

FEB 7 1963

Approved For Release 2005/01/04 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000700400011-2

1963

tleman from Indiana also quotes Senator KEATING as saying:

But Senator KEATING said Mr. McNamara had failed to "dispute" any of his specific claims that Soviet forces in Cuba have been strengthened since October or that Russian medium-range missile sites in Cuba have not been fully destroyed.

Mr. Speaker, let us now take a look at the specific charge that was made so that we can know exactly what is being talked about here. When the President of the United States directs the Secretary of Defense to reveal some of our most highly held and closely held intelligence on a nationwide television show, risking an impairment of security about which any individual in the intelligence service must be deeply disturbed, just to reassure the American people and to clear up some of the confusion and put an end to efforts to frighten the American people that have been going on, I think it is important that we ought to know exactly what the charges are to which this massive effort, this unprecedented effort to respond last night was being directed.

Mr. Speaker, I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 31, 1963, where Senator KEATING is speaking beginning at the bottom of page 1388 and continuing over to page 1389:

Furthermore, while evidence mounts of new equipment pouring in from the Communist bloc, there is continuing—

Get this—

there is continuing, absolutely confirmed and undeniable evidence that the Soviets are maintaining and guarding the medium-range sites they had previously constructed in Cuba. There has been no Soviet move to dismantle these concrete sites or withdraw the launching bases, as one might expect if the Soviets intended in good faith to keep these missiles out of Cuba in the future.

Now, let us be clear about what Senator KEATING was alleging. He says:

There is absolutely confirmed and undeniable evidence that the Soviets are maintaining and guarding the medium-range sites they had previously constructed in Cuba.

Not missiles in caves that we have been talking about, not something that is under a tree somewhere camouflaged where even the highly competent planes of our Air Force and Navy could not get at it, not something that is in some obscure part of the island where perhaps it might be alleged we had not even penetrated with the U-2 or with anything else.

What he is saying is that they are maintaining and guarding the medium-range sites "previously constructed in Cuba," the same ones that created the crisis, the ones that all the fuss was about. And he goes on to say:

There has been no Soviet move to dismantle these concrete sites.

Well, did you not see on television last night those pictures? Did you not see where the Soviet bulldozers had gone in and pushed the concrete aside, where they had taken everything out and there was not a single thing left except one beat-up Soviet truck driving around, trying to pick up a few pieces that were left? How much evidence do you have

to have? There they are, the medium-range sites, the intermediate-range sites, destroyed, dismantled, broken up, the concrete destroyed, presented by photographic evidence, not only to Senator KEATING but to the people of the United States. And yet the charge has not yet been withdrawn and it stands here in the RECORD of the Congress on the 31st of January of this year.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from New York yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that it is not my province to yield for a parliamentary inquiry; that is an inquiry that has to be addressed to the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman yield for that purpose?

Mr. STRATTON. No; I do not yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Is it permissible under the rules of the House to use the name of a Member of the other body in criticism?

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I am not criticizing him; I am just trying to analyze the charge. Then we will know whether the information presented last night was correct.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I made the point of order that the name of a Member of the other body may not be used in the well of the House.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman insist on his point of order?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that under the rules of the House, if a Member insists upon strict compliance, to mention the name of a Member of the other body is not consistent with the rules of the House. The rules of the House are different from the rules of the Senate.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. We in this body—and this is in addition to an answer on the point of order—we in this body recognize the comity between the two branches.

The gentleman from New York will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, my parliamentary inquiry is this. Would it be in order to refer to a Member of the other body without the use of his name?

The SPEAKER. The Chair feels that a proper reference to the other body as such may be in order, but reference to a Member of the other body may be not consistent with the rules of the House.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York yield for that purpose? The Chair would like to say that the Chair is trying delicately to answer the question.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order for the gentleman from New York to proceed without reference

to the name of any Member of the other body and simply refer to him as a Member of the other body?

The SPEAKER. Under the rules, even a reference in praise of a Member of the other body is not consistent with the rules of the House. The Chair has not ruled as yet that the gentleman has violated the rules. The Chair wants that clearly understood.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, it is my wish to proceed in order and in accordance with the rules. But it is my recollection that Members on the other side of the aisle have been mentioning names of Members of the other body most of the afternoon.

The SPEAKER. That may be correct, but then no Member voiced a question of order. The Chair asked the gentleman who made the point of order if he insisted on it. There are degrees of statements that might not be consistent with the rule. Some might be in violation.

Without objection, the gentleman from New York is recognized.

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, referring to the charge that appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that I have just read on page 1389, I think we ought perhaps to pursue the chronology just a bit. This charge was made on the 31st of January. It is my information, and I so disclosed it to the press yesterday, that the following day the individual that made the charge was visited by the head of the Central Intelligence Agency, the top man of the intelligence service of this country. Mr. John McCone, who is incidentally a distinguished member of the Republican Party, came there for the purpose of presenting to the individual that had made the charge the same information, the same proof, that was presented publicly to the American people on television last night, to prove that the minimum range sites which had previously been constructed in Cuba had not only been dismantled but the concrete had been all destroyed, and that was the end of it.

That was on last Friday. In spite of that fact, on the following Sunday there appeared a television show in which the same charge was made. There were then on Monday press releases issued by the same individual who made the charge renewing that charge, getting further publicity out of it. There was a picture circulated nationwide, to which I have referred, with the individual making the charge holding a Minuteman intercontinental ballistic missile over the map of Cuba, although actually there has been no charge about intercontinental ballistic missiles. Then on Monday there appeared in the U.S. News & World Report a detailed interview with the individual once again repeating the charge which Mr. McCone, of the Republican Party, and the man who is charged with the top management of our intelligence services, had already demonstrated to him personally was false; yet it was repeated without any effort being made to correct it.

On Tuesday as a member of the Armed Services Committee and as an

officer in the Naval Reserve I just could not take it any longer. I felt that regardless of the comity between the branches of the Congress, regardless of the regular courtesies that prevail in this body, to which my good friend from Iowa referred a moment ago—and I want to tell him I apologize for not having informed the gentleman from Indiana, because it was my intention to deal specifically with another charge, and this statement of the gentleman from Indiana was one that I brought in parenthetically, simply because I happened to read it in a newspaper just before I came onto this floor.

But on Tuesday, as I say, I could not stand it any longer and I pointed out that on the basis of the information already presented to our committee, there could not possibly be any basis to that charge and any individual who would make it would be talking through his hat. Well, surprisingly enough, that did get some attention. Apparently it even got back to the individual who made the charge because on Wednesday morning, there appeared an interview, an exclusive interview that came over the wire—I have not seen it in the paper to tell the truth, but it came over the wire—an interview with the individual who had made the charge, by the Associated Press. The interview was conducted by reporters Jack Bell and Fred Hoffman. They were asking him about this charge. Here is what he said. They were asking him a question. The individual replied as follows:

The intermediate range missile bases have a concrete base. I was at no time talking about that—no reference to that whatsoever. When the Defense Department replied, they got that into the picture. Now a great many of those have been bulldozed and broken up and, perhaps, all of them have so far as I know. What I was talking about was the medium range missile sites which do not have a concrete base at all. They are gravel or hard-top in character.

Now, who was it again that got the concrete in? The Defense Department? Oh, no, here it is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. On Thursday, the 31st of January, and I read it again—"There has been no Soviet move to dismantle these concrete sites." And yet on Wednesday he says, "Oh, I never mentioned concrete—no, I was talking about gravel, of course." The IRBM sites have concrete bases. I was not talking about them. I was talking about the medium range missile pads. They are made of gravel or black-top construction or macadam or asphaltic concrete or whatever you want to call it.

Well, the fact of the matter is—and I think if you watched television last night you saw it—the fact of the matter is that the medium-range missile sites that were constructed in Cuba, and that is what we are talking about here, those previously constructed, also had concrete and you saw in the pictures last night the concrete and you saw the concrete broken up; and when the portions of the medium-range site were sitting on the dock waiting to be loaded, Mr. Hughes, the Department of Defense intelligence expert pointed out how these launching

rings for the MRBM had been torn from their concrete bases. So where does the gravel come in? Not certainly from the intelligence service of the U.S. Government—not from the pictures—not from any facts. But nobody was talking about gravel in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 31 and in the subject TV, newspaper, and magazine publicity, and the fact is there never was any gravel or black top in the intelligence pictures taken over Cuba?

I think we should nail this thing down right now because if someone is going to charge anything about the intelligence service of our Government, then certainly he should know what he is talking about, and if someone is going to frighten the American people and destroy their confidence in what their Government is doing, then he ought to know what he is talking about. And yet, here we see he is just talking nonsense because on the 31st of January he is talking of concrete and on the 5th of February he is talking about gravel.

A little bit reminiscent, if I may say so, of the late Senator Joe McCarthy, who sometimes said one thing one day and another thing another day.

Now maybe the gentleman who made this charge would say, "Well, there is the word 'concrete' in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—that is right. But that was just an oversight. I didn't really mean concrete. I just got it in there by mistake." And, Mr. Speaker, it is true that the "concrete" does not appear in the charge that appeared subsequently in the newspapers. The word "concrete" had been stricken and it is also true the word "concrete" had been stricken in the U.S. News & World Report article. So maybe he might claim that one of our good friends who was recording the deliberations of another body somewhere had just made a mistake. Oh, no, no, no. Here is a clipping from the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle dated February 1, 1963. It refers to this same speech, this same charge, and it says that after his speech the individual who made that charge was asked by a reporter, Edmund B. Lambeth of the Gannet News Service, to describe the sites and remaining equipment and their maintenance.

He replied to Mr. Lambeth that the sites and the equipment he referred to were concrete emplacements.

There is no mistake about that. It was not a slip of the reporter:

Concrete emplacements with embedded metal attachments.

Then a little further on in the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle story we read:

The medium range missiles believed to have been removed were fired by mobile launchers.

Actually were not set up for firing from mobile launchers in Cuba. They had concrete bases.

Asked whether he had evidence of where the mobile launchers were physically located on the sites, this individual is quoted as saying:

No, I don't, but the concrete emplacements are still there.

Here he was talking to reporters after the speech, so there is no error in transcription:

The concrete emplacements are still there.

I challenge any fairminded American who looked at the television broadcast last night to say that the concrete emplacements are still there. If that presentation was not a refutation, a sweeping refutation of the gentleman's original charge, then I cannot read the English language.

I have heard it said that the individual who made the charge said that if anything he had said was disproven he would eat his hat. Well, I think we in this body can look for a good deal of hat eating around here in the days ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have said enough now to indicate that our Defense Department is still safe, fortunately, that our intelligence agencies are still in good hands, and that we would be well advised to continue to entrust the collection of intelligence, its evaluation, and its dissemination to the duly constituted agencies of our Defense Department. I think it is quite clear that an individual who cannot tell the difference between a medium range ballistic missile and an intermediate range ballistic missile, or a person who cannot tell the difference between concrete and gravel, or a person who cannot recall on the 5th of February a sweeping charge he made on the 31st of January, is not the kind of person we want to take over the top operation of our intelligence services and supersede those who have been duly constituted by our Government to handle these matters.

As I say, any individual is welcome to have any source of information he wants—revelation, dreams, myths, fiction; but, believe me, when it comes to maintaining the security of this country in time of peril—oh, let us not make any question about that, we are certainly facing peril here, there is no question about that; when you look at what was facing us in Cuba you realize that there was peril and there is still peril—but when we are facing a time of peril this is precisely the reason why we cannot now turn our intelligence services over to fiction and fancy and to whimsy, but we must base their conclusion on hard and established facts.

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

Mr. STRATTON. I am afraid I do not have time to yield. I have a couple of other points I am very anxious to make. I am sorry.

Mr. Speaker, this is a matter that transcends party. We are facing the possibility of serious action at any time. The individual who made the charges that were quoted a moment ago is also quoted as saying:

I am not at this moment advocating a specific course of action.

How easy it is to be an armchair strategist. How easy it is to talk about things when all you have to do is fill pages of the RECORD or to get headlines in a newspaper. But, Mr. Speaker, when you have

the security of 180 million people in your hands, when you have been through once and are likely to go through again the threat of nuclear warfare, as President Kennedy went through it in October with great courage and great determination and got the thanks, applause, and respect of the people of America as well as the freedom-loving people around the world for his forceful leadership, then you are not going to base your actions on the kind of flimsy thing I have been analyzing here this afternoon, you are going to look for hard facts.

Oh, it is all right to play legitimate politics. We all play politics at times, and sometimes we even play politics on the floor of this House, and I think, frankly, Mr. Speaker, there has been a little more of this play in the past few weeks on the left side of the aisle, if I may say so, than I have seen here in some time. It is all right to play politics; it is all right to try to undermine a party, even the Democratic Party; we are all fair game. But there is no right, on the part of any responsible individual, any responsible American, to try to undermine the confidence of the American people in our Government, in our defense intelligence service, or in the Department of Defense, at a time when we face a Soviet threat 90 miles from our shores. Let us not pursue personal gain or personal aggrandizement, and let us not be making irresponsible charges that do not even stick together, that do not even make sense, that cannot even be remembered from one day to the next. This is the kind of thing that undermines our national security and gives aid and comfort to the enemy.

I sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker, that the individual that made them, as an honorable gentleman, will admit publicly that he was wrong when he claimed that Secretary McNamara had not disputed any of his specific claims. Otherwise he surely forfeits the confidence of the people that he represents. We cannot deal effectively with the Communist threat if we are going to have people sniping irresponsibly and trying to undermine established agencies of Government on the basis of nothing more substantial than the flimsy, evanescent, off-again-on-again evidence I have revealed here today.

Mr. Speaker, some years ago a Member of the other body was censured for actions unbecoming that body. I certainly hope that as the result of some of the activities that have been going on in recent days, that there will not be a repetition of that action in days to come on the floor of the Senate of the United States.

NATIONAL SERVICE PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] is recognized for 15 minutes.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on January 19, 1963, I received the following unsolicited letter from the Office of the At-

torney General and signed by David L. Hackett, special assistant to the Attorney General:

JANUARY 18, 1963.

Hon. H. R. GROSS,
Congress of the United States,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GROSS: Enclosed are two copies of the report to the President on a national service program. As you know, the President appointed a Cabinet-level committee to make a recommendation on the feasibility of such a program.

In the course of this study, we contacted several hundred organizations and individuals in a wide variety of areas. In almost every case, these groups indicated interest in and support for the concept of a service program.

We will very much appreciate your comments and suggestions regarding this proposal.

Sincerely,

DAVID L. HACKETT,
Special Assistant to the Attorney General.

On January 29, 1963, I responded to Mr. Hackett's letter as follows:

Mr. DAVID L. HACKETT,
Special Assistant to the Attorney General,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. HACKETT: Reference is made to your letter of January 18, with which you included copies of a Report to the President on a "national service program."

Since I am unaware of any action by Congress authorizing a "national service program," can you tell me the source of the funds used for the preparation of this report? Also, please advise me of the total amount spent.

According to an Associated Press dispatch in the Washington Evening Star of January 28, "youthful planners" are already at work on the program in a "few top story rooms at an old house on Jackson Square."

How many planners are at work, and what is the salary level of each planner? From what funds are they being paid?

Sincerely yours,

H. R. GROSS.

Today, I received the following reply from Mr. Hackett:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GROSS: Thank you for your letter of January 29 concerning the proposed Domestic Peace Corps. I would also like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to you and Congressman DEVINE for your visit on January 30.

Congresswoman FRANCES BOLTON wrote to the Attorney General on January 30 raising some of the same questions raised by your letter. A copy of the Attorney General's reply to Mrs. BOLTON is enclosed.

The 10 agencies assigned by the President to prepare a report concerning the desirability and feasibility of establishing a domestic service program have cooperated in this activity in accordance with his instructions. Each agency has developed data within its own area of concern and contributed its ideas to the report.

I have no reliable information as to the number of persons the various departments and agencies may have assigned to the development and presentation of data in connection with the preparation of this report, their respective pay scales, or the amount of time they devoted to this activity; however, it is my understanding that this work was accomplished as a part of the regular activities of the persons involved and without significant disruption of their regular duties.

If we can be of any further service to you, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID L. HACKETT,
Special Assistant to the Attorney General.

At no place in Mr. Hackett's letter to me or in the Attorney General's letter to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON] are specific answers provided to my questions. He does not see fit to advise me of the number of youthful planners already at work on a national service program. Neither will he tell me the salary level of each planner nor the source of the funds from which they are being paid.

Despite the evasiveness of Mr. Hackett's reply, I can assure my colleagues that there are in fact "youthful planners" at work to get this latest New Frontier boondoggle rolling—even though Congress has never authorized a domestic Peace Corps, a national service program or whatever the new Robert Kennedy baby is to be named.

On January 30, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE] and I paid a visit to the domestic Peace Corps nursery, which is located in top story rooms of a building at 736 Jackson Square—just a stone's throw from the White House. This is what we found:

We found among other things that the start of this so-called domestic Peace Corps is already an accomplished fact in the minds of the youthful planners as they are called. There is no question about that. They are off and running.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to my friend from Ohio.

Mr. DEVINE. On the afternoon of Wednesday, January 30, 1963, just before 2 o'clock, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] who is presently addressing the House and I paid a visit to this National Service Corps, or Domestic Peace Corps, or whatever it may be called. We found it located on the third and fourth floors of an old-type residential building that now apparently has been acquired by the General Services Administration. The first two floors, I believe, are occupied by some music organization; 736 Jackson Place is located on Lafayette Square.

As we entered the third floor of this walkup office structure, we found quite a number of desks and quite a number of papers strewn around the various desks and maps on the wall outlining each congressional district in the United States. We made inquiry of some of the girl secretaries who were occupying office space and they advised us that there was a Mr. McClure apparently in charge in that local facility. We were introduced to Mr. Don McClure who treated us quite cordially and attempted to conceal nothing particularly, and he in turn introduced us to a man, I believe by the name of Ellinger.

Mr. McClure advised both the gentleman from Iowa, Congressman GROSS, and I that he was on loan from the Peace Corps which incidentally is located at 806 Connecticut Avenue, just a few doors from the domestic Peace Corps offices.

We asked him how much time was spent there and he said he usually reported at the Peace Corps in the morning, then he came over on loan and spent all day long at the domestic Peace Corps and sometimes in the evening he would check back at the so-called for-

sign Peace Corps. Mr. Ellenger I believe was attached to the staff of the Attorney General. They both indicated to us that the entire operation was under the guidance and control apparently of the author of the letter to which the gentleman from Iowa has alluded, a Mr. Hackett in the Attorney General's Office.

They also indicated that there was another man in some type of supervisory capacity by the name of Boone. Upon inquiry as to the number of persons engaged in this particular operation they said that they imagined there were around 18, and I think they went up to about 22. They stated that these employees were on loan from various departments of the Government, including HEW and the Department of Justice, or the Attorney General's Office and the Peace Corps. They said they had been in operation, I believe, at this particular location, since November 17, 1962.

Mr. GROSS. That is right.

Mr. DEVINE. Of course, as the gentleman knows, our interest in this was, how could there be in existence a national service corps, or a domestic Peace Corps at this time without an authorization of the Congress of the United States? The purpose of our inquiry was to find out how many people were there, what they were doing, and who or what group of taxpayers were paying the salaries of these persons.

I might say upon inquiry that they said they had corresponded with a number of organizations across the Nation. We asked them on whose letterhead they directed their inquiries, and they said that they were written on the letterhead of the Attorney General of the United States.

I merely put that in the Record so there is no question of the purpose of our visit, when it occurred, and what we did.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his observations concerning this matter.

This Mr. McClure from the Peace Corps said that he was there full time getting this show on the road, and when questioned as to how the Peace Corps could operate without a man of his dimension on the job, he being a full-time employee of the international Peace Corps, he said, as my good friend from Ohio has just related, that he stopped at the office in the morning and made certain checks and then came on over to the office of the domestic Peace Corps.

Of course, the staffing of this outfit on Jackson Place on the basis of loaned personnel means that other departments of Government must be liberally overstaffed with stenographers and organizers, and what-have-you. Congress ought to be interested in finding out how they obtain these surplus employees they have available to move around with the greatest of ease throughout the Government.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Did the gentleman inquire of this group of people whether or not this development was the

result of any studies or any contact with the youth organizations in America whose principal objective concerns the youth of America, and who have definite programs to develop character and help take care of their leisure interests, and to do those things that build for good citizenship, et cetera?

Mr. GROSS. They claimed to have contacted many organizations over the country. I could not say whether they have contacted any specific organization.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I am interested in whether or not the Boy Scouts or the Girl Scouts were contacted.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know. I cannot answer as to that. I do know that they said that they had contacted many organizations across the country.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Does not the gentleman think it would be better for us to show an interest in the program now established to do the job that they say they want to do?

Mr. GROSS. I quite agree with the gentleman.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. DEVINE. I might add that they—Mr. McClure and Mr. Ellenger—provided us with a pamphlet indicating an outline of the President's study on, I think, juvenile delinquency. They also gave us a mimeographed sheet with questions and answers.

There is one thing to which I would specifically like to call to the attention of the membership, and that is at page 1772 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 6, 1963, where they will find a very fine breakdown by the senior Senator from Ohio in connection with the operation of the so-called National Service organization, or domestic Peace Corps.

In addition, I am wondering if the gentleman is aware, in speaking of the Peace Corps generally, of quite a gala entertainment or reception of some kind or other that was held about a week or 10 days ago at Duke Zieberts to celebrate the acquisition of this fine Washington Redskin quarterback as a member of this organization. I understand from the papers recently he was hired at \$75 a day, then, for some reason, he decided or was persuaded that he was a volunteer. I thought in our general inquiry we might find out who picked up the check for this lavish entertainment.

Mr. GROSS. I assume that came out of the representation allowance of some Government agency. Some of us have been opposed to these lavish entertainment funds which are provided by the taxpayers.

There is still another interesting development in this Domestic Peace Corps story, for now it is revealed as a result of the diligent work of a Member of the other body that on August 1, 1962, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare made an outright grant of \$250,000 to an organization known as Associated Community Teams, Inc., with offices at 179 West 13th Street, in New York City. Of the total grant of \$250,000 another distinguished Member

of the other body reports that \$157,080 is to be spent for personnel, or more than one-half of the total grant. This is fantastic.

The Department lists one of the incorporators of Associated Community Teams, Inc., as ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Congressman, Minister.

I might say in passing that I endeavored to contact Mr. POWELL early this afternoon to tell him I would use his name on the House floor. I was informed that his whereabouts is unknown to his office. I was totally unable to contact the gentleman. There are newspaper reports to the effect that he is at his residence in Puerto Rico. In any event I learned nothing of his whereabouts.

I repeat, Adam Clayton Powell, Congressman, minister; Livingston L. Wingate, associate counsel for labor-management, Committee on Education and Labor; David D. Jones, Deputy Commissioner of Correction; Jawn A. Sandifer, attorney, civic leader; and Jose Ramon Lopez, assemblyman, New York City.

This grant allegedly was made for the purpose of developing the nucleus of a domestic peace corps. There is a serious doubt, in my mind, at least, that the Department had the authority to make the grant, coming as it did from an appropriation specifically earmarked for the study of juvenile delinquency.

Perhaps it is appropriate to mention that it will be the House Committee on Education and Labor, chaired by the same gentleman from New York, Mr. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, which will consider domestic peace corps legislation, providing, of course, that the President and the Attorney General condescend to consult the Congress about it. In view of what has happened thus far, there is some reason to doubt that they will bother with anything so "unimportant" as obtaining congressional approval for a program which obviously already is on the road.

NATIONAL ACTORS' EQUITY WEEK

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of my colleagues to a joint resolution I am introducing today to designate the week of May 20-26 as National Actors' Equity Week.

I am delighted to join my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. LINDSAY], in the sponsorship of this resolution. And I wish to take this opportunity to commend the distinguished gentleman for his interest, concern, and activity on behalf of all phases of the performing arts. I am privileged indeed to join with him in this step to give proper recognition to the performers in the American theater.

The dates designated in this resolution have a special significance, for it was on May 26, 1913, that a group of leading American actors and actresses, dedicated to their art and determined to improve the status of those in the theatrical profession, formed Actors' Equity.

001080953