

scorn as the wrecker of the foreign aid program.

The truth seems to be, however, that Mr. PASSMAN knows more about the foreign aid program than any President has had an opportunity to know for the simple reason that he has studied it longer and in more detail.

He has handled the foreign aid appropriation for 9 consecutive years. Mr. PASSMAN is not a liberal; he is a conventional Louisianian, but with a flair for rather rakish attire and an endless patience in coping with one of the really big practical problems of modern government.

It is only a slight exaggeration to say that officials of the foreign aid program would much prefer it if neither Congress nor the public knew much about its activities, except the puff stories on its great achievements which are not inconsiderable.

The official attitude about foreign aid is that it is an instrument of foreign policy used by the President under his constitutional authority to direct this policy. What flows from that conception is that Congress should not, indeed cannot under the Constitution, interfere.

This is an impractical concept, which Mr. PASSMAN annually demonstrates to be faulty. However, much of what is done under the foreign aid program is hidden from the public. There was a time when it was a secret how the money was divided up between various countries. Even now the secrecy label is so widely used that "it looks like a ticker tape parade when you see us lifting secret and classified stuff in the hearings."

Every now and then a little something leaks out, like Lebanese bulls with nine stalls apiece or extra wives for Kenyan Government officials, or air-conditioned Cadillacs for Middle Eastern potentates. A suffering public has become more or less conditioned to this kind of thing and would not abandon foreign aid for this alone. Nor is it likely that the public as a whole would end all foreign aid, however much annoyed it may become over waste and incomprehensible spending abroad when there is so much that needs improvement in this country.

But it is clear that a majority in Congress believes that the country wants to go slower on foreign aid, be more selective, be more certain that definite policy aims are being pursued toward a useful conclusion.

Every year for 9 years the clamor has come from the White House and the Department of State that any cutback will wreck our foreign policy. And any time there is a cut our foreign policy never seems to be demonstrably better or worse off.

A few facts are useful in this connection. In the last 8 years Congress has reduced the White House budget requests by more than \$6.5 billion. Yet every year more money was appropriated than foreign aid officials could use. The so-called pipeline funds from past years which are committed to continuing projects now amount to more than \$7 billion. Foreign aid could go on for several years without another penny of appropriation.

It is not uncommon for officials to make huge allocations of their funds in the last 2 or 3 days of a fiscal year so that they won't have any uncommitted money left, and can claim they are emptyhanded in meeting the world's challenges.

Last year the White House, the State Department, and the Defense Department all said our foreign policy was being wrecked by a billion-dollar cut. Yet these agencies finished the fiscal year with a total of \$744 million of unobligated funds on their hands.

Basically, the facts do not support any contention that Congress has either wrecked the foreign aid program or really harmed it. Nor does the contention hold water any longer that the Russians are rushing in where we pull out. The Russians have had their own serious problems with foreign aid.

This appears to be one case where instinctive public reactions are right; that we have been spending too much on foreign aid and not getting enough out of it.

The CIA is too much a law unto itself. For its own good, and the country's, it should be curbed and put under constant check.

CIA Needs Watchdog Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1964

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, day by day the evidence mounts that a congressional watchdog committee on the Central Intelligence Agency is needed; and day by day public support grows for the creation of such a committee.

Created as a central agency to gather and analyze intelligence information, the CIA has, all too often, been guilty of formulating foreign policy.

Recently, former President Truman, under whom the CIA was first organized, expressed his belief that the CIA had strayed off course and should be made to adhere to the original purpose for which it was created.

I could not agree more. For the reasons set forth by President Truman and other constructive critics of the CIA, I have introduced legislation into every Congress since 1953 calling for the creation of a Joint Congressional Committee on the CIA.

My bill, House Concurrent Resolution 2, currently is pending before the House Rules Committee. I urge my colleagues on that committee to consider this resolution and companion bills as soon as possible.

Further, under permission granted, I include an editorial from the January 4 issue of the Milwaukee Journal calling on Congress to approve a committee such as that proposed in House Concurrent Resolution 2.

TRUMAN: CIA OFF TRACK

Former President Truman has added his doubts to many others about the operations of the Central Intelligence Agency. And he speaks with authority, for the CIA was organized during his presidency to serve the needs of his office.

As organized, Truman says, the CIA was to bring together intelligence information available to all branches of Government, evaluate and interpret it for the President. It was never meant, Truman says, to "be injected into peacetime cloak and dagger operations." It was never meant to make policy.

CIA activities have frequently been embarrassing to this country in the last decade. In numerous instances the Agency actually has worked counter to our foreign policy. Certainly we need no agency to work to subvert foreign governments—yet the record indicates that the CIA has done that very thing.

Truman is quick to acknowledge the patriotism and the dedication of CIA officials. He just thinks they have been off the track. The Agency, he says, should return to its basic job of gathering and assessing intelligence for the use of the policymakers.

In connection with this, the proposal that the CIA be audited by a special committee of Congress, just as the Atomic Energy Commission is, deserves congressional approval.

No Compromise on Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1964

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the Record the following Chicago Daily News editorial of January 13, which briefly but concisely analyzes the background of the Panama crisis and recommends a firm stand by the United States:

NO COMPROMISE ON CANAL

Facing the first international crisis of his administration, President Johnson was understandably eager to fill the role of peacemaker in Panama. We have some qualms, however, that his eagerness led him to concessions he may regret.

It was essential to seek an end to violence and bloodshed. It was also essential to deal with the political overtones that quickly came to the fore. But neither howling mobs nor demagogic politicians are likely to be deterred by weakness, and in Panama the United States has exhibited more weakness than strength.

Why should we adopt an almost apologetic attitude either in the United Nations or in the Organization of American States for trying to protect Americans from Panamanian attack? Nothing more than self-defense was involved, and the loss of American lives and the extensive destruction of U.S. property are ample evidence that we were more timid in exercising that right than the circumstances justified.

The mobs that stormed the U.S.-controlled Canal Zone were organized too well and too quickly to qualify as an accident. The Government of Panama has incited the people against Americans in the Canal Zone year after year, for its own political benefit, and this is its harvest. There is good reason to believe that Castro-Communists joined the attacks, if they did not help instigate them in the first place.

Panama's quick break in diplomatic relations, and the immediate demand for control of the canal, seemed well rehearsed. And, as might have been predicted, the Soviet bloc plus the anti-American clique in the Latin republics joined in the howl against American "imperialism."

It is clearly true that the history of the Panama Canal is somewhat checkered, and that conditions have changed since the United States engineered both the canal and the creation of the Republic of Panama. But it is also true that in recent years the United States has made many concessions to appease the Panamanians.

If there are other negotiable grievances, they can be settled around the conference table when things quiet down again. But nothing should be conceded in an atmosphere of bloodshed and blackmail, for to do so is to invite more of the same not only in Panama but elsewhere.

In particular, U.S. ownership and control of the Panama Canal must not be regarded as negotiable. If it takes a show of strength to shut off the threats to the canal, let strength be shown. That, at least, is something everybody understands—and it is more likely to win respect than a willingness to be everybody's doormat.

1964

Slandering Congress Is Slandering Our System of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most widely played indoor game in the United States is that of slandering the Congress. It is not a new game. It has been played with great fervor and spirit ever since we became a nation.

Usually, but not always, the tide of slander arises because Congress has refused to act as a rubberstamp for a popular President.

The torrent of abuse that is being poured out against the Congress today is not unprecedented, but it is serious and it is growing in its intensity. Newspaper cartoonists delight in picturing Members of the legislative branch either as egocentric clowns or as mindless slugs. National columnists, ridicule the Congress unmercifully because we do not throw our doubts and our convictions out the window and vote instantly for measures of which the columnists personally approve. Since most newspapermen are somewhat more liberal in their politics than the average American, their scorn usually falls heaviest on legislators whom they consider to be conservative.

There is a dangerous tendency to judge a Congress merely by the amount of legislation it passes. Too many commentators are interested in quantity, not quality. If a Congress refuses to pass a flock of laws, regardless of their merit, it is inevitably tagged with the "do nothing" label, and the inference is that its leaders are weaklings and its Members timewasters.

Such people confuse progress with mere motion. When a man spins around in a revolving door, Mr. Speaker, he is not making progress. Neither is he making progress when he falls down a flight of stairs.

Because we have moved with deliberation in areas of enormous importance to the Nation and to the free world we have been accused of weakness. Our procedures have been a sign, not of weakness, but of strength. The Congress is a continuing body with roots sunk deep in every corner of the land. The Members of Congress collectively know far better than anyone else what the people of the country think and what they want and what they are saying. It is my considered opinion that the average American citizen is less liberal in his thinking than most of the columnists and commentators would like him to be. And I am absolutely certain that the average American citizen does not want his Congress to plunge the Nation swiftly into vast and continuing programs as a result of hysterical snap decisions made at the behest of the executive branch.

As we all know, our Government was founded on a system of checks and balances. The executive branch sometimes acts as a check on the impulsiveness of the legislative branch, and vice versa. During the past 2 years the 88th Congress has been a wholesome and restraining influence upon Executive exuberance.

By acting with thoughtful deliberation we are making certain that human rights are being preserved; that property is being properly protected, and that individual liberty is not being imperiled by expediency.

Over the centuries, Congress has built a structure of laws upon a foundation of precedence. Because we have built this structure with thoughtful deliberation, it is the soundest legislative structure in the world today.

Our critics, Mr. Speaker, make the claim that our refusal to act impulsively is proof that our legislative processes are not efficient. Although I deny the allegation, I also maintain that bloodless efficiency is not the sole aim, or even the principal aim, of Government. A representative democracy, such as ours, is not nearly as efficient according to your definition of efficient, as a Fascist or a Communist despotism, where the merest whims of the dictator have the iron effect of law. But who would exchange the comparatively inefficient freedom of this land of ours for the prisonlike efficiency of the slave state?

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that the value of a Congress should not be measured merely by the number of bills it passes. In many cases, as we all know, it takes harder work and a great deal more courage to resist legislation than it does to ride complacently with the tide. It also takes courage to insist upon the thoughtful shaping and refinement of legislation so that it will achieve the maximum good for the maximum number of people, when the strident voices of the propagandists are demanding that we pass it instantly, without debate or deliberation. It takes courage, in short, "to keep one's head when all about are losing theirs, and blaming it on you."

This is not the spectacular brand of courage, but it is something immensely valuable to the Nation. It is the brand of courage that the 88th Congress has exhibited in abundance.

The fact that we have been able to do so, Mr. Speaker, is a tribute to your own firm and understanding leadership.

I am proud of being a Member of the 88th Congress and I deeply resent the libels and slanders that the irresponsible propagandists for instant legislation have been throwing at us.

And, Mr. Speaker, it is heartening to know that there is a growing segment of the Nation's press that is beginning to appreciate the value of the 88th Congress. Under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD two recent examples of such constructive thinking:

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News,
Jan. 3, 1964]

IN DEFENSE OF CONGRESS

Barely 30 hours before the end of the old year, Congress adjourned—if that's what you can call it. It might be more correct to say

that Congress has recessed, since the 1st session of the 88th Congress set a peacetime longevity record and allowed only 8 days of vacation for the legislators before the 2d session is called to order January 7.

There has been a tremendous amount of criticism leveled against Congress lately for being slow and failing to enact legislation. Most of this criticism is unfair.

Americans for Democratic Action refers to Congress as the "iceberg on Capitol Hill," charging that it is run by a "reactionary-conservative" coalition. Roy Wilkins of the NAACP says Negroes are "disenchanted" with the whole legislative process.

Walter Lippmann, in a recent column, goes so far as to charge that the "88th Congress has been paralyzed by * * * a conspiracy to suspend representative government." He adds, referring to efforts by Congress to prohibit credit guarantees for sale of wheat to Red nations, that the legislative branch has been attempting to usurp the President's constitutional power to conduct our foreign relations.

Such charges are not altogether valid. With respect to the wheat deal, as one of our readers pointed out in a letter on this page Wednesday, article I, section 8 of the Constitution grants Congress the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations." How can Congress be engaged in "a conspiracy to suspend representative government" when it is essentially the most representative branch of government?

Congress is closer to the people than the President or the Court can ever be.

The fact that Congress has refused to grant certain Presidential requests or failed to act on others does not mean that we have a "do-nothing" Congress, as frequently charged. It might, and often does, mean that Congress thinks some of these requests are not in the best interest of the Nation. Or it might mean simply there have been too many requests.

Every year the President asks more of Congress, and in the last session the administration kept coming back with the same requests for second and third tries after initial attempts to win congressional approval failed.

Most of the people who attack the congressional seniority system, the power of committees and the rules of Congress have been extremely hypocritical.

When seniority, committee power, and the rules are used to promote liberal legislation, the liberal critics are not loud with their complaints. They make noise usually when these factors work against legislation they would like to have passed.

One thing is sure: The next session will be shorter. Though the number of requests in the President's program may be greater than ever before—with a civil rights bill and tax cut proposals left over, plus a revival of medicare and other issues to come up—Congressmen from both parties, both liberals and conservatives, will be anxious to adjourn early to go home for the primaries, the conventions and the politicking for next November.

CONGRESS AND THE AID PROGRAM—PASSMAN'S BATTLES BELIEVED REFLECTIONS OF PUBLIC REACTION TO WASTE SPENDING

(By Richard Wilson)

OTTO ERNEST PASSMAN, 63, is a Congressman from Louisiana. Annually, Mr. PASSMAN gets into a fight with the White House over spending for foreign aid. He is chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee which handles this troublesome item.

It is usually said that Mr. PASSMAN is trying to superimpose his judgment on that of four Presidents of the United States and any number of other outstanding personalities. This devastating remark is supposed to crush Mr. PASSMAN and hold him up to public

panies of America and, as a matter of fact, Project Gasoline was initially begun by one of the major coal producers of America. So there is a great deal of research, a lot of which has been encouraged by the Federal Government. May I say to the gentleman that in addition to the research projects, coal mined by automation has attempted to make itself more competitive. The price of coal today is less per ton than it was in 1947. All of the factors along the line economically with respect to coal have been rather stable, but when we continually lose great market areas such as New England—and I for one would not for 1 minute say that we have to turn all of New England back to the private domain of coal; I do not suggest that at all but simply say in my remarks we ought to have a level which this should not go beyond. In other words, the continual raiding of markets, no matter how swift our research might be or how vastly improved automation in the mining of coal becomes, makes it hard for us to keep pace when they take the markets away from us in such an unfair competitive situation.

Mr. WHARTON. Then, the gentleman would say these programs are definitely worthwhile in making the statement from your own personal experience?

Mr. MOORE. With respect to research, I hold out great hope for the fact that the programs which are now undertaken and the various contracts that the Office of Coal Research has engaged in, will make a major contribution which would encourage a greater use of coal in many areas of the country.

Mr. WHARTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MOORE. I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

CIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

(Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important agencies of our Government, particularly during this period of international uncertainties and anxieties, is our Central Intelligence Agency.

The time has long since arrived when someone should take cognizance of the baseless criticism that has been and continues to be heaped upon it. That is my purpose here today, as a member of the CIA Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services since its establishment. I do not purport to speak as an authority on all the functions and activities of the CIA. But I do presume to speak with some factual knowledge about the CIA as an organization and how it functions.

I do not mean to imply that the CIA should be above criticism. No agency of Government should be above criticism. Constructive criticism makes for improvement, and there is always room for improvement.

But much of the criticism directed at the CIA is not constructive. It cannot possibly be, as it is not based on facts. It is based on half-truths and distortions. Indeed, some of it constitutes complete untruths, with no foundation whatever in fact or in reason. This is what concerns me. Something once said, however false, is readily oft-repeated and in time is accepted as a fact although an outright falsehood. And we know there are those who would, if they could, discredit the CIA. Others of us, having no such intention, unwittingly become their victims.

Let me present one illustration. I refer to the much publicized, much discussed case of the Polish defector, Michal Goleniewski. I refer to the irresponsible series of articles concerning the CIA that has been recently published in the New York Journal American.

Among these wild accusations is that the CIA has attempted to prevent Michal Goleniewski from appearing before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. They go so far as to charge that the CIA has quashed subpoenas. That simply is not true. A simple telephone call to the chairman of that subcommittee would have brought forth the information that going back to last August, when the first subpoena was served on this man, the executive branch of the Government has been cooperative with the Senate subcommittee throughout.

Contrary to what has been reported in the press, the postponements of Michal Goleniewski's appearance before the Senate subcommittee were at the request of the man himself. And the subcommittee agreed to his request.

I might add that the CIA subcommittee, of which I am a member, went into every aspect of this case. I am personally satisfied that the publicized statements purported to come from Michal Goleniewski are not correct. The information as reported in the press is not in agreement with the information Michal Goleniewski has made available to many departments of Government.

Stories such as have been circulated on this case display a reckless regard of the truth. They can be harmful, and those who circulate them do a great disservice to maintaining public confidence in the CIA.

Before commenting further with respect to the CIA and unfounded criticisms of it, perhaps I should first take cognizance of the criticism of the CIA Subcommittee, of which I am a member. It is quite understandable that some Members of Congress might feel we are not as well acquainted with the operations of the CIA as we should be. No one, except members of the subcommittee itself, has any knowledge of just how extensively and intensively we inquire into the activities of this intelligence agency. We hold no public hearings. We issue no reports. We cannot do otherwise and preserve the effectiveness of the CIA as a secret fact-gathering agency on an international scale. We can only hope that the House has sufficient confidence in our subcommittee, as individuals and as a committee, to accept

our assurances that we are kept well informed and we have no hesitancy of keeping a close eye and ear on CIA operations.

I was very much distressed to read an article in Esquire magazine written by a distinguished Member of Congress—one of the best and one of my good friends—in which he says:

The members of four subcommittees themselves, by definition, have relatively low status.

Not because I am a member of one of those subcommittees, but for the other members of our Armed Services Subcommittee on CIA, I must take exception to the implication of that statement as to their status.

The membership of our subcommittee is comprised of the distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]; the distinguished ranking majority member, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS]; and another distinguished ranking member, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT]. Serving with them are the other very distinguished members: The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT], the gentleman from California [Mr. WILSON], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUBLESTON], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. OSMERS].

I am not at liberty to announce the members of the other subcommittees in the Congress dealing with CIA matters; but I can assure the House they are not "by definition, of relatively low status."

The article to which I refer goes on to state:

But even had those subcommittees both status and time, the difficulties involved in dividing jurisdiction among them would, I think, be insuperable.

This point deserves analysis. Since the proposed solution to the matter of low status and little time would be to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence, several questions arise.

In addition to CIA, there are other intelligence activities which are component parts of the Department of Defense, the Department of State and the Atomic Energy Commission. I do not believe that the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the Armed Services Committee or the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy would be likely to relinquish their responsibilities for legislative oversight of the components of those departments which are presently under their jurisdiction. We would thus be establishing a Joint Committee on Foreign Intelligence that would, in fact, be superimposed on the existing committees and subcommittees. This brief analysis does not begin to delve into the jurisdictional problems that would thus be raised within the congressional committee structure and the Congress itself.

In the same Esquire article it is asserted in connection with the Bay of Pigs situation, and I now quote, "Not only was CIA shaping policy—perhaps understandable because of the absence

of direction from policymaking organs of the Government—but that policy was patently at odds with State Department thinking." The author of the article then adds that he does not wish to fully rehearse the events which preceded the Bay of Pigs, nor do I. This accusation, however, is not founded in fact but, on the contrary, is flatly inconsistent with the truth. It will be recalled that the White House issued a statement on April 24, 1961, saying:

President Kennedy has stated from the beginning that as President he bears sole responsibility for the events of the past few days. He has stated it on all occasions and he restates it now so that it will be understood by all. The President is strongly opposed to anyone within or without the administration attempting to shift the responsibility.

To assume or assert that CIA shaped policy and then executed it when that policy was at odds with the official policy of the Department of State not only demonstrates a lack of knowledge of the coordination and control procedures in the executive branch but further implies that the Director of Central Intelligence or other officials of the CIA are violating their oath of office by willfully disregarding the views and instructions of the President. Based on my knowledge, the assertion and implications of the statement are false.

The Esquire article indicates the author's recognition that a high degree of secrecy is essential to the workings of the intelligence community and with this I agree. But the article continues by saying there are dangers if public confidence in the intelligence establishment erodes. The article continues by stating:

[Such erosion] is less likely if a body of the people's representatives properly constituted and carefully chosen by the leadership of the two Houses of Congress remains continuously aware of the activities of the intelligence community.

Based on my long-term membership of the CIA Subcommittee, I again can assure the House that the subcommittee has been continuously aware of agency activities. I must reemphasize that this subcommittee in fact is properly constituted and carefully chosen by the distinguished chairman of this committee.

The statement has been made that CIA meddles in policy. This is an often heard allegation about the Agency, but the facts do not support it. CIA is an indirection from the policymakers. The late President Kennedy commented on this in October 1963 when irresponsible sources were alleging that CIA was making policy in Vietnam. He said:

I must say I think the reports are wholly untrue. The fact of the matter is that Mr. McCone sits in the National Security Council. I imagine I see him at least three or four times a week, ordinarily. We have worked very closely together in the National Security Council in the last 2 months attempting to meet the problems we face in South Vietnam. I can find nothing, and I have looked through the record very carefully over the last 9 months, and I could go back further, to indicate that the CIA has done anything but support policy. It does not create policy; it attempts to execute it in those areas where it has competence and responsibility.

The President went on to say:

I can just assure you flatly that the CIA has not carried out independent activities but has operated under close control of the Director of Central Intelligence, operating with the cooperation of the National Security Council and under my instructions. So I think while the CIA may have made mistakes, as we all do, on different occasions, and has had many successes which may go unheralded, in my opinion in this case it is unfair to charge them as they have been charged. I think they have done a good job.

This was President Kennedy's statement.

It has been asserted that there are no effective checks on the Agency's activities. The facts are that every activity the Agency engages in is approved in advance at the appropriate policy level. It is also said that "Crucial decisions are made for us and in our name of which we know nothing." This is not true. The subcommittee, of which I am a member, is kept informed on a current basis of the activities of the Agency and, as I mentioned before, this organization is not a decisionmaking body but one which carries out the instructions of others.

The magazine article I mentioned speaks of the personnel in the Agency, and acknowledges that CIA officials are among the most distinguished in the entire Federal establishment. With this I would readily agree. But the author of the Esquire article is in error when he says that CIA is "served by only one politically responsible officer." Both the Director and Deputy Director of the Agency are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, and I would note that all other employees of the Agency can be terminated by the Director on his own authority. The implication that they are not responsible is beneath reply. He says that CIA relies heavily on the services of retired military officers. The facts do not support this as there are very few retired military officers in the Agency. Of the top 46 executives in the Central Intelligence Agency, only two are retired military officers, and the proportion of retired military officers to professionals throughout the Agency is even smaller. He says that the Agency relies heavily on services of political refugees. It is true that it does on occasion use political refugees, but a misimpression is given here. These individuals are used when their expertise and area knowledge is required and the information they provide is extensively cross-checked against a great variety of other sources.

I would note also that my esteemed colleague in one paragraph indicates that the daily chore of coordinating and cross-checking intelligence data is the responsibility of the Defense Intelligence Agency. According to the National Security Act of 1947, the Central Intelligence Agency is actually charged by law with the coordination of intelligence. The law reads:

For the purpose of coordinating the intelligence activities of the several Government departments and agencies in the interest of national security, it shall be the duty of the Agency, under the direction of the National Security Council—to make recommendations to the National Security Council for the co-

ordination of such intelligence activities of the departments and agencies of the Government as relate to the national security.

As a matter of actual practice the responsibility for coordination over the years has been that of the Director of Central Intelligence, who has been supported in this regard by the CIA.

The magazine article also makes the statement that CIA is both the chief fact gatherer and the chief agency for coordination. As I have just mentioned, the Agency is charged by law with coordination, and it is also charged, and I quote:

To correlate and evaluate intelligence relating to the national security, and provide for the appropriate dissemination of such intelligence within the Government.

In effect, what this means is that the CIA takes intelligence from all different sources, departments and agencies and produces the national intelligence required by the policymakers.

During the years that I have served on the CIA Subcommittee I have sat many hours questioning the Director and other Agency officials about their activities and how they go about their work. On many occasions this subcommittee has quietly looked into some of the then current accusations against CIA.

Let me assure you, Mr. Speaker, that we have always received the information needed. Also, we have been privileged to learn of many events in the secrecy of our meetings before the events had happened.

The CIA officials who have been before our committee have at all times been responsive and frank in their discussions with us.

I do not believe that baseless charges against the CIA are serving the national interest. If there are those who have information which they believe would be of assistance to the CIA Subcommittee in its review of Agency activities let them come forward—we would welcome such information. Let me make it clear, however, that those who would expect the subcommittee then to report on its findings will be due for disappointment. By the very nature of the Agency's mission, revelation of its activities will truly destroy it.

It is my view that the establishment of CIA in 1947 by the Congress was extremely wise and showed amazing foresight into the problems that would face this country in the years to follow. The wisdom of the Congress in establishing this Agency to provide the President with the necessary information on which to base our foreign policy has been borne out by the performance of the Agency. I do not claim that the Agency has been 100-percent correct. But I do believe it has provided the President and our policymakers with the tools that they must have.

Certainly the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee of both Houses have been enabled to judge more correctly our defense needs on the basis of the information CIA has been able to provide. While the Agency is a newcomer in the history of the Nation and among its foreign counterparts, I wish to state now that it probably is the finest intelligence agency in the world

1964

6169

today. I believe that the Congress and the country should applaud the dedicated and highly professional career officers of CIA for the magnificent job they have performed over the years.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. KELLY. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding to me at this moment for a few remarks, and I hope he will answer a few questions.

I was the first one to introduce a resolution in this House in 1953 for the establishment of a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters. During my first year on the Committee on Foreign Affairs I found the need for such a committee, and in 1953, together with two of my colleagues, Congressman ZABLOCKI and Congressman Judd, I introduced a resolution to accomplish this. The purpose of my resolution was not to make charges against the CIA, or to criticize the CIA. It was an endeavor to make sure that the CIA operate properly, coordinate intelligence gathered by the various Government agencies, evaluate it, and get it to the President. I also felt that a joint committee of the Congress was the most appropriate instrument to accomplish this task and make sure that our Chief Executive receives total and full information based on the data gathered by all intelligence agencies of the Federal Government.

In 1961 I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 3 and by now I think there are several dozen Members of Congress who have introduced similar resolutions.

I want to ask the gentleman, who is a member of the Committee on Armed Forces, several questions. I am not satisfied with the performance of the CIA. I realize that all agencies of Government have problems and do not at all times meet with success in all their efforts.

When I was in Europe some years ago, Secretary of State Dulles was there at the Geneva Peace Conference, and a revolution took place in Hungary. At the same time we had an arms deal with Russia. Many people in our Government did not seem to be on top of the situation in those instances, and our Ambassador to Hungary was not there at the time.

Cuba, South Vietnam, the information that has come out of these countries in some instances, and the developments then, took the country by alarm. I think the need for a joint resolution is more important today than it ever was. I feel that had we had that resolution back in 1954 and a committee like this formed, many of these instances would not have happened. But the problem involved is that they do not trust the Members of Congress to receive this information.

I thought that in 1962 we might have a revision, because the then President, when he was a Member of the other body, had accepted the same resolution. Many others had done it. Now, when they get into the executive branch they feel there is no need to inform the Members of Congress on what is going on to insure that the proper information is collected

and sent to the proper agencies of Government.

Mr. ARENDS. I will try to answer the gentlewoman. There is a great deal of difference of opinion about that matter. The gentlewoman stated there are shortcomings in the CIA, which I mentioned in my speech, and that certainly is true. They are human beings. I am talking of the overall picture of the value of the CIA. But in this particular respect you would have a joint committee set up between the Senate and the House, and there would be a certain number of people on that committee. I do not know how you would go about getting the information disseminated to the Members of Congress, because we will never get to the place where every Member of Congress knows exactly at all times exactly what is going on.

Then we finally get to the place where I think we have to be like the fellow who when he was asked if he could keep a secret replied, "Don't worry about me keeping a secret, you have to worry about the people I tell it to."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, supplementing the statements of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], I must say that I have seldom read an article so misleading and so replete with errors as the article to which he refers.

The Central Intelligence Agency is not a policymaking agency. It has no control or oversight of military programs. It is purely a factfinding service.

I may also add that after years of close association with the present personnel of the Agency and those who have preceded them, I do not believe there is another group of men more dedicated to duty or of higher integrity or more effective in the discharge of their assignments, than those who constitute and have constituted the personnel of this important service.

So far as its budget is concerned, it is perhaps more carefully scrutinized than any other of the estimates processed by the committee.

Necessarily, its relations to the committee and the Congress are executive. For the same reason it is not at liberty to answer the many irresponsible innuendos carried in the press and contributed to periodicals seeking the headlines.

In conclusion, may I express appreciation of the statement just made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], and at the same time may I take advantage of the opportunity to express my appreciation and warm regard for the CIA, individually and as a whole.

PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH A JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE CIA AND INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman be good enough to yield before he proceeds with his main speech?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. KELLY. I am very happy, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] has introduced a resolution similar to the one I have sponsored. I have asked the gentleman to yield at this time in order to comment on the remarks of the previous speaker. We are dealing with a problem which relates to intelligence activities that affect our national security—to the coordination and utilization of such intelligence by various departments and agencies of the Government. I do not propose that the Congress of the United States as a whole be kept fully informed on each intelligence operation, on each and every "cloak and dagger" activity, and I am sure there are many Members of the Congress who would not want to know these details. I have never sought classified information from the Atomic Energy Commission, for example, and I know there are many others among my colleagues who have likewise never sought such information. We put our trust in these matters and respect the judgment of those of our colleagues who sit on the duly constituted committees which have jurisdiction and oversight over these activities. By the same token, we feel that there should be a duly constituted congressional "watchdog" committee to oversee the affairs of the Central Intelligence Agency and of the intelligence community in general.

I thank our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY], for yielding to me and I am very appreciative of the fact that he has had articles published pointing out the need for the establishment of such a committee.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentlewoman for her statement and I should like to associate myself with her remark when she says that there is not any Member of the Congress who wants to uncover even for themselves the secrets of the CIA. Congress need not know the details of clandestine operations, the names and numbers of the players. The gentleman from Illinois in his remarks on that point entirely missed the point.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that my good friend and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois did not ask for more time than 20 minutes as I had hoped he would which would have permitted me, while he was on the well of the House, to submit to questions from the floor, instead of just reading his prepared text. It is for this reason that I asked for 30 minutes of my own, in order to permit proper debate to take place on the floor of the House on the merits or demerits of the question. The question is whether it is desirable to create a Joint Congressional Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence.

I hope the gentleman from Illinois will remain on the floor while I discuss this subject as I will have some comments to make about the speech he just made and will point out areas of disagreement and also areas of error, in my judgment.

The gentleman referred to an article that appeared in Esquire magazine

which he said was written by a "distinguished Member of the Congress" and "one of the best" and "one of my good friends." He did not identify the Member of Congress. I am the Member of Congress who wrote that article. It was based on an hour-length floor speech that I gave in the well of this House 7 months before the article appeared. It was a condensation and simplification of that floor speech. Most everything that was stated in the article had been stated on the floor of the House by me and by other Members of the Congress.

I regretted at the time that I spoke, 7 months ago, that so little attention was paid to it. I did not hear the gentleman from Illinois make any comment with respect to it and I think a debate at that time, as now, would have been a very healthy thing.

As the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] pointed out, this proposal for a joint congressional committee on the subject of intelligence community, comparable to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, has been sponsored by 19 Members of the House of Representatives—14 Democrats and 5 Republicans—which makes it bipartisan. The gentlewoman from New York introduced the proposal long ago. She is a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee and knows a good deal about this subject. Other members who have introduced this resolution are the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI]; the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO]; the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL]; the gentleman from New York, [Mr. RYAN]; our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS], who is on the floor today and who has taken a leadership position on this whole question; also the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS]; the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. HARDING]; the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UNALL]; the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT]; the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNAGAY]; the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA]; the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG]; the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE]; the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]; the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON]; the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MORRIS]; and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SIBAL].

This proposal came to a vote in the Senate, in 1956, and was defeated. It was sponsored by the distinguished Senator from Montana, Mr. MANSFIELD, now the majority leader. Among those who voted for the bill was the then Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. John F. Kennedy.

So I disagree with the implication made by the gentleman from Illinois, who, I am sorry to say, has left the floor and is no longer present, that there is something radical or irresponsible about this proposal and our reasons for being for it.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I commend the gentleman for his previous speech

on the floor and for his action in sponsoring this vitally needed legislation to form a Joint Committee on the CIA and its intelligence activities. He joins a responsible group concerned about this problem.

The Hoover Commission first looked into this problem and recommended that a special committee be formed. I do not believe anybody would say that the Hoover Commission was an irresponsible body. This Commission, after great study, considered it a necessary thing to have a watchdog committee on the CIA.

Furthermore, former President Truman, in an article in 1963, stated that he was the one who really formed this Agency and he now saw the need for it to be looked into. He said:

But there are now some searching questions that need to be answered. I, therefore, would like to see the CIA be restored to its original assignment as the intelligence arm of the President, and that whatever else it can properly perform in that special field—and that its operational duties be terminated or properly used elsewhere.

He further said:

We have grown up as a nation, respected for our free institutions and for our ability to maintain a free and open society. There is something about the way the CIA has been functioning that is casting a shadow over our historic position and I feel that we need to correct it.

Furthermore, the Washington Post, in an editorial, commented on the need for this joint committee and the fact that something needed to be done, because of the concern all of the American people have for this Agency acting without any bridle at all.

I believe it is interesting to note that one could term the Washington Post "a most liberal paper," in its viewpoints, yet it also suggests something should be done. The editorial stated:

The proposal for a congressional watchdog committee paralleling the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is neither novel nor rash. The Hoover Commission strongly urged the creation of such a committee. The chief proponent in Congress in years past was Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, who on three occasions introduced the needed legislation. And the idea is alive again in Congress, as it should be.

No other intelligence agency in the free world has the scope and nonaccountability enjoyed by the CIA. In Great Britain, the CIA's counterpart is directly answerable to Cabinet officers, who in turn must face the scrutiny of Parliament. In addition, the British separate the intelligence and operational functions, whereas the CIA has responsibility in both areas. This has been at the root of much criticism of the Agency's activities.

Furthermore, it says that Congress has given it a perfunctory supervision.

Senator SALTONSTALL has been one of those whom the Post called nominal watchdogs, and Senator SALTONSTALL said:

The difficulty in connection with asking questions and obtaining information is that we might obtain information which I personally would rather not have.

That was his attitude. Of course, according to Senator SALTONSTALL, they have questioned Mr. McCone perhaps only once or twice a year.

So there is a vital need for the Congress to be aware of the actions of this Agency and to establish a joint committee, so that Members can be kept informed and know what the Agency is doing. This has been called for widely from many sources, from sources of leadership, and from the very President who founded the Agency. I believe that the gentleman is on most sound ground in his proposal.

Certainly he did the public a service in his speech and in sponsoring the legislation, and I think also in the very fine article that he wrote.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS]. He is an expert on national security affairs. He has made it his personal duty to see to it that national security affairs are checked by Congress. I thank him for his knowledgeable contribution.

I wish to point out to the House that at the conclusion of my remarks I will ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the Esquire article I wrote. It has already been put in the Appendix of the RECORD by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE], but I would like to have it reappear at this point because of the attack made on it by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS]. Also I want to make reference to the floor speech I made upon which the article is based. It appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for August 15, 1963, beginning at page 14263. I urge Members to read it.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] began by attacking the remarks I made on the floor and in this article with respect to the level of supervision provided by four subcommittees of the Congress in respect to the CIA. In addition to that he protects or defends the present jurisdictional setup and says:

I do not believe that the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the Armed Services Committee, or the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy would be likely to relinquish their responsibilities for legislative oversight of the components of those departments which are presently under their jurisdiction.

Referring to the intelligence arms of various departments in the Government.

I am surprised to find the gentleman defending the status quo on such narrow grounds. Are we so petty that we have to hold onto these little empires of jurisdiction, or are we willing to take a look from time to time at where we stand? The gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] is a ranking member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. The gentleman from Florida, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] is a member, and so is the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE]. And yet they want this new proposal. If they were jurisdictionally jealous they might, quite appropriately, argue that the Foreign Affairs Committee or at least one of its subcommittees should be named. This problem has more to do with foreign policy than with the armed services.

The distinguished gentleman from Illinois seems to take personal offense at my suggestion that the level of watchdog supervision is too low. Really, now, it should be obvious that this is not to

the point. Our point is that this subject requires a nearer full-time attention, high status and coordination. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy does a good job. It watches matters of great sensitivity. But I doubt if the job would be done properly if it were divided up rather haphazardly among four subcommittees of other committees.

I want to stress again that what is chiefly needed is a high level committee that will examine the relationship between the CIA and other departments and agencies of Government, intelligence gathering and special operations, personnel, intelligence evaluation and relationships between departments and agencies abroad. We are not talking about details of operations overseas although from time to time that may be included. The CIA has always insisted, and the gentleman from Illinois insists that nothing is withheld from the authorized subcommittees. I am sure that is so. But, as I pointed out in the article, apparently the notion exists that if the whole matter is kept on the lowest possible level of congressional concern, secrecy will receive a higher degree of respect. There is no logic in the notion. I should think just the opposite would be true.

The other day the press reported that in the Committee on Rules a member of the Rules Committee asked one of the most high-ranking and distinguished members of the Committee on Armed Services, who is also on the CIA Subcommittee, the question, "Do you know how many employees the CIA has here in Washington?" The member answered that he did not. That he had never had occasion to ask. I should have thought he would be interested in knowing. If he did, his answer of course would have been "Yes I do." Period. He would not have been expected to answer further, nor would he have in a public session, or even in a private session with members only present. I would like to recall to you, also, that several other high-ranking Members of the Congress have referred to the little time that is spent on this subject. The gentleman from Florida mentioned the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. When I made my speech on the floor in August 1963 the second ranking member on the minority side of the Committee on Armed Services said as follows:

Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks. I think we should have had a joint committee to monitor the CIA when it was first established. I have had a little experience in the matter as a member of the Committee on Armed Services. As you may know, we have a subcommittee on the CIA. I was a member of that committee for either 2 or 4 years. We met annually—one time a year, for a period of 2 hours in which we accomplished virtually nothing. I think a proposal such as you have made is the answer to it because a part-time subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, as I say, which meets for just 2 hours, 1 day a year, accomplishes nothing whatsoever. I want to compliment the gentleman on his proposal.

It may be, I am sure, that more time is in fact spent; and it may be that there has been some jacking up. But the fact also remains that CIA has become a very important aspect of our governmental

establishment and it can, and sometimes has, played an important role in the execution of foreign policy. I claim that it has at times shaped it. The great importance of the CIA in the governmental establishment is symbolized by the very large, very expensive, white building erected on the banks of the Potomac. It symbolizes the degree to which this agency of Government has been brought to the surface and elevated in the governmental establishment. Isn't it about time that we elevated our practices a little bit too?

I was surprised to hear the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], defending the governmental mishmash surrounding the Bay of Pigs fiasco. He says that the policy lines were clear. Even the people chiefly responsible will admit that this is not true. The gentleman might try asking the Secretary of State. He supports his argument by recalling that the President later took full responsibility for the errors of the Bay of Pigs. Of course, he did.

The President is responsible for everything that happens in Government, or does not. But why did the President find it necessary immediately to appoint the Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Robert Kennedy, and Gen. Maxwell Taylor to find out what went wrong and why he was so badly served by agencies of Government? Their first stop was the CIA. And, remember the little tale never denied by the President, about the battle between the hawks and the doves? Meanwhile the Pentagon was waiting for someone to tell it to fly or not to fly. If there was clear policy here, I would hate to think what kind of shape we would be in if policy became really confused.

I made very clear in the speech that I made and in the article that I wrote, that the foreign policymaking organs of Government, just by an absence of clear policy, or by not asserting it when it does exist, can cause other agencies of Government to occupy the field. Operations abroad may snowball themselves. The CIA, or the Pentagon for that matter, may be bootstrapped, even unwillingly from a headquarters point of view, into the position of making policy as they go along. The failure of the State Department to give clear direction and to dominate can cause this.

The CIA is not a policymaking organ and should not be, nor does it want to be. This much is agreed by all. But from time to time the fact of the matter is that there has been no clear policy from Washington. The result has been in at least one instance that operations have snowballed themselves into policy.

The gentleman from Illinois defends the mishmash of Vietnam. I think even the most careful of the public commentators and foreign policy experts, in during the Diem regime have recognized that separate agencies of the U.S. Government were at times pulling in separate directions: and, in fact, as you will recall, the President found it necessary in the middle of all of this, to reassert the supremacy of the foreign policy organs of Government over other agen-

cles of Government which have no business making foreign policy.

Unless there is clear direction from Washington, this kind of fiasco is going to happen. And unless Congress is willing to take the responsibility for being the double check on questions of policy, including the question of who is making policy, the press attention given to the problem is going to get worse. I do not think it is a healthy thing to have the press of this country increasingly being the only institution that is the watchdog over the difficult problem that we have of trying to separate intelligence and intelligence gathering and operations from the making and shaping of foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that it is time we pulled ourselves together in the Congress and reorganized ourselves as necessary in order to be true representatives of the people, and responsible ones.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think the present machinery is performing satisfactorily. I don't think it can, because it is structurally unsound. This has nothing to do with the caliber of the gentlemen involved, which is of the highest. It has everything to do with the structure of the institution. We are charged with the responsibility in seeing to it that that structure is correct and proper.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I am delighted to yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. KELLY. I want to thank the gentleman from New York for yielding to me at this point. I want to join him in the thoughts which he has just expressed.

Would the gentleman agree with me that with the speed of communications that we have today there is a great need for us to have this evaluation ahead of time, if possible, in order to insure that our President receives the coordinated intelligence from all sources from which to formulate policy? I do not want the CIA to carry out policy. All we want in this joint committee is to be sure that the proper department of Government in the executive branch receives for evaluation and determination the intelligence in order to make a policy decision with as much speed as possible, and for us as Members of Congress to have an agency on which to depend, to insure us that we can legislate on that policy and to be sure that we can carry it out.

Mr. Speaker, I have many examples that I could cite on this point. However, I do not want to take the precious time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] who has been so kind to yield to me at this point.

Mr. Speaker, I think one of the big items of concern today is the fact that our policy in Vietnam—and as it did without any question, and right at this point, at this moment, as witness the remarks of the Secretary of Defense yesterday before the Committee on Foreign Affairs in challenging Congress for not giving the proper amount of authorization and appropriations to defend our national security—is something which I find wanting.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentlewoman for her constructive comments.

Mr. Speaker, I only have a few minutes left and I want to make it once again clear that what many of us suggest to the Members of Congress is that a joint congressional committee be established on foreign intelligence and information. It should have status, staff and coordination. It should look into some of the very important questions, including:

First. The relationship between the CIA and the State Department, especially overseas.

Second. The relationship between intelligence gathering on the one hand and special operations on the other hand.

Third. The selection and training of intelligence personnel.

Fourth. The whole question of intelligence evaluation.

We should not forget that contrary to the Pentagon, where there are levels of political appointees responsible to the President, in the CIA there is only the Director who is a political appointee, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. Right here you have lost your double check. There is the possibility of massive bureaucracy, unchecked. The most important aspect of our Military Establishment is its political control by civilians—by the President through his civilian appointees, and by the Congress.

Unless the Congress is willing to assert its own jurisdiction in the vast area of intelligence work, which includes many things in the operational sense, then we are abrogating our responsibility.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman is making a very important and significant statement, and I should like to congratulate him on it. I am particularly impressed with his concern over the fact that this agency is making policy. I would be much more impressed if we in this Congress recognized that this is a joint tendency. All of our executive agencies are setting down policies that the Congress never intended. You will find that in every agency we have in the Government today. They take the laws that we pass here and stretch them to mean what they want these laws to say, and very frequently in the determination of policy set down by the agencies they are, in fact, contrary to the very intent and spirit of the laws passed by the Congress.

So it would seem to me that the Congress when it reconvenes next year should give serious thought to giving the committee a greater appropriation so that it can develop topnotch staffs of its own in order that the Congress may run its own legislation instead of going to the agencies every time a bill comes up. The gentleman knows very well that a lot of legislation is written by some bureaucrat who does not have to stand up against the voters. We have been passing legislation, yet they do what they want with it.

I congratulate the gentleman particularly on that aspect of his statement.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, as I come to the conclusion of these remarks I would like to read to the Members of the House the last two paragraphs of the article that was made the subject of today's speech by the gentleman from Illinois.

Finally, I would observe that such a joint congressional committee would perform a useful, perhaps an indispensable, service for the Intelligence community itself. There has been a tendency to assign the burden of blame to the CIA when some foreign undertakings have gone bad or failed altogether. Whether the blame has been justified—as in some cases it may have been—or whether unjustified, the liability to blame is apparent, and the CIA, unlike other less-inhibited agencies, can do little to defend itself. A joint committee could do much to maintain the record fairly.

As the Central Government grows in size and power, and as the Congress, like parliaments everywhere, tends to diminish in importance, the need for countervailing checks and balances becomes all the more important. The shaping and implementation by secret processes of some part of foreign policy is an extremely serious matter in a free society. It cannot be shrugged off or stamped as an inescapable necessity because of the dangers of the time and the threat from present enemies of democracy. To do so is to deny our history and to gamble dangerously with our future. There are internal as well as external dangers. Free political systems and individual liberties can be swiftly undermined. Confidence in the systems and liberties can be lost even more swiftly. And when that happens to a free society, no foreign policy, however well conceived, will protect its highest interest, the continuation of the free system of government and the society on which it rests.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members of Congress and those who read the RECORD at a later time to refer to the remarks that many of us have made on this subject from time to time. I was shocked and disturbed to discover that some of the people who took issue with me for writing an article on this subject had not even taken the trouble to read the article before taking issue.

I must say that when the day comes when we cannot debate these things intelligently and have an exchange of views and ideas about matters of importance, such as this, then we really are in trouble. If this happens in the Congress, then perhaps everything that is being said about the Congress—its procedures, its part-time Members, its failure to move, its failure to organize itself properly—is the truth. We Members of Congress have an obligation and a responsibility to take note of the existing facts. The speech I just heard made by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENS], on this important and complicated subject pretends that nothing has happened; that all is well; that nothing is wrong; that the governmental machinery is the same as it was 20 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, unless we Members of Congress are willing to assert ourselves with respect to difficult subjects, unless we are willing to do the check and balance job we are supposed to do under the separation of powers doctrine, then we will be justly criticized, and other institutions of our society, like the press, will step into the vacuum and do it for us.

(Mr. LINDSAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include the full text of an article he wrote which appeared in the March issue of Esquire magazine, entitled "An Inquiry Into the Darkness of the Cloak and the Sharpness of the Dagger.")

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may insert their remarks at this point in the RECORD, following the remarks I have just made on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in support of a Joint Congressional Committee on Central Intelligence.

For the past 10 years I have introduced into the Congress resolutions calling for the creation of such a committee. Only yesterday I once again wrote the distinguished chairman of the House Rules Committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], asking that hearings be scheduled as soon as possible on my bill, House Congressional Resolution 2, which would create a "watchdog" committee on intelligence matters.

It is my hope that some action may be initiated on this measure during the current session of Congress.

There is, in my opinion, a pressing need for the establishment of this committee. There are several reasons which have prompted me to propose the creation of this committee.

The foremost reason lies in the tremendous importance of intelligence activities conducted by the executive branch of our Government. Since the end of World War II and the advent of the nuclear age, our need for adequate and timely intelligence has intensified greatly. Such intelligence is necessary if we are to survive as a free nation and the leader of the free world.

Are we getting the high quality intelligence we need in these time of peril? Are our present intelligence operations efficient and effective?

There is ample reason for doubt. For example, the Hoover Commission, in 1955, reported that there were at least 12 major departments and agencies engaged in intelligence of one form or another.

These included the National Security Council, the Central Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency, the Department of State, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and five agencies within the Defense Department.

Since 1955 there have been some organizational changes within the Department of Defense toward consolidating the intelligence operations of the separate services within the Defense Intelligence Agency. At the same time, however, intelligence activities seem to be proliferating as the cold war grows older and more complex. For example, it recently has come to my attention that the Air Force Systems Command is operating a semiautonomous intelligence-gathering agency and wishes to expand its operations.

1964

Other agencies in this field are the U.S. Intelligence Board, the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, and the Atomic Energy Commission.

The multiplicity of agencies operating in the area of intelligence gives rise to many questions about the efficiency of our activities.

What is, for example, the relationship between the CIA and the DIA? Are they working toward a unified end, cooperating together? Or do their efforts overlap and conflict?

The latter seem to have been true in Vietnam last year where it was reported that the CIA personnel in the country were supporting and assisting the Diem regime, while the DIA personnel were known to be seeking the overthrow of President Diem and his family.

After examining similar instances of our intelligence-gathering agencies working at cross-purposes, the Hoover Commission, in 1955, recommended that a Joint Congressional Committee on Intelligence be established, patterned after the Joint Atomic Energy Committee.

Another reason for a "watchdog" on intelligence activities is the rising amount of money our Nation is spending on such operations.

The CIA alone has been called a "billion dollar operation" by many reliable sources. Certainly, the combined intelligence activities of our Government would reach well over a billion dollars annually.

The budgets of these agencies must be given the closest possible scrutiny in order to do away with waste and duplication of effort. Congress must have a special committee with the time and knowledge to do this effectively.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasize once again three things that we who advocate the Joint Committee on Central Intelligence do not mean to imply.

First, we are not in any way casting doubt on the loyalty or patriotism of our CIA and other intelligence employees. For the most part they are doing an excellent job which often receives too little recognition.

Second, we do not wish to "investigate" the CIA or any other agency. The committee would not pry into the secrets of the intelligence-gathering agencies. It would simply obtain enough information on the operations of the intelligence community to enable the Congress to make a reasonably sound judgment on its budget and its effectiveness.

Third, we do not intend any criticism of the committees and Members of Congress who currently handle CIA activities and appropriations. They are doing the best possible job.

Unfortunately, the result of the present system is all too often a piecemeal, hit-and-run examination of the policies and activities of our intelligence-gathering agencies by Congress.

The remedy is a Joint Congressional Committee on Central Intelligence. It is my earnest hope that the House Rules Committee will soon report this measure favorably to the floor of the House, so that the Members of this body may work their will.

INTEROCEANIC CANAL PROBLEMS: ADEQUATE STUDY REQUIRES TIME

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

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, as the result of two statements on Panama-United States relations by President Johnson, March 16 and 21, 1964, the crisis over the Panama Canal has received increased world attention.

In the first, made under dramatic circumstances before a meeting of the Organization of American States, the President refused to agree to commit his administration in advance to renegotiate the basic 1903 Panama Canal Treaty as a prerequisite for Panama's resumption of normal diplomatic relations with the United States, which President Chiari of Panama severed on January 10. It was President Johnson's knowledge of how President Chiari tried to blackmail the United States with mob assaults on the Canal Zone led by Castro agents and of how Panama's chief envoy to the United Nations attacked the United States with threats to take the Panamanian case before this international body which accounts for President Johnson's refusal to yield under the presence of Panamanian blackmailers.

The second statement by President Johnson on March 21, in a conciliatory effort to end the crisis, was specific in calling for a solution that "protects the interests of all the American nations in the canal" as well as of Panama.

Officials of our Government know that a claim behind the insistence of Panama for a renegotiation of the 1903 treaty is the Panamanian assertion that this treaty is null and void. This must be clearly understood, for were our Government to agree to such a basis for diplomatic discussions it would put itself on the defensive by telling the world that it has been wrong in dealing with Panama. The delay thus far occasioned affords an opportunity to review the Panama crisis in the light of the overall interoceanic canals problem. Certainly the recurring mob invasions of the Canal Zone and the resulting slaughter of U.S. soldiers and citizens there constitute powerful arguments for the continuance of U.S. sovereignty over the zone.

As stressed in my address to the House on March 9 on "Panama Canal: Focus of Power Politics," the January 1964 Panamanian outbreak has aroused the interest of the Nation in the interoceanic canals question to a degree not equaled since the dramatic dash of the *Oregon* in 1898 to join our fleet off Santiago. In my March 11 statement, "Panama Canal: Formula for Future Canal Policy," I summarized the problems that must be considered in its formulation. Such policy, Mr. Speaker, must be determined before there can be intelligent discussions of diplomatic questions with any country, especially Panama, where, according to an editorial in the March 11 *Estrella de Panama*, the garbage collection situation, if not soon solved, will become a national calamity. Moreover,

Panama is in the midst of a heated presidential campaign, with candidates vying with one another in presenting programs to the electorate for driving the United States off the isthmus or, at least, for wringing absolutely unjustifiable and destructive concessions and benefits from the United States.

Until our Government, by means of an adequately constituted and independent Interoceanic Canals Commission, develops what our future canal policy should be, there can be no basis for important negotiations with any country, least of all with Panama where we have a workable treaty which would permit the modernization and increase of capacity of the existing Panama Canal to meet future needs without a new treaty.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the present deplorable situation on the isthmus, much of which was caused by our own pusillanimous conduct of policy matters in contemptuous disregard of the Congress, I believe that I reflect the views of informed Members of the Congress and many leading canal experts in various parts of the Nation when I urge that nothing be done in the way of serious diplomatic discussions not only until after the Panamanian election in May but until after the necessary independent Interoceanic Canals Commission is created, put to work on the overall canal question, and indicates the time and type of the required solutions.

Our country must become more realistic in its approach to Latin America. Certainly there is no imperialism or colonialism in the exercise by the just and indispensable sovereignty over the Panama Canal enterprise; and such exercise is best for Panama itself, its radical politicians and Castros notwithstanding.

The two indicated statements of President Johnson follow: also an editorial in the Evening Star commending the President on the first statement and an article by William S. White supporting a realistic approach in dealing with Latin American questions

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 17, 1964]

REMARKS BY JOHNSON ON PANAMA SITUATION
(The White House transcript of President Johnson's remarks on Panama, during his Alliance for Progress speech.)

Let me now depart for a moment from my main theme to speak of the differences that have developed between Panama and the United States.

Our own position is clear and it has been from the first hour that we learned of the disturbances. The United States will meet with Panama anytime anywhere, to discuss anything, to work together, to cooperate with each other, to reason with one another, to review and to consider all of our problems together, to tell each other of our opinions, all our desires, and all our concerns, and to aim at solutions and answers that are fair and just and equitable with regard to the size or the strength or the wealth of either nation.

We do not ask Panama to make any pre-commitments before we meet and we intend to make none. Of course, we cannot begin on this work until diplomatic relations are resumed, but the United States is ready today, if Panama is ready. As of this moment, I do not believe that there has been a genuine meeting of the minds between

the two Presidents of the two countries involved.

Press reports indicate that the Government of Panama feels that the language which has been under consideration for many days commits the United States to a rewriting and to a revision of the 1903 treaty. We have made no such commitment and we would not think of doing so before diplomatic relations are resumed and unless a fair and satisfactory adjustment is agreed upon.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 22, 1964]

L.B.J. STATEMENT ABOUT PANAMA

(Following is the statement by President Johnson, which he read personally to newsmen yesterday on the dispute with Panama:)

The present inability to resolve our differences with Panama is a source of deep regret. Our two countries are not linked by only a single agreement or a single interest. We are bound together in an inter-American system whose objective is, in the words of the charter, "through mutual understanding and respect by the sovereignty of each, to provide for the betterment of all."

ALLIED IN STRUGGLE

Under the many treaties and declarations which form the fabric of that system, we have long been allies in the struggle to strengthen democracy and enhance the welfare of our people. Our history is witness to this essential unity of interest and belief. Panama has unhesitatingly come to our side, twice in this century, when we were threatened by aggression. On December 7, 1941, Panama declared war on our attackers even before our own Congress had time to act.

Since that war, Panama has wholeheartedly joined with us, and our sister Republics, in shaping the agreements and goals of this continent. We have also had a special relationship with Panama, for they have shared with us the benefits, the burdens, and trust of maintaining the Panama Canal as a lifeline of defense and a keystone of hemispheric prosperity. All free nations are grateful for the effort they have given to this task. As circumstances change, as history shapes new attitudes and expectations, we have reviewed periodically this special relationship.

We are well aware that the claims of the Government of Panama, and of the majority of the Panamanian people, do not spring from malice or hatred of America. They are based on a deeply felt sense of the honest and fair needs of Panama. It is, therefore, our obligation as allies and partners to review these claims and to meet them, when meeting them is both just and possible.

READY TO REVIEW ISSUES

We are ready to do this.

We are prepared to review every issue which now divides us, and every problem which the Panama Government wishes to raise.

We are prepared to do this at any time and any place.

As soon as he is invited by the Government of Panama, our Ambassador will be on his way. We shall also designate a special representative. He will arrive with full authority to discuss every difficulty. He will be charged with the responsibility of seeking a solution which recognizes the fair claims of Panama and protects the interests of all the American nations in the canal. We cannot determine, even before our meeting, what form that solution might best take. But his instructions will not prohibit any solution which is fair, and subject to the appropriate constitutional processes of both our Governments.

I hope that on this basis we can begin to resolve our problems and move ahead to confront the real enemies of this hemisphere—the enemies of hunger and ignorance, disease and injustice. I know President Chiari (of

Panama) shares this hope. For, despite today's disagreements, the common values and interests which unite us are far stronger and more enduring than the differences which now divide us.

[From the Washington Evening Star,
Mar. 23, 1964]

BID TO PANAMA

President Johnson's latest comment on the Panama issue is an energetic attempt to break the logjam which has been blocking settlement of the canal dispute.

Mr. Johnson made his move in an "impromptu" appearance at a conference held late Saturday by George Reedy, who has replaced Pierre Salinger as White House press secretary. The President proclaimed his readiness to name a special representative to seek a solution of the Panama Canal differences—a solution which "recognizes the fair claims of Panama and protects the interests of all the American nations in the canal." He also said, "We are well aware that the claims of the Government of Panama, and of the majority of the Panamanian people, do not spring from malice or hatred of America."

The first is a reasonable statement of what has always been the position of the United States, as we understand it. The second, while obviously intended to be conciliatory, ignores certain facts which are clearly spelled out in the record. One of these is that it was the President of Panama who broke off diplomatic relations with the United States. A second is that it was Panama's Ambassador to the United Nations who falsely accused our forces in the Canal Zone of "bloody aggression" against the people of Panama.

The President, however, may be justified at this stage in glossing over the difficulties. He is trying to repair the damage resulting from last week's misunderstanding with the OAS committee and to clear the way for a settlement with Panama. In striving to attain such objectives, little harm can result from generous statements—provided always that the essential interests of the United States are not neglected. We do not think that Mr. Johnson means to neglect them.

[From the Washington Evening Star,
Mar. 23, 1964]

THE PASSING SCENE: UNITED STATES STIFFENS ON LATIN AMERICA

(By William S. White)

The Johnson administration is moving on every front toward a more realistic approach to Latin America—an approach in which the legitimate interests of the United States will be the final test of every policy.

There is not the slightest intention to be tough or arrogant with the Latins. There is not the smallest purpose to be ungenerous with American aid or unsympathetic to the poverty and the fierce national and cultural pride which make the Latins perhaps the world's most sensitive people.

There is, however, the firmest of determination here to end a long era of well-intentioned but undue submissiveness in Washington to every wind of disapproval of us, however unjustified, which may blow up from south of the border.

In a word, the U.S. Government is casting off the moldy hair shirt which for decades it has worn. It is saying goodbye to an absurdly extreme sense of American guilt. For these same decades this guilt feeling has assumed that the United States is automatically and inevitably to blame for every difficulty in the Western Hemisphere simply because half a lifetime ago this country sometimes practiced "gunboat diplomacy" in Latin America.

GOOD NEIGHBORS

We intend to be good neighbors in the true and adult and self-respecting sense. We do not intend, however, to be simply Uncle Sam

good neighbors forever, saying we are wrong when we are right, and forever remorseful because some President Coolidge of the dim past sent the marines to Nicaragua.

All this is one columnist's interpretation of the direction in which the U.S. Government is turning under two men whose human connections with and personal understanding of the Latins are facts of lifelong experience—President Johnson and Assistant Secretary of State Thomas Mann.

They know the Latin mind. Mr. Johnson knows it because of 30 years of mutually cordial political association with the Mexican-Americans of Texas. Mr. Mann knows it through much service as perhaps the most skilled diplomat of his generation in Latin American affairs.

Each man's awareness is intimate and factual; not bookish and theoretical. Each man truly likes the Latins; but neither man is filled with purely academic assumptions that are foreign to human reality.

They know, for illustration, that while the Latins naturally like a United States which bows to every demand, the Latins at bottom respect only those officials who are "muy hombre" (very manly) and frankly prepared to uphold their own rights. This must be done with grace and good humor; but also with dignity and resolution.

COMMUNIST CUBA

Thus, this country now sees honest American efforts to settle difficulties like that in the Panama Canal Zone with full respect for the right and feelings of the Panamanians—but also with full insistence on the right and feelings of the United States of America.

Thus, this country will later see powerful and tireless Washington efforts to do more than talk about the menace posed by Castro Cuba. This Government will expect its Latin friends to realize that we are attempting to excise the cancer of communism in Cuba not so much for our own sake as for theirs. And this Government will expect the true cooperation of those it is trying so hard to save.

The round sum of the developing policy of the United States toward Latin America might be thus expressed: Mr. Johnson did not come to the Presidency to preside over liquidation of free governments in this hemisphere to suit the world's Fidel Castros, nor to waive every American interest in the doctrinaire notion that the United States is always wrong.

Mr. Mann did not undertake perhaps the toughest job in American diplomacy simply to solicit hurrahs from those who still think that every criticism of the United States—and every thrust at American business abroad—must be met with instant American concessions and instant American breast beating.

OUTSTANDING FEDERAL ADMINISTRATOR FOR 1963

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

Mr. RYAN of Michigan, Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to announce to this honorable body that one of my constituents, Dr. O. C. Williams, was named "Outstanding Federal Administrator for 1963."

Presentation of the plaque and certificate, which is awarded by the Federal Business Association of Detroit, will be made on April 2.

Dr. Williams is the medical officer in charge at the U.S. Public Health Service Hospital in Detroit, Mich. A graduate of the University of Kansas Medical

1964

to expansion of antimissile defense. But civil defense is valuable and necessary in its own right. Civil defense is a far more economical lifesaving measure than equivalent dollar additions to strategic retaliatory or active defense systems. Civil defense, that much scorned and derided activity, is a good buy, a good bargain, if we may use these words in talking of such precious commodities as the lives of the people, the life of the Nation.

I dare to hope, therefore, that civil defense will not be relegated to the heap of unsolved problems and deferred until such time as every vexing defense problem is ready for solution. Civil defense should be first in time and is, in fact, least in cost. It is the quickest and best lifesaving defense system we have for the immediate future. I trust that the committee of jurisdiction in the other body will consider the matter in this light, and that the Secretary of Defense will make it crystal clear in his next posture and budget presentation to the Congress that action on civil defense is imperative.

We can take a note of encouragement from a public statement Secretary McNamara issued a few days ago in which he said:

I foresee a firm and high priority for civil defense as an integral part of our national security effort.

He went on to say that the administration would press its civil defense program as the lowest cost possibility for saving lives under nuclear attack, whether the strategic forces package to be presented next year is large or small.

Referring again to the March 4 letter of the Senate subcommittee chairman, I am pleased to note that he has described the current civil defense effort under Mr. Pittman's leadership as "well managed," with "well defined and practical objectives." A similar conclusion was reached after hearings by the Military Operations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations in 1962 and by the House Armed Services Committee last summer.

I have talked with Stuart Pittman about his resignation and there is no question about his motives. He was able to undertake the assignment only on the understanding that he could return to his law practice after 2 years, and he has overstayed by 6 months because the shelter bill was pending. He tells me that the only reason that would have led him to change his plans would have been failure to bring the civil defense program out of the woods. His cautious optimism that a new civil defense program has been firmly launched appears to me to be justified. A shelter system for 70 million people is in the advanced stage of preparation and has made possible a new realism in civil defense organization, training, and planning. Civil defense planning has been effectively tied in to military planning.

Military operations and organization are taking on a capacity to supplement and support civil defense. State and local civil defense has adjusted successfully to a more unified and coherent national effort. These achievements are

the direct result of a new professional competence in the management and leadership of civil defense. This change has been brought about by Secretary Pittman and the able staff which he has assembled.

I want to say a word about Stuart Pittman, whom I have come to know well both personally and professionally during his 2½ years in office. During the House debate on the shelter bill, this man was given his due by unusually laudatory comments from many Members of the House. So what I have to say is not new to you. I can think of no more difficult and lonely high post in Government than heading civil defense. It requires a selfless man who is not discouraged by the difficulty of communicating with the public, with Congress, and even with his colleagues in Government who are on a different wavelength, which does not readily admit the possibility of disaster. It also requires exceptional management ability and imaginative programming to get things done under the kind of loose civil defense organization which we now have in the United States.

Stuart Pittman leaves his post with the high regard of the President, the Secretary of Defense, and the key people in this administration. He is widely respected by the Congress as a uniquely able public servant, who has changed many minds about the need for civil defense. While the newspapers and columnists of the country have done their share of ridiculing and doubting civil defense, they have consistently recognized Stuart Pittman as the kind of man who contributes more than he gets from public service.

For my part, I think it is one of our great problems that the Government does not offer a career which brings men of this kind of integrity and ability to higher responsibility and keeps them there. However, I am confident that Stuart Pittman will be persuaded to participate again in a vital way in public affairs and I am glad his law practice is in Washington where his advice and experience will be readily available to the Government.

Finally, I want to say that I hope and expect that Secretary McNamara will see the high priority for civil defense, which he has publicly predicted, translated into action on a nationwide shelter system, backed by firm Federal leadership and support. Evidence of the priority for civil defense at the point of critical action on legislation and appropriations has not been entirely convincing to date. Congress will do its part when the President and the Defense Establishment make it clear that this program is vital and can be delayed no longer.

THE GOLENIIEWSKI CASE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I was present on the floor today when our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr.

ARENDS], my friend, delivered his remarks in defense of CIA. I listened with great interest to his analysis of the Michal Goleniewski case, his charge of irresponsible journalism played against the New York Journal American for its series of articles on this case, and his statement that the CIA subcommittee of which he is a member went into every aspect of this case.

I want to make it clear I have no intention to enter into the dispute between my colleague from Illinois and my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY], over the article by the latter on CIA which appeared in Esquire magazine, which I have not had an opportunity to read. Nor do I desire at this time to engage in the issue over the necessity of a joint committee for the oversight of CIA, the case cited by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

What I am concerned about is the blanket statement made by my colleague from Illinois concerning the Michal Goleniewski case as reported in the New York Journal American. Let me quote the particular statements in my colleague's remarks which give me concern:

I might add that the CIA subcommittee, of which I am a member, went into every aspect of this case. I am personally satisfied that the publicized statements purported to come from Michal Goleniewski are not correct. The information as reported in the press is not in agreement with the information Michal Goleniewski has made available to many departments of Government.

Stories such as have been circulated on this case display a reckless regard for the truth. They can be harmful, and those who circulate them do a great disservice to maintaining public confidence in the CIA.

By his statements the oppression is created that my colleague and other members of the CIA Subcommittee are completely informed on all the facets and implications of the Goleniewski case. I question the accuracy of that statement, not because I question the integrity of my colleague and friend, but because I am convinced that if he and the other members of his subcommittee were completely informed on all the facets and implications of this case, he would not have delivered the remarks he has made today. I say this because I have confidence in the gentleman from Illinois and all the members of the Subcommittee on CIA, of which he is a member. That confidence is based upon the hard road of experience and the proven integrity and dedication of all the members of the subcommittee. That is not the issue in the Goleniewski case. To raise that issue or to have it interjected by others can serve no other purpose but to confuse the real issue which goes to the heart of the safety, the security, and the future happiness of all the people who elect their Representatives to Congress.

A great and dedicated American, Al Smith, used to say "Let's look at the record"—or at least part of the Record today.

My colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], discusses the Goleniewski case, but what he leaves out is far more important than what he has said.

In an earnest effort to assist him and the other members of the House CIA Subcommittee, I present the following questions for consideration by the members of that subcommittee.

First. Have the members of the subcommittee personally interviewed Michal Goleniewski and if they have had that opportunity, how much time was spent with him and to what extent was he questioned with respect to political intelligence and Russian KGB agent infiltration into the vital organs of our Government?

Second. If the members of the House CIA Subcommittee have probed deeply into KGB agent penetration of the vital organs of our Government, are the members satisfied that everything that needs to be done has been done by the security arms of our Government to ferret out and prosecute the guilty?

Presuming the members of the House CIA Subcommittee have interrogated Mr. Goleniewski in depth, which I sincerely hope is the case, I raise these additional questions:

First. Is it not true that Goleniewski, who defected to the United States in 1961, had revealed deep penetration into the CIA by Russian KGB agents?

Second. Is it not true that Goleniewski has told how over \$1 million of CIA funds fell into the hands of the Russian KGB and about \$400,000 of this money was pumped back into the Communist Party, U.S.A., to pay for their operations to destroy our country?

Third. Is it not true that Michal Goleniewski has been discouraged by certain CIA officials in his efforts to present what he calls political intelligence and which he regards as essential to the defeat of international communism?

Fourth. Did Goleniewski name Russian KGB agents in both the State Department and CIA and state that to date none of these agents have been arrested or prosecuted?

I regret exceedingly that limitation of time under the special order permitted to my good friend, the able and distinguished minority whip, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], did not afford any time for me to ask him questions and to hear his response. After his remarks I spoke to my friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], and advised him that I would request time to address the House to raise a number of questions concerning the Goleniewski case. I have raised those questions. They are serious questions. The American people have a right to hear forthright answers to those questions. I hope they will be answered.

There is no question about CIA being one of the most important agencies of our Government, particularly during this period of international uncertainties and anxieties.

The CIA can be used for immense good or terrible evil. The CIA can be used to save this country from the tyranny of communism or it can be used to deliver this Nation into the bonds of communism.

The CIA can be used to waste millions of dollars of taxpayers money and lose countless millions of lives, or it can be

used to save nations and this country from the dread yoke of communism.

The CIA can be useful through good and accurate intelligence estimates to guide U.S. policy decisions to victories over communism or, through slanted intelligence estimates, to take this country down a road of appeasement until there is no other choice but all-out nuclear war or surrender.

These are not only critical times, but these times are decisive for our country, for the cause of universal freedom, for the cause of a just and lasting world peace.

It is time that Congress faces up to its responsibility and obtains the answers—the full story of Russian agent penetration of our Government.

Mr. Speaker, as a man who believes in the message of Holy Week, I am an optimist. But I also believe it is high time we weeded out of our Government all those who wear the cloak of Judas so that we can freely spread the great message of American liberties, freedoms, and individual dignity throughout the world.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

[Mr. RYAN of New York addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

NORTHERN OHIO JUDGESHIPS

(Mr. ASHLEY (at the request of Mr. LIBONATI) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I have joined my distinguished colleague from Ohio, Senator STEPHEN M. YOUNG, in introducing legislation to make the present temporary judgeship in the northern Ohio Federal Judicial District a permanent one.

Northern Ohio is the only district in the entire Nation with a temporary judge. This means that whenever the first of seven judges now sitting in Cleveland, Toledo, or Youngstown retires or dies, he will not be replaced.

The situation came about in 1961 when President Kennedy signed a bill creating 73 Federal judgeships, a move recommended by the Judicial Conference of the United States to relieve serious congestion in many of the larger districts.

Under that legislation, northern Ohio received two new judgeships, one permanent and one temporary. That increased the district bench from five to seven judges with the proviso that the first vacancy would not be filled, leaving the northern district with a permanent bench of six judges.

The theory behind this was that a temporary judgeship would be needed only long enough to clear up the congestion existing in 1961. It is now a matter of record, however, that the additional judgeships voted for northern Ohio in 1961 have failed to reduce the caseload.

Reports of the administrative office of the U.S. courts show that as of June 30, 1962, shortly after the appointment of the two new judges for northern Ohio, there were 1,158 civil cases pending in the northern Ohio district. A year later, on June 30, 1963, the pending caseload had moved to 1,199. In February of this year the administrative office reported that there were 1,280 pending civil cases as of December 31, 1963.

Need for prompt enactment of the legislation proposed by Senator YOUNG and myself is attested to by Warren Olney III, the Director of the Administrative Office of the Federal Courts, in his statement that the growth of the backlog of civil cases has been due more to an increase in the number of filings than to slowness of the court to act.

In the last half of last year, for instance, the northern Ohio bench disposed of a respectable total of 512 cases, only to have 593 new ones filed in the same period.

It thus becomes apparent that the future workload will demand at least as many judges as are presently sitting in the northern Ohio district. The loss of a judgeship, which will take place if the temporary judgeship provided in the 1961 act is not converted into a permanent one, will inevitably result in the chaotic situation which existed prior to 1961 and the legislation adopted that year creating additional judgeships throughout the country. In order to prevent the delay and frustration of judicial proceedings, Senator YOUNG and I have offered legislation which I hope will receive prompt and favorable consideration.

(Mr. GALLAGHER (at the request of Mr. LIBONATI) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

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

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. BLATNIK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CURTIS, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. DOLE (at the request of Mr. BOW), for 1 hour, on Monday, April 6; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RYAN of New York (at the request of Mr. LIBONATI), for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOLIFIELD, for 20 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. FEIGHAN, for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

the Merchant Marine Act, relating to construction differential subsidies, 10 a.m., 219 Cannon House Office Building.

Committee on Rules, on H. Res. 652, travel authority; S. 2394, to facilitate compliance with the convention between the U.S. and Mexican States; H. Con. Res. 3, and similar resolutions, to establish a Joint Committee on Intelligence to be followed by an executive session on H.R. 9903, Transportation Act amendments, 10:30 a.m., H-313 U.S. Capitol Building.

Committee on Un-American Activities, on pending legislation re Freedom Academy and Freedom Commission, 10 a.m., 304 Cannon House Office Building.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Subcommittee on Insurance, on pending insurance bills, 10 a.m., 356 Cannon House Office Building.

Committee on Ways and Means, executive, on Medical Care for the Aged, 10 a.m., committee room, Longworth House Office Building.



Congressional Record

The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed at one time. ¶ The Congressional Record will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, for \$1.50 per month, payable in advance. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, directly to the Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402. For subscription purposes, 20 daily issues constitute a month. The charge for individual copies varies in proportion to the size of the issue. ¶ Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and is sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶ With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.

reported favorably to the full committee H.R. to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to locate a portion of a vehicular tunnel under the U.S. Capitol Grounds and the U.S. Botanic Garden grounds. Also approved various sundry build-out projects for public buildings.

to taking action on H.R. 10392 (title above), an open hearing and heard testimony from Jerome Stewart, Acting Director of the Botanic Gardens; and Brig. Gen. Charles M. Duke, District Engineer Commissioner.

FREEDOM ACADEMY—FREEDOM COMMISSION

Committee on Un-American Activities: Resumed hearings on legislation to create a Freedom Commission and a Freedom Academy. Testimony was given by various public witnesses.

RENEGOTIATION ACT

Committee on Ways and Means: Met in executive session and ordered reported favorably to the House H.R. 10669 (amended), regarding the extension of the Renegotiation Act.

The committee will resume hearings on proposed medical care for the aged legislation.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, APRIL 8

(All meetings are open unless otherwise designated)

Senate

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, executive, to mark up S. 2446, NASA authorizations bill, 9 a.m., 235 Old Senate Office Building.

Committee on Appropriations, subcommittee, on fiscal 1965 budget estimates for public works, 9:30 a.m., room S-126, Capitol.

Committee on Commerce, to continue hearings on S.J. Res. 71, directing FTC to investigate certain chainstore practices, 8:30 a.m., 5110 New Senate Office Building.

Committee on Foreign Relations, to continue its hearings on East-West trade, to hear Export-Import Bank President Linder, 9 a.m., 4221 New Senate Office Building.

Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, on interagency coordination of environmental hazards—buildup of pesticides in water sources and the general environment, to hear Food and Drug Administrator Larrick and Interior Secretary Udall, 8 a.m., 3302 New Senate Office Building.

Subcommittee on National Security Staffing and Operations, executive, to hear U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union Kohler testify on the role of the American Ambassador in countries behind the Iron Curtain, 9 a.m., 3112 New Senate Office Building.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, executive, on the nomination of Mary Keyserling, to be Director of the Women's Bureau, Department of Labor, 9:30 a.m., 4232 New Senate Office Building.

Committee on Public Works, Special Subcommittee on Western Water Development, to hold an executive organizational meeting, 9:15 a.m., 4200 New Senate Office Building.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Independent Offices, executive, 10 a.m., H-143 U.S. Capitol Building.

Subcommittee on Public Works, executive, 10 a.m., H-307 U.S. Capitol Building.

Subcommittee on Military Construction, executive, 10 a.m., H-140 U.S. Capitol Building.

Subcommittee on Defense, executive, 10 a.m., H-140 U.S. Capitol Building.

Subcommittee on Agriculture, executive, 1 p.m., H-305 U.S. Capitol Building.

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee No. 2, on H.R. 7278, re disposal of cadmium from the national stockpile, 10 a.m., 313-A Cannon House Office Building.

Committee on Banking and Currency, executive, on H.R. 5845, re authority of national banks to underwrite and deal in securities issued by State and local governments, 10 a.m., 1301 Longworth House Office Building.

Committee on Education and Labor, Ad Hoc Subcommittee on the Poverty War Program, 10 a.m., 429 Cannon House Office Building.

General Subcommittee on Labor, on H.R. 9824, re extension of the Fair Labor Standards Act, 9:45 a.m., 214-B Cannon House Office Building.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, executive, on foreign aid, 10 a.m., H-322 U.S. Capitol Building.

Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Government Information and Foreign Operations, on use of polygraph machines, 10 a.m., B-300 Rayburn House Office Building.

Subcommittee on Military Operations, re satellite communications program, 10 a.m., 1501-B Longworth House Office Building.

Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, to resume hearings on drug safety, 10 a.m., 1310 Longworth House Office Building.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, on H.R. 7684, to provide that the United States shall hold certain land in trust for the members of the Alamo Band of Puertocito Navajo Indians, 9:45 a.m., 1324 Longworth House Office Building; to be followed by an executive session by the Subcommittee on National Parks, on H.R. 5886, relating to the establishment of concession policies in the areas administered by National Park Service.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Subcommittee on Public Health and Safety, on H.R. 10042, re Professional Nurse Training Act, 10 a.m., 1334 Longworth House Office Building.

Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics, executive, re guide dogs for the blind, 10:30 a.m., 1333 Longworth House Office Building.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee No. 1, on private immigration bills, 10 a.m., 327 Cannon House Office Building.

Subcommittee No. 2, on private claim bills, 10 a.m., 327-B Cannon House Office Building.

Subcommittee No. 5, executive, on pending legislation, 10:30 a.m., 346 Cannon House Office Building.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Subcommittee on Merchant Marine, on H.R. 10053, to amend section 502 of