have covered all areas of danger. With constant reference to the information and intelligence we have, we establish the elements we require to supplement or verify that picture so as to identify the courses of action.

We have, as I have pointed out, many existing agencies collecting information, and many resources that can be applied to this effort. These are all usually engaged in supporting their own responsibilities. But there must be a central or coordinating agency to meet the needs of the President, to establish requirements relating to national policy and to lay such specific orders on the separate agencies as are needed. These directives and requests must be issued in coherent and clear-cut terms. Those responsible for the preparation of orders and instructions must be fully aware of the capabilities and the situation of an actual or possible enemy. They must also be aware of the capabilities of the collection agencies, as well as their relia-

bility. An extreme or unrealistic order to a collection agency can result in failure in many ways—possibly even in compromise and death if the agency undertakes to secure more than it can reasonably be expected to accomplish.

What lesson should be drawn from this? Obviously the central authority must be thoroughly familiar with the capabilities and resourcefulness of the departments working with it. There must be excellent liaison and coordination to insure that full exploitation is made of the means—but that such means are not wasted through unrealistic expectations. If the latter occurs, a natural consequence is to dismiss the idea of full use of such resources and establish duplicate or parallel agencies.

Planning, then, is another phase in the intelligence cycle. Planning must be continuous at all levels—but it is at the central or coordinating authority that the greatest responsibility lies.

FAULTS IN THE PRESENT ESTABLISHMENT

If planning is the most important part of the intelligence process—and there could be considerable discussion over whether the phases are coequal—then it follows that the Central Intelligence Agency, as the designated coordinating authority, deserves the most careful scrutiny by Congress. Let me review briefly what responsibilities are assigned to CIA under the statute which established it.

First, CIA must advise the National Security Council on matters concerning such intelligence activities of the Nation as affect the national security. The National Security Council is the principal advisory organization available to the President to bring together the threads of policy in foreign affairs. Its composition includes the Secretaries of State and Defense.

Second, CIA is directed to recommend policies concerning the coordination of all intelligence efforts in the Government. In practice, the Director of Central Intelligence sits as chairman of a committee on which all departments—military or otherwise—having intelligence missions are represented.

Third, the CIA analyzes such intelligence and sees that it gets to those who should have it. This does not prevent other agencies from continuing to make their own evaluations of the information they have. The Director of Central Intelligence is, however, given the important responsibility of seeing that intelligence methods and sources are not exposed and betrayed.

Fourth, CIA has a general clause giving it the authority to perform what are described as services of common concern to all the separate agencies.

Fifth, it may carry out special assignments given it by the National Security Council.

In recent years there have been a number of incidents in which CIA has been informally, at least, identified as having participated in events which did not redound to the credit of the United States. The recent Cuba situation is one of the more burning cases. The U-2 incident before that raised this question. Criticism of the oversea op-

1961

erations of CIA in general for their failure to mesh into overall policy has been voiced.

In the years since the creation of CIA in 1947, following upon postwar reorganization of central intelligence efforts, that agency has grown year by year. In many ways it has become stronger and more effective. But in the absence of surveillance by Congress with respect to its role in the intelligence community, it has become a rather sprawling organization. Its secret functions have become confused with its overt functions. It has enjoyed a freedom from control which has permitted waste and encouraged some abuses of power. Often its covert operations have bordered on open activities. The very fact that all functions of CIA enjoy the same cloak of security has led to a disregard for security. When every document is marked "secret" or "top secret," it leads to carelessness with those matters that do deserve the highest security classification. Gilbert and Sullivan put it this way: "When everyone is somebody, then no one's anybody."

The time has come to analyze the functions which are coming under one roof in the new CIA headquarters at McLean and to examine them carefully and make them responsible to democratic government. This must be done without harming the central core of an intelligence effort that has been in existence since 1941 and which has been nursed and strengthened by a succession of dedicated persons. The role of the central agency must be clearly defined as to perform those functions not being executed or incapable of being executed at departmental levels. And its coordinating role must be to strengthen the valuable intelligence-gathering capabilities within those departments and agencies—not to assume their duties.

There is some reason to believe that part of CIA's spectacular growth has occurred in just this fashion—doing jobs that other agencies ought to be doing, duplicating effort in other instances. This has led to a natural feeling in many areas that CIA ought to be cut back to size, broken up, stripped of some of its functions. But it is here that Congress ought to proceed most warily. For there is no congressional committee specifically designated to oversee the entire intelligence community—as I shall propose there should be—and yet if the functions of any part of that community are altered, it may affect the product of all of it—and it may affect the decisions that are made on the basis of such intelligence—decisions that could be intimately interwoven with the survival of the United States.

How does this relate to the present organization of intelligence activities in the U.S. Government? Basically, we can agree that the intentions are good; the postwar planners sought to coordinate the various information-gathering services, to insure them protection against unwarranted disclosure, to give them sufficient prestige so the product would be respected at the highest levels, and to maintain some of the capabilities that made our wartime intelligence agencies effective.

Yet I think it is a matter of common agreement among those who are most informed regarding our intelligence activities that we are not as effective as we were. Why not? There are a multitude of reasons. We cannot claim the services of some of the most talented operatives in time of peace. We face a different and often more difficult task than we did in 1941, and we have been slow to face up to the type of assignment we must undertake. And, I think, we have not strengthened the independent sources which are available to us.

Basically, the problem of improving our intelligence organization for national policy deserves congressional attention.

DANGERS OF IMPENDING CHANGES

If, after analysis, we agree that the CIA establishment and the intelligence community deserve careful review and correction where prescribed, what are the problems posed by the changes now being made or proposed?

There are certain perils, for instance, in the recent directive setting up a Defense Intelligence Agency. While some of this has been aired on the floor of Congress, through publication of a memorandum sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and through articles written by an expert military correspondent, I am unaware that the House has had an opportunity to pass on these problems. I would agree that this particular change is within the province of a standing committee which is entitled to the full respect of the House, but I would submit that its results may have a bearing on the total product of the intelligence community and transcend the responsibilities of that committee.

Considering that every commander should have an intelligence adviser on his staff, it is logical that the Secretary of Defense should have someone to whom he may turn—even though the directive carefully specifies that he may exercise control of the DIA only through the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Under this new DIA, the Director will organize, direct, manage, control, review, coordinate, and supervise, intelligence resources, watch the execution of plans and programs, and meet the intelligence requirements of components of the Department of Defense. He will also meet priority requests levied by the U.S. Intelligence Board.

This new Director of Defense Intelligence is charged with developing estimates to forward to the U.S. Intelligence Board. He is to work out a general plan for intelligence requirements and assign relative priorities to specific agencies. He, however, also may have counter-intelligence responsibilities as they may be assigned. I do not quarrel with the assignment of negative, or counter-intelligence duties to what is established as a positive agency, but I do express concern over the extent of such counter-intelligence authority as may be vested in him.

At the present time, the Director of Defense Intelligence is to be one of the Department of Defense representatives on the U.S. Intelligence Board. His agency will develop and produce all

DOD intelligence estimates and DOD information and contributions to national estimates for the U.S. Intelligence Board. Such estimates and contributions may indicate differences in analysis and evaluation. But if such an agreed estimate is then considered in the preparation of the final estimate, which also may indicate, by footnotes, any differences of opinion, how much will the nonconcurring opinions of the three separate departmental intelligence offers weigh in the final product? And suppose, at some future time, the U.S. Intelligence Board itself is reorganized by a simple directive to reduce Defense representation to this new DIA man alone? What then?

I would hope, at any rate, that Congress will have some committee at that time to take a long and vigorous look at such a proposal as it affects the total intelligence capability of the Government.

A second cause of concern in the recent reorganization of the national intelligence programs is the role of Gen. Maxwell Taylor, as the President's military representative. He has a mission of being an adviser and staff officer to the President within the intelligence field. He has a responsibility, assigned by the President, of watching the function of the intelligence apparatus of the Government to assure the President it meets the future needs of the Government. He is to work closely with the Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board to see that maximum use is made of its recommendations.

I am happy that the President has chosen a man of General Taylor's ability and acknowledged professional competence to serve as an adviser. But I am puzzled by the nature of his duties with respect to intelligence. As a former military attaché and a special operations emissary himself, General Taylor is not a stranger to the hazards and complications of the field. But I would like a clearer statement with respect to his relationship to the U.S. Intelligence Board.

In the U.S. Intelligence Board, over which the Director of Central Intelligence presides, are brought together the intelligence representatives of the Department of State, the Department of Defense, the military services and the other departments which have capabilities in collection or analysis. Included on the Board are representatives of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and of the Atomic Energy Commission. The USIB draws on the knowledge and experience of private organizations, as well as educational institutions. Obviously here is an element of great strength in producing the ultimate in estimates towards national policy. Yet not only is General Taylor's relationship to this institution undefined, but its operations, too, are without congressional oversight. Were there such an oversight I am confident that unresolved questions such as those I have posed would be less numerous in the minds of Congress.

A third factor of concern are the recommendations purportedly made by the Kilian Committee for reorganization. These have not been made public offi-

cially, to my knowledge, and so I will not discuss them here. But I emphasize that there is no congressional committee instructed by this organization to examine such matters and their bearing upon intelligence policy.

A fourth factor has been examined in the hearings of the Appropriations Subcommittee on State, Judiciary, and Justice, under the able chairmanship of Mr. ROONEY. This is a proposal within the Department of State for a reorganization of functions of that Department's Bureau of Intelligence and Research. The new director spoke ably and well of some of his plans and studies for tightening up and making the Bureau more manageable. The Secretary of State thinks there should be more attention to what is called "policy-oriented research." I am advised that the general presentation was not sufficient to sway the judgment of this Congress, but I propose that these decisions, reviewed as a matter of control of appropriations only, must have an impact on the total intelligence picture.

As a last point in this discussion of events taking place outside the general field of Congress, I mention again the possible change in leadership at the Central Intelligence Agency. Mr. Dulles has often mentioned that he came down from New York about eleven years ago for a six weeks tour of duty. That tour is now ending, from all signs, and the search is on for a qualified successor.

Mr. Dulles himself has set some high standards for such a man. He has said that in the key positions of the agency must be men who are prepared to make intelligence a life work, not merely a casual occupation or stepping stone. The Agency should be directed by a relatively small but elite corps of men with a passion for anonymity and a willingness to stick at that particular job. They must be prepared to find their reward primarily in the work itself and in the service they render their Government, rather than in public acclaim. He felt that whoever took the post of Director of Central Intelligence should make that his life work. He attributed the success of the FBI to the fact that the director has been on the job for a sufficient period of years to build up public confidence and esprit de corps in his organization and high prestige.

Mr. Dulles's views may have changed somewhat during his long trusteeship. For one thing, he has accepted speech-making assignments on occasion, something that continues to astonish the intelligence organizations of other nations. He has become quite accessible to congressional committees. And it is probable that he conceives his role now more as he described it in an interview in 1954 when he said:

In intelligence, you have to take certain things on faith. You have to look to the man who is directing the organization and the result he achieves. If you haven't someone who can be trusted, or who doesn't get results, you'd better throw him out and get somebody else.

I personally prefer Mr. Dulles' earlier guidelines than the later. I believe strongly that we must depend on an institution, not a man, and that the

organization for obtaining a good intelligence product must depend on dedicated, selfless individuals.

I would agree with him wholeheartedly in his belief that the appointment as Chief of Central Intelligence must be free from political interference and I would add that it must be wary of persons committed too deeply to any political philosophies. The task of an intelligence agency and its director is to be as objective and thorough as possible in gathering and processing information. The addition of an element of predisposition would be fatal. At this time, I think we need a tough-minded, independent administrator to supervise this work. We need someone who will deal ruthlessly with incompetence, impatiently with slipshod performance and insatiably with the quest for information. Only such a man, backed up loyally by the man he serves, working in relative protection from any need to be a public relations expert, can produce the type of intelligence this Nation deserves.

Intelligence is a serious business. So is the choice of a man to direct this effort.

WHAT CAN THE CONGRESS CONTRIBUTE TO THE INTELLIGENCE PROCESS?

Someone must take a continuing interest in the intelligence community and be fully aware of the guidelines to the choice of a new director, the task before him and the best way to help him carry it out. That there are serious weaknesses in national intelligence, few should question. There are some obvious steps that should be taken to improve the product.

First, there ought to be an appraisal of the planning and operational experience of the agencies contributing to the intelligence community. The military agencies, for instance, have had long years in this field, and yet one of the most serious charges leveled against the competence of our total intelligence product is that intelligence has often been a stepchild in the military services. It is a waystation on the route to promotion. How does this affect the product?

Second, consider the training for information gathering and intelligence production within all agencies, and particularly the Central Intelligence Agency. We need to know if an organization is adequate to do its job, and if the use made of the intelligence, once secured, is proper and efficient. We are not seeking the great at the moment. We are in search of the good and the efficient. We are in search of the organization and framework within which they will work. How is a man trained to take his place in the organization? There are those who believe that intelligence is one of the liberal arts; that any man with a degree of some kind can take his place in the field. Believe me, intelligence is an applied art.

I have gone through many instances and many missions where this lesson has been forcibly driven home. The study of the locale and the circumstances, the use of facilities and instruments of intelligence, the careful planning, the opera-

tional factors, the alternatives, the cover plans, the recovery, all figure into any intelligence mission.

I am interested in the practical, not the theoretical. I am concerned with the working intelligence organization, the improving organization. I think this Nation has been confused this year by too much talk about paramilitary operations, as if they constituted intelligence effort. There is such a thing as operational intelligence, where extra effort is needed to influence the collection of information. But paramilitary operations are just that, with the emphasis on military. If they belong any place in our plans, they belong in the Department of Defense.

I have discussed the different parts of an intelligence organization that go to make up the finished product. Let me warn briefly of some factors that should affect congressional supervision—indeed should be encouraged by the proper kind of congressional supervision. Information gathering must be a self-sustaining factor. Such operations must be responsive to requirements from the top, but they cannot be so tied to a communications line or to an inflexible organization that they can be identified and destroyed.

Agents must be free to seek information without rigid books of rules to guide them. What, after all, causes a man in some alien world to provide information to another nation? We have a wealth of information in the files of the Committee on Un-American Activities speculating on this matter from cases uncovered within our own country. Some want power. Some want money. Some want revenge. Most have political motives. They want to change the course of events in which their own lives have become unsatisfactory. In such cases, information is only a by-product to them. They are seeking their own ends; they view the passage of information to someone else as a means to that end.

Within such a framework, and with the recognition that among the people with whom an intelligence agent may deal, the petty motives are not the most prevalent, it is possible to build a strong network of informers. With the judicious use of funds, loyalties may be created. The desire for political change within one's country has proven a most powerful motive over the years for inducing such new loyalties. Eventually these loyalties may be sufficient to provide a means of influencing the course of events. No one has seen Communist agents shrink at sabotage or even assassination. In wartime, as here in 1917, agents may be hired to destroy critical facilities.

But none of this is possible on the basis of short-term planning. Such growth of a network must be sustained by continued requirements and continued reward. It may be that in the life of an agent, not one shot will be fired. What, then, will continue to draw his best effort, his continued service? How can funds be developed, or programs, that will insure continuity and improvement?

This short analysis has shown some of the difficulties that Congress must consider in supporting an intelligence

1961

agency as it builds a foundation for steady and reliable information. That agency cannot deal only with intellectuals, or even with normal persons. It must look to the neurotic, such as William Joyce; the traitor, like Benedict Arnold; the criminal, or the subject of blackmail, like Col. Alfred Redl. And it is no surprise that many people shrink away from such associations. One of the most famous remarks in American history, uttered by a totally decent and honorable man, was: "Gentlemen don't read other people's mail." But the consequences of that statement was to deny the United States information it needed for its own protection and security in dealing with people who were not gentlemen.

Espionage is an unlawful activity. It is punishable by death. Historically it has been distasteful. Yet no activity is more delicate or vital to the effectiveness of modern government engaged in fighting for survival. Is it necessary to conduct activities that may be distasteful to the general public of any democratic country? The real argument is that we have a stake in freedom, and in freedom everywhere. As a result, we must know what is being done to subvert freedom, and we must be prepared to act when necessary to intercept and defeat such subversion.

The tools and instruments of such action are highly trained and well-equipped personnel. They must not be identifiable. They must not be exposed to danger because too many know their mission. They must be protected with every resource at the Government's command. This is why Congress first entrusted authority to the Director of Central Intelligence and bade him to see that no unauthorized disclosure of agency methods was made. The most regrettable part of recent failures in this area has been the disclosure of people and methods.

Let me recapitulate briefly what Congress can contribute to the improvement on the national intelligence program. It can oversee the methods of training and planning for intelligence operations. It can weigh the quality and performance of the component parts of the intelligence community. It can make suggestions for improvement and it can spur action where a necessary program has been slighted.

Specific corrections needed in our intelligence agencies today are an improvement in the choice and development of experienced personnel for intelligence; improvement in planning and execution of projects to guarantee that all possible failures have been systematically recognized and safeguards constructed; better coordination of the parts played by all agencies and departments; better utilization and development of departmental intelligence arms; ruthless elimination of inadequate personnel; and strict compliance with policies intended to improve the intelligence capability.

It may be argued that these are critical times and we cannot afford to tamper with our organization for intelligence. The same argument might have been proposed at the time of Pearl Har-

bor. I may point out that the faults disclosed at Pearl Harbor stimulated the postwar effort to build a permanent and effective intelligence organization. We are in the midst of many administrative changes in our organization for intelligence. Congress has a responsibility to act.

Can it do so responsibly and effectively? I think the record shows it can.

A JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY

We need a Joint Committee on the Intelligence Community to oversee the intelligence community, to define the limits of its actions, to assure ourselves of the competence and effectiveness of its components and its methods, and to assist the community in raising its standards. Such a committee would also serve as a safeguard to regulate the growth of what can be a most dangerous element in a democracy. I want to recognize this danger candidly, for throughout history those who served commanders and kings as sources of information have sometimes turned that power to their own use—especially when they had counterintelligence authority as well.

This was a matter of great concern to the Congress when it first established the Central Intelligence Agency. I believe it acted wisely in confining CIA operations to areas outside this country. Yet I may respectfully point out that the Cuban situation clearly involved planning and training within this country, and if we are to utilize fully the resources and capabilities within the Nation's boundaries, it entails activity of some size here.

The Congress must establish a committee which has the authority to explore the way in which our intelligence community is growing. There are legitimate fears that this might lead to compromise of secret information. I, myself, would place the utmost safeguards on the handling of covert operations, and limit the amount of information regarding them, as well as certain details of sources and intelligence agencies. But I would not concede for one instant that legislative oversight means loss of information or loss of discretion. Actually, the information which now prevails is much more prone to defects. Virtually all committees have a call on the services of the Director of Central Intelligence. A study made for me by the Legislative Reference Service in mid-September discloses that he appeared before six different committees on seven separate occasions this year. In addition, another committee has a call on him but this committee carries its own secrecy so far that it would not release any information on his appearances.

This practice of appearances by Mr. Dulles before different committees confuses the intelligence picture and perpetuates a myth—that all intelligence comes from the top. Any line outfit will fall prone to waiting for higher headquarters to provide an intelligence or estimate if it believes that such reports will waive its own necessity to send out patrols. And yet the reports of patrols are, more often than not, the basis of the estimates that are ultimately received. In point of fact, many committees are

asking CIA for information that could have been gathered and evaluated by the departments directly under their supervision.

I see this trend from the Committee on Science and Astronautics on which I serve. It is true that CIA has certain added duties in the field of science, but the National Aeronautics and Space Administration should be well aware of what is being done by other agencies in the field in which it has the acknowledged experts. From time to time, NASA has produced reports on comparative efforts, which certainly reflect the views of NASA, but which usually invoke the magic name of CIA in order to share any blame that may accrue. If every commander should have an intelligence officer on his staff, then NASA certainly deserves to use its technical brains in behalf of the common effort and in its own interest.

Let us consider again the question of discretion on the part of the Joint Committee on the Intelligence Community which I propose. At the present time, although Mr. Dulles appears before different committees in response to invitation, only two committees of the House have asserted general jurisdiction over the specific Central Intelligence Agency, and both have, through members or the respective chairmen, asserted to the House that they are kept aware of activities of the Agency. Yet no one would say that the members of these committees have been indiscreet with the information entrusted to them. Indeed, just the opposite is more likely to be heard—that even basic information on this Agency is difficult to obtain by the Members of the House, and that it is only when CIA's work is compromised in some way that some details come to the attention of Members who are responsible to their constituencies for appraisal of the executive branch.

I want to present, however, as the best example of congressional discretion, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Ever since this Committee was established under the chairmanship of the late Senator Brian M. Mahon, of Connecticut, its record of maintaining secrecy about critical and important matters has been outstanding. It has high standards of security and I pay tribute to them. I have recently reviewed some of the regulations set forth by the Committee staff to control its work, with the approval of the Chairman, and they are excellent.

These regulations impose on each staff member a duty to be aware of proper handling of classified information. They constitute a thorough briefing on the different classifications, the penalties for unauthorized disclosure, and the individual responsibility that is required. Needless to say, each staff member is subject to a background investigation before being hired and has clearance only on a need-to-know basis. A security officer maintains surveillance over compliance with regulations.

The physical security of the Committee rooms is excellent. For purposes of security and efficient operations, the rooms are divided into an outer reception room, and an inner enclosure area

20142

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

September 26

for the use of classified materials. No visitor is admitted to the inner exclusion area without an escort and registration. No classified information is permitted to be discussed in the outer reception room.

Specific instructions are also on record for the handling and receipt of classified documents from other agencies. The committee makes broad use of couriers, rather than the mail. With the concurrence of the chairman, it insists where possible on use of documents only within its own quarters, rather than circulating them freely. It imposes its own security classifications on materials originating within the committee, and handles them with the same care provided in military regulations. Much of its authority comes, of course, from the broad grant of responsibility in the Atomic Energy Act.

The committee makes use of expert personnel from other agencies charged with security duties in order to reinforce its own security. Inspections may be conducted at regular intervals to check on security provisions. Precautions are taken against invasion of the committee's hearing rooms. Now the committee is in the process of moving from the Capitol quarters to new quarters especially designed and planned to assure maximum security.

I cite this to point up the attention to detail which a responsible committee has taken. Without question, the Congress can take great pride in the security record of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Beginning with care in the selection of personnel and progressing through maximum physical security to strict regulations in the handling of classified information, the committee has shown great responsibility and discretion in critical and sensitive areas.

In itself, this sets guidelines as well as a precedent for the Joint Committee on the intelligence community. The personnel of the committee must be selected with care. The staff must have equal professional and technical qualities. It would do no good to establish oversight of a critical area without men who have the intelligence and imagination to conduct their mission with responsibility, discretion, and vigor.

What is that mission? The first task is to conduct a survey of the existing elements of the intelligence community, with particular reference to the Central Intelligence Agency, and report to the Congress such legislative or statutory changes as may be needed to make it a more effective instrument. For some years, aside from frequent efforts to bring it under control, the only legislative changes I have seen have been those put forth by the Agency itself.

The second task is to set the goals for intelligence. In recent years, there is some evidence that successes have been few and far between, even though the effort has increased. There is some evidence that the Agency has been willing to spend large sums without a realistic weighing of costs and benefits. It has been subject to a Government disease which consists of following the fashions—plunging into purchases of the newest and latest fads. Although

I believe in the integrity of those men entrusted with intelligence expenditures, Congress should have some means more responsive to the membership to determine such trends, and the authorization and need therefor.

The third task is to set up continuing surveillance and examination of the functioning of the Agency, in so far as nonsensitive functions are concerned. There will be a battle over where this line—between sensitive and nonsensitive—is drawn, but the Congress must insist that it be drawn as far forward as possible. The library, the research grants, the routine travel—all deserve close supervision. I believe firmly that we must guarantee secrecy to the covert operations of our intelligence arm, but I would be strict in defining covert or clandestine.

The fourth task is to insure that the responsibilities laid on the intelligence community by the Congress are being met. The present Central Intelligence Agency is often accused of being too unwieldy, too loosely coordinated, and often lacking in efficient top level direction.

I have left to this point another positive benefit of congressional oversight of the intelligence community. It is the confidence that can result, both in Congress and among the general public, from knowledge that this community and the Central Intelligence Agency is under constant and watchful attention, with constructive criticism where needed, measured against a yardstick of performance. As the Hoover Commission noted when it recommended a Joint Committee on Foreign Intelligence, such a congressional committee could collaborate with the President's special advisory committee on matters of special importance to the national security. It would fulfill the task force's hopes that the public could be kept assured of the essential and trustworthy accomplishments and it could promote awareness of the significance of intelligence.

CONCLUSION

I, therefore, recommend that we take steps to establish a Joint Committee on the Intelligence Community, which would concern itself with the legislative oversight and authorization of activities vital to the intelligence arm of our national operations. I am introducing a concurrent resolution to that effect at the conclusion of these remarks.

Membership on this Joint Committee would include designated members of the respective Committees on Foreign Affairs and Foreign Relations; the two Armed Services Committees; the Joint Economic Committee, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Activities and the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, and the Committees on Government Operations.

Members of each of these committees would be appointed to fill the vacancy on the Joint Committee on the Intelligence Community by the Speaker of the House or the President of the Senate, as the case may be. Nothing in this resolution would derogate from the authority of the Central Intelligence Agency subcommittees of the respective Committees

On Appropriations to review appropriations for that agency.

We must improve the oversight of and the functioning of the intelligence arm of our Government. This is a world of revolution and chaos. We talk a great deal about revolution, but we seldom face up to its challenge. We talk about rising aspirations, and we look anxiously to a social and economic system that will meet those needs. We believe in stability. But the facts of the cold war are that one power seeks to irritate and aggravate social tensions, to exploit injustice, to impose social and economic systems while we wait hopefully for the adoption of freedom as a way of life. These pressures, this constant attack on the status quo, is what characterizes the Soviet threat.

Intelligence operations are at their best in just such a chaotic condition. They seek both to create such conditions and to exploit them. This is a lesson that communism learned well. By preventing the attainment of stability, by encouraging dissatisfaction with those systems that work honestly toward that goal, communism creates a desire for order at all costs and it moves to take advantage of that feeling.

If this no man's land is so suitable for such operations, why doesn't the West seek to exploit them as well? Partly because the West declines to exploit misery and partly because the West seeks stability and therefore refrains from activities which would tend to destroy it. Yet it must be painfully clear to many that we are refusing battle when we do that, refusing to meet a direct challenge from the forces of confusion. We must determine whether we must first meet such challenges and conquer them so that we create the conditions in which such stability can be nourished.

This is an undercover war, a gray area of unrecognizable enemies. In this area, intelligence operations constitute the only nonpassive weapon at the disposal of any government. If properly used, it can obtain information of vital significance to national policy, it can covertly implement such policy in areas where orthodox diplomacy is chained, it can eliminate enemy surprises of both a political and military nature, and it can attack and defeat communism and force it on the defensive.

I know there is a feeling this can be done with social and economic weapons. The cold war, the protracted war, are all expressions of a feeling that we must find and fight the aggressive expansionism of communism with every resource at our command. But these programs, too, avoid coming to grips with the force that is used to promote instability and chaos to defeat them.

Without meeting this challenge, the United States will continue to be forced back on a line beyond which it cannot retreat—and a line on which it could have a choice of total war or nothing. The proper use of functional intelligence is a vigorous weapon in the hands of freedom, and one that deserves to be employed.

To be employed properly, it must be made of good material, honed to the best

1961

degree, and controlled at all times. This, in a democratic society, is a major responsibility. It calls for a joint congressional committee to discharge this awesome responsibility.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. FEIGHAN'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix].

PATRICK HAYES, AMERICA'S LEADING CULTURAL STATESMAN, SPEAKS OUT ON THE FEDERAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON THE ARTS

(Mr. KEARNS (at the request of Mr. LANGEN) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, in his 1955 message on the state of the Union President Eisenhower urged the Congress to enact into law legislation to establish a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

President Eisenhower said:

In the advancement of the various activities which will make our civilization endure and flourish, the Federal Government should do more to give official recognition to the importance of the arts and other cultural activities.

During the presidential campaign last fall Vice President Richard M. Nixon strongly endorsed the proposed Federal Advisory Council on the Arts. In the Saturday Review of October 29, 1960, Vice President Nixon wrote:

This Council should make recommendations to the President and Congress as to the best line of Federal action in support of artistic endeavor. It might also be helpful in suggesting steps by which State and local governments might stimulate private cultural activities.

Legislation to create such a Council has been introduced in Congress with broad bipartisan backing. I support this idea and will work for its passage.

In the same issue of the Saturday Review President Kennedy declared:

The platform of the Democratic Party proposes a Federal advisory agency to assist in the evaluation, development, and expansion of cultural resources of the United States. We shall support legislation needed to provide incentives for those endowed with extraordinary talent as a worthy supplement to existing scholarship programs.

If the people send me to the White House, I shall push this program. A gifted child deserves the finest education this Nation can provide. He is a national asset, whether his gift is to paint, write, design a jet airliner or a dramatic set, or explore the cosmos with a radio telescope. His worth cannot be estimated in the ledgers of the budgeteers.

Legislation to establish a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts passed the Senate without opposition in 1956 under the cosponsorship of Senator Herbert H. Lehman, Democrat, and Senator H. Alexander Smith, Republican.

Undoubtedly, if President Kennedy had shown the same interest in, and zeal for this legislation which President Eisenhower has consistently shown this legislation would be on the statute books today. He has not lifted a finger to get this bill passed. He has not pushed for it, as he promised he would.

Unlike President Eisenhower, President Kennedy has not spoken out in support of the Federal Advisory Council on the Arts. He did not refer to it in his 1961 message on the state of the Union. He has not referred to this legislation since the people sent him to the White House. He has not yet pushed this legislation himself in any way which is discernible to the naked eye. Our cultural leaders want to know, and they are asking, why? He let our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, carry the heavy burden of this legislation alone on the floor of the House on September 20, and September 21. The Senate, completely controlled by the Democrats, has not even held hearings on Senator Humphrey's Fine Arts Council bill. Why?

One can only wonder what President Kennedy had in mind when he promised the American people:

If the people send me to the White House, I shall push this program.

When is the President going to begin to push this program? In 1962? In 1963? In 1964? A whole year, nearly, has passed, and no push is in sight.

Was this only campaign oratory, or campaign rhetoric? Or will the President ask the Congress to enact it when he delivers his 1962 state of the Union message?

Certainly the Soviet Union is pushing its art programs, and they are exporting them to this country to influence our citizens. The Soviet Union is exporting its programs to other nations, as well, in a coldly calculated attempt to win friends and influence people around the world.

The Soviet Union is supporting the arts at home. We do not agree with what they are doing with the arts, but we are doing very little to counteract it, and we are doing nothing at all to support our own arts at home.

In the October 1961 issue of McCall's magazine the great playwright, a former colleague, Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce, wife of the great publisher of Time and Life magazines, Henry Luce, writes that our Government does less toward the support of art and culture than any civilized nation. She points out that Soviet Russia spends a great deal on cultural programs. To win the cold war, says Mrs. Luce, "we must gain ascendancy over the minds of men."

However, says Mrs. Luce, "We have sorely neglected the role of a nation's art and culture play in accomplishing this."

I include the editorial by Mrs. Luce in the October 1961 issue of McCall's, to which I have referred, and the text of the Sunday, September 24, 1961, broadcast by Patrick Hayes, our Nation's leading cultural statesman, over radio station WGMS, Washington, D.C.'s good

music station, dealing with the Federal Advisory Council on the Arts

[From McCall's magazine, October 1961]

PORTFOLIO

(By Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce)

Our Government does less toward the support of art and culture than any civilized nation. In fact, almost nothing. Soviet Russia spends a great deal on cultural programs, and all the free nations of Europe subsidize, to some extent, their art and artists. To win the cold war, we must gain ascendancy over the minds of men. We have sorely neglected the role of a nation's art and culture play in accomplishing this. We have impressed people by our intellectual attainments, material possessions (including armaments), and power. But it is only through a nation's arts and literature that other nations discover it has a soul.

Although we have created a great political and economic democracy, we have not yet created a great cultural democracy—a democracy that vigorously, consciously, and purposefully helps bring the enduring values of the arts into our own daily lives as well as to the peoples of other lands. I think, however, that the United States is on the eve of a tremendous and fruitful cultural explosion, which could be triggered by Government recognition and support of the performing and other arts.

Congressmen have been battling public apathy (and private pressures) ever since I can remember, in an effort to provide Federal encouragement to cultural activities. A great deal of legislation has been introduced in Congress toward this important goal. In his 1955 state of the Union message, President Eisenhower said, "The Federal Government should do more to give official recognition to the importance of the arts and other cultural activities." He proposed a permanent Federal Advisory Commission, under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The proposal passed the Senate but was too late for action in the House.

[From Radio Station WGMS, Washington, D.C., Sept. 24, 1961]

THE FEDERAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON THE ARTS (By Patrick Hayes)

I now turn to that awesome document, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, of last Wednesday, September 20, volume 197, No. 166—the 87th Congress, 1st session, page 19266. Topic: "Federal Advisory Council on the Arts." Congressman FRANK THOMPSON of New Jersey arose and said:

"Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 4172 to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts to assist in the growth and development of the fine arts in the Nation's Capital and elsewhere in the United States, as amended."

Then the Clerk read the entire bill, with which all of you are generally familiar from more than a few mentions in his Sunday commentary and from articles in the Washington press.

After a brief exchange between Congressman Gross, of Iowa, and Congressman KEARNS, of Pennsylvania, about a second to the motion, Mr. THOMPSON gave a brief summary of the background and purposes of the bill—pointing out that the proposed Advisory Council was originally recommended by former President Eisenhower and is now recommended by President Kennedy; that the Council was to be advisory only, to aid and encourage the Nation's cultural development; that no appropriation was requested other than enough to support a small staff within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, about \$100,000. Then Mr. KEARNS made a point of order that a quorum was not

present. He agreed to withdraw the point of order on condition that Mr. Gross would withdraw his demand for a second to the motion.

Mr. THOMPSON then revealed that the House Committee on Education and Labor had approved the bill for full consideration by the House of Representatives.

Then two cosponsors of the bill, both Republicans from New York, Congressmen HALPERN and LINDSAY, spoke eloquently in support of the bill. Mr. HALPERN said that the bill would have an important impact on American cultural activities, pointing out that such recognition of the arts in America is long overdue, and that creative cultural activity would be encouraged—and at the same time the legislation should by no means be considered an attempt to direct the course of creativity nor regarded as a Government-regulated program of artistic endeavor.

Then Mr. KEARNS, long a champion of such legislation in support of the arts in America, spoke at length in favor of the bill. He referred to the published statements by both Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Nixon last fall when both were candidates for the Presidency—both highly in favor of such a step. Then still others spoke in favor—pointing to the long and impressive list of citizens who have testified, in person and by mail, including Governor Rockefeller, of New York.

At this point in the proceedings it is clearly established that the bill has solid bipartisan support. An impressive group of Democrats and Republicans are for it.

Then Congressman Gross spoke as follows: "Mr. Speaker, I do not know too much about the arts, but I do know we are more than \$290 billion in the red in this country; that we are spending \$9 billion a year on interest on that debt; we are already in the hole in this fiscal year, less than 3 months old, to the extent of 6 billion, according to the Secretary of the Treasury, and we will be lucky to get out by June 30 of next year, the end of the present fiscal year, with less than \$10 billion additional to the Federal debt, according to the estimates of some people who ought to have a good idea of what is going on financially. I am sure the spending of \$100,000 each year for this purpose, for culture, can very well wait until we have a balanced budget in this country and start retiring the Federal debt. I just do not see any necessity for this kind of business at this time."

Even if you are a speed reader, you pause when you come to a passage like that one. Then Congressman SMITH of Virginia spoke, saying: "The thing that troubles me is—and since it was brought to the floor this afternoon I have asked everybody that seemed to know anything about this bill—What are the arts? And there is where I display my ignorance. I do not know. What does it include? What is it about? I suppose fiddle players would be in the arts and the painting of pictures would be in the arts. It was suggested that poker playing was an artful occupation. Is this going to subsidize poker players that get into trouble?"

Mr. GROSS. I agree with the gentleman. I, too, am troubled—perhaps because I do not understand and appreciate all the arts and culture.

Then for five full, three-column pages of fine print the argument goes on. There is patient explanation that it is not a subsidy bill, it is an advisory measure, it is a step to dignify and recognize an important segment of the national life. Points were made about possible conflict of interest in the case of members of the proposed council. The discussion veered off into an analysis of why the Metropolitan Opera was nearly closed for the coming season.

Then on page 19274 I find that I personally got into the discussion, with two quotations, one from testimony before Congressman THOMPSON'S subcommittee and one from a

broadcast about New York State's partial-subsidy program now in effect in music, dance, and theater. My remarks were affirmative—I am in favor of a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts, as sponsored by Congressman THOMPSON and KEARNS and a host of others in both parties. Now we come to the final stage of the floor debate in the House:

"The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4172, as amended?"

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. Gross) there were 44 yeas; 36 nays.

Since a two-thirds majority was required for passage, the bill lost. Then Mr. THOMPSON spoke:

"Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present."

"The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the order of the House of September 18 further proceedings on this bill will be postponed until tomorrow."

This meant that the bill had one more chance. There was a vote on Thursday. Again a two-thirds majority was required. It wasn't even close. There was not even a simple majority in favor of the bill—the vote was seven less than a simple majority. It is hard to find the words with which to encourage Congressman THOMPSON and KEARNS and the others to keep up the good fight. We do thank them for their valiant labors in the vineyard.

(Mr. OSTERTAG (at the request of Mr. LANGEN) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. OSTERTAG'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. OSTERTAG (at the request of Mr. LANGEN) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. OSTERTAG'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. ROUSSELOT (at the request of Mr. LANGEN) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. ROUSSELOT'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TAX BILL

(Mr. BRADEMAS (at the request of Mr. JOHN W. DAVIS) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, on Friday I voted to reject the conference

report on H.R. 258, the District of Columbia tax bill. I based my objection to this bill primarily on the understanding given to many Members of the House that to include the District of Columbia in Public Law 874 would substantially decrease the monies available to other areas now receiving aid under the impacted area program.

I have been assured, however, by the Office of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that the funds provided in the supplemental appropriations bill now pending before Congress will be sufficient so that, at the very least, there would be a reduction of only 2 percent for each jurisdiction, and that it is probable that each jurisdiction will receive its full entitlement.

With this explanation, there is now reason to believe that other impacted areas in the United States will not suffer if H.R. 258 is enacted. In view of the fact that adequate funds for education in the District of Columbia were not passed by Congress in the District of Columbia appropriations bill this year, and because I feel a responsibility to the young people of our Nation's Capital, I shall support the conference report at this time, even though the bill as it now stands is not ideal.

FORTY-EIGHT BANK MERGERS PENDING BEFORE FEDERAL BANKING AGENCIES

(Mr. PATMAN (at the request of Mr. JOHN W. DAVIS) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, September 22, I sent letters to the Comptroller of the Currency, the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, requesting a list of all bank merger applications pending before these agencies. My purpose in making this request was to supply Members of Congress with a list of such bank merger applications, so that a close watch can be made, pending the changeover in the Comptroller's office. It would be contrary to the public interest to rush through a lot of bank mergers during this interim period without full consideration of the various factors the agencies are expected to examine, including particularly the effect on competition or tendency to monopoly.

In all, there are 48 bank mergers now pending before the 3 agencies. The breakdown is as follows:

Pending	Opinion of Department of Justice			
	Adverse	No objection	No report	
Comptroller of the Currency.....	28	18	4	6
Federal Reserve Board.....	11	7	1	3
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.....	9	1	5	3
Total.....	48	26	10	12

SENDER WILL CHECK CLASSIFICATION TOP AND BOTTOM
 UNCLASSIFIED CONFIDENTIAL SECRET

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP

TO	NAME AND ADDRESS	INITIALS	DATE
1	Inspector General		
2	<i>Leg Cunn.</i>		
3			
4			
5			
6			

<input type="checkbox"/>	ACTION	<input type="checkbox"/>	DIRECT REPLY	<input type="checkbox"/>	PREPARE REPLY
<input type="checkbox"/>	APPROVAL	<input type="checkbox"/>	DISPATCH	<input type="checkbox"/>	RECOMMENDATION
<input type="checkbox"/>	COMMENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	FILE	<input type="checkbox"/>	RETURN
<input type="checkbox"/>	CONCURRENCE	<input type="checkbox"/>	INFORMATION	<input type="checkbox"/>	SIGNATURE

Remarks: *Dahlquist's Comments*
 Kirk: *in Comg Record on 9/26/61*

The Director wondered whether you had seen this, what you thought of it, and what action, if any, should be taken. He said he would like to bring this up at the Deputies' Meeting on Monday, 2 October.

No action

FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO SENDER

FROM: NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NO.	DATE
EO/DCI/ <input type="checkbox"/>	30 Sep 61

STAT

STAT

STAT

STAT