

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 20, 1962:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Norman S. Paul, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

U.S. ARMY

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. David William Traub, O17110, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in the grade indicated:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Charles Breckenridge Duff, O18438, U.S. Army.

To be Chief of Chaplains, U.S. Army, as major general in the Regular Army of the United States, and as major general in the Army of the United States

Chaplain (Col.) Charles Edwin Brown, Jr., O25845, U.S. Army, for appointment as indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3036, 3284, 3307, 3442, and 3447.

The following-named officers to be placed on the retired list, in the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be general

Gen. Clark Louis Ruffner, O15968, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. William Peirce Ennis, Jr., O16436, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3384:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Frederick Henry Garber, O385526.
Brig. Gen. Beryl Jacob Pace, O287041.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Edward Ferdinand Baumer, O323662, Infantry.

Col. Lowell Joseph Bradford, O357923, Army Intelligence.

Col. James Rleser Bright, O376675, Ordnance Corps.

Col. Allan Robert Greene, O294164, Artillery.

Col. August Herman Groeschel, O345922, Medical Corps.

Col. Oscar Perry Hampton, Jr., O403301, Medical Corps.

Col. Hatsel Lester Harris, O306806, Infantry.

Col. David Canfield Hastings, O352481, Transportation Corps.

Col. Raymond Edward Mason, Jr., O409410, Artillery.

Col. Walter Gordon Moran, O296649, Corps of Engineers.

Col. Edwin Fay Smith, O325548, Infantry.

The Army National Guard of the United States officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3385:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Clarence Birnie Johnson, Jr., O268791.

Brig. Gen. Wendell Crane Phillippi, O1288114.
Brig. Gen. Everett Selden Simpson, O405521.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Robert Maddock Backes, O374057, Artillery.

Col. Marvin Theron Ball, Jr., O403935, Artillery.

Col. Robert Aye Ballard, O342774, Infantry.

Col. Harold Raymond Bauer, O298149, Artillery.

Col. Robert Clarke Dunnington, O300413, Artillery.

Col. Donald Charles Grant, O360644, Artillery.

Col. Kermit Lafayette Guthrie, O346619, Artillery.

Col. Ivan Hardesty, O399704, Infantry.

Col. Ralph Maurice Krieger, O405796, Infantry.

Col. Edwin Leroy Shull, O335061, Infantry.

Col. Edwin Anson Simpson, O358764, Infantry.

Col. Thomas Graham Wells, Jr., O366471, Artillery.

The Army National Guard of the United States officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3392:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Thomas Sams Bishop, O403542.

Col. Junior Franklin Miller, O385454, Infantry.

To be brigadier general

Col. Bernard Joseph Kitt, O330803, Infantry.

The Army National Guard of the United States officer named herein for appointment as a Reserve commissioned officer of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3392:

To be brigadier general

Col. William David McCain, O288111, Adjutant General's Corps.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Anthony J. Celebrezze, of Ohio, to be Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JULY 20, 1962

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

II Corinthians 13: 11: *Be of one mind, live in peace and the God of love and peace shall be with you.*

Almighty God, grant that through the mediation and ministry of this moment of prayer our aspirations and ambitions shall be inspired to remain elevated and exalted during all the hours of this new day.

We beseech Thee that the lofty conception of our high vocation may never allow us to shirk our responsibilities or shrink cowardly from any appointed tasks no matter how difficult and distasteful they may be.

Wilt Thou graciously widen the circle of our service and sympathies and may it include the last man living in the very farthest corner of the earth who also is entitled and eager to enjoy the blessings of the more abundant life.

Show us how we may cooperate with one another in fulfilling that glorious promise when the hearts of men and

nations everywhere shall be established in the ways of righteousness and peace.

In Christ's name we offer our prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 46. An act to provide for the establishment and administration of basic public recreation facilities at the Elephant Butte and Caballo Reservoir Areas, N. Mex., and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10606) entitled "An act to extend and improve the public assistance and child welfare services program of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes."

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1963

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 11289) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MAHON, SHEPPARD, CANNON, FORD, and TABER.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight to file a report on the bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN reserved all points of order on the bill.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

THE LATE ERNEST TRUMAN HOWELL

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I much regret to announce to the House the death of Ernest Truman Howell, the father of one of our former colleagues, Judge Evan Howell.

Ernest Howell would have been 87 on August 25, 1962. He was the grand old man of the county board of supervisors in my home county of Champaign, Ill.

Ernest was born in Williamson County, Ill., and taught school there. It was there that he met and married his wife in 1904.

The family moved to Villa Grove, Ill., in 1911, and Ernest Howell played an important part in the life of Villa Grove, Ill., for many years. He served as a member of the board of education there. He was an organizer and served many years on the board of directors of the Villa Grove State Bank.

He came to Champaign in 1923 and has lived there since. He was a long-time member of the railway mail service and retired after 33 consecutive years of service.

He has been a most valuable member of the Board of Supervisors of Champaign County for more than 25 years, and he was still a member of the board at the time of his death this week. Ernest Howell was a kindly man and there was never too much that could be done for his friends. He will be long remembered in Champaign County by those who have known him for his good works as well as his thoughtful actions and honest public service.

He is survived by his wife and also by his sons, Evan and William H., and his daughter, Mrs. Edward Sanford, of Champaign. He also has seven grandchildren and two great-grandchildren.

I know that the sympathy of all people who knew Ernest Howell goes out to the Howell family.

He will be buried in Mt. Hope Cemetery, in the shadow of the University of Illinois stadium, and near the school he loved so much.

FELIPE O. PAGDILAO

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2147) for the relief of Felipe O. Pagdilao.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman briefly explain the bill?

Mr. WALTER. This bill will enable a discharged American veteran to become eligible for citizenship. He is a Filipino who served in the U.S. Army honorably and was decorated for bravery. At the end of 6 years' service he was discharged as a staff sergeant. If he can become a citizen it will be possible for him to have his wife and children, who are now in the Philippines, join him in Hawaii, where he was taken after the completion of his military service and discharged.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to have that assurance from the gentleman. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania knows, I joined in objecting to this bill on the Private Calendar. One of the reasons for the objection, and the principal reason as far as I am concerned and I believe on the part of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON], was that this ex-serviceman's wife and five children were in the Philippines. We had no way of knowing whether this family would be reunited by the granting of citizenship to this man. In other words, we had no way of knowing whether this man, now living in Hawaii, had deserted his family. If so, this seemed to us to make quite a difference in regard to the passage of this bill granting this man the right of citizenship. With the gentleman's assurance that this family will be reunited, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. WALTER. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Felipe O. Pagdilao shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POLARIS SUBMARINES

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on this day, 2 years ago, one of the most historic feats in the history of

the world, of freemen, and the history of war, was performed. A submarine bearing the name of the father of our country, *George Washington*, fired from beneath the surface a Polaris ballistic missile. This was the greatest act in the operation of warfare in the history of this Nation or of any nation, or in the history of mankind's fight to be free. On this day, today, we have at least six of these submarines on station or patrolling in the interest of deterring warfare and keeping freemen free.

NORTH CAROLINA TERCENTENARY CELEBRATION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 87-437, the Chair appoints as members of the North Carolina Tercentenary Celebration Commission the following Members on the part of the House: Messrs. WHITENER, RAINS, KITCHIN, and JONAS.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 167]

Alford	Flood	Multer
Alger	Frazier	Norblad
Anfuso	Fulton	Nygaard
Ashbrook	Garland	Peterson
Ashley	Glaimo	Pilecher
Bass, N.H.	Gubser	Powell
Becker	Halleck	Roberts, Ala.
Blitch	Hansen	Roudebush
Boggs	Hardy	Roush
Bolling	Harrison, Va.	St. Germain
Bolton	Harsha	Santangelo
Boykin	Harvey, Mich.	Saund
Breeding	Hays	Scherer
Bromwell	Hébert	Scranton
Carey	Hoffman, Mich.	Shelley
Celler	Karth	Smith, Miss.
Cramer	Kearns	Spence
Curtis, Mass.	Kee	Steed
Dague	Kelly	Taber
Davis, James C.	King, Utah	Teague, Tex.
Davis, Tenn.	Latta	Thompson, La.
Dawson	Loser	Utt
Devine	McSween	Vanik
Diggs	Macdonald	Van Zandt
Dole	Mailliard	Westland
Dominick	Martin, Mass.	Willis
Dulski	May	Winstead
Ellsworth	Merrow	Yates
Farbstein	Moeller	Zelenko
Findley	Montoya	
Fino	Moulder	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 341 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1962

Mr. MORGAN submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 2996) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

TO PERMIT MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES TO ACCEPT FELLOWSHIPS, SCHOLARSHIPS, OR GRANTS

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 7727) to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit members of the Armed Forces to accept fellowships, scholarships, or grants, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "Notwithstanding" and insert "(a) Notwithstanding".

Page 2, strike out lines 11, 12, and 13 and insert:

"However, the benefits of such a fellowship, scholarship, or grant may be accepted by the member in addition to his pay and allowances only to the extent that those benefits would be conferred upon him if the education or training contemplated by that fellowship, scholarship, or grant were provided at the expense of the United States. In addition, if such a benefit, in cash or in kind, is for travel, subsistence, or other expenses, an appropriate reduction shall be made from any payment that is made for the same purpose to the member by the United States incident to his acceptance of the fellowship, scholarship, or grant.

"(b) Each member of the Armed Forces who accepts a fellowship, scholarship, or grant in accordance with subsection (a) shall, before he is permitted to undertake the education or training contemplated by that fellowship, scholarship, or grant, agree in writing that, after he completes the education or training, he will serve on active duty for a period at least three times the length of the period of the education or training; and".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand this bill will increase the number of servicemen or those eligible for service who may accept educational grants, grants by foundations of one kind or another?

Mr. PHILBIN. It may to some extent, but not very much. There are only a very small number of these men being assigned under the program at the present time. This bill will not increase the number very much.

Mr. GROSS. Specifically, what is the purpose of the bill?

Mr. PHILBIN. The purpose of this bill is to authorize members of the armed services to do just what civilian employees of the Government are entitled to do now by law; that is, take higher training in universities, here and abroad, under various programs, foundation plans, and the like.

Mr. GROSS. That is, to accept Rhodes scholarships, Ford Foundation grants for scholarships, et cetera?

Mr. PHILBIN. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask the gentleman the \$64 question. Is Pete Dawkins still playing rugby over in England instead of doing his obligated

service? He was a graduate of the U.S. Military Academy. Is he still over in London, living high on the hog, under one of these scholarships? Why is he not down at Fort Benning doing his military service, as he ought to be?

Mr. PHILBIN. I cannot answer the gentleman's question. I do not know whether he is there or not; I think he may be there. He is a very fine young man and is serving his country faithfully and well.

Mr. GROSS. I have no doubt that he is a fine young man. But it seems to me it would be well for these graduates of the U.S. Military Academy or any other service academy to get busy and do their service and then go to these foreign educational institutions for higher learning. I am opposed to this business of Military Academy graduates spending 2 years or 4 years at Oxford or some other educational institution in a foreign land before meeting at least some of their service obligation. I hope the House Committee on Armed Services will give some attention to this matter. There is no hesitancy in taking the 18- or 20-year-olds who graduate from high schools and universities and putting them in military service. Let us get some service from these people before sending them to institutions of high learning, or whatever they are.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**GENERAL OF THE ARMY
DOUGLAS MACARTHUR**

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 347) tendering the thanks of Congress to General of the Army Douglas MacArthur.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the thanks and appreciation of the Congress and the American people are hereby tendered to General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, in recognition of his outstanding devotion to the American people, his brilliant leadership during and following World War II, and the unsurpassed affection held for him by the people of the Republic of the Philippines which has done so much to strengthen the ties of friendship between the people of that nation and the people of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. ARENDS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, I want to commend the gentleman from South Carolina on submitting this

resolution. This resolution was reported out by unanimous action of the Committee on Armed Services. I think this is a recognition of the services of General MacArthur that is long overdue. I hope this concurrent resolution will be agreed to unanimously.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, of course this resolution will be adopted unanimously. Douglas MacArthur is one of the greatest military captains of all history. His superlative strategy during World War II and in Korea saved this Nation and the free world many thousands of lives.

The genius of a truly great general is marked by his ability to accomplish the objective with a minimum loss of lives and resources—also by his ability to prevent war altogether. Douglas MacArthur possessed to a maximum degree this genius. General MacArthur could foresee the coming of World War II and desperately, as Chief of Staff, provided for a bare nucleus around which our magnificent armies of World War II were built.

If we had listened to MacArthur in the 1930's on preparedness, we might have prevented war through strength. Had we listened to MacArthur's warnings in the Pacific, we would not have been caught unprepared and might have prevented war with Japan through strength.

General MacArthur could see in the 1920's and 1930's the advantage of controlling the air in the next war. I have always believed that General MacArthur was a great admirer of Gen. Billy Mitchell. They were beneath the surface kindred spirits in that they had the ability to look ahead and the courage to point the way.

If General MacArthur's recommendations had been followed during the early stages of the Korean war, the world would not be in such critical condition today. If General MacArthur had been permitted to win the Korean war conclusively, Red China would have been destroyed in a matter of months and the balance of world power would have been tipped heavily today in favor of the cause of freedom. The North Korean attack and the subsequent entrance of Red China into the war was a God-given opportunity for the United States to correct with little cost the tragic mistakes of Yalta and Potsdam. Red China's only armies were ground to pieces in North Korea. The Russians were recuperating from World War II and did not have nuclear weapons in mass production.

MacArthur noted with regret and much sadness the passing of this unbelievable opportunity.

Someday we will have to fight Red China on her terms at a time of her choosing. She will have atomic power backed by the entire Eurasian land mass. This issue could have been resolved forever in our favor in 1951 had those of us in Washington had the foresight to give MacArthur the green light in Asia. This great general could have secured the peace and could have assured the ascendancy of the Western

democratic world. MacArthur was right and many of us here in Washington, in London, and in the United Nations were wrong.

The committee report speaks eloquently of MacArthur's magnificent career. We can add little to the report. The least we can do now is to adopt this resolution unanimously expressing the appreciation of the Congress and the American people to General of the Army Douglas MacArthur.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I support the concurrent resolution expressing the thanks of Congress and the American people to General of the Army Douglas MacArthur.

General MacArthur has devoted a lifetime of service to our country. He has distinguished himself as a leader of three wars and in the intervening years. It is very appropriate that this resolution be adopted in recognition of a lifetime of devotion and brilliant leadership to this country.

His honors and decorations are manifold and in each instance, greatly deserved. His military achievements are unsurpassed in the history of our country. His qualities of leadership are of the very highest order. He is the exemplar of the highest tradition of the military service and of American leadership.

I believe that the action of this resolution will be unanimous and I am privileged to have a part in the adoption of the resolution which expresses and tenders the thanks of Congress and of the American people to General of the Army Douglas MacArthur.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD in regard to General MacArthur.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1963

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12580) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that

general debate on the bill be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided between the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this bill, as I understand, is about \$140 million above the expenditures for much the same purpose last year.

Mr. ROONEY. No; the gentleman must have in mind the \$118,636,500 increase in appropriations for the Small Business Administration and \$21,062,064 in other items. But the bill itself is \$102,112,300 less than the amounts of the fiscal year 1963 budget estimates.

Mr. GROSS. Another facet of it is that there is well above \$1 million in it for entertainment. We will discuss that later.

Mr. ROONEY. I expect that we will.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think that in the short period of 2 hours we will have ample time to discuss the entertainment features and the antics of the troupe of so-called entertainers that has been touring Asia, and a number of other things?

Mr. ROONEY. I think that with 2 hours of general debate and under the 5-minute rule there will be ample time for discussion. The committee expects to be unusually liberal with regard to time on this bill. I think we shall be able to cover this situation.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to have the assurance that the committee is going to be liberal in the matter of time.

Mr. ROONEY. I think the gentleman is entitled to speak freely, and I shall cooperate.

Mr. GROSS. With that assurance and that comment from the gentleman from New York, I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 12580, with Mr. THORNBERRY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, as indicated in the title of the pending bill, H.R. 12580, it covers the appropriations for the present fiscal year, to wit, fiscal year 1963, which began on July 1 for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and for

the Federal judiciary. It also includes the 1963 appropriations for a number of related agencies as follows: The American Battle Monuments Commission, the Commission on Civil Rights, the Federal Maritime Commission, the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, the Small Business Administration, the Subversive Activities Control Board, the Tariff Commission, the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and the U.S. Information Agency.

The total carried in the bill is \$1,902,065,700, which is a reduction to the extent of \$102,112,300 below the amount of the budget estimates presented to the committee.

I should at the outset thank my distinguished colleagues on the subcommittee who labored assiduously and long in connection with the important bill which is before you. The amounts included therein represent the considered judgment of all the members of the subcommittee. I doubt there will be very much controversy with regard to any of the items in this bill so far as the members of the subcommittee are concerned. I refer to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL], the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB], and the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG].

I should also pay our sincere respects and extend our thanks to the hard-working staff assistant to our subcommittee who has been with the subcommittee for the past 15 years, Mr. Jay B. Howe, who is here seated alongside me.

I should point out that the printed volumes of the hearings of this subcommittee constitute over 4,400 pages of testimony. The committee heard in connection with the various items in this bill almost 300 witnesses. We feel that when we recommend the amount of \$284,330,000 for the Department of State, \$305,727,000 for the Department of Justice, \$781,695,000 for the Department of Commerce, \$60,270,700 for the Federal judiciary, and \$470,043,000 for the related agencies that I previously mentioned we have allowed sufficient funds to support the proper and legal activities of all these areas of Government in the present.

With regard to the Department of State, while the amount is a \$5,130,850 increase over the appropriation in the fiscal year 1962 which ended just this past June 30, it is \$50,734,000 below the amount of the budget estimates presented to the committee. I should point out that there was not requested, nor has there been allowed any increase in the number of positions in the item for salaries and expenses of the Department of State. We hope and trust that the example and policy set by the Department of State in this regard will be followed by other departments and agencies of the Government in the future.

The following table summarizes the amounts recommended in the bill in comparison with the corresponding budget estimates and the 1962 appropriations:

\$21 million, which would be a cut of \$1,444,000 in the amount of the budget estimates.

The committee has allowed the amount of \$35,900,000 for the Coast and Geodetic Survey, which is merely a cut for this important agency of \$1,100,000.

For the Maritime Administration the committee has seen fit to allow \$298,175,000. Of this, \$225 million is for the operating differential subsidies for the American merchant marine. Admittedly, the committee could have made this bill look a bit better by reducing the substantial amount included for these subsidies, but I should like to call the attention of the members of the Committee of the Whole to the fact that any such reduction would be spurious and would merely defer the payment of these subsidies. If they are not paid promptly on their contracts the maritime operators can go to the Court of Claims and obtain their money, possibly with interest. These subsidies are provided in order to maintain a U.S.-flag merchant marine in support of U.S. foreign commerce with the capacity of serving as a naval auxiliary in time of war or national emergency. To be eligible for subsidy an operator must provide regular berth services on an essential trade route, show that Government aid is necessary to place the operation on a parity with its foreign competition, and employ vessels constructed in the United States and manned by U.S. citizens.

The bill includes \$3,550,000 for "Research and development," which is a reduction of \$1,950,000 below the amount of the budget estimate and \$2,950,000 below the appropriation for the past fiscal year. The decrease of \$1,950,000 is due to the elimination of the funds for studies of automation.

Included in the bill is a total of \$3,289,700,000 for the Bureau of Public Roads, of which \$38,500,000 is to be derived from the general fund of the Treasury and \$3,251,200,000 from the highway trust fund. This means the committee was presented with a check for the amount requested, and merely signed it. This is what the action of the committee amounted to insofar as appropriations for the Bureau of Public Roads are concerned.

For the National Bureau of Standards there is included \$60,500,000, which would be a reduction of \$9 million below the amounts appropriated in the past fiscal year.

For the U.S. Weather Bureau there has been included the amount of \$112,250,000. In connection with the appropriations for the Weather Bureau, the committee has seen fit, if the Committee will bear with me for a second, to include funds as indicated at page 19 of the committee report for additional weather information for the extreme northwest part of Arkansas, for the distribution of agricultural weather services to southeast Georgia, and to provide 24-hour weather service at Grand Island, Nebr.

Included in the bill are funds, as I have previously mentioned, for the Federal judiciary in the amount of \$60,270,700, which is a reduction of \$964,300 in

Department or agency	Appropriations, 1962	Estimates, 1963	Recommended in bill for 1963	Bill compared with—	
				1962 appropriations	1963 estimates
Department of State.....	\$279,199,150	\$335,064,000	\$284,330,000	+\$5,130,850	-\$50,734,000
Department of Justice.....	295,474,900	309,300,000	305,727,000	+10,252,100	-3,573,000
Department of Commerce.....	794,405,936	703,049,000	781,695,000	-12,710,936	+78,646,000
The judiciary.....	57,795,650	61,235,000	60,270,000	+2,475,650	-964,300
Related agencies.....	335,491,500	480,050,000	470,043,000	+134,551,500	-10,007,000
Total.....	1,762,367,136	1,888,698,000	1,902,065,700	+139,698,564	+13,367,700
Adjustment for borrowing authority replaced in bill by appropriations.....		115,480,000			-115,480,000
Grand total including above adjustment for comparability.....	1,762,367,136	2,004,178,000	1,902,065,700	+139,698,564	-102,112,300

With regard to the subject of State Department representation allowances, which is a favorite subject of discussion between the gentleman from Iowa and myself, the committee has included a modest increase of \$25,000. This would cover the allowances on the opening of a number of new posts, including three in Africa. It would provide for three new consulates in the Far East and for two new consulates in the European area, as well as necessary price increases. The gentleman understands that the prices of commodities have risen in practically all countries as the years have rolled by.

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

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. First of all I want to commend the gentleman and the members of his subcommittee for the excellent hearings. I will say to the gentleman that as far as the operation of the State Department and the diplomatic service over the world is concerned I can get more out of these hearings by accident than I can on purpose out of the hearings of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and this is not to speak disparagingly of a very few members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, notably to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. Church] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Adair]. I cannot, however, pay the same compliment to a majority of the Foreign Affairs Committee. I am speaking of information that gives us some enlightenment as to what is going on.

I would like to point out to the Members of the House that the gentleman and his colleagues both on the majority and minority sides of this Appropriations subcommittee have done an excellent job this year in their hearings. However, they did not cut deep enough. I will go into this later if I can get some time.

The gentleman spoke of the emerging nations. These African nations, I seem to recall from reading the hearings with respect to the increased need for money for entertainment, that one of the State Department officials testified that these emerging African nations have adopted our habits as to what is required and expected in this respect, which, of course, includes the booze fund. We have helped them develop some of their appetites in

certain departments, according to the hearings on the bill.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman from Iowa realizes, of course, does he not, that the committee saw fit to cut the amount for representation allowances from \$1,100,000 to \$950,000? I might further point out that there were 15 instances in this pending bill where increases in entertainment and representation were requested. In only one instance, the one to which I have presently referred, was an increase allowed. Of the other 14, in a number of instances reductions were made.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to hear that, but it is still well above \$1 million in this bill, is it not?

Mr. ROONEY. I have to admit that that is the fact.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I am sure the gentleman from New York remembers that in years past I have offered to pour lemonade on the troubled waters. If it is thought desirable I can supply good California lemonade.

Mr. ROONEY. I thank the gentleman from California for his contribution but I must say I have never cared for lemonade.

In connection with the Department of Justice the bill includes the necessary funds for the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The committee has seen fit to allow \$130,700,000, the full amount requested. It has allowed practically the full amount requested for the Immigration and Naturalization Service, to wit: \$64,050,000.

The committee has practically gone along, with one notable exception, a new psychiatric institution—and the present speaker disagreed with the action of the majority of the committee with regard thereto—concerning the Federal prison system. There has been allowed the amount of \$55,109,000 for carrying out the functions and responsibilities of the Federal prison system in the coming fiscal year.

With regard to the Bureau of the Census in the Department of Commerce, the committee has allowed the amount of

the total amount requested for the courts.

There is included \$1,523,000 for the American Battle Monuments Commission, which maintains the cemeteries for our war dead all over the world and \$950,000 for the Commission on Civil Rights. I for one did not vote to reduce the amount requested, to wit, \$995,000 for the latter Commission. There is also included \$2,100,000 for the Federal Maritime Commission, which is a very substantial increase over the amount they had last year because of certain additional activities which have been given to them as the result of legislative action on the part of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House.

For the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission the committee has allowed \$700,000, and a transfer in the amount of \$30,000 from the war claims fund.

For the activities of the Small Business Administration, the committee has allowed \$305,750,000, of which \$300 million is for the revolving fund.

There is included in the bill \$395,000 for the Subversive Activities Control Board, \$2,900,000 for the Tariff Commission, \$6,500,000 for the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the full amount requested, and \$149,225,000 for the U.S. Information Agency, including \$10,750,000 for the acquisition and construction of important radio facilities and \$1,500,000 for the informational media guarantee fund. The amount for the U.S. Information Agency is a reduction of \$8,835,000 in the amount of the budget estimates.

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

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. First, I want to say that I commend the gentleman and his subcommittee for the excellent job they did in this particular field. I would like to ask the gentleman, however, this question. This budget is approximately \$140 million above the 1962 appropriation for these same services, is it not?

Mr. ROONEY. The substantial increase to which the gentleman refers, and as I have previously stated, is principally in connection with the funds for the Small Business Administration. There is included in this bill \$118,636,500 in appropriations for that Administration over the amount in fiscal 1962. That is the reason our total figures do not look as good as we would like them to look.

Mr. HALEY. I thank the gentleman. The figures look very well. And, again I would like to commend the gentleman for the thoroughness with which he and his subcommittee go into these matters. I think the taxpayers of this Nation owe him a debt of gratitude, because by his thoroughness and willingness to do the work that is necessary to appropriate this money he has saved the taxpayers of this country millions and millions and hundreds of millions of dollars. I want to compliment you on the fine job you have done.

Mr. ROONEY. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

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

Mr. ROONEY. I will be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I have looked at the figure with respect to the Department of Justice, and I cannot find any entertainment allowance for the Attorney General. I find \$20,000 for the collection of evidence, but I do not find any representation allowance.

Mr. ROONEY. While I, as one member of the committee, favored the inclusion of a small amount for that purpose, the majority of my subcommittee decided that the Department of Justice could do without that allowance.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I am glad to hear that. There is no money in this bill for the Secret Service, is there?

Mr. ROONEY. There is no money in it for the Secret Service.

Mr. GROSS. I ask the question because I noted in the paper the other day that the Secret Service was operating a jet propelled speedboat for the Attorney General's water skiing. In another bill Congress added more Secret Service employees and provided more money, and I wonder if it is now becoming fashionable to use the Secret Service to tow bigwigs of Government around in speedboats for water skiing.

Mr. ROONEY. There is nothing included in this bill for those purposes.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to hear that.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB].

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of this committee, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], has done his usual fine job of explaining the details of this particular bill. I consider it an honor and a privilege to serve on this committee under his leadership and under the leadership of the minority member of the committee, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. Chairman, the bill now before the House, H.R. 12580, proposes an appropriation of \$1,902,065,000 for fiscal 1963 for the Departments of State, Justice, including the FBI, Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies.

The related agencies include the U.S. Information Agency, the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the Subversive Activities Control Board, the Small Business Administration, and others.

As such, the funds provided under this bill affect many vital functions and programs of our Government involving the conduct of our foreign relations, our economy, and Federal judicial and investigative activities. How the money is spent and for what purposes is therefore of great significance to all of us.

The subcommittee, as in the past, held detailed and comprehensive hearings on most of the items in the bill. Yet, I would venture to guess that no one of us on the subcommittee would attempt to completely justify each item or attempt to guarantee that the money that may be appropriated under the bill will necessarily be applied in the fashion we understand from the hearings held on these items.

Most of us, I believe, find ourselves in conflict with certain of the budget requests. Some may be too high, some too low. We may not agree with the philosophy behind a program, we may believe a particular program is poorly administered, or we may find ourselves in the position that we must support an appropriation which we may not agree with, but which must be included in the bill because the program is authorized by a law voted by a majority of the Congress.

From working on and studying this bill, I personally have serious questions on various of the amounts contained in the bill, and certain of the budgetary and management practices and procedures followed by the agencies. We can be thankful Congress does possess a measure of control through its power over the purse. It is necessary, however, that this control be exercised meaningfully and effectively.

The amount included in H.R. 12580 for the Department of State totals \$248,330,000. This is an increase of \$5.1 million over fiscal year 1962 though it represents a reduction of \$50.7 million below budget estimates. Over half of the reduction of \$27.79 million is attributable to a request for funds to acquire and maintain buildings abroad which was denied since there is no legal authority for such appropriation.

I am confident you will hear cries of anguish that \$284 million is not sufficient for the State Department. On the other hand, undoubtedly some will say, and with merit, that it is far too much.

Certainly no Member of the House or citizen of the United States has any doubt of the purpose, need for, or the requirement for an adequately financed Department of State.

It is recognized that the Department, through the Secretary of State, is the chief adviser to the President on foreign affairs and has awesome responsibilities for initiating and implementing foreign policies. It is recognized that the difficult and broad areas of responsibility of the Department of State require tools to do a job.

I believe, too, that there are many dedicated people in the Department of State attempting to do a job in the best interests of our Nation and for our welfare and security. It is known that improvements in administration have and are being made, and that more are contemplated.

At the same time, I sincerely believe there are grounds for complaint about the job being done by the Department and the manner in which it is performing some of its tasks.

Aside from strictly policy matters, which in essence may fall outside the purview of budget considerations, there are many other matters closely affecting policy which in my view can and must come under strict scrutiny. Questions must be raised on such matters as to the emphasis placed by the Department on various activities, type of projects undertaken with the money provided, the management job done by the Department, and others.

Apparently there is also a belief held in certain quarters in the State Department that it should be able to operate under complete flexibility. A good example of how flexibility can be accomplished is to arbitrarily classify something they wish to do as an emergency and proceed to spend funds on that basis. This approach is followed for many types of activities, ranging from far-reaching matters to personal brainstorms and pet ideas.

My remarks are not, of course, limited to the Department of State. As the House knows, large amounts are included in the bill for a number of other departments and agencies. Many of these comments apply equally to these sections of the bill.

As the committee studies these budget requests and unearths problems, and these problems often come to light only after persistent questioning, all-important considerations arise.

Does Congress grant complete budget requests, or do we cut? If we cut, the cry goes up that we are adversely affecting our foreign policy or necessary domestic programs. It is often quite difficult to know whether this is true, so in my opinion, we generally have erred on the side of appropriating too much.

I would like to discuss various specific examples of some of the matters discussed during the course of the hearings which give cause for concern.

UNBUDGETED EXPENDITURES

There are instances of where funds budgeted for fiscal 1962 and appropriated by the Congress were diverted to other nonbudgeted purposes by the State Department. One item affected was the State Department Office of Security and Consular Affairs, where money was budgeted and appropriated for new equipment. The equipment was not procured, however. Home leave was curtailed because the funds were used for other purposes. Of the unbudgeted items, \$600,000 was spent for the Under Secretary's conferences, the conferences by the then Under Secretary Bowles.

Under our appropriation process system, and particularly in the bill before us, we generally do not delete on a line item basis. It is an exception when our committee feels that it can attempt to direct an agency specifically to do or not to do something. It should be clearly noted, however, that the amounts we appropriate, once they are in the hands of an agency, can and are spent in ways not justified to the Congress.

As a practical matter our only means of control is to review such expenditures the next time the Department comes before the Congress with a request, and then sometimes it is too late. Programs or activities are started, however, and the Department is in then up to its neck. The plea then is that if we do not give them the money to carry on dire results will follow, with of course, grave consequences to our foreign relations.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting]. One hundred and ten Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, the use of unbudgeted money is indeed a poor procedure in the conduct of our business and the committee very significantly took note of this, and I sincerely hope that the administration takes note of it, also. I shall read from the report on page 3:

The use of funds heretofore appropriated for specific purposes such as security of the Department and home leave and transfer travel to finance other activities for which funds had not even been budgeted or requested such as the regional conferences last year is inexcusable. The Department is expected to use the funds provided in the bill for the purposes for which they were justified and appropriated.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. What are the provisions for discipline when such a thing occurs, does the gentleman know?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I believe the committee has taken note of it, and I am sure that the chairman and others on the committee have properly informed the administrators. The Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of State does not appropriate on a line item basis. The committee appropriates a lump sum for a particular classification. We do not administer the policy of the Department. All we can do is to take their word as to their justification and then when they get the money, they spend it in any way they see fit within that particular appropriation.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I think I bespeak the thoughts of every member of this subcommittee when I say that if the sort of thing to which the gentleman has referred, the use of funds for purposes other than those justified, is continued, this subcommittee will certainly get around to appropriating on a line item basis, and we have so stated to officials of the State Department. We are not going to continue with this sort of operation because it is a wasteful expenditure of the taxpayers' funds.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I certainly thank the chairman of the subcommittee for that comment, because I think that is the kind of discipline that is needed. May I ask one other question? Has the General Accounting Office made any comments on this, or has the matter been referred to them?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Not to my knowledge.

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

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY. The General Accounting Office, which is a fine organization,

generally comes along after this subcommittee has discovered the facts and reports to a certain other committee of the House. They could read the testimony before our committee long before and generally find it all there.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman; and I commend the gentleman, too.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, included in this item in the State Department for "Salaries and expenses" are all kinds of expenses of speakers traveling across the Nation, public affairs officers in great numbers, money for pamphlets, news releases, and a great many other things. It would be practically impossible, in my opinion, to pull all of these items out to see how much these activities are going to cost the taxpayers. But there is one thing sure, the public is paying plenty of their own money to be propagandized. I would just like to point out to you just one of the items to show you how these things grow up over a period of a year.

The State Department in a bulletin entitled "Work Improvement Plans for June of 1961" had a little item contained in it which said that the State Department planned to redesign the Foreign Service Newsletter to include material covered in the employee bulletin and the communique.

In July of 1961, in a report by the State Department of actions taken to improve the effectiveness of administration, they came out with an item entitled "Internal Communications," and told about a communication entitled "The State Department Newsletter" which was going to contain 60 or 70 photographs and 30,000 words, and they were going to send it to approximately 8,000 people.

This particular bulletin started out in rather modest size. It had 44 pages and a cover. On June 25 of 1962, into our offices came a notice from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office. It said that they wanted to notify as many persons as possible of the availability of the worthwhile publication mentioned in the enclosed announcement. In this announcement was an advertisement advertising the State Department Newsletter to be available to the public. This State Department Newsletter was originally intended to be an internal document to bolster the morale of the State Department and was to contain items to help them administer their affairs. Now in June of 1962, 1 year later, we find that they are putting the State Department publication on public sale. It has grown now from a small 44-page-and-cover article to a slick-cover magazine containing 64 pages and cover, and contains all kinds of articles.

A summary of progress that was contained in a bulletin put out by the Department states that the newsletter has been very successful, that they are sending it now to college students, to help recruitment, and has assisted the Department's public relations and public affairs programs by facilitating an understanding of foreign policy.

This particular bulletin has grown in size in just a short period of time from a \$375-plus mailing charge monthly

newsletter to employees, of 3,800 employees, to an annual cost now of \$68,-845-plus, with a mailing list of 10,000 a month, a cost of \$5,700 per month or 57 cents per copy. I think it is interesting to know that the Government Printing Office has placed these on sale at 40 cents a copy. In other words, the taxpayers are subsidizing the public sale of this bulletin.

In the work-improvement plan for 1962 they have done it again, and they are beginning a new project. Now they have to have a newsletter for the administrators, and have a study to determine the feasibility of developing an administrative publication to cover the professional aspects of the administrative functions of the Department of State. So they are on their way again to spend more of the taxpayers' money.

Over and above this they have another bulletin which they are issuing.

This particular bulletin should receive plenty of attention by the House of Representatives. The Department of State publishes this publication which is entitled "Bulletin," which is supposed to provide the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service.

This publication is increasingly carrying articles which are questionable to the intent of the magazine. At the present time this particular bulletin is sent to 2,700 people, and is also on public sale. About 2,700 copies are distributed within the Department of State and other officials. Their cost is roughly \$2.97 each. The Bulletin is supposed to contain speeches by administration officials, the Secretary of State, the Under Secretary, and Assistant Secretaries and other official actions. One of the speeches which was given recently and is now carried in the State Department Bulletin says that to slash the budget is an item which indicates that cold war battle fatigue is setting in among those who are active anti-Communists.

In the July 9 issue of this particular bulletin, which costs \$2.97 each to send out, there are at least nine instances by quick count where the speakers who have been out on the road published speeches in this bulletin which were critical of the Congress as to their actions regarding the cutoff or limiting of aid to Yugoslavia, Poland, and Communist countries. I would like to read you one paragraph to show you exactly what kind of material is getting into this bulletin:

The recent vote on the aid bill indicates to me that a President or a Secretary of State can hardly be expected to wage a war of intellect and diplomacy that goes far beyond the intellect and diplomatic skills of Congress and the public. But this is democracy. And this is sometimes referred to as our country's great weakness. The Communists clearly—like tyrants of past eras—regard it as our weakness.

This was a speech made by a bureaucrat of the Department of State at a high school graduation and they take the time to publish it in the State Department publication at \$2.97 a copy to put out this kind of information.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I want to compliment the gentleman on the very fine and lucid statement he is making. The work that has gone into it certainly indicates once again that he is one of the more able and industrious Members of the House. I want to ask the gentleman this question. As he knows because of some other work he has done, there is a law against any Department of Government using appropriated funds for the purpose of influencing Members of the Congress. I do not know whether any of the situations the gentleman has indicated are specifically intended to influence Members of Congress—possibly to influence members of the public instead, but does the gentleman know of any law which would prohibit such a thing? I think he would agree with me that there should be such a law.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I am not in a position to itemize for the gentleman from Arizona many items, but I do say, in my own opinion, and I am not an attorney, there have been such instances that have happened and which should be looked into. There was one instance in particular which I referred to the Attorney General. He ruled that the Constitution said that the administration officials below the Secretary of State level and others had the right to lobby Members of the House. I disagree and I have introduced a bill in this regard which is before the Committee on the Judiciary, but I have not been able to solicit a report from the Committee on the Judiciary. I believe this must be looked into, where pressure is put on the individual Members of the Congress to pass legislation.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman and of the Members of the House to section 701 of the bill which is now before us which reads thusly:

No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes not authorized by the Congress.

I would assume, if the bill passes with this provision in it, that the type of publication the gentleman has brought to the attention of the House might well be prohibited.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I hope you are right. I believe I would interpret that section as strictly as the gentleman interprets it.

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

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COLLIER. Does the gentleman have the name of the author of that speech to which he referred?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Yes, the author of that speech was the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs, Carl T. Rowan.

Mr. COLLIER. Carl T. Rowan?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. That is correct.

One of the most fantastic programs and requests contained in the State Department budget which is before us is for the mutual education and cultural

exchange activities. The request presented to the subcommittee was \$56.7 million, an increase of over \$26 million. The committee reduced the amount to \$40 million. It may seem inconceivable to Members of the House, but the preliminary estimate of the needs for this program arrived at after a survey by the agency was a whopping \$142.6 million, which the agency felt "was well in excess of the feasible levels." This figure was then reviewed by the agency and was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget in the amount of \$91.7 million. The Bureau of the Budget before submitting it to the Congress reduced it \$56.7 million and we have now reduced it to the \$40 million.

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

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CAHILL. I wonder if the gentleman could tell me and the other Members of the Committee how the Department of State determines the eligibility and the qualifications of the recipients of this aid. I note, for example, that the Joey Adams show was awarded, I believe, about \$256,000 last year to make a tour of the Near East.

On the other hand, I had in my district a local American Legion band which has won a national contest and was asked to participate in a world music contest in Holland representing the United States. They were not able to get any money whatsoever to aid them. I have been trying to find out what it is that qualifies one of these recipients and I have been told that actually it is not the State Department that determines the qualifications, but some organization in New York City. I wonder if the gentleman could tell us the name of it.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. This is an organization in New York City entitled "ANTA." This organization, ANTA, is on a contract basis. There is \$110,000 for this in this budget. This association has a panel of so-called experts that evaluate both the artistic ability and the quality of the performance of these people.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. In just a moment, it is a closed shop and I feel there should be some analysis of this agency by the Government to find out how they can get better entertainment, more qualified entertainment, more representative people to send overseas if we are going to put millions into this program.

The committee has taken specific notice of it in the report.

Mr. CAHILL. I thank the gentleman and agree wholeheartedly with him.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and that they may appear immediately following those of the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The organization, the American National Theater and Academy is a congressionally chartered organization. It has various panels made up of persons recognized as expert in the various fields. They have had, in answer to a reference by my friend from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL], a policy, which I consider to be somewhat questionable, of sending abroad almost exclusively professionals rather than younger people. I think they should reconsider this policy.

The Adams thing according to the newspaper reports was something of a fiasco. I discussed it with the distinguished gentleman from New York. I think perhaps the quality of selection is excellent. I think some of these problems are overemphasized. The Adams incident was an isolated instance. The others have been notable for their great success.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I am a bit reluctant to get into this, but it seems to me that they always have a couple of deadheads or eggheads over in the State Department to handle this program who do not know the difference between Corse Peyton and Joe Cook, as to which one was the comedian, and put them in charge of negotiations with ANTA. Now, most everybody in show business knows that Joey Adams is a low-grade comedian but because of the fact that he was president of AGVA which is the union of which we have been hearing and to which strippers and B-girls must pay substantial dues, instead of sending a real comedian of A-1 quality like Buddy Hackett they have to send Adams at \$1,200 a week with his wife who wrote a series of newspaper articles which knocked the block off the foreign people whose friendship we were trying to court.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, the items I have mentioned today bear on only a small portion of the programs represented in the bill before the House.

Appropriations requests are constantly expanding, which in turn sets the stage for still larger appropriations in the years to come.

Though in large part, Congress must rely on the integrity and best judgment of those in the executive branch to operate programs and carry out policy in the best interest of our Nation and its citizens, Congress must appraise these requests with the knowledge that the American taxpayers do not want, nor can our Nation afford, unrestricted spending, whether it results from lack of control over expenditures, mismanagement, overzealous promotion of activities or any of the many other factors which have contributed toward pushing the national budget to its present peacetime high.

My support of this bill before us is a qualified support. I do not think the cuts that have been made will adversely affect the operations of these agencies in any way or the security and welfare of

our Nation, and in fact believe further reductions may have been made.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, once again our subcommittee brings before the House an appropriation bill that in our best estimates will meet the needs of the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Federal judiciary, and related agencies. We have tried to bring you a lean bill and a bill that is adequate for the purposes of programs and services involved.

TRIBUTE TO CHAIRMAN

To the extent that we have succeeded in this intention, much credit is due to our chairman, the gentleman from New York, JOHN ROONEY. During the years of my service on the Committee on Appropriations, it has been my good fortune to work with chairmen who are among the ablest men in the House. None is more capable or conscientious than JOHN ROONEY. A bill that involves so many controversial functions of the Government is bound to cause disagreements. With great diplomacy and tact, our chairman helps to iron out differences and compromise varying viewpoints in order to bring a bill before the House that has the support of his committee. Anyone who has read our hearings cannot help but respect his intimate knowledge of the detailed operations of these agencies and his determination to have all of the facts on the record.

During my service on the Committee on Appropriations, I have found all of the members with whom I have served to be dedicated and hard-working men who placed nothing above the welfare of their country. Although we have had differences of opinion, I have never had cause to doubt their sincerity of purpose or their dedication to public service. This subcommittee is no exception to this experience. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW], the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] are all capable and conscientious members. The Congress and the country are fortunate in having men of their ability and judgment serving on this committee. During our long and tedious hearings, I have learned to appreciate each of them and I hope they are aware of the high personal regard in which I hold them.

PAST CONTRIBUTIONS

Perhaps I might be excused if I take this opportunity to reminisce a bit today. My first experience on this subcommittee sat me next to one of the finest gentlemen it has been my privilege to know, the late Prince Preston, of Georgia. His name was appropriate since he was in every way a prince among men. It means a great deal to a new Member to have the friendship and help of an experienced Member. I wish all Members could be as helpful to new Members as Prince Preston was to me.

The ranking Republican member at that time was Karl Stefan, of Nebraska, who was determined that the United

States should have the strongest foreign service possible. At that time, there was a tendency among some groups in Government to bypass our Ambassadors in dealing with other nations. While I am happy to say that this situation was corrected in large part due to his efforts, I regret to say that in some instances we still find ambitious and thoughtless people making the same mistake. This must not be permitted to happen again. The Department of State must be the strong arm of Government in our relationships with other nations of the world.

DEBT TO STATE DEPARTMENT

During my service on the subcommittee, I have been impressed by the persons of real ability representing us in the State Department. The work is always arduous and sometimes thankless, and I am sure that many of these dedicated people feel a sense of frustration at times. But in my opinion, based on observations through the years, I think we in the Congress and the country owe the State Department an immeasurable debt of gratitude. In the main, we can well be proud of their efforts. I say to the House that the work of the State Department is in capable hands.

Allowing for an adjustment made in the bill before us today to substitute a direct appropriation for back-door spending, the amount recommended by the committee is \$102,112,300 below the budget request. The reductions were carefully selected and will not impair vital functions of the Government. These reductions made it possible for us to recommend a direct appropriation of \$115,480,000 for the Area Redevelopment Administration rather than authorizing Treasury borrowing.

TRIBUTE TO SECRETARY

This bill includes funds for carrying out some of the most important activities of our Government. The Department of State is charged with the primary role in the conduct of our country's foreign relations. As head of the Department of State and the principal adviser to the President in the determination and execution of the foreign policy of the United States, the Secretary of State carries a heavy responsibility not only in policy-making but in the administration of his Department. In my remarks last year, I complimented the Secretary on his genuine interest in the day-to-day operations of his Department.

Secretary Rusk's testimony this year is an excellent presentation of the problems of the Department and the steps that have been taken, or are contemplated, in the effort to find workable solutions. Our report on this bill commends the Secretary and the other officials of the Department of State responsible for the decision not to request additional personnel in their budget estimates for fiscal year 1963.

NO PERSONNEL ASKED

To the best of my recollection, this is the first time that a Cabinet member has come before a subcommittee on which I have served and did not ask for more personnel. As our report says:

The committee recognizes that such a stand is highly unpopular especially among

the so-called empire builders. It is to be hoped that not only will the Department of State continue to advocate such a policy but that the officials of other departments and agencies will adopt it as well.

In his testimony before our subcommittee, Secretary Rusk has ably highlighted a problem all too prevalent throughout the Government:

For years the Department has allocated too much of its available funds for salaries of people and too little for their support.

In this new budget the Department proposes to strike down this imbalance in resources—to have enough but not too many people, and to support them with the funds they must have to perform to the best of their abilities.

This is a purpose all of us can applaud and we wish the Secretary well in the worthwhile effort he has undertaken to reorganize and modernize this important Department of Government. Although we realize that tradition and custom continue to play an important role in the conduct of foreign affairs, we cannot expect a 19th-century State Department to cope with complexities of a 20th-century world.

RESPECT FOR FBI

At least one valid measure of an agency's work is public support and public approval. An immediate example of this is the Federal Bureau of Investigation which has won the respect of the American people through efficient and dedicated service. The committee's recommendation that the Bureau be granted the full amount of its budget estimate, \$130,700,000, reflects this confidence in the Bureau and in its able Director, J. Edgar Hoover. The amount allowed will provide for 218 additional employees, 145 special agents, and 73 clerks, all of whom will be assigned to the field.

Another measure of an agency's effectiveness is its ability to retain experienced employees. The record of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in this regard is an enviable one: 46 percent of its employees have served for more than 10 years and an impressive 76 percent of its investigative staff has served from 10 to 40 years. The turnover rate of the special agent staff during a test month was three-tenths of 1 percent, as compared to 2 percent for Government employees as a whole.

An experienced staff has enabled the Bureau to absorb many of the new responsibilities imposed upon it by law. In addition, the investigative staff worked a total of 3,668,416 hours of overtime. This voluntary overtime service represents the equivalent of 1,764 agents on a full-year basis, which would have cost an estimated \$18,702,387.

Mr. Hoover requested the new employees for next year to meet the manpower needs of the Government's stepped-up program directed against organized crime and racketeering. All of us, I am sure, are in support of the Attorney General's intention to press a coordinated drive by all Federal agencies against organized crime in this country. I recommend that Members of the House read Mr. Hoover's highly informative testimony on this subject. Crime con-

tinues to increase rapidly and to rise four times faster than the population.

CITIZEN MUST FIGHT CRIME

In analyzing this trend, Mr. Hoover reminded us that "the ultimate weapon in the fight against crime is the American citizen."

He said:

The overlords of organized crime could be dealt, I believe, a death blow if citizens would stop trading with the bookie, the prostitute, the druggusher, and other salesmen of the criminal empire. The pennies, nickels, dimes, and dollars funneled into the underworld bankrolls provide the means for the hoodlums and racketeers to spread graft and corruption throughout the Nation. Too, the customers of organized crime, desperate for funds, often turn to robbery, burglary, or other such crimes.

One of the most disheartening problems is the great increase in the frequency and viciousness of criminal acts by young people. Mr. Hoover correctly characterizes this as "a damning indictment of some parents." Crime by juveniles has increased twice as fast as the adult crime rate and the trend is continuing. Law enforcement officers alone, at whatever level of government cannot hope to solve this problem. It is clearly the most important challenge facing parents who have the high moral responsibility of guiding their children to proper development as good, law-abiding citizens.

IMPORTANT SECURITY RESPONSIBILITIES

Most Americans are well aware of the important work of the FBI in investigating communism, espionage, sabotage, treason, and subversion. It is imperative that the FBI continue to have the best possible coverage of the activities and plans of individuals and groups which threaten our internal security. Although much of our discussion in this area was necessarily off the record, the Director's testimony on these subjects will give Members an accurate estimate of the current state of the problem.

BUREAU OF PRISONS

In discussing Department of Justice items, I again want to compliment the capable and experienced director of the Bureau of Prisons, James V. Bennett, for the efficient and determined manner in which he and his associates are coping with the ever-increasing problems of our Federal prison system. The increase in prison population and the longer sentences resulting from the increase in serious crimes continue to complicate these problems. To help meet the need for buildings and facilities, the committee included funds for the advance planning, replacement for the National Training School; chapel facilities, El Reno, Okla.; additional facilities, Texarkana, Tex.; an open youth institution; general repairs and improvements; and \$75,000 for commencement of construction of an activities building at Sandstone, Minn.

FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES

Members will also be interested in the state of the Federal Prison Industries, Inc., a wholly owned Government corporation. A board of six directors ap-

pointed by the President controls its policies. Supervision is by the Director of the Bureau of Prisons who has jurisdiction over all industrial enterprises and vocational training programs in all Federal penal and correctional institutions. Products manufactured by inmates are sold only to penal institutions and to other Government agencies. Earnings, in excess of operating revenues, are paid as dividends to the U.S. Treasury.

The corporation is authorized, under the Attorney General, to establish and operate industries in Federal penal and correctional institutions and disciplinary barracks. Its objectives are to provide employment for physically fit inmates; to provide maximum vocational training for qualified inmates in connection with regular institutional and industrial activities; and to operate a placement service to assist released inmates to secure jobs. Earnings from the sale of these products pay the expenses of the corporation and have permitted payment of \$43 million in dividends into the Treasury since January 1, 1935. Although no dividend was paid during 1961, it is anticipated that a dividend of \$4 million will be paid both in 1962 and 1963.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. Chairman, the committee has included the full \$300 million requested in the budget for the revolving fund to carry out the activities of the Small Business Administration. This includes loans to small businesses, loans to disaster victims, loans to small business investment companies for organizational growth and operating purposes, and to State and local development companies.

Since questions sometimes arise in this area, I would like to briefly discuss the repayment record of this agency. Through the close of business on December 31, 1961, the agency had charged off \$4.8 million on 396 loans. In addition, 813 loans were in liquidation and were handled in a special manner prior to or during foreclosure and 843 loans were delinquent over 60 days. It is estimated that probable losses on these loans will amount to \$7.1 million. Losses, therefore, will probably total \$11.9, which is only 1.3 percent of total disbursements to this point of \$909 million. Considering the great benefits to many communities as a result of new and expanded business activities, this is a good record of repayment.

U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to discuss briefly the work of the U.S. Information Agency and the Voice of America in particular. Last year we wished Mr. Edward R. Murrow, its Director, well in his undertaking. This year we can compliment him on an excellent job and offer him continued support in his further efforts to make this Agency an efficient and effective arm of Government in our dealings with the world. Mr. Murrow has worked tirelessly to improve USIA's projection to the world of a strong, democratic, and dynamic America which is serving the interests of all free peoples. He assures us that these efforts will continue in all of the communica-

tions techniques—personal contacts, libraries, press, radio, motion pictures, television, book publishing, and distribution.

In our report last year, we urged greater emphasis on information programs in Latin America and Africa. Mr. Murrow has increased our broadcasts to Latin America from a total of 3 hours in Spanish to 9 hours in Spanish and 3 hours in Portuguese. The placement of package programs on local medium-wave transmitters has increased substantially.

LATIN AMERICAN EMPHASIS

USIA conducts informational and cultural programs in every Latin American country except Cuba, and in the British West Indies, French West Indies, and British Guiana. This is a time of great change in Latin America and it is more important than ever to promote understanding and acceptance of democratic processes by demonstrating them at work in the United States.

During the past year, radio, television, and local motion picture production has been expanded in order to reach a greater audience and to provide programs of special interest to rural, student, and labor groups. Included in the 9 hours of Spanish broadcast daily are 3 hours of news, commentaries, and features especially aimed at Cuba. The committee has expressed interest in increasing the 3 hours of Portuguese broadcasts for audiences in Brazil. I have seen pictures showing antennas on the houses in the low-income sections of Brazil and learned that our programs are being received and welcomed.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO PEACE

In dealing with programs of this kind, our problem is always one of making choices in the use of limited funds. We can point to many accomplishments; we also know that there have been failures. For the greater part, however, it is my opinion that we are getting a real return on our investments in many of these programs. The future may yet prove to us that the pennies we have spent on some of these efforts may well bring us closer to the goal of peace in the world than the dollars spent on hydrogen bombs and long-range missiles.

Mr. Chairman, our report is the result of many weeks of hearings and deliberation and presents our best estimate of the funds needed to carry on essential activities in the departments concerned. With proper husbanding and better utilization of men and materials, these amounts should be ample for efficient and effective administration of the programs assigned by law.

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

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MacGREGOR. In speaking of the rural development program, is the gentleman from Minnesota referring to the funding of the area redevelopment program?

Mr. MARSHALL. That is exactly right.

Mr. MacGREGOR. I commend the committee for funding this by direct

appropriation instead of by borrowing through the back door of the Treasury.

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

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the gentleman for his fine statement. I would further like to make the observation that it is my understanding the gentleman from Minnesota, Congressman MARSHALL, intends to retire after this session. He being my neighbor for a long time and having been associated with the work that the gentleman has done and observing what the gentleman has done, I want to say that all of us owe a vote of gratitude to the gentleman for his fine and conscientious work. We have appreciated his companionship and his fine attitude in this body over a period of many years. Certainly I must say that has been true during the time I have served in this body.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman's statement today has been one that shows a profound study of the work of our Government. The gentleman has made a very distinct contribution to better execution of the affairs of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. MARSHALL. I am very happy, Mr. Chairman, to yield to my distinguished colleague from Minnesota for that purpose. I regret that I am retiring, because I could use the gentleman's comments in a political campaign if I were to run again. They would be, I am sure, a great help to me. I do appreciate the gentleman's statement. Although the gentleman used the word "retiring" I do not feel in that sense of the word that I am retiring. I am looking forward to having the time to do a lot of things which I have wanted to do for a good many years.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I was most certainly remiss a while ago in not reminding the Members of the Committee of the Whole of the voluntary retirement of the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL]. I do want to say that his leaving the House of Representatives is a distinct loss to this subcommittee, to the full House Committee on Appropriations and to the entire House of Representatives. In the years that the gentleman from Minnesota has served on this subcommittee, for a man who is not a lawyer, he has always had the reputation of being the best cross-examiner on the subcommittee. The gentleman always knows exactly what he starts out to prove and is capable of proving exactly what he has in mind. I say, to repeat, that it is a great loss that the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota is leaving the House of Representatives.

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

Mr. ROONEY. I am delighted to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I should like to express the hope to my colleague that his promise of further

hard work in central Minnesota when he leaves this body will not bode ill for the efforts of those who sit on this side of the aisle.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota referred to the help given him when he was a first-term Member of this body. I should like at this time, although we are of differing political parties, to express to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL], and so that the Members of the House might know, my appreciation for the guidance and counsel given to this first-term Member from Minnesota by the gentleman now in the well. I appreciate it a great deal.

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

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I want to join my colleagues who are paying tribute to the congressional career of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL]. When I first came to Congress our offices were adjacent. I spent many pleasant hours with the gentleman from Minnesota and received much beneficial advice and assistance from the gentleman.

I shall never forget one time when I offered an amendment to the Mutual Security Act which I thought was a very meritorious one, and I was able to get only one on the majority side of the aisle to support that amendment; that was the gentleman from Minnesota. I have never forgotten his kindness in that regard.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman completes his service in the House of Representatives, I wish him well.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to my distinguished friend from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I should like to join my colleagues on this side of the aisle in paying tribute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] and to the service he has rendered the Congress and the country. From my observation, he has been a great statesman. I regret very much that he is leaving our body.

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

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to join in these richly deserved compliments that are being paid to my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL]. When we came to Congress together, in the 81st Congress, our offices were across the hall from each other. I met the gentleman immediately. We had many conversations at that time and came to know each other well. I have the highest respect for the gentleman; I shall miss him greatly, and it is my hope that if ever this Congress adjourns in reasonable time, say in August, I may join the gentleman up in Minnesota in something we both like to do, and that is to get out in a boat and do a little fishing in the lakes of Minnesota.

Mr. ROONEY. Would the gentleman bring any of the tools of the trade with him?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman that when the gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from Iowa go fishing, we do not need any tools of the trade.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, it has been my good fortune to be associated with the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL], not only on the floor but in committee and at close range. He is and he has been one of the most valuable Members of the House and has rendered special service not only on this committee, but particularly on the Subcommittee on Agriculture, on which subject he is one of the best informed Members in Congress today.

His decision to retire is a distinct loss to the Congress and the country. He is intimately acquainted with every phase of agriculture—both as a prominent administrator in the Department of Agriculture and as the owner and operator of a farm where he has engaged in diverse farming and put into practice the various improvements of agencies of the Department.

He is a scholarly man and able to appraise and report on the research studies and specialization activities of the greatest decade of progress in the history of American agriculture in a very practical way. Consequently his loss to the House and the farmers of the Nation is far greater than the average layman can visualize.

He is retiring over the vigorous protest of the Department and the committee but he is entitled to this well-earned vacation and we trust we can still call on him in time of special need. We wish him Godspeed and the special rewards which come to the man engaged in the work nearest to his heart.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, certainly I do not want this opportunity to pass without expressing my great personal admiration for the outstanding work which has been done in the Congress by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL]. I deeply regret that he has decided to leave the House. He is the type of sound, solid, rugged American that this Nation needs in Government. So it is with genuine sorrow that I see him give up his work here. He is a hard worker, a patient and careful worker who has rendered such valuable service to this committee and to the Congress. We need him and we need more like him. There are not enough Fred Marshalls in Government.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I have had the pleasure of sitting alongside the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] on this subcommittee for a number of years now. I want to join the chorus of admiration which has been expressed here. It has been a distinct

pleasure to serve with him. We are all sorry to see him go. The Congress and the country are going to be the losers.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON].

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I join the other Members in paying my tribute to FRED MARSHALL. He and I came to the Congress at the same time, the 81st Congress. I served with him on the Subcommittee of Appropriations for the Department of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare. I was impressed with his remarkable knowledge of the programs in that Agency. I think we all remember the work he did about the health of the Indians. He was dedicated to that service. The Indians had had a very, very high mortality rate. He made it a point to see that this was corrected. The health of the Indians has improved tremendously because of his effort, especially insofar as tuberculosis is concerned. I think we can all be proud of the work he did in that respect. I am very, very sorry he is leaving Congress.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy that the members of this great committee are taking the time to pay deserved tribute to a great Member of this House and a great American. I am very sad that this distinguished gentleman is departing from the Congress. I have had the privilege of watching him on the floor for many years. He has been one of the most conscientious Members that I have known during my service here in the House. His attendance record, I am sure, is one of the finest. He is a man of independent judgment. He makes his mind up, but he does not make it up without thought and consideration. He is fair. He can disagree without ever being disagreeable. I join the members of this great and distinguished committee in wishing him many happy and useful years back in his home State of Minnesota.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, FRED MARSHALL and I came to Congress at the same time, in 1949. This has given me the opportunity to know him and his attractive wife more closely than would otherwise be possible. I know of no one in Congress who has better expressed in our deliberations independence of thought, careful judgment and a feeling of good will toward all. It has been a pleasure to serve with him. He has set a standard of excellence in service here that we could all use as a goal toward which to strive.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] who is blushing to such an extent that it is very apparent to all of us, because he has always been a really modest gentleman.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, my heart is overflowing with gratitude for the fine things the Members have said about me today. If I had known the Members would have had these fine things to say I would have had Mrs. Marshall sitting in the gallery so that I could convince her

that my work and effort have been a little worthwhile.

It has been a privilege to serve as a Member of this body. The people of the country ought to appreciate more than they do the fine men and women that are representing them in this great body. This is the greatest legislative body in the world. It is a privilege to be a participant in the activities that take place. I say to all of you that this country is in good hands in our system of Government, when we have the representatives that come from all over the country and serve the people of this country and the world as well as they do here.

It is a wonderful privilege to have been with you. I am going to take with me many fine memories of my acquaintance with you. I am sure that I appreciate the friends that I have on both sides of the aisle. If any of you at any time are up in our section of the country, we would be most happy to have you stop in and visit some of our 10,000 lakes in order to enjoy our fine State and if you fish I hope you will have the usual good luck of those who fish in our waters.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG].

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-three Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 168]

Alford	Flood	Mailliard
Anfuso	Flynt	Martin, Mass.
Auchincloss	Fogarty	May
Ayres	Frazier	Merrow
Bass, N.H.	Fulton	Moeller
Becker	Garland	Montoya
Blitch	Gialmo	Moulder
Boggs	Gilbert	Multer
Bolling	Green, Ore.	Norblad
Bolton	Green, Pa.	Peterson
Boykin	Gubser	Plicher
Breeding	Halleck	Powell
Brewster	Hardy	Roberts, Ala.
Bromwell	Harrison, Va.	Roush
Buckley	Harsha	Santangelo
Carey	Harvey, Mich.	Saund
Celler	Hays	Scherer
Cramer	Hébert	Scranton
Curtis, Mass.	Hoffman, Mich.	Shelley
Dague	Karth	Slack
Davis	Kearns	Spence
James C. Davis, Tenn.	Kee	Taber
Dawson	Kelly	Thompson, La.
Devine	Keogh	Utt
Diggs	Kilburn	Vanik
Dole	King, Utah	Van Zandt
Dominick	Kirwan	Waggonner
Dulski	Lane	Willis
Ellsworth	Lankford	Winstead
Farbstein	Latta	Yates
Findley	Loser	Zelenko
Fino	McSween	
	Macdonald	

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 12580, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 336 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal. The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, at the time of the call for a quorum I had yielded 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG].

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, just prior to the quorum call my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] was explaining the bill now pending before us in his usual able manner. We on our side of the aisle also want to extend our regrets, FRED, that you are going to be leaving us. We are going to miss you a great deal.

Mr. Chairman, I might say in this connection that immediately following the passage of this bill we are going to have some comments for our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] who is also going to retire and who is going to be honored by an affair in his district on tomorrow, which affair a number of us hope to be able to attend.

Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the remarks of others on our subcommittee who have spoken on this legislation.

This is a bill which covers very many important agencies of our Government. The State Department, of course, is charged with the responsibility of carrying on foreign affairs for our Nation throughout the world. I want to say this: I believe that there are many areas in this bill where the amounts allowed are too high. But we all recognize, as we sit down and discuss these things, that we have to reach some kind of negotiation. What we have come up with is this as the best negotiated judgment of the entire subcommittee. We never get everything we want one way or the other. As has been stated before, there are no new positions for the State Department. This is true in spite of the fact with the emerging nations of Africa there is a requirement for the opening of new posts. But there is going to be a shift of personnel from other areas in an effort to try to take up this requirement for new personnel for these new areas.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say personally in passing that I thought last year the State Department had a wonderful team—administrative team—in Assistant Secretary Roger Jones and William Crockett. Mr. Jones has left. I happen to be one who believes that he is going to be missed in the State Department. I trust that his successor will do an excellent job. In my opinion the shoes of Roger Jones will be difficult to fill.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to state that we recall that some time ago—and while this has nothing to do with the appropriation itself, it does have something to do with the State Department—we heard a great deal about the appointment of noncareer Ambassadors and how this was going to be changed by this administration. Well, I have a review of the number of Ambassadors that have been appointed. As of May 1 there were 72 new appointments; 29 of these are noncareer appointments. I for one happen to believe that there is a real place for noncareer Ambassadors. I think it is excellent that they are appointed. This was true under the old administration. It was my understand-

ing that this was not going to take place under the new administration. There is a place for both career and noncareer Ambassadors. I am glad the administration has realized this.

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell me what has happened to Ambassador Chester Bowles?

Mr. LAIRD. He was out at SAC the other day.

Mr. GROSS. I seldom see his name in the newspapers these days.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Let me say this: He, as the gentleman knows, was the Under Secretary of State. Then, for some reason or other, he left that job and is now a special adviser to the President on foreign affairs.

Mr. Chairman, I might say that this appears from the record to be rather expensive advice, because if one will check in the hearings on page 47 one will find that these conferences which Mr. Bowles is holding around the world already have cost us something like \$600,000, which is a rather large and expensive sum.

Mr. Chairman, we heard a great deal of criticism in the past about the travels of Secretary Dulles and many others, but there has not been any reduction in travel in recent years, from looking at the record. Mr. Bowles is still on, he is still advising on foreign policy and, in my opinion, I think it is rather expensive advice.

Mr. GROSS. Making his contribution to the detriment of the taxpayers by running up bills of \$600,000 for travel; is that correct?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I leave it to the gentleman's own conclusion whether or not these \$600,000 of conferences were necessary.

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the question asked by the gentleman from Iowa, I would like to state that Ambassador Bowles was out at the Offutt Air Force Base in Omaha this last week, being briefed on the strategic strike capabilities of SAC. The Ambassador is trying to learn what happened to the missile gap which he talked about as chairman of the Democratic national platform committee in 1960. I think it is well that he went to the SAC headquarters so that he could see that the United States is a strong Nation and does have the power to carry out a positive foreign policy. It is too bad he did not make this visit earlier.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin, a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Defense. I always said that this was more of a yap-gap than a missile gap, because we just did not have a missile gap.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to go on and discuss the Disarmament Agency, which is an agency we hope will suc-

ceed, but it does not seem that we are going to make too much progress with it in the very near future. This is another one of the growing agencies. For 1961 they had 413 actual positions; in 1962 897, and the estimate for 1963 is 1699. I hope that we will get some results, and we should like to give them a chance to produce.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to say something on an item that is of interest to me in my own area. We have had reports of the great success with the lamprey eel. Many of the Members who have been here for some years recognize that this has been of concern to many of us from the Great Lakes area. We are told that the lampreyicide is making real progress and we are getting results from the electric weirs and that the lampreyicide program is going along very well. When we go back into the House I shall ask unanimous consent to insert an article from my hometown paper on that matter. The Bay City Times, of June 17, 1962. The article follows:

LAMPREY CONTROL DEFINITE

(By Woodie Jarvis)

DETROIT.—Nearly 90 percent of all sea lampreys in Lake Superior have been destroyed by the chemical stream treatment program of the past 4 years, according to the most recent figures.

The long-sought turning point in the struggle against the vampires was reached this spring when the count of lampreys captured in electric weirs dropped to one-tenth of what it has been in recent years.

The beneficial effect of destroying 9 out of 10 lampreys already is showing on Lake Superior's trout population. Commercial fishermen in recent months have reported heavy catches of 4-year-old trout in perfect condition, unmarked by lamprey scars. In past seasons, this year class would have been virtually wiped out by lamprey attacks.

The dramatic destruction of adult lampreys, anticipated by both United States and Canadian authorities for this year, was disclosed by the count of spawning lampreys taken in electric weirs on 29 Lake Superior spawning streams.

On June 1, at the halfway point in the spawning season, only 3,630 lampreys had been captured as compared to 28,981 taken in the same weirs during the same period last year.

These figures are for the United States side of Lake Superior, ranging from the Waiska River near Sault Ste. Marie to Wisconsin's Amnicon River near Duluth, and officials say the Canadian catch has shown a similar dramatic drop.

The missing lampreys are the ones that have been killed as larvae in the streambeds during the past 4 years and never reached the point where they could mature and enter Lake Superior to prey on fish.

This means that attacks on fish have been reduced 90 percent during the past year. This reduced predation began to show up last fall, when the scarring rate on trout dropped suddenly toward the zero point.

With continued treatment and retreatment of Superior streams going on each year, the lamprey population is expected to show a further decline in the years ahead.

Authorities in charge of the program cautiously refuse to predict complete victory over the vampires. They say the most they hope for is to reduce attacks to the levels of 10 years ago.

The two largest lamprey spawning streams on the south Superior shore continue to be the Big Two Hearted River in Michigan and Wisconsin's Brule River.

Mr. Chairman, with regard to the Department of Commerce, they requested something like 2,200 new jobs. I believe that this bill will allow them about 900 of those. I do not think we can state exactly how many, but I will say as a member of the subcommittee that I believe this is still too many new jobs. It might be of some interest to you to know that the total of travel expense for the Department of Commerce is reported to be about \$10 million a year. We hear a great deal of talk about the expense of travel of Members of Congress of the United States, but the agencies in the executive department are far ahead of us; do not forget that. So in the Department of Commerce \$10 million is asked for travel expenses, both foreign and domestic.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a statement about the ship construction subsidy program. The administration reduced that this year to \$50 million from \$98 million last year. That is a phony reduction. Contracts are going to have to be made next year, so you may have to look forward to this amount being increased. I think every member of the subcommittee is in agreement that this \$50 million figure is just a figure that was put in here to make it look a little better in the budget. Really it ought to be a little higher than that.

Another agency that you are going to see growing by leaps and bounds is that of the Area Redevelopment Administration. I do not believe there will be any distressed area as far as the paper industry is concerned, because I do not know an agency—and you are getting them in your office—that can issue more press releases than this one. Here are press releases for less than a month. On the 3d of July they issued eight in 1 day. On the 7th of July they issued nine in 1 day. They are really undistressing the paper industry if it is distressed. They are requesting increases in personnel and getting into the very area where I believe the Small Business Administration is doing a better job than the Area Redevelopment people. Nevertheless, they are authorized by law, and we have to do what we can to provide the appropriations, although in my personal opinion they are not doing the job that they are stating in their propaganda.

They have a formula that every time they make a loan it means the creation of X thousand new jobs. You will find nothing in the justifications that will bear out that that is the case. I suppose there is no more disappointed group of Members of Congress than those from say the State of Pennsylvania. When the hearings were held, not one loan from the Area Redevelopment Administration was made in the State of Pennsylvania. West Virginia was distressed, and I think one loan had been made there. I believe they are getting ready to pour out more money, but I do not believe the record indicates that this is a successful operation. We hope that it will be, but I have serious misgivings about it.

The U.S. Information Agency I believe in this appropriation is adequately funded. If we have some criticisms

about these activities here, mine would be this, that they are not hard-hitting enough in their propaganda, they are not selling the American way the way they should. I hope this will be corrected. The best commodity we have to export is the free enterprise system. We should do better in this area. I regret the lack of time makes it impossible to go more into detail in regard to this appropriation.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I have the highest regard and respect for this subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, led by the able gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOWL].

I was surprised to some extent when I noticed a reduction in the budgeted item for the Federal Maritime Commission of \$800,000. Reorganization Plan No. 7 provided for the establishment of the Federal Maritime Commission as a separate agency on August 12, 1961. Its primary purpose was to insure a more vigorous enforcement of the shipping statutes. Immediately following the reorganization, two major shipping bills were enacted after intensive congressional investigation. The first of these bills related to the dual-rate contract structure of the steamship conferences and foreign carriers in commerce with the United States, and the second provided for the licensing and regulating of foreign freight forwarders. Both, enacted after intensive and exhaustive hearings, represent major revisions of statutes and require the Commission to greatly expand its activities to insure enforcement.

In addition, the Antitrust Subcommittee completed a 3-year investigation into the shipping laws, conference agreements, and other practices detrimental to our foreign commerce. Its report included numerous recommendations calling for the Commission to assume new responsibilities and increase its enforcement to more effectively administer the statute for the protection of the American public against unreasonable rates and shipping practices.

These actions by this Congress, namely, establishing a new agency to provide more vigorous enforcement of the law; enactment of new legislation placing greater regulatory authority in the Commission; and committee recommendations for the Commission to expand its activities for the protection of the American shipper, exporter, and importer were made in fiscal 1962.

This was the first year of operation of the Commission as a separate agency. Funds were made available on the basis of business as usual under conditions existing prior to the reorganization and made no provision for a staff required to accommodate the aforementioned actions by this Congress.

The Federal Maritime Commission has presented a budget request for \$2,900,000

which provides for a staff of approximately 300 employees in 1963. The need for a staff of this size was urged as far back as last October upon enactment of the new legislation. Efforts to obtain a supplemental appropriation for 1962 were unsuccessful, and, if staffing permitted in 1963 should be insufficient, the years of study, investigation, and hearings in Congress will have resulted in establishing statutes on the books without providing adequate means of enforcement.

The appropriation proposed in H.R. 12580 in the amount of \$2,100,000 which, I understand, covers funds for all expenses, including the additional requirement for rental of commercial office space since sufficient Government-owned space is unavailable, will only permit 200 man-years of employment. This is approximately 100 less than the number the Federal Maritime Commission urged as the minimum necessary to meet its responsibilities. Congress created this new agency, gave it additional duties, and recommended expanded regulatory effort. The degree of effectiveness of the Commission in implementing these actions is largely dependent upon adequate staffing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when I noticed that the budgeted item for the Federal Maritime Administration to carry out the enforcement of existing laws prior to the reorganization and the other requirement brought on them by the reorganization plan, I notice the item of \$800,000, a reduction from the recommended budget. Naturally, I was concerned for from time to time, the Merchant Marine Committee has had the Maritime Board and the new Maritime Commission before it questioning them about carrying out their responsibilities for the protection of the American importer and exporter and particularly vigorously with respect to freight forwarding and the enforcement of the regulatory laws applicable the steamship conferences. So with my respect for this subcommittee, naturally, I wanted to rise here today and ask for the comments of this subcommittee, for I am certain they went into this matter pretty thoroughly before they reduced this amount from the budgeted recommendation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. BONNER. I would like for the subcommittee to explain to the House why this tremendous reduction was made in this budgeted item which is for the protection of importers and exporters and the general public who depend on water borne commerce—not only American flag vessels but foreign vessels that have to be supervised under the laws already on the books.

Mr. MARSHALL. I would say to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina that the committee did go into this matter very thoroughly. This agency asked for a 100-percent increase in personnel or an increase of 153 new positions. The committee felt that was too much and we reduced that by 50

percent. We think they can do a good job and do what they are required to do with this 50-percent increase in personnel.

Mr. BONNER. I thank the gentleman for his explanation. I am sure that the subcommittee did examine the situation fully and fairly. I am sure too that the gentleman understands my concern lest this new agency not be able to carry out its functions due to lack of adequate staffing. As I explained, the work of this commission was the subject of 3 years of intensive study by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and others. We found that the regulatory responsibilities of the old Federal Maritime Board, and the predecessor Maritime Commission, had not been properly carried out and that the work of the regulatory portion of the agency suffered from neglect in relation to the overall activities of the agency as a whole. Thus, we felt and could understand that to carry out its responsibilities under previously existing law the new Commission had to have a greatly enlarged staff over that previously assigned to regulatory work.

Then, of course, with the added burdens of new responsibilities stemming from the enactment of the Steamship Conference and freight forwarder legislation last year it seemed that the budget request for a still further increase in qualified staff was not unreasonable. I greatly appreciate the assurances of the chairman of this subcommittee that he and the subcommittee will follow the activities of the Maritime Commission closely. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee knows the problems of the American shipping industry as well as any man in this House and I am sure that if it appears that the responsibilities of the Federal Maritime Commission cannot be carried out under the appropriation contained in this bill, he will be the first to move to remedy the situation.

I will say to the gentleman that the Merchant Marine Committee will continue to keep in close touch with the Maritime Commission in order to see whether it is adequately staffed to carry out its responsibilities under Reorganization Plan No. 7 and under the important regulatory laws dealing with both international and domestic waterborne transportation which it is obligated to administer.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I think this is the first time I will have only one or two amendments to offer to this bill. I have tried repeatedly in the past to cut the liquor and entertainment funds. I think I will let someone else offer the amendments this year, if they so desire. Nevertheless, I am opposed to more than a million dollars being appropriated in this bill for that purpose.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY. I assure my colleague that I shall be glad to recompense him for the time I now take.

My attention has been called to a letter written by the late Abigail Adams to Mary Cranch, dated September 5, 1784, on this very subject. Her husband, John Quincy Adams, was then the U.S. Ambassador to France. She said:

I have become steward and bookkeeper determining to know with accuracy what our expenses are, and to prevail with Mr. Adams to return to America if he finds himself straitened as I think he must be. Mr. Jay went home because he could not support his family here, with the whole salary. Mr. Adams is determined to keep as little company as he possibly can, but some entertainments we must make and it is no unusual thing for them to amount from 50 to 60 guineas at a time. More is to be performed by way of negotiation many times at one of these entertainments, than at 20 serious conversations, but the policy of our country has been, and still is, to be a pennywise, and a pound foolish.

We stand on sufficient need of economy, and in the curtailment of salaries. I suppose they thought it absolutely necessary to cut off their foreign ministers. But my own interest apart, the system is bad, for that nation which degrades their own ministers by obliging them to live in narrow circumstances cannot expect to be held in high estimation themselves. We spend no evenings abroad, make no suppers, attend very few public entertainments or spectacles as they are called, and avoid every expense that is not held indispensable. Yet I cannot but think it hard, that a gentleman who has devoted so great a part of his life to the public service, who has been the means in a great measure, of procuring such extensive territories to this country, who saved their fisheries, and who is still laboring to procure them further advantages, should find it necessary so cautiously to calculate his pence for fear of overrunning them.

Do we not have just about the same situation today? And do not all the Members of the House of Representatives and of the Congress of the United States want our diplomats to have sufficient funds? We want them to have enough, but we do not want them to have so much that they become wasteful, intemperate, and extravagant. That, generally, has always been the position of the subcommittee.

I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Just a minute, was there not a little bargain to compensate me for time you have taken?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield the gentleman from Iowa 1 additional minute.

Mr. GROSS. Oh, Mr. Chairman, I protest.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, in view of that I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman, but I think he used the better part of 3 or 4 minutes.

I suppose the problem of entertainment has been with us since the beginning of the Republic, but I will say to the gentleman from New York that I live in a place where I can see the New State Department Building, and there is scarcely a night that the lights do not burn brightly at the "Top of the Mark" on that building.

Mr. ROONEY. In this connection I should like to say to the gentleman from Iowa that it has come to my attention, that this committee should inquire whether the taxpayers are being reim-

bursed for the electric light, janitorial service, wear and tear, and other such things at the new building when used by outsiders. In my town of Brooklyn when an affair is held in a public school or other public building, somebody must pay the cost of the electric light, janitorial and cleaning service, and so forth. I do not see any reason why the State Department should not insist upon the same thing for all the nonofficial functions being held there.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from New York consumed another minute of my time with that speech.

I do not know whether it is State Department officials or who that is using it, but the fact is that plush setup on top of the State Department Building is being operated almost every night.

There are a great many questions that ought to be asked about this bill. Not so long ago I read that the State Department is hiring only girls five feet in height to go down to Ecuador.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I will try to be very brief.

Mr. GROSS. I yield, but I am curious to know why they have to be just 5 feet, and not 5 feet 2 with eyes of blue.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman in the State Department here in Washington in charge of personnel thinks that because a girl is more than 5 feet tall she should not be assigned to Guayaquil, Ecuador, because she cannot get male dates. He apparently does not take into consideration the question of whether or not she is a capable code clerk. His paramount criterion is whether she may be invited out to dinner.

The following is from pages 571 and 572 of the State Department hearings:

Mr. ROONEY. My attention has been called to an interesting article also in this morning's newspaper. Mr. Jerry Klutz reports that:

"For reasons of romance, State is giving preference for its jobs in Ecuador to single girls who are shorties, no more than 5 feet tall.

"The Department for years had been assigning G-girls to that country routinely and without regard to their height. Many were lonesome and dissatisfied because they were rarely asked out socially by Ecuadorian men. A diplomatic sleuth went to work and came up with this happy solution:

"Send short girls with low heels to the South American country. Ecuadorian men are small and short by our standards and they wouldn't be caught dead taking out girls who are taller than they are.

"Preliminary evidence indicates the plan is a success. The 5-foot G-girls are breaking into the country's social life; they're happier, and they do better work."

Is that accurate reporting?

Mr. POLLACK. Mr. Chairman, may I have permission to go off the record a moment.

Mr. ROONEY. No, we are on the record.

Mr. POLLACK. Mr. Chairman, that is—let me take a second to think of my answer.

Mr. ROONEY. You can take 5 minutes to figure out the answer to this, if you need to.

Mr. POLLACK. Mr. Chairman, I am afraid I am the "diplomatic sleuth" that is referred to in that article.

Mr. ROONEY. That was my next question.

Mr. POLLACK. That is Mr. Klutz' choice of language, not mine. I was in Guayaquil for a very brief visit last fall and did have an opportunity to talk to every employee at that post, and a minor point was made of the problem in Ecuador posed by a single

American girl of unusual height finding suitable male companionship, and I did bring back to Washington, among many other notes, the suggestion that this be taken into account in making assignments to a post like Guayaquil. I think this illustrates the variety of problems we are confronted with at our posts abroad. This is just one of the many things that have to be taken into account.

Mr. ROONEY. I assume the article Mr. Klutzz wrote is correct, then?

Mr. POLLACK. In essence; yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. I thought you were too busy, Mr. Pollack, to be engaged in looking after the love life of your people in any post?

Mr. POLLACK. Mr. Chairman, if to keep one of our valued staff employees happy and content it is necessary to provide an assignment according to height, we hope to do that; if it means providing a place for rest and recuperation, we hope to do that. It is important that we try to have people who stick to their jobs instead of moving them and reassigning them, which would mean additional costs.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. ROONEY. I assume you gave that to Mr. Klutzz, did you, Mr. Pollack?

Mr. POLLACK. Are we off the record, sir?

Mr. ROONEY. No. We are on the record. This is the kind of nonsense that gets your Department in trouble.

Mr. GROSS. This is an absurdity. Screening out girls over 5 feet high. In other words, the State Department now attempts to regulate the love life of its employees in terms of stature.

There are many questions I would like to ask.

For instance, this cultural setup in Hawaii, and the reception center out there. I have some information about that, and I have written the State Department, but I am having a tough time getting information.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to join with others who have paid tribute to a great Member of this body, the gentleman from Minnesota [FRED MARSHALL]. We shall miss him.

I would like to incorporate in what I have to say all of the things that have been said about him. He has been an excellent Member of this committee, and it has been a great pleasure to serve with him on it.

Mr. Chairman, I take up a duty formerly taken over by the chairman of the committee in reference to discussions of these bills. We always listened very carefully to the chairman when he would get into the question of the judiciary, when he explained to the committee how the bankruptcies were increasing, when he would point out they are the largest in the history of the Republic, and tell us about the great increase.

But strangely enough, during this administration he has been silent.

May I point out what our record shows.

It is estimated that the number of bankruptcy cases filed in 1962 will approach 170,000. In 1963, the total filings will be in the vicinity of 185,000, or 40,000 in excess of the number of cases filed in 1961.

So the bankruptcies have increased this year, they increased last year, and

this is in all areas, including business, individuals, and agriculture.

In order to keep the record in sequence year after year, we ought to point out this year's figures so that we can see what the situation is.

Mr. CEDERBERG. This is the way we are getting the country moving ahead again.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I should like to discuss several other matters. May I first discuss very briefly some matters in Commerce. The gentleman from Iowa has been pointing to the representation allowances, and so has this committee.

You will find this on page 305 of the hearings of the committee. I should like to point out that we have now in the Commerce Department a Travel Bureau. We voted for it. I did not.

We have a Travel Bureau that is all over the world trying to induce people to come to the United States, to travel over here. They had some pretty good gimmicks in this.

You will find in here one of the gimmicks that was used over in London. There was a double-decker bus with a combo band and Indians on it. They drove through the streets of London, England, with the combo band and the Indians. This is to attract people to visit the United States of America.

In addition to that, there was also on that double-decker bus a port receptionist. This comes up in another bill involving immigration and naturalization. But it is very interesting, when we talk about the Indians, when we talk about the cowboys and Indians going through the streets of London with a port receptionist aboard who has in her possession letters from the President of the United States inviting people to visit our country.

During the investigation I turned to my chairman and I said, "Did you know about this?" The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] replied, "I am blushing. It is all news to me." But, we were made to feel much better about it, because the next thing that the head of this agency told us was, "Well, they are locked up every night at 7 o'clock. The combo band and the Indians and the port receptionists are locked up at 7 o'clock. They can't do much damage from 7 on."

Now, there is another matter I wish to refer to. I do not have the page number here, but I can point out to you what they had to say about it. This is on the question of the representation allowances. We asked them why they needed as much money as they had, and he pointed out that again, in London, the only justification for the thousands of dollars they wanted for representation allowance and the only specific case they could give us was the case of where one of their representatives proceeded to a seashore resort in England and took six people—took them to tea. I think we should all feel very happy that at least this agency is now taking our English cousins to tea at seashore resorts in Great Britain. But, I hope that the Members will read the statement of this travel agency and then determine

in your own minds whether or not you feel these are justifiable expenditures.

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

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

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I would like to tell the gentleman that the director of this agency has been speaking across the country on this subject, and I notice in the Los Angeles Times of July 19 that he was telling about the accomplishments of the agency. He said that the statistics prove that they have been doing a great good. He said:

Already Gilmore emphasized, with the 16-percent increase experienced in the first 4 months of this year—and they are our poorest for tourists—we've attracted 147,000 visitors spending an average of \$540 each.

Mr. BOW. Of course, what is happening is that the economy of Europe has increased and the people are traveling, but I still have confidence in the free enterprise of our own people, the airlines, the steamship companies, and others, to put out the proper travel information.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. That is exactly what I wanted to point out. Mr. Gilmore is taking credit for this accomplishment the agency had nothing to do with. He said in the hearings, which you are quoting from, that their advertising was not even going to start until February or March of this year, and they were not going to open offices until June or July of this year. They have not even been in operation long enough to take credit for the first 4 months of this year.

Mr. BOW. That is right. I thank the gentleman.

I should like now to call your attention to the State Department. I join in what has been said by the gentlemen who have preceded me, particularly the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL]. There are some fine people in the State Department; many of them fine, dedicated Americans, trying to do a good job. Too many times, I think, perhaps, we point at the ills in this Department rather than some of the good, and I want to at least pay tribute to those who are dedicated. But, there are things that disturb me, and I should like to call the attention of the committee to something that disturbs me and I think will disturb you. We have a Bureau of Research and Intelligence in the State Department headed by a gentleman by the name of Mr. Hilsman. When he was before the committee he brought with him some secret reports which we had an opportunity to read. And, after I had read these reports I said to Mr. Hilsman, "Do these frighten you as they do me?" And then we discussed some things which were in them, which I cannot repeat on the floor.

But, I said, "Who gets these reports?" He said, "Well, the President gets them, and the Secretary of State." I said, "I think we are in bad shape." He said, "Well, we certainly can improve, and I think we are."

Mr. Chairman, I followed through on these documents. When he started talking about them I said, "Are we off the record or are we now reading from a secret document? Are you opening this

document up so I may use it publicly?" He said, "May I supply you with an unclassified, sanitized version of this?" I asked him, "What does sanitized mean? Do you have one that is sane, and this is not sane?" He said, "Sanitary." I said, "Cleaned up?" I said, "You have been reading from these documents which are presented to the President and the Secretary of State that had to be cleaned up?"

Then, listen to this: I shall not read all of this because time will not permit. He said:

The point I wanted to make here is that there is some utility in having a person write documents that are not fully cleared and do not have to go through the whole clearance process. Of course, some of these statements you have read are not completely valid. On the other hand, there may be half-truths and partial truths which will make people sit up and think.

Mr. Chairman, the secret, highly informed, the intelligence reports that go to the President and to the Secretary of State of the United States upon which our foreign policy is based, by the language of the head of that Department, on the one hand may be half-truths here and partial truths which will make people sit up and think—to make the President of the United States and the Secretary of State—to make them sit up and think, they submit partial truths and half-truths.

Mr. Chairman, I think that it is time we take a long, hard look at situations of this kind. I regret the necessity that I feel in bringing this to the attention of the Congress. But it would seem to me that this is a very dangerous practice.

Mr. Chairman, we have in the Public Affairs Department many things being done for which there is no necessity. We could have reduced this bill last year I feel by more than \$1 million if we had taken out the publicity and propaganda that was being circulated in behalf of the reciprocal trade program. Why, there were divisions of the State Department in publication after publication where people were assigned to the White House from the State Department for the sole purpose of propagandizing for the reciprocal trade program. I asked the Director of Public Affairs this: "Now, you have been printing the speeches made by Under Secretary Ball. Will you print mine?" I had been speaking against it. Oh, no; "we will only print the one side." I pointed out and I said "That is for the purpose of getting to the people to influence the Congress," and he admitted it. You will find that in the record of the hearings of the Deficiencies Subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that they are in complete violation of title 218, section 1913, when they are using public funds in departments of Government for the purpose of propagandizing the American public so that they may make their wishes known to the Members of Congress in an attempt to influence legislation.

Mr. Chairman, something has been said about the numbers of employees. I might say with reference to the State

Department that I give them credit for this: Under "Salaries and expenses" there were no new employees. There were 12 in their entire bill and they were in the cultural exchange program. However, the thing that concerned me was the Commerce Department. The Department of Commerce was asking for 2,200 new employees. They had built it up last year. We, actually, under the bill granted appropriations for 1,377 employees, the total of new employees under this bill. I have not the time to list them, but I will put them in the RECORD.

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

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the Department of Commerce asked for 2,200 jobs in addition to those they had last year?

Mr. BOW. That is correct.

Mr. JONAS. If the gentleman will yield further, 2 or 3 weeks ago the Secretary of the Department of Commerce was quoted in the press as saying that all agencies and departments of Government could do a more efficient job with a substantial reduction in employment. I applauded that statement and thought he should be commended for it. I had been led to believe from that statement that, certainly, substantial reductions in employees would be recommended by the Department in this bill and in the estimate that came before the committee. I am amazed at the statement that the Department of Commerce requested more than 2,000 additional employees above the number they had last year.

Mr. BOW. The committee reduced that number by 896. I do not think we went far enough. I think we could have reduced it some more. But, as I say, for the gentleman from New York, there are some areas where he wanted to go one way and we wanted to go another; but we are in agreement on this bill. I believe there are some areas where greater reductions could have been made.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the committee on the reductions. The point that I am making is that the Department asked an increase of 2,200 jobs above those they had last year.

Mr. BOW. That is correct. I will say that during the course of the hearings and in some of our executive sessions, the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] raised the same question that the gentleman from North Carolina is now raising. That is the question of the Secretary's statement which he made over the country that they would be more efficient with far less employees, that there were people he would like to get rid of. We thought that it was an excellent time and place to accommodate the gentleman. Unfortunately he was not accommodated to the degree that I felt he should have been accommodated.

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

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

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact we are discussing the number of employees in the Federal Establishment of the departments in question, I think it proper to note here that the total number of permanent employees on the Federal payroll as of May 31, 1962, was 2,478,791. On January 1, 1961, the number of permanent employees on the Federal payroll was 2,372,580. In other words Federal civilian employees increased more than 106,000 in the 17-month period, ending May 31, 1962. These figures were given to me by the Civil Service Commission. I made a computation of the increased payroll resulting from such increased number of employees some time ago. Such increased payroll amounts to almost \$600 million per year. In view of the fact that we are considering a tax reduction when we have a deficit such as we had at the end of this fiscal year, I think we should take a long, hard look at the alleged justification for any additional Federal employees.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, I might point out that these figures I am giving you as to the number of employees are rounded out by the committee staff.

They are not exact positions but are accurate to the best of our ability to estimate. The increase under this bill will be 3,201 employees. But we reduced the number from the request that was made by 1,960. I should also point out that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] asked some questions about the bill and what we did with the Maritime Commission. I think we were very fair to the Maritime Commission. We gave them 76 new employees. This is an agency just getting underway. I remember very well when the reorganization plan was on the floor we were told that this was going to save us money. Like so many other things, when you separate an organization and have new organizations you end up so that it costs more money than if you had just not bothered with it in the first place. I think we were very generous in providing these additional employees and I would suggest to that Commission that they take a good, hard look at their budget in the future. If you will read the justifications I do not think you will find any justification anywhere for any additional employees above those which we approved.

Small Business had an increase of 430. That is one of the larger ones. They made a good case before the committee. But I think that was a proper allowance, although we reduced them by 48 positions.

Mr. Chairman, I think this bill overall is a good bill. As I have said, there are some areas in which I would have favored further reductions. But we have an agreement and I should hope that next year these agencies will recognize the fact that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH] has just brought out, that we are in a serious situation, that we are talking about a tax reduction to prevent a recession. If we are going to have to reduce taxes we are going to have to reduce costs, and we are going to have to reduce these big bills. I hope when they

bring up the budgets next year they will keep that in mind because I, for one, will fight against any increase in these budgets if there is any effort to reduce taxes.

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

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to compliment the gentleman from Ohio for the fine presentation he has made, for the way he has thoroughly gone into this budget for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce.

I have read the hearings. He has continually throughout the hearings dug into the agency budget to cut out every bit of waste and fat in these agencies.

I should like to ask the gentleman: Several years ago, in fact, in September of 1960, the 86th Congress passed a resolution, Public Law 86-796. At that time, I was joined by the U.S. Senator, now President, Mr. Kennedy, in getting that resolution through, inviting certain foreign countries to send representatives to the United States this summer to participate in an international parachute jumping contest. It will take place in Massachusetts next month. I am informed that 28 nations have accepted, including Russia, Italy, Britain, France, Yugoslavia, Japan, Korea, and many other countries. I requested under Public Law 87-256, the Cultural Exchange Act, funds to finance this international contest. I was turned down by the State Department and informed that this particular international contest did not have priority.

Mr. BOW. May I ask the gentleman if all the parachute jumpers are all Communists?

Mr. CONTE. No, they are not.

Mr. BOW. That is probably the gentleman's problem, because recently they paid the expenses of a Communist Soviet Union track team to go to California to compete. I can say to the gentleman in all seriousness, however, that this committee does not allocate for specific projects. In other words, they do not come before us and ask for specific projects, they give the overall picture of what they expect to do. But we do not have line items. I hope perhaps some day we can have line items in this bill so we can begin to do some of that.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman has called our attention to the cultural program. It has come to my attention that the State Department brought to this country a considerable taxpayers' expense from Poland a hot jazz combination without knowing that they were a jazz combination. They thought they were bringing to the United States at Government expense four separate exchanges. Lo and behold, they arrived in Washington and participated in the Washington Jazz Festival, then went up to the Newport Jazz Festival. They were on television. This indicates how little the people in the State Department

know about the background of those they bring here from behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. BOW. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts should go back and point out to the people from all these other countries coming in that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, now President of the United States, was one of those who helped get through this project to invite these people here. It seems to me that fact should have some influence on getting some of these funds released for the gentleman's parachute exhibitions up there. I do not know whether the experience a young lady had the other day of jumping 2,000 feet into a lake has dampened their spirits, but this committee has nothing to do with that. If it did, I am sure many of these activities would be cut out.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I should like to call to the attention of the committee an exchange which appears on page 94 of the hearings on the judiciary, in which the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] asked this question:

What is the reason for that increase in the bankruptcy cases?

This of course has to do with the comment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] on the increase in bankruptcy cases. Mr. Jackson, who was testifying, said this:

Sir, I do not believe I can tell you the reason for it. The only thing I can tell you is the character and kind of cases coming before the courts. The majority are filed by salaried people. The proportion runs now about 90 percent employees or salaried people and 10 percent business firms. I think Mr. Covey would say, if he were here, that primarily the reason for the salaried person going into bankruptcy is overextended credit.

Thus, it would appear, may I say to the Committee, that the increasing number of bankruptcies is pretty largely a matter of people who are in debt for something they should not have bought in the first place.

Mr. Chairman, this bill covers a wide area of important subjects. Other than independent offices, the work of this subcommittee embraces the widest field in the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations. Our work extends from the complexities of the State Department which through the U.S. Information Agency, which to all intensive purposes is an arm of the State Department. From there, however, we branch out to completely unrelated activities. We take in Justice and the judiciary. This brings in the Supreme Court which is against prayer in the schools—and sometimes I think is against the United States. It also takes in the Civil Rights Commission. This one, I shall vote to do without and have done so on a number of occasions since I think it represents a waste of money and a public nuisance. Then we go over to the broad field of the Department of Commerce which includes highways, maritime, Census, ARA, Small Business, and heaven knows what else. And, if that is not enough, we throw in some "related agen-

cies" which extend all the way to the Rama Road in Nicaragua. Altogether, this bill embraces 100 separate appropriations items. Corraling all these under one heading is about like achieving unification in the Armed Forces.

These are highly important agencies of Government. It would be well if we were to direct much more time to discussing them here. I can assure you, however, that considerable time was taken in the considerations of the Appropriation recommendations which are before you. The members of this subcommittee are old hands at their job. I believe the recommendations that are made are, with one or two exceptions, sound ones which merit the endorsement of the House.

Initially I want to comment on the efforts of the chairman to keep nonessential expenditures to a minimum. With him the work of this subcommittee is just about a full time enterprise. He knows more about the work of the agencies of Government represented here than does any other person in Congress—and, I suspect, more than any other person in Government. Because he tries to hold spending down, he rubs some people the wrong way; particularly those people who do not want spending held down. There has been a furor in some quarters about criticisms he has directed toward some of the shows which are hired to travel abroad at ridiculous prices to represent culture in America. Much of this program has been a ridiculous waste of money, and the chairman is right in what he has done. I do not think there is any doubt about that in the Congress.

Let us talk for a moment about ARA. It is a new agency. It is just getting a feel for the work which has been assigned to it. It enjoys the services of topflight personnel. With these considerations in mind, I feel that the agency is doing a good job and, that it will make an increasingly valuable contribution to the economy of the Nation.

There have been delays in this program which are regrettable. Because of the delays there are some who are disappointed in the program. I do not feel this is a fair evaluation. Ground rules had to be established and the cooperation of the various State and local agencies had to be achieved. I am confident that more substantial progress will be made in the future. This agency fills a long existing need. There are areas in our country whose economy is stagnant. For one reason or another, the growth and progress which are characteristic of so many communities have passed them by. This is not necessarily the fault of the people in those areas whose economy is standing still. But, whether or not it is their fault, the fresh ideas and inspiration and the monetary wherewithal which are available through ARA can trigger new activity, new growth, and a new revitalization of the economy in many such areas.

In its broader field, the SBA has one of the ablest administrators in Government in John Horne. This agency has rendered very material service nationwide, and my contacts indicate this service is constantly improving. That does

not mean everyone can get a loan who wants it. The Government must have some rules of procedure and a reasonable certainty of getting its money back when a loan is made. Even so, I believe that SBA in most cases makes every effort within reason to grant loans and that the agency has filled a very definite need—and filled it successfully.

Moving to another area, I consider that USIA has made one of the most significant improvements that has been shown by any agency of Government in the past year. Edward R. Murrow as Administrator has obviously devoted his very special talents to the fullest in behalf of USIA. He has accepted his appointment as Administrator as a working assignment and by his example, he has been an inspiration to the personnel of this important Agency.

It is an extremely important Agency. We have not been too successful at tooting our own horn. As propagandists, we are a poor second to the Russians. For instance, we seem largely unable to convince India that democracy is good for the world, and good for India. We have no trouble getting that nation to take our money, but her leaders persist in carrying on a love affair with Communist Russia. We pay the bills. The Communists enjoy her favors. In Latin America, despite all our efforts and all our dollars, the Communists have made a great many people feel that the United States is a friend of the ruling elements and not a friend of the masses which oftentimes are oppressed by those same ruling elements.

Important changes have been made in the approach of USIA to foreign audiences. Under the present administration, a far greater effort is made to talk to people in their own language and in language which carries a meaning we want them to receive. I am certain we still have far to go, but I am equally certain progress is being made—and this is the important thing.

I want to talk principally about the State Department. I speak of it with disappointment and with some sense of frustration. Now, let me hasten to say that I consider there has been improvement in some areas of foreign policy. If this had not been true, we would have been out of Berlin and out of southeast Asia by now. In these instances, the United States has reacted to pressure as a proud and powerful nation should react. We have rejected efforts to push us around. This is not the picture everywhere. In many parts of the world, we still are looked upon as a pushover in a conference. We give the impression of wanting to give away our money, asking nothing in return. In too many cases we give the impression that we are trying to get along with everybody. We baby the neutrals. We nurse the immature founding nations which we helped bring into the world prematurely and for which we have now been saddled with major responsibility.

I am not proud of the State Department. I know that it includes many dedicated and patriotic individuals. But there is still too much of business as usual—not enough of the recognition of

the sobering responsibility which is ours; a responsibility which requires realism and toughness. We are a powerful nation. We have the power to enforce a peaceful world. Failure to exert that power results in a foreign policy which leads nowhere. Let me give one illustration. A few American warships in the waters off New Guinea would have been enough to stop any talk about war over that territory. Instead, we have attempted to negotiate and currently we are credited with negotiating New Guinea away from the Dutch and into Indonesian hands. The Dutch are our friends. The Indonesians are Communist dominated. The fallacy of our policy—or the weakness of our efforts, as the case may be—is clear enough.

A short time ago, the State Department informed Senate investigators that it had censored the word "victory" from anti-Communist speeches of Defense leaders because this implies an all or nothing approach leaving no reason for accommodation. To me, it is a shocking thing that our principal agency for foreign policy can consider that we have any policy in mind but victory. When America's leaders at any level think in terms of compromise, we have entered upon a dangerous stage in our Nation's history. When victory is eliminated, only compromise or defeat is left.

A short time ago, I saw a listing of aid to the nations which voted against the United States at Punta del Este. It was twice as substantial as the aid given to the people who voted with us. It is frequently said that the United States treats its enemies better than its friends. Certainly the neutrals have the inside track on America's largesse, and nothing is required or expected in return. This makes no sense in my book. I learned a long time ago to help the people who help me. A touch of realism in dealing with the nations of the world who look to us for help will bring many of those who now work both sides of the street around to evidence of support for democracy.

It is easier to try to get along with everybody than it is to provide vigorous and positive leadership, but we cannot afford that kind of policy. We are the prime target of the Communists. We are fighting for our lives—for the life of America. But, we are not fighting very hard. I remember the case of a young man, a patriotic young American only 21 years of age who was captured behind enemy lines during the American Revolution. He was tried as a spy and sentenced to be hanged. And then, with a rope already knotted around his bared throat, he broke his steadfast silence with words which echo down the corridors of time. He said:

I regret that I have but one life to give for my country.

Not long ago another young American went on trial for his life in Soviet Russia. Here is what he said:

I didn't know what I was doing—I know now I was risking world peace. My superiors were responsible.

I hope there are not too many like that. I hope there are not too many who are looking for an easy way out. Now, I

know the American State Department is not just looking for an easy way out in its dealings with the nations of the world, but I do not think the world knows it. And only the State Department can convince the world this Nation has a firm foreign policy; that we intend to lead to freedom those nations which want freedom.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE
Administration of foreign affairs
Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses of the Department of State, not otherwise provided for, including expenses authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 801-1158), not otherwise provided for; expenses necessary to meet the responsibilities and obligations of the United States in Germany (including those arising under the supreme authority assumed by the United States on June 5, 1945, and under contractual arrangements with the Federal Republic of Germany); salary of the United States member of the Board for the Validation of German bonds in the United States at the rate of \$17,100 per annum; expenses of the National Commission on Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Cooperation as authorized by sections 3, 5, and 6 of the Act of July 30, 1946 (22 U.S.C. 287c, 287g, 287r); purchase (not to exceed sixteen, of which four are for replacement only) or hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding outside the continental United States without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U.S.C. 111); services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); purchase of uniforms; payment of tort claims, in the manner authorized in the first paragraph of section 2672, as amended, of title 28 of the United States Code when such claims arise in foreign countries; dues for library membership in organizations which issue publications to members only, or to members at a price lower than to others; employment of aliens by contract for services abroad; refund of fees erroneously charged and paid for passports; radio communications; payment in advance for subscriptions to commercial information, telephone and similar services abroad; care and transportation of prisoners and persons declared insane; expenses, as authorized by law (18 U.S.C. 3192), of bringing to the United States from foreign countries persons charged with crime; and procurement by contract or otherwise, of services, supplies, and facilities, as follows: (1) translating, (2) analysis and tabulation of technical information, and (3) preparation of special maps, globes, and geographic aids; \$140,710,000, of which not less than \$12,000,000 shall be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States: *Provided*, That passenger motor vehicles in possession of the Foreign Service abroad may be replaced in accordance with section 7 of the Act of August 1, 1956 (70 Stat. 891), and the cost, including the exchange allowance, of each such replacement shall not exceed \$3,800 in the case of the chief of mission automobile at each diplomatic mission (except that eight such vehicles may be purchased at not to exceed \$7,800 each) and \$1,500 in the case of all other such vehicles except station wagons.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] had the floor he ran out of time. I was asking certain

questions about Public Law 87-256. I would like to pursue this subject a bit further. As I understand the law—I am reading here, it says:

U.S. representation in international artistic, dramatic, musical, sports, and other cultural festivals, competitions, meetings and like exhibitions and assembles.

Is there any doubt in the gentleman's mind that this international parachuting championship is included within this law and that funds could be provided for it by the State Department if they saw fit?

Mr. BOW. I think the very broad language of this bill takes in most anything. We have included the World's Fair in New York, and other items of that kind, and I think, yes, it would undoubtedly cover that.

Mr. CONTE. I must say I regret, and I am somewhat distressed to learn some of the things that have happened under this law. The State Department brings a jazz band from Warsaw to the United States under the auspices of this law. Mr. Chairman, we asked the State Department to bring these 24 nations here to the United States to compete in this international contest, and we requested \$100,000. We were not asking the Department to pay their airplane fare over here. We were only asking for money to conduct this meet itself.

This is ridiculous. Very soon the representatives of these countries are coming over here. Let me read some of them: Australia, Belgium, France, Germany, Great Britain, Hungary, India, Poland, Rumania, Russia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, and the United States will participate in this meet.

When I could not get money for that, then I went to the Defense Department to try to obtain some tents and bedding. I was promised by the Defense Department that they would cooperate, but only yesterday I learned we cannot get the tents and cots unless we get enabling legislation through the Congress. Time is of the essence.

It is disgraceful to think of all these people coming over here, these teams of five men from each country and we do not have tents and bedding to accommodate them. We spend billions of dollars to try to win the hearts and minds of men all over the world, yet in this case we are asking for only \$100,000 from the State Department and they will not give it to us. The Defense Department will not give us even tents or cots or communications systems to take care of this important world competition.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ROONEY. I should like to say that I know of the strenuous efforts the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts has made in trying to get the State Department to cooperate insofar as this parachuting contest which is to take place up at Orange, Mass., is concerned. He discussed this matter with me some time back. The State Department or those in control did not see fit to send a budget estimate to the committee, so that the committee is now

and has been in the position where we do not have a budget estimate or a request for funds for this parachute contest. Again I say I know how hard and how long the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts worked on this project.

Mr. CONTE. I want the record to show that I certainly appreciate everything the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Ohio tried to do for me. They realize the predicament we are in.

On this matter there has been a resolution passed by the U.S. Congress, signed by President Eisenhower and pushed through the Senate by the then Senator Kennedy, inviting the nations over here. It is ridiculous, it is a shame for them to come at all when we do not have a tent or a cot for the participants to use. We are using a school building, yet we do not have cots to put in the school, so that they can sleep there. At the same time we are bringing these jazz bands from Warsaw to kick up their heels and spend the taxpayers' hard-earned money. We send abroad comedians, who put on a disgraceful performance that hurts the image of the United States with other countries—the very countries we are trying to win over to our side.

I hope the President of the United States will read the RECORD tomorrow morning and answer my appeal for help in this situation.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I feel I should bring to the attention of the committee some additional information on the subject discussed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] a little while ago, with reference to Roger Hilsman.

I do so because I know Mr. Hilsman. I have a high regard for him, and I know that he is making a significant contribution to our knowledge of an important area, southeast Asia. I was not present at the discussion in the committee to which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] referred, and I do not attempt to discuss what happened there with authority. But I do feel that it will be well if I read into the RECORD a letter which Mr. Hilsman sent to me after I had asked him for some explanation of the misunderstanding between the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] and himself, both of whom I regard very highly.

Here is what he said:

JULY 20, 1962.

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SIKES: This is in response to your request for an explanation of the misunderstanding between Mr. Bow and me.

Mr. Bow and I were discussing the "external research" program. In this program the State Department signs contracts with experts in a university or private business to do a study that the State Department needs but cannot do itself, usually because the study requires special skills.

Mr. Bow and I were discussing off the record one particular study, on the Communists' use of guerrilla warfare as a means of aggression. Mr. Bow, as he said in the report, did not have time to read the study, since it was the size of a small book, but in

glancing at it, saw one statement with which he did not agree.

This was a statement of judgment not of facts which as I recall characterized a foreign government as "highly unstable" and therefore vulnerable to Communist guerrilla warfare.

I agreed with Mr. Bow that this judgment might have gone too far. He asked me if the statement was not therefore a "half-truth" and I said that if you prefer that language it could be used.

Our further discussion on the record, used this unfortunate phrase "half-truth." But what I was trying to say is as follows:

An outside contractor offers his best judgments, as he is hired to do, and this is good. I might not agree with every single judgment that every one of our contractors makes, but it would destroy the value of getting outside research and judgments if we forced outside contractors to clear their work in advance with all the Bureaus of the State Department and modify them accordingly before submitting the final study.

This particular study, in fact, has been enormously useful. It shows how the Communists are trying to use guerrilla warfare to conquer nations friendly to the United States. It has helped to alert our Government to a Communist threat. It has furnished some valuable ideas on how we should meet this threat. Some of the suggestions in this study are being used today with good effect against the Communists in South Vietnam. The study is used today by our Armed Forces to alert our soldiers to the Communist threat of guerrilla warfare and how to fight it.

After the misunderstanding with Mr. Bow developed I tried several times to get to see him to explain all this. I am sure that once he has heard the full story he would agree that both this particular study and the external research program that made it possible are valuable assets in the struggle our country faces.

Sincerely,

ROGER HILSMAN.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Florida reading that letter into the RECORD, and I am glad to know the extent to which Mr. Hilsman has gone to try to create a personal feeling on my part against him or that we had some point of disagreement. That is as far from the truth as it can be. I was objecting because he, in his own testimony, said that his secret reports to the President and the Secretary of State contained half-truths and partial half-truths, probably from people who said it to them. There is no disagreement about whether that is in the record or out of the record. When we go back into the House I am going to ask permission to include that testimony following the letter that has been read so that you can see exactly what the testimony was and that this is a matter that there is no disagreement on. I am not trying to attack Mr. Hilsman. I understand he has a magnificent war record. He was a guerrilla fighter and probably a great patriot. My objection is the fact that he invited these people in from the outside, using money to get experts. Why do they not have them in the State Department? That is where they are supposed to have experts on intelligence, on things of this kind. But they are bringing in these people from the outside saying they do not have to be cleared and putting in

half-truths and partial-truths and are not valid in some respects. If that is the position upon which our foreign policy is decided, no wonder we are in the position we are in now in this particular area with which this report had to do, southeast Asia. What is the situation there today as compared to what it used to be? Are we in worse shape now because of the half-truths and partial-truths and invalid statements upon which our policy has been made by the Department of State? Now, we have not cleared up any situation in southeast Asia, and that is the question of this guerrilla warfare.

The same things are in here. Mr. Hilsman has tried his best. He has had distinguished Members on the other side of the aisle and distinguished Members on this side of the aisle trying to arrange for him to come in and get this straightened up. But you cannot change this record. The record is here, and I ask every Member who is interested in the question of foreign policy to read the RECORD tomorrow with this testimony in it and determine for himself what kind of language this is and whether this is a personal feud or not.

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

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

Mr. SIKES. I feel that I must comment on the gentleman's reference to conditions in southeast Asia. I feel very strongly that there has been improvement in that area, that for the first time since trouble began in South Vietnam, the forces of that country are beginning to push back the Viet Cong. Over a period of years the Viet Cong had been steadily expanding their operations—and their control of territory. They were rapidly increasing their numbers, doubling in strength about every 9 months. Now as the result of a stronger policy on the part of this Nation in foreign affairs, and a more realistic policy on the part of the Vietnamese Government that picture has begun to change. For the first time the Viet Cong forces in South Vietnam are being pushed back. They are finding it harder and harder to obtain supplies. The villagers are being encouraged to resist the Viet Cong, and they are doing so in more and more instances.

Mr. BOW. I would like to remind the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] now that for the first time in the last few weeks the casualty list of American boys are beginning to come in from southeast Asia and that there is a change. There is a change in casualty lists.

Mr. SIKES. Because the Vietnamese forces are fighting more realistically and more aggressively than at any time heretofore. Our forces are there as advisers. Their presence at this time is essential to victory. If we pull them out, the gentleman knows very well South Vietnam is going down the drain and that would be another victory for communism. Our forces are exposed to danger, and I deplore the fact that it is necessary that they be exposed to danger, but we are now beginning to win that conflict. There is no other course for victory.

But as a result the forces of democracy are winning in the world for a change.

Mr. BOW. I am sure that the gentleman will agree with me that it is not proper to establish our foreign policy on reports of half-truths and partial-truths and some which cannot be valid.

Mr. SIKES. I am not defending the passage in the hearings to which the gentleman referred. I simply read into the RECORD a letter addressed to me from Mr. Hilsman which showed that he felt there had been a misunderstanding and that he wanted an opportunity to try to clear up that misunderstanding.

Mr. BOW. There could be no misunderstanding because of the language used, and it can be read in the RECORD, for the benefit of those who are interested:

POLICY RESEARCH STUDIES

Mr. BOW. Who reads these policy research studies, one of which I am holding in my hand marked "secret"?

Mr. HILSMAN. That particular one the President has seen.

Mr. BOW. Did it frighten him?

Mr. HILSMAN. I am not guaranteeing he read it. I know he is aware of the contents.

Mr. BOW. But who in your Department reads these?

Mr. HILSMAN. The Secretary of State has read it.

Mr. BOW. Was he frightened after he read it?

Mr. HILSMAN. In what way, sir?

Mr. BOW. The way I am frightened when I read it. We are in awful bad shape.

Mr. HILSMAN. Let us say we certainly can improve, sir, and I think we are.

(Off the record.)

Mr. BOW. Hurriedly going through the policy research study, I can find nothing of any real substance which I believe contributes to the peace of the world or to a sound foreign policy for this country. I would like to tell you, if we can, on the record, just how much good this has done.

Mr. HILSMAN. Sir, I think it has done a lot of good.

Mr. BOW. Where?

Mr. HILSMAN. If you will look on the first page past the letter where it says, "Major conclusions and findings," the first one is that "the key to fighting guerrillas is to adopt the tactics of the guerrillas themselves."

Mr. BOW. Now we are reading from a secret document. Are you opening this document up so I may use it publicly?

Mr. HILSMAN. May I supply you with an unclassified, sanitized version of this?

Mr. BOW. What does sanitized mean? Do you have one that is sane and this is not sane?

Mr. HILSMAN. Sanitary.

Mr. BOW. Cleaned up?

Mr. HILSMAN. Cleaned up, meaning removing—

Mr. BOW. I did not know whether you were putting sanity or sanitation into it.

Mr. HILSMAN. Sanitation in the sense of cleaning it up.

Mr. BOW. It is a rather remarkable thing that you want to submit to us something which has been cleaned up. You mean by that, something classified should be taken out?

Mr. HILSMAN. Yes, information which was acquired through sensitive sources.

Mr. BOW. Were the things I just read to you, do you think, classified?

Mr. HILSMAN. Some of them may have been, sir. I would have to check.

Mr. BOW. Go ahead.

Mr. HILSMAN. Sir, let us take this one, the first one, "The key to fighting guerrillas is to adopt the tactics of the guerrillas themselves."

First of all, I think this is fundamentally true. Perhaps I could make this point by telling you an anecdote. I was in Burma during World War II, and a guerrilla myself, operating behind the enemy lines. At one stage we had blown up bridges and ambushed trucks. During the middle of a rather large battle, the Japanese took 3,000 men out of the line of combat to chase this guerrilla unit.

Mr. BOW. This was where?

Mr. HILSMAN. In Burma, in World War II, an OSS guerrilla unit I commanded. The point was that this Japanese unit fought as regiments and battalions against guerrillas. They were the trained soldiers and we were not. I remember once they moved their battalions into a U-shaped trap, and then tried to chivy my OSS group up into this trap. We just went off into the jungle and faded away. They closed the trap on air. At the end of a month of this, the Japanese had suffered over 100 casualties and the OSS guerrilla group had suffered only 1. It was not because they were not better soldiers than we were. They were, in fact, much better soldiers than we were. But they did not adopt tactics which were suitable to fighting guerrillas.

Mr. BOW. Do you think this document has to do with fighting guerrillas?

Mr. HILSMAN. Yes, sir; it certainly does.

Mr. CEDEBERG. Then it is a defense paper.

Mr. HILSMAN. It is not a defense paper precisely because the key to fighting guerrillas is basically political. If you do not adapt your military tactics to political measures or measures of civic action, you will fail. In this particular instance, for example, which I mentioned, if the Japanese had adopted the correct military tactics and coupled them with certain civic actions, they would not have failed. This, I think, is the fundamental point about fighting guerrillas, and it is why we moved into this field, because no one that we could tell, and we checked this out—

Mr. BOW. With your experience and background in this, why did you not write the memorandum, instead of having this outsider come in and write these things about our country?

Mr. HILSMAN. I helped write it, sir.

Mr. BOW. You did not write the things I read to you.

Mr. HILSMAN. No, sir. There are a couple of points to this. One is that we want to do this as a supplement. This particular man used some expertise inside the Department, including some of my own and some of my own experiences. The second thing about it—

Mr. ROONEY. Expertise is one of your favorite words, is it not?

Mr. HILSMAN. Yes, sir; I am sorry. It is a bad word, too. I agree with you. I cut it out of all the written things, but I fell into it, here.

Mr. ROONEY. You overlooked one here.

Mr. HILSMAN. I apologize. I will not use it any more.

The point I wanted to make here was that there is some utility in having a person write a document that is not fully cleared and does not have to go through the whole clearance process. Of course, some of the statements you have read are not completely valid. On the other hand, there may be a half-truth here or a partial truth which will make people sit up and think.

Mr. BOW. If I am sitting down in the State Department and this is given to me as a research study from the Bureau of Intelligence and Research, I should think I would have a right to believe this is not half-truth or partial truth and to be able to rely upon it. Is our foreign policy made on reports with "half-truths" or "partial truths"; that is pretty dangerous.

Mr. HILSMAN. It should make you think and it should have some findings which are

useful if, in your judgment and in your own experience—

Mr. BOW. Do you mean to tell me in order to get the people in the State Department to think, we have to feed them half-truths? I do not agree with that. I would hope they are much more intelligent than that down there.

Mr. HILSMAN. May I point out in the letter of transmittal of this, I stated that it was done by a consultant working full time with the help of specialists within the Bureau of Intelligence and Research. "Our intention was to provide research that would be a useful input," but it was not necessarily to be the last word.

Mr. BOW. Where does it say that?

Mr. HILSMAN. I am sorry sir, in the letter of transmittal.

Mr. BOW. It does not say it is not to be the last word.

Mr. HILSMAN. No.

Mr. BOW. You started to quote from the letter. You did not have a chance to put your quotation marks where they should be. You read some pretty good language but it is not in that letter. You probably should have put that into the original letter. It is not there. If I were in the Department of State and read your original letter, I would take it this is something I could rely upon as being factual, not half-truth.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, earlier in the consideration of this bill during the general debate the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] mentioned and read into the RECORD a letter from a Mrs. Adams which was dated in 1784 describing the difficulties of John Quincy Adams as Ambassador to France. In that recitation she indicated the debt that this country owed to him because of the fact that he had saved our fisheries.

Mr. Chairman, may I say that as far as I know he is the only Ambassador or anyone who followed the policies of our State Department who saved any of our fisheries.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say to the distinguished gentleman from Washington, on behalf of the gentleman from Ohio and myself, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and all the members of this subcommittee, that we have done plenty to save the fisheries. There is plenty of fish money right now in this bill.

Mr. PELLY. I was referring in the policies of our State Department and our Ambassadors. I would particularly refer to the fact that no Ambassador who ever represented this country in Japan was able to save our fisheries, because all we have done is build up and help the fisheries of foreign governments while these foreign nations, in turn, competed with us and through imports ruined our own industry and the fishermen who were earning a livelihood through that means.

Mr. Chairman, I might add that this year in Alaska the salmon pack, for example, is only about half what it was last year.

All during recent years the Japanese have fished in the North Pacific with nets, taking immature salmon while our

own American fishermen could not use such nets. I point this up because of the fact that I have had a conservation bill which I introduced 6 months ago on which the Merchant Marine Committee has not yet had reports from the Department of State or the other agencies concerned. Thus there has been a delay in holding a hearing and the Congress could not consider a means by which the United States might protect our own American fishermen and our own fishery resources.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the entertainment industry has come in for some adverse comment today. I could not say that there were not isolated instances where it was justified.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from California yield?

Mr. CORMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I should not like the distinguished gentleman from California to think that I have any animus toward the entertainment industry. I am one who has known something about it through the years. I worked in my college days as a union musician. If I were looking for a top-flight comedian, as I mentioned awhile ago, I would pick Buddy Hackett. In days gone by we had Joe Cook and his four Hawaiians; we had Fred Allen; we had Joe Penner and his duck; we had Eddie Cantor; we had many really top-notch comedians. If we must have a comedian to send abroad at the taxpayers' expense on a good will tour, for goodness sake, let us get a good one and not a ham to go abroad and make a "damphool" of himself and all of us.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I certainly concur in what the gentleman has said. I do not pretend to be qualified to select individual performers nor comment on the specific instances criticized here. But the RECORD should show that the American entertainment industry has contributed substantially during both the hot wars of yesterday and the cold war of today to the strength of this Nation and to an understanding of democracy in many parts of the world.

The selfless contributions over the years of top stars such as Danny Kaye, Bob Hope, Benny Goodman, Carole Lombard, Ella Fitzgerald, Betty Hutton, and Glenn Miller should be remembered by those who indict the profession as selfish.

It seems elementary to me that American artists and entertainers provide a necessary ingredient of the American picture we are intent on presenting to the developing and contested parts of the world. Our form of government and economy is well known for its high productivity and high living standards and is sometimes charged with being too preoccupied with gadgetry and creature comforts. Yet, this free society of ours has been equally productive in the creative arts, the theater, and music. We can be proud of artists of the caliber of Isaac Stern, Igor Stravinsky, and Helen Hayes, and groups such as the University of Michigan Symphonic Band and

the Alvin Ailey Dance Group who have let millions of people around the world see this side of our Nation.

In addition to the words of criticism directed on this floor today toward many of the personalities involved, I am hopeful my colleagues and the public will read the comments of newspapers around the world evidencing the goodwill created by this program.

The athletic feats of our young men and women participating in this program are a forceful answer to anti-American propaganda abroad that we are "a soft people living in a decadent society."

It has been implied that entertainers, unlike all other professional people hired by the Government, should work without compensation. This hardly seems more logical than to contend that doctors, dentists, and engineers should serve their country without compensation because they are professionals. The record discloses that in most instances professional artists, like all other professional people, sacrifice a part of their salary when they work for the Government. Further, I doubt that any profession has contributed as much in free talent over the years as have star performers.

As to the total cost of the program, \$2½ million is a lot of money. But on a comparative basis, it is to be noted that it is about as much as this Government spends annually on maintenance of the Senate Office Building and about one-fiftieth—not fifth—of the cost of maintaining one B-52 bomber wing for 1 year.

I respectfully submit that we would be denying ourselves of an important weapon in this crucial competition should we neglect this program.

I, for one, salute the artists who have contributed to it.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if I may have the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee, with respect to several remarks that have been made on the floor this afternoon relative to the cultural exchange activities. About a year ago this House and the Congress rewrote the law providing for cultural exchange programs. It is my purpose this afternoon to try to discover a little more specifically, if I can, how much money is in this bill for these exchange programs and for what purposes it is available.

Mr. ROONEY. There is included \$40 million. That is the exact amount, as I recall, and I was Chairman of the Committee of the Whole in this Chamber at the time that the gentleman from Indiana assured the Committee of the Whole would be the overall cost of the consolidated cultural exchange programs.

Mr. ADAIR. The gentleman is correct; that was the figure that was given by representatives of the State Department to the subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield further at that point?

Mr. ADAIR. Yes, I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Is the gentleman from Indiana familiar with the fact that at the very time that that figure of \$40 million

was given to the gentleman and to the members of his Foreign Affairs Committee there was in the works, in the Department of State, a request that would have brought the program up to about \$91 million a year?

Mr. ADAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is now familiar with that; he was not at the time the hearings were being held. I would like to ask the gentleman from New York further if the evidence before his subcommittee indicated that this sum of \$40 million would do an adequate job in the field of exchange of persons and educational and cultural activities.

Mr. ROONEY. I should fairly say in reply that when it came to the markup with regard to this item I suggested a figure in excess of \$40 million; but this figure of \$40 million represents the considered judgment of all the members of the subcommittee during the course of the markup, during which all the pros and cons were discussed. In other words, representing the subcommittee, I should say to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana that the committee feels that this will furnish an ample program in fiscal year 1963.

Mr. ADAIR. As I read the record of the hearings and the report, I gather that the request was more in the neighborhood of \$56 million.

Mr. ROONEY. I am sure the gentleman realizes that, as pointed out at page 8 of the committee report, in addition to the funds that are in this item, to wit, \$40 million, the Department plans to utilize an additional \$8,043,798, which is available from the unexpended balance of prior-year appropriations for "International Educational Exchange activities—special foreign currency program."

Mr. ADAIR. So there is in effect \$48 million-plus available?

Mr. ROONEY. That is correct.

Mr. ADAIR. For the sake of the record, what was the budget request for this item?

Mr. ROONEY. The budget request was in the amount of \$56,657,000.

Mr. ADAIR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, when my time expired in general debate I had started to ask a question concerning the cultural setup in Hawaii. I should like to know from one side of the aisle or the other whether we are going to continue to spend millions of dollars out there, some of it in construction of new buildings, and not have title to the buildings or to the land on which the buildings are erected. Has this situation, which was discussed to some extent last year, been resolved?

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman will perhaps recall that the gentleman from Ohio a year ago raised the question about the lack of title. The grants provided that we could be put out within 30 days. This has now been changed. This grant has been entered into and the title of the property has been properly researched, and we have an unlim-

ited tenure of occupancy. So far as the gentleman from Ohio is concerned, the changes were made that now give us protection.

Mr. GROSS. Then the gentleman is satisfied now that whatever expenditures are made there the U.S. Government will be protected?

Mr. BOW. We will be protected, I am satisfied of that.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. I understand there is a reception center in Hawaii. There is also a reception center somewhere in California. I do not know whether it is in San Francisco or Los Angeles. For the life of me, I cannot understand why we maintain a reception center in California and another in Hawaii.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

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

Mr. ROONEY. I should like to say that in both November and December of last year I inspected that reception center in Honolulu. There is a director, an assistant director, and just a few employees. The space used for the center could very well fit into just a corner of this Chamber. They were busy meeting foreign students, foreigners coming to Honolulu and the mainland under the exchange program, putting them up in private homes in Honolulu, and generally seeing that they were properly taken care of so that they might have a good impression of us.

Mr. GROSS. Recently it was brought to my attention—and I cannot get a complete fill-in on this for some reason or another from the State Department—that a gentleman by the name of Pershing Boswell, a Negro, was sent out to Hawaii as director of the reception center. Boswell, I am informed, has long years of experience. He is a career officer in the State Department.

Mr. ROONEY. A fine gentleman, a good Foreign Service officer, who has a charming wife. I have known him for years.

Mr. GROSS. Now I understand a gentleman by the name of Goemans has been sent out to head up this reception center.

Mr. ROONEY. He is a very competent young gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. And he is a friend of Teddy Kennedy.

Mr. ROONEY. And he is a friend of mine, too.

Mr. GROSS. Just a minute now. And I understand he has displaced Mr. Boswell as the director of the reception center, but both are paid the same salaries. This is the information I get. I have not confirmed it yet. Do you know whether or not we are paying two persons out there the same salaries and whether this friend of Teddy Kennedy has displaced this career officer as director of the reception center in Hawaii?

Mr. ROONEY. I believe they are not paying salaries as the gentleman suggests. But, having been there both in November and December, and having been in the company of Mr. Goemans and Mr. and Mrs. Boswell, I can report to you that everybody seemed happy.

They were doing a good job insofar as running the reception center is concerned, and there was no apparent acrimony or trouble at all.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman answer the question, Why did Mr. Goemans take his own secretary out there—if he did?

Mr. ROONEY. Well, that is a problem I suppose for personnel to decide.

Mr. GROSS. Are there no stenographers in Hawaii instead of having to ship one from this country? And does this conform to civil service procedure?

Mr. ROONEY. Again we are with that gentleman over in the State Department who says girls shall be no taller than 5 feet for Guayaquil, Ecuador. This is in his area. This is a personnel matter and belongs to Mr. Pollack over at the State Department.

Mr. GROSS. I hope the State Department will fill me in. I am trying to find out, I will say to the gentleman, about these cases.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Now, I would like to know something about the contributions to international organizations. There was supposed to have been a financial crisis, you know, in the United Nations beginning last November, and they said they had to have a bond issue. The bond issue still has not been approved.

What I want to know is how they are financing the United Nations operation, if there was a deficit of \$100 to \$200 million last November. Where are they getting the money to operate without the bond issue?

Mr. ROONEY. I understand they hope to obtain in this bill from the United States \$26,739,279. This sum has nothing whatever to do with UNEF, the United Nations Emergency Force operations in the Congo or the operation in the Middle East. This \$26,739,279 is in effect to pay for the dues of the United States to the United Nations. I might advise the distinguished gentleman and the House that just today, the International Court of Justice announced their decision with regard to the United Nations matter. They have held that any nation which has refused to pay their assessments with regard to the Congo is technically in arrears, and I would expect that our American representatives to the United Nations will very shortly make objection that unless the Soviet Union, the Communist satellites and those nations which have refused to pay the Congo assessment and other assessments pay them up, they must be disqualified when it comes to the right to any vote in the United Nations.

Mr. GROSS. Is it true or is it not true that they have been raiding other funds? This bill today makes funds available to UNESCO, to UNICEF and various subsidiary agencies.

Mr. ROONEY. Yes, they are all listed on page 5 of the committee report.

Mr. GROSS. Just a minute. Is it true that they have been raiding other funds to keep this polyglot organization going?

Mr. ROONEY. It is pretty hard to agree to the gentleman's suggestion when he uses the word "raiding."

If they have been transferring some funds from one account to another because of this emergency and in order to keep the United Nations' activities going, and I believe everybody is interested in keeping the United Nations and its activities going, I find no fault with the transfers.

Mr. GROSS. Call it raiding or whatever you want, they have been manipulating funds as when they took \$10 million from the U.N. Children's Fund.

Mr. ROONEY. I did not say that. I said that if they did I would not object to their transfer.

Mr. GROSS. Where have they been getting the money to run this organization?

Mr. ROONEY. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that a certain amount of the bonds has already been sold?

Mr. GROSS. Already sold? There are pledges to take a certain amount of them. We have agreed, according to Under Secretary Ball, to reimburse the British for taking \$12 million of these bonds, and we will find means of reimbursing the British. But I still do not have an answer to the question of where they are getting the money to run this organization.

Let me ask the gentleman another question.

Mr. ROONEY. I shall say to the gentleman that we are merely paying our dues to the U.N. under the terms of this bill—trying to do it, and I expect we are going to do it.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, and by keeping our assessments paid to all these various subsidiary organizations we are in turn financing the deficit if the U.N. is raiding these funds as they did a year or so ago from UNICEF, the U.N. Children's Fund; they took \$10 million out of that fund to keep the organization going. I hope it has been paid back. When we pay our regular assessments and they raid these funds then we are certainly putting up the money for the deficits, irrespective of the bond issues, and I do not like it.

Mr. ROONEY. I think the gentleman is correct in understanding that the \$10 million has been paid back.

Mr. GROSS. I hope so.

With respect to the pay of the United Nations employees, do I understand they are paid salaries that in effect reimburse them for their Federal and municipal taxes; that they are paid salaries that give a cost-of-living differential, in other words, a hardship differential, in the city of New York? I did not know until recently that New York was a hardship post.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman is using the wrong word. It is a cost-of-living differential rather than hardship. We generally use "hardship" to indicate a place like Ouagadougou.

Mr. GROSS. But they are reimbursed for their taxes paid. Is that correct?

Mr. ROONEY. That is my understanding.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I trust the comments I am about to make will not be construed as being critical of the distinguished chairman or any member of his committee. Also I trust they may not be construed as being critical of the entertainment industry in general. I wish to continue the colloquy I had with the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPS-COMB] in regard to this cultural program that is being administered by the State Department. I therefore hope that what I am about to say will be considered as being extremely critical of the administration of this cultural program by the State Department.

Before generalizing and making my criticism of this program I would like to bring to the attention of the committee an incident that occurred in the State of New Jersey, where the American Legion band was the State champion of New Jersey for 9 consecutive years, recommended by the National American Legion band to participate in the world music contest in Holland.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. CAHILL. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I wonder if the gentleman would be kind enough to tell the Committee of the Whole whether it was a band in the true sense of the word or a fife, drum, and bugle corps?

Mr. CAHILL. No, it was a band in the true sense of the word. It is my understanding that there were 150 bands and orchestras invited to this forthcoming music festival.

Mr. ROONEY. If the gentleman will further yield, the reason I asked that question is because of my having been an oldtime band and orchestra musician, and a member of the musicians union in New York. I have an aversion to fife, drum, and bugle corps, which make a lot of noise.

Strange to say, being Irish I am also against the bagpipe bands. They make too much noise, too.

Mr. CAHILL. I may say to the gentleman, being Irish myself, I am agreed as far as the Scotch bands are concerned, but not the Irish bugle corps.

Having heard this band, Mr. Chairman, I can assure you they would have made America proud. However, the point is not quality of the music. The point is this organization had to raise some \$35,000 to attend. They raised \$28,000. Then they made application, after having written to Mr. and Mrs. Kennedy, to somebody and to somebody. They finally got to the Cultural Division of the State Department there. They asked for \$15,000 in order to let these people go to represent the United States and they were turned down.

Here is my objection—not to their turn down, Mr. Chairman—and I would like to ask this question: Why is it that in addition to the Joey Adams show, which cost us \$250,000, why do we pay professional entertainers who could through the medium of their own booking agents be booked in the finest the-

aters, the finest restaurants, the finest cafes in Europe, and make money out of it? Why do we pay these people?

Mr. ROONEY. My answer has to be, I do not know, to be honest with the gentleman. His is the very question I have been asking the State Department ever since they started this program.

Mr. CAHILL. Let me say to the chairman, we paid Benny Goodman's Band \$109,000, we paid Louis Armstrong \$20,000, we paid the Holiday on Ice \$53,000. I know myself that every one of these organizations could have been booked into the best hotels in Europe and could have gone anywhere and been paid for it.

I have come to the conclusion, Mr. Chairman, they have perverted the admonition of our distinguished President. They have said in effect, it is not what you can do for your country but what your country can do for you that counts.

The State Department should listen more to the admonitions of the distinguished chairman and cut out this nonsense.

Mr. ROONEY. Before the gentleman leaves this subject, this colloquy reminds me of the fact that Helen Hayes of stage fame made a great sacrifice by playing at the rate of \$1,500 a week of the taxpayers' money, as did June Havoc on the same trip at \$1,300 a week. When the stage company was playing in English and touring in Latin America Miss June Havoc, who was getting \$1,000 a week, threatened to quit the tour unless she was raised to \$1,300 a week.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Speaking of nonsense, I would suggest to the Members, if they want to really read some nonsense, read Cindy Adams' articles that she wrote to the newspapers while she was on tour with her husband in this Asian territory. I have never read more hogwash than that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. ROONEY), Mr. CAHILL was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

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

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

Mr. ROONEY. In connection with the subject mentioned by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] about the newspaper articles written by Cindy Adams, there will be found in the printed hearings every article that she wrote which was handed to the committee, having been clipped by the State Department. There is no testimony in these printed hearings with regard to Joey or Cindy Adams which was put in the mouth of any witness. Everything in this regard was read directly from documents produced by the State Department on demand of the subcommittee.

Mr. GROSS. But it took hours and I suspect a few days.

Mr. ROONEY. It not only took hours, but the committee encountered delib-

erate lies. We were first told there were no derogatory reports made. I believe it was Dorothy Kilgallen who wrote a column which came to the attention of the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] and the gentleman from California brought up the matter in the subcommittee. When we first inquired as to whether or not there were any troubles on the trip, we were told "Oh, no." Were there any derogatory reports back from the posts that the troupe visited? "Oh, no." Then we said, "Please bring all the wires on the troupe up here at 2 o'clock this afternoon and we shall see." Well, we then went through them and they were full of derogatory reports in regard to the conduct of Adams on the tour.

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

Mr. CAHILL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. Could I ask the gentleman where in the record this testimony occurs? I would like to read it.

Mr. ROONEY. It is in the Department of State hearings.

Mr. CAHILL. May I conclude my remarks by saying there is one other matter I would like to bring to the attention of the committee that was brought to my attention by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB].

Now, we have all of these professional organizations who are being paid by the State Department to go to Europe and yet, according to the information given to me by the State Department, whoever or whatever organization is to go must first be auditioned, and it is my understanding that the State Department is paying an organization in New York, ANTA, over \$100,000 to arrange these tours. It seems to me a bit ridiculous that Benny Goodman and Louis Armstrong and Helen Hayes have to be auditioned before they can be sent to Europe at American expense.

I sincerely trust, Mr. Chairman, that you will continue your vigilant and very effective fight to straighten out the State Department.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, here is the Joey Adams troupe testimony, which I shall read to you, beginning at page 755 of the printed hearings:

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Bow?

Mr. Bow. Mr. Chairman, Mr. LIPSCOMB will have to leave. May I yield to him?

Mr. ROONEY. Surely.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Thank you, Mr. Bow.

JOEY ADAMS SHOW

Could you tell us something about this Joey Adams show listed on page 356 of the justifications?

Mr. COOMBS. I would like to ask Mr. Isenbergh to reply to that. I can only say personally that I had a meeting some weeks ago in Bangkok of all our Asian people who had experienced the Joey Adams show and as far as the public reaction was concerned it was reported uniformly good. The show went beyond the big cities. It fascinated people who had never seen anything of this sort. It was much better in quality than the kind of vaudeville and trained bear acts the Soviet Union had been putting on in this area.

Perhaps Mr. Isenbergh could add to that.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. We spent \$256,000 on this show?

Mr. ISENBERGH. Yes, Mr. LIPSCOMB.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. How many entertainers?

Mr. ISENBERGH. There were 25 in the company. They gave 97 performances in 122 days. In addition to that, they made over 40 special appearances at hospitals, orphanages, schools, and foreign military installations.

May I add to what Mr. Coombs has said that both the Russians and the Chinese have been sending variety shows to south Asia and the Near East with a great deal of success. Our posts have repeatedly requested a variety show and it was in response to those requests and the Communist competition that we started on this.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mrs. Adams was the mistress of ceremonies of this show?

Mr. ISENBERGH. Mrs. Adams was along and began each show with an introduction in the language of each new country. She was paid only for her transportation.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Is she also a newspaper writer? Did she send columns back to the United States?

Mr. ISENBERGH. She is a writer and I believe she did do that, sir.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Has your Department had an opportunity to read her columns or see what she was writing and sending home?

Mr. ISENBERGH. Yes, sir. They have come to our attention.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Do you have them available so that the committee could look at them?

Mr. ISENBERGH. I do not have them here but I can supply a file of those columns for you.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Was she inclined to be critical of the presentation or the problems the group encountered?

Mr. ISENBERGH. On the contrary, I think her columns were a verification of the success of the show.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I do not mean of the show, naturally, as she was a part of it, but of the countries and some of the things that were going on?

Mr. ISENBERGH. I do not recall that that was the general tone of her comment.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I understand she said in one column they had been playing nothing but palaces, to the heads of state of the elite of various foreign lands at the taxpayers' expense. Do you recall anything of that sort?

Mr. ISENBERGH. No, I do not. The experience is very much to the contrary and I would be surprised if she described her experience in exactly those terms. I do not know whether I pointed out that the total attendance at the performances of the variety show was 222,400, an average of about 2,500 per performance. I also pointed out that in addition to this there were special appearances in hospitals, schools, and orphanages, as well as at the military installation of the countries. This would hardly be consistent with merely playing to the heads of state, although they did that as well.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. How much was Mr. Joey Adams paid?

Mr. ISENBERGH. The whole troupe was paid for on a package basis. The cost was \$10,000 per week. This figure was arrived at as a result of long negotiation.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Isenbergh, surely you know how much Adams got a week, do you not?

Mr. ISENBERGH. No, sir; I do not.

Mr. ROONEY. Is there any secret about this? Excuse me, Mr. LIPSCOMB.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Surely.

Mr. ROONEY. You mean in the negotiations you did not learn from ANTA how much he was paid?

Mr. ISENBERGH. Do you want me to tell you how the negotiations were conducted?

Mr. ROONEY. I do not care how the negotiations were conducted. Mr. Adams was paid every week. You should know how much.

Mr. ISENBERGH. Payment was made as a package to the agent for the company. The show was full of headliners who had played

Las Vegas and like spots and their original demand was for exactly three times the final figure. The average pay per performer comes out at \$450 a week, out of which they had to pay all their food and lodging. The result is that the total cost was much lower than a comparable show could be gotten for in the United States, and I do not know how much of this went to Joey Adams.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Will you submit for the committee to observe the columns that Mrs. Adams wrote so that we can take a look at them?

Mr. ISENBERGH. Yes, I will.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, on last Tuesday we discussed some newspaper columns which were written during the tour of Joey Adams. The articles have been submitted and I have had an opportunity to look at some of them very quickly. These articles were written, as I understand it, by Mrs. Cindy Adams, who is Mr. Joey Adams' wife and who was on the tour. Is that correct?

Mr. ISENBERGH. That is correct, sir.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. And what was her responsibility on the tour?

Mr. ISENBERGH. She gave an introductory talk at every performance in the language of the particular country.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Did she speak the language of all these countries?

Mr. ISENBERGH. She learned it phonetically for the purpose of doing this.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. And she was briefed on what to say in each country they visited and given the phonetic introduction she would give at each performance?

Mr. ISENBERGH. This must have been so, sir.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Is this the way it was done? Mr. ISENBERGH. I do not know but I assume that she had competent guidance.

I have just had this verified, that she was briefed on what should be said.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Is this an accurate quote from an article written by Dorothy Kilgallen and appeared in the press:

"She does not know the language of the countries being entertained.

"I ascertained from Mr. Bowman that someone in the State Department at each stop along the line whips up a phonetic introduction for her and she memorizes it. Mr. Bowman said she is very good at it."

Mr. ISENBERGH. Mr. Bowman has just confirmed that this is the case.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. In my questioning I do not want in any way to imply that these people who go on these tours are not doing it at some personal sacrifice. Traveling in some of the underdeveloped countries; I realize it is difficult. What is the purpose of sending a unit such as the Joey Adams troupe to these countries in the Far East? What is our objective as a country?

Mr. ISENBERGH. Our objective is to have an American presence there that reaches the people in an effective, affirmative way, which is precisely what this tour achieved.

I have here a clipping from the New York Times of December 10, 1961, headed "U.S. Variety Show Is Charming India—Audiences and Critics Like Joey Adams Troupe." This is typical of the reactions throughout his tour.

I also, to repeat what I said yesterday, point out that this particular show was designed to respond to the heavy saturation in this area of variety shows by the Communist countries.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Did Mrs. Adams have any arrangements with the State Department in regard to sending a column back to the Town and Village newspaper in New York?

Mr. ISENBERGH. No, sir. We were not aware of these columns until after the event. The Town and Country newspaper is, as you know, a community newspaper which does not come to the attention of people outside of the community. It did not come to our attention until after the columns had appeared.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Did the columns come to your attention while the troupe was on tour?

Mr. ISENBERGH. My recollection is that the first that I heard of this was after the tour was over, but I am not absolutely certain.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Has there been any opportunity for you to evaluate these articles that have appeared in the press and to determine whether or not they did any harm to the tour or to our relations with the people we were trying to reach in an effective affirmative way?

Mr. ISENBERGH. As I pointed out, the audience for these columns is a very limited audience.

Mr. ROONEY. He did not ask you that. He asked you what the consequences of the published articles were.

Mr. ISENBERGH. I feel they did not do any harm to the purposes of the tour. In any event, what we know about the reaction is overwhelmingly favorable.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. In other words, you feel the contents of these articles have not in any way been funneled back to the countries she discussed in the articles?

Mr. ISENBERGH. I have no way of knowing that, but I would be surprised if they have been communicated to any significant extent to the other countries.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. There was a young lady in the Peace Corps who dropped a post card accidentally before it was mailed and it created considerable turmoil because she spoke of the poverty in the country in which she was stationed. Is that right?

Mr. ISENBERGH. That is true, sir.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. How do you think Mrs. Adams can write about this kind of thing in this country and not have any objection from the State Department?

Mr. ISENBERGH. The State Department, as I said, had no opportunity to object because the columns did not come to our attention until after they had appeared. But the proof of the pudding is in the eating and we have had no indication of any adverse effects in any of the countries. On the contrary, we have letters from officials of the other countries commenting upon the success of the Joey Adams show there.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Do you think the kind of articles written by Mrs. Cindy Adams is the type of thing that should accompany a tour or cultural presentation? Do you think that this was a good thing?

NEWSPAPER ARTICLES BY CINDY ADAMS

Mr. ROONEY. The difficulty with this interrogation, Mr. LIPSCOMB, is that we do not presently have in the record the articles to which you are making reference, so I suggest that we insert all the columns in this regard in the record and then the reader of the record can decide for himself whether they are good or bad.

CINDY SAYS: KABUL—A CITY OF CONTRASTS (By Cindy Adams)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Cindy Adams is currently on a good will tour of the Near and Far East with her comedian husband, Joey Adams, and a troupe of entertainers. The tour is sponsored by the U.S. State Department.)

KABUL, AFGHANISTAN.—Well, as we clever writers say, here we are in Afghanistan. It's 12,000 miles away from the United States. It's 250 miles away from the U.S.S.R. It's 10 days away from anything by airmail and if Rand McNally himself quizzed me, I still don't know where we are. I only know we had breakfast in New York, lunch in London, a snack in Paris, tea in Geneva and heartburn in Cairo before changing planes in Bombay and Delhi where we inherited a barefoot pilot. Nice and early Friday we grabbed an Air India jet and nice and late Monday, 4 days later, we landed in Kabul. So, if your travel agent claims it's a keen place for a weekend—forget it.

Desert area surrounded by mountains, Kabul's hot and dry daytime, cool and dusty

come night and the altitude is very high. It's the home of karakul or what we call persian lamb. It's where you order postage stamps in advance 'cause they're printed as needed. It's where the Army's trained by Soviets and uniformed by Germans. It's where Moslem ladies in modern knee-length skirts trot alongside women in centuries-old "Chadari" which means "curtain" and is the veil which covers from head to foot. It's where transportation is divided betwixt American made autos and garden variety mules. It's where main boulevards are shared by sheep, oxen, 1961 Ford station wagons, bearded men in turbans, horse-drawn carts, and high-heeled women in angle-length veils. And it's where you have to guzzle bottled water even to brush your teeth.

Our troupe of 24, traveling on behalf of President Kennedy's cultural exchange program, is appearing here at the Jeshyn Fair. This is their annual week-long independence celebration which really falls in May but gets celebrated come August cause the weather is better. It's outdoors with booths and pavilions. Sort of like the World's Fair only turban style. Every country is represented by an exhibit.

I wouldn't say the admission is commensurate with Joey's talent, but to see us it's roughly two Afghans or, when you smooth it out, a hot nickel. We did a command performance for the royal family and the King sent us his compliments. The Crown Prince came back four times to see Buddy Rich and his great jazz group. An amateur guitarist, he's asked permission to sit in. Joey said "Sure" if His Highness could arrange for him to do a split week at the palace. Poor Joey's always wanted to work at the palace.

CINDY SAYS: A RESPONSIBLE PRESS?

(By Cindy Adams, written while airborne from Bangkok to Chiangmai, Thailand)

"The American press has become superficial," snapped our Ambassador of Afghanistan, Henry A. Byroade, who was the youngest general in the Army and a once-upon-a-time Assistant Secretary of State before brightening the Foreign Service. He told this to me in an exclusive interview just before we left Kabul. "Their anxiety to sell newspapers and sensationalism at the risk of inaccuracy and misleading statements about foreign relations makes our job more difficult.

"Such sloppy reporting is particularly true in underdeveloped areas where they figure nobody reads it anyhow."

Warning to his pet conversational peeve, His Excellency refuted this by illustrating that President Nasser fathoms the depth of U.S. sentiment against him by devouring seven major U.S. dailies every night.

In 1955 Nasser spoke these words: "No Arab is now speaking in terms of the fact that Israel should be destroyed." Three days later a New York newspaper featured the headline, "Israel should be destroyed," says Nasser.

"He was furious," related the Ambassador, his powder-blue eyes narrowing with disgust. "As Ambassador to Egypt, I could only try to explain how America's press is really free. How there's no Government control. I played the incident down. But he's no fool. This worsened our relations. Made him distrust us."

Our interview has been staged in the back of the busy Ambassador's official limousine as, with flags flying, he whisked about Afghanistan's capital. En route to a conference with the Prime Minister, he continued with underdeveloped areas of the world getting underdeveloped coverage in the news. "They figure nobody else knows anything more about these out-of-the-way places than they do anyhow. But what's out of the way today isn't out of the way tomorrow. Take Korea, Laos, the Congo, and other

spots Americans knew previously only through fiction."

One top magazine immortalized Afghanistan without explaining it's but 250 miles from Khrushchev's boardinghouse reach or that there's 400 miles of Russian border at that point, or that Russia has a greater concentrated effort on this country in proportion to its size than anyplace in the world. Instead, the article was sexed up to create the impression the King had a harem. "Wasn't true, but it was more interesting," commented the Ambassador dryly. "The Government was very upset and protested officially to Washington at this vile treatment of their country. This particular magazine was barred here, which in turn hurts our spread of democracy through the printed word."

Another newspaperman wrote that the Pathans, the warring tribe of nomads on both sides of the Pakistan-Afghanistan border, quote—"Love to fight even more than they love to lust." "Just so happens lusting is not an outstanding occupation among these people," commented Byroade, "but what's he care? It's a catchy phrase. Any news about the Khyber Pass is exciting. So what if he doesn't know the people? So what if he's never seen any of them? This is an unknown part of the world anyway."

The chauffeur, at that point, had swerved to avoid an unescorted sheep who was sauntering down the dirt road which is to Kabul what the Champs Elysees is to gay Parea. Without dropping a comma, the Right Honorable "Hank" Byroade continued.

"These people begin to doubt us. They feel such irresponsibility, such misinformation, sways public opinion in a government where public opinion determines the government.

"When I was Ambassador to South Africa 2½ years ago, one reporter spent weeks looking for a sign saying, 'Natives and animals aren't allowed.' I roamed the whole country. Never saw it. He claims he did. And that was the story he sent home. Hell, there's no problem without two sides. But he didn't want to study the issues. He traveled 5,000 miles with one object: To find a dramatic example of how bad something is.

"Our editors must realize this fault and redouble efforts to insure accurate reporting. It's worth any cost to cover the world more competently than we do. It is our responsibility as leaders of the free world that our public be as fully and accurately informed as possible. We cannot afford the luxury of misinformation just to sell newspapers."

CINDY SAYS: RAGS AT A PREMIUM

(By Cindy Adams)

KATMANDU, NEPAL.—Beginning of our fourth week—80 miles south of the Red China border, ringed by the Himalayan Mountains, is Nepal. Considered by Government academicians to be the most underdeveloped country on this planet, it's the farthest point from central United States of America. From here on in, wherever you wander, you're nearer home.

A country of 9 million, this kingdom has no sanitation whatever but zillions of gilt encrusted Buddhist temples all over. It has but 80 miles of railroad and but 300 miles of "navigable" dirt road. Navigable, meaning just barely "jeepable." Barring occasional bicycles, jeeps are the mode of transportation for foreigners. The locals make it on foot.

The primitive Nepalese live in the equivalent of the 1500's. There's practically no sign of the wheel. There are no cars except official ones. No wheelbarrows. Brick and wood are toted on one's back with the straps around the forehead. No wagons. Water is carried in pails connected by a pole balanced across the shoulders. No carriages. Babies are carried either papoose style or on the hip. Not even a revolving

wheel in the wells. Water buckets are lowered manually.

The tail end of their monsoon season, Katmandu is steamy afternoons and rainy come night. There's only one road out of Nepal and come monsoon season that's closed off, so the only exit and entrance is by air. And in bad weather, the DC-3—only aircraft that can set down here—can't land, thereby virtually isolating Nepal. There are no phones. There are no cable offices except one and that's in the Indian Embassy. Air-mail in this out-of-the-way stop is slow, as planes do not arrive or leave more than a few times a week. The only contact you feel closely in this part of the world is the hot breath of Red China.

To describe the poverty of the Nepalese is to cite what happened when our troupe did an outside show. Joey wanted to scrape the mud from his shoes and asked for a rag. Answered an English-speaking Nepalese, "Mr. Adams, we have no rags in Nepal. We're all wearing them here."

Average day in the life of Joey and I, as heads of President Kennedy's cultural exchange program, was one day last week. Up 5:30 a.m. in Delhi, India, the overnight stopover from Kabul to Katmandu. As usual, the 8 a.m. Indian Airlines flight was hours late taking off. After sitting around the airport like displaced persons, all 24 of us plus 3,000 pounds of equipment, arrived in Katmandu midday. Posed for pictures (Life magazine sent a crew to photograph the troupe during our 5 days here), had an official lunch, an hour briefing on local do's and don'ts, 2 hours with our Ambassador in an official visit, a press conference with the Minister of Public Affairs, then rehearsal, then an impromptu appearance at a hospital, then finally unpacking.

Had 1 hour to press clothes and bathe, before the official Embassy reception, where Joey and I stood 2 hours on the receiving line. In our 1 hour, we discovered the water was off (naturally) so no bath, and the electricity suffered a power failure (figures) so no pressing. After the reception came the 2-hour show, then an official state dinner with the royal family to welcome us on behalf of the Royal Nepalese Government.

Natch, us commoners couldn't amscray before their highnesses and their fantasticnesses were having a ball * * * so-o-o, with a song in my heart and a pain in my passport, I finally laid me down to sleep at 2 a.m.—21½ hours later.

Come to think of it, this was an easy day—one show.

CINDY SAYS: "PRINCE—ANYONE?"

(By Cindy Adams)

BANGKOK, THAILAND.—As we left Katmandu, Nepal, in some kind of twin-engine kite for Calcutta, India, I discovered the Red Chinese Ambassador was aboard. I mean, I had no choice, I had to wish the old boy Godspeed. After all, we were on the same plane.

Whilst changing for a jet to Bangkok, we experienced a great kick. In a window was a copy of Joey's 1954 bestseller, "Cindy and I." We didn't price it though cause, let's face it, we'd both read it before.

Our troupe had been briefed that in Moslem and Buddhist countries, we shouldn't whack anyone on the back Yankee-style or in any way touch them. The more orthodox scrub their persons and houses top to bottom if a westerner even crosses their threshold let alone has physical contact. Unfortunately, our briefings came just a couple of physical contacts too late.

One of our group was relating a pleasant little joke to a bunch of pleasant little listeners. One of them didn't laugh. Our hero thumped him on the shoulder with a "Doncha get it, Mac?" "Mac" turned out to be the Crown Prince.

In India, another of our boys was standing behind a nice, unassuming seated gentleman. Our boy was weary, the chair was backless, so he leaned his paws on the shoulder of the nice, unassuming seated gentleman who stiffened slightly. When rigor mortis set in everybody wondered why, till we found out he was the Indian Ambassador.

Then, of course, there was the time I personally kept calling a certain Prime Minister "honey." I don't know what a prime example of a Prime Minister is. I only know that whatever he should look like, this dear soul didn't.

In Kabul, Afghanistan, one of us, when introduced to another Prince, said, "Pleasure to meet you, Your Highness. I hope we can play your country sometime." Muttered Joey quietly, "This is his country."

In these smaller places, there's almost more royalty than commoners. Sometimes you can't tell the princess from the peasants without a scoreboard. * * * In one country even our well-oriented Ambassador made a class A goof. Sitting outdoors, in the semi-darkness, amongst the 20,000 people in our audience, our Ambassador saved one empty seat for his wife. Engrossed in conversation, he barely noticed somebody lowering himself into the seat. He only said quickly, "Sorry, this is reserved." Even in the blackout he thought he detected a surprised look blanket the face of the seat stealer. Something made him do a double take. When he did, he looked smack into the wounded eyes of the King's brother. Many apologies and scrapings and bowing later, he and the King's kin were gabbing away whilst Mrs. Ambassador was craning her neck from behind the SRO sign.

Everywhere, admissions for our show equaled admissions to a show their country would have. In Bangkok, prices are 5, 10, and 15 baht. A baht's 5 cents. In Kabul we worked the Jeshyn Fair. It's held annually. Every few years there's the International Jeshyn, like this year, where all countries participate in pavilions, exhibits, and/or shows. I won't tell you what it cost to see us. I can only tell you that admission to the whole fair was the equivalent of 2 cents.

I don't care what my mother says, this is an underprivileged area and it had nothing whatever to do with Joey's talent.

CINDY SAYS: U.S. "DON'T" LIST IS LONG

(By Cindy Adams)

PHNOM PENH, CAMBODIA.—I'd always heard the cheapest commodity in Asia was human life. However, when trouping for our country's cultural exchange program, you soon discover that even more plentiful than rice bowls are your lists of do's and don'ts issued by the State Department.

For females, high on the list are low necklines. They're verboten, forbidden, and you positively darsn't feature them in Moslem countries. And you don't wear slacks or shorts. And, for men, you don't trot about with sportshirts, no jackets, and 5 o'clock shadow.

The biggest don't is don't discuss politics. Second, don't boast how wonderful our wonderful United States of America is. Third, biggest don't being don't call the locals natives. Do call them, nationals. (Anybody ever hear that old saw, "The nationals are restless tonight?")

In Afghanistan, if you buy karacul hats, turbans, their embroidered national dress, or other indigenous garb, don't wear it locally. It's felt you're trying too hard. In Hindu India, don't whack anybody on the back in palsy-walsy Yankee style. And, so's we don't look too openhanded, don't overtip; don't feed the beggars. In Buddhist Nepal, don't dare touch or even graze a lady. Don't even shake hands unless she offers first. It's an unpardonable offense punishable by the un-

written law, the written law, and any other laws the menfolks got laying around. And don't step on orange or yellow rocks; they're considered gods.

But, like the gentleman says, you ain't heard nothin yet til Bangkok. Here, they got two No. 1 don'ts. First No. 1 don't concerns "The King and I." Just don't mention it. They're sensitive about this, deem it fiction not truth, consider it demeaned he who was Thailand's father of education and reduced His Majesty to an ordinary mortal rather than a supreme being.

Second No. 1 don't regards the worst word in Thai language which is the bottom of your foot. Because of this, even sheshine parlors are taboo hereabouts. So, don't point your feet at anybody; don't sit with your legs crossed; don't expose the soles of your shoes.

Comes next the bunch of make sures. Make sure you don't mention President Kennedy more than once in your official speeches. Sounds like we're pressing. Make sure you throw in a kind word for our ambassador but make sure you don't lay it on too thick. Sounds like logrolling.

Then there's the second-string don'ts: Don't touch Thai on the head or shoulders. That's the sacred part of their being. Don't point or shake your finger. In Thailand it's a gesture of accusation. Don't stand over a seated Thai when conversing. Nobody knows why, unless maybe that it's just plain rude. For females, don't touch orange-robed monks. For everybody, don't raise your voice or shout to anyone. And don't kiss or display affection publicly.

CINDY SAYS: TOURIST-TEACHERS IN LAOS

(By Cindy Adams)

SINGAPORE.—Teachers who teach readin', writin', and whateveritis in a little red schoolhouse in Maine may have difficult moments, but tourists who double at cramming it into 700 Lao in a little bombed schoolhouse in Vientiane are really put to the test.

The Lao-American Association opened its doors September 1959. They nearly shut them August 1960. State Department sponsored, it was staffed by wives of the menfolk stationed hereabouts. Come August 19 all 500 were ordered to amscray and take to the high ground for protection. This left our American men femaleless, our Lao pupils teacherless, and it's a draw as to who was hardest hit.

Anybody who spoke English was pressed into service. If you could say, "How are you?" without faltering, you taught advanced classes. The substitutes—Army officers, Embassy staffers, an odd missionary or two—were aided by shanghaiing anybody passing through. Photographers in town for National Geographic took a class, some Yale fellow rattling around the world took a class and though today tourist rate doesn't reach that of Siberia, anybody, who made a wrong left and landed just long enough to get out—took a class.

Joey Adams' show, touring for President Kennedy's cultural exchange program, arrived on a Thursday. Friday, one of our dancers, our pantomimist's wife, and myself were smoked out, given ricksha service to the school, handed the lessons and pointed toward a blackboard. Lao-American's slogan is, "Have books will travel." This was 2 weeks ago. I'm reminded of it today because a thank you letter from the school just reached me here in Singapore.

Pupils, age 10 to 50, pay 600 kip (\$7.50) per 3-month course. They have 8 classrooms. Come emergencies the auditorium is sectioned. This expedites pandemonium since their method is choral mimicry. The instructor recites; the class repeats. This having been French Indochina, many speak French. We were cautioned to employ "direct" methods, meaning only English.

My class, 2-C, had 180 hours of English. At times it felt they'd had more than I. "Janet Taylor was ready 10:30 on the dot," I recited. They repeated it beautifully. Everything's going to be fine, I thought. "What means 'on the dot'?" somebody asked. Utilizing my wristwatch I explained it meant "exactly." Feeling proud of myself I commenced forging onward but something stopped me. "How would you use 'on the dot'?" I asked. Grinning, one lady announced brightly, "I want a dress on the dot like yours."

I continued, but with less bravado, till Janet Taylor, my nemesis, opened a can of fruit. They couldn't understand "can." I started explaining in French. Then I recalled that's taboo. Then I realized I could not remember the French word for "can" anyway. Immediately I thought: The most important thing is not to panic. I claved at the 26 pictorial charts lining the wall. Nothing. I pantomimed. Nothing. I squawked, "Tin—metal—." Nothing. I drew a picture. It looked like a square with a yo-yo on either end. Eventually I grabbed an interpreter who announced dolefully that the stupid teacher would bring one next day to show the class.

It was a broiling hot day. Drenched with perspiration and failure, I emerged a sodden mass. Before I killed myself, all I wanted out of life was an iced tea. Nobody understood. I used sign language, drew sketches. Nothing.

Frankly, I'd love to take another class. If only to bring them a can and teach them two words: "iced tea."

CINDY SAYS: COMMAND PERFORMANCE PROBLEM

(By Cindy Adams)

DJAKARTA, INDONESIA.—Since the Joey Adams Variety Show amscrazed New York on August 18 for the Java-Sumatra-Indonesia circuit, which is the southeast Asian version of New York, New Haven, and Hartford, we've played the Palace more times than Nora Bayes. Traveling as good will ambassadors on behalf of President Kennedy's cultural exchange program, our troupe of 23 has entertained the King and Queen of Thailand, the King and Queen of Afghanistan, the King and Queen of Nepal, the Queen and a stray princess or two in Cambodia and one of those three cranky princes from Laos.

So, although another command performance was routine, sharing a rice bowl with Sukarno wasn't. To do it, we flew in from Laos via Bangkok the night before with no sleep. We'd hoisted ourselves at 7 a.m. to make a 10 o'clock Royal Air Lao flight to Bangkok which didn't leave until noon. For reasons, known to absolutely nobody, we always have to decorate the bloody airports an hour and a half ahead of even the pilot. "Hurry up and wait" is our slogan.

In Bangkok, seems our 3,800 pounds of equipment plus hand luggage couldn't fit our Garuda Indonesian airplane. They removed some seats. Then there weren't enough seats so they replaced them and removed the luggage. Finally they replaced them and bumped some extra passenger. We left 3 hours late.

Only one problem upon arrival. Nothing serious. Just seems someone mislaid 17 pieces of luggage. "Don't worry," they chorused. "Fear not," they said. "It'll come manana." So, they bowed, we bowed, and next day there was only one problem. The sole plane due from Thailand arrived luggageless. We were scheduled for Sukarno's country palace in Bogor, 5 p.m. Djakarta's 6 hours from Bangkok. Bogor's an hour drive from Djakarta. Noontime everyone was in a funk. Except Joey. He was calm and cool and numb from panic. I mean, lets face it, who stands up a presi-

dent? We could find our next stop would be Loew's firing squad.

A priority cable was sent from our Indonesian Ambassador to our Thailand Ambassador. Couched in diplomatic talk, the gist was "H-E-L-P." Sukarno had requested an American show for years. He'd looked forward to this for months. He'd invited 500 of the top 400 of Indonesia. And we hadn't one shred of stage equipment and half our girls had no personal luggage whatever.

The Thailand Embassy chartered a Royal Thai Airforce plane and cabled back, "Keep your tuxedo on, luggage arriving 7 p.m." The plane was an hour late. President Sukarno stationed his army at the airport to unload, had his aides whisk it through customs and Government trucks and a police escort stood by to careen it to Bogor.

Meanwhile, back at the Palace, the natives were getting restless. It was 9:30. The calmest and most gracious of everyone was the President himself. Like any good host, he mixed, mingled, soothed, joked, even sang songs to pass the hours and told us that although his invitees sported silks, satins, and brocades, we girls looked lovely in our 2-day-old crumpled, perspired drip-dry flight outfits.

The show was a big hit, the President was delighted and said it accomplished much in bringing the love, friendship, and joy of America to Indonesia.

But there was just one thing. I still think that extra delay at the Palace could've been avoided if Joey hadn't asked the guard for backstage.

CINDY SAYS: MARRIAGE IN CAMBODIA

(By Cindy Adams)

PHNOM PENH, CAMBODIA.—In Cambodia, a gent may have seven wives. And, seems to me, if he can withstand the Cambodian courtship—which is like an endurance test—he's entitled.

Firstly, ladies hereabout never go out alone even in daylight. They're always chaperoned by parents, relatives, or someone as incorruptible as a Canadian Mountie. Instantly, this lowers the odds on a sneak meeting betwixt the Cambodian Romeo and his Juliet.

If a boy wants to set his beret for a girl, he must be a longtime family friend, have attended the same schools, have the same type home and background, and his father must know her father.

For the first date, he needs permission from her father. Being there's no telephones, a week ahead he makes an appointment with the girl, who must be 18, for an appointment to see the old man. She gives him the address; he gives her the time and day he'll call. This whole date is merely an OK for the date.

Once past the reviewing stand, they may get out the first time—but only to a public party—and only if her parents know the party throwers. And there's no pulling the wool over Mr. and Mrs. Cambodia either. The party throwers must personally call for you and your shiek in their own car. It's knay on hand holding and first name calling. Even the impersonal French pronoun "vous" instead of the familiar "tu" is used.

Date No. 2 must include a group of friends, all known to mummy and daddy. The friends must come to be reviewed personally and officially request the parents' permission and guarantee the offspring's safety. The witching hour is midnight or Cinderella turns into a juvenile delinquent according to local standards. With afternoon dates, her deadline is dusk.

If he's this far through the obstacle course, third date may be a movie. Even at that pop might drag along. But no dinner. Dinner and movie is only if you're engaged. Phnom Penh being very small, she can't share a rice bowl with a man without the proper jewelry on the proper finger.

Later, dinner's permissible. But only if their kin are well acquainted. And then no movies. For some reason, the eats and picture combination spells danger in these parts.

Like the United States of America, boys play the field. Unlike it, girls can only date one suitor at a time. And only if there's some intention of marriage. If there's mutual affection but not enough for marriage, he's welcome at her house but not welcome to take her out.

With French, Chinese, and Vietnamese "strangers" who've lived side by side for centuries here in what was French Indochina, there's additional preventives. With Americans it's worse. Wary, their main theme regarding us is, "You take the high-road and we'll etc., etc."

No matter who he is, she sees him only twice a week. No matter what it is, any gift must be presented in front of mama. When it's getting serious and his mama's looking to give her the onceover, it's at her house. Going to the home of the boy, who mustn't be over 5 years riper than the girl, is 100 percent disallowed.

When he's ready for husbandhood, he pops the question—but to his parents. Next her parents. Last, the lucky girl. She'll accept because Cambodian daughters obey Cambodian mamas. Then his parents and the soon-to-be in-laws arrange details.

CONTINUATION OF HEARINGS ON JOEY ADAMS TOUR

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I would like to ask if the State Department has set up any regulations that this type of thing can go on or should not go on?

Mr. ISENBERGH. We always try to profit from experience, sir, and we in the future shall attempt to make it certain that no unfavorable description of the countries in question is publicly made by anybody on a tour of ours.

Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, may I, out of fairness to this company, ask that there be inserted in the RECORD two articles from the New York press, one from the New York Times and one from the New York World-Telegram, which describe the tour and puts quite the contrary stamp on it, a stamp of complete approval.

I offer you these, Mr. Chairman, and request that they be put in the RECORD as well.

Mr. ROONEY. Each member of the committee will have an opportunity to inspect these articles.

Mr. ISENBERGH. Thank you.

Mr. ROONEY. I still do not understand your position. At the outset you said there was nothing wrong in the articles by Cindy Adams and now it appears you are trying to offset such unfavorable effects as may have resulted therefrom. That is the way I sum it up.

(Discussion off the record.)

COST OF JOEY ADAMS TOUR

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Is the cost of this presentation as listed on your justification sheets \$256,000?

Mr. ISENBERGH. That is correct, sir; \$256,000, although this is subject to final accounting.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. And Mrs. Cindy Adams was a member of the troupe and participated in the cost?

Mr. COOMBS. Her travel only was paid.

Mr. ISENBERGH. Only her travel.

Mr. ROONEY. We certainly still want to know what he got out of it.

Mr. ISENBERGH. As I explained, this is not known to the Department.

Mr. ROONEY. You shall find out about it. There are a number of Government agencies that would have this information.

Mr. ISENBERGH. Yes, sir.

JOEY ADAMS TROUPE

Mr. ROONEY. I should like to thank Mr. Isenbergh for calling our attention to these clips from the New York Times and Herald Tribune. I should particularly express our thanks for bringing to our attention the following, which is in the item in the New York Times of Sunday, December 10, 1961:

"Whatever internal wrangling the troupe—"

Referring to the Joey Adams troupe of 24-25—

"Whatever internal wrangling the troupe suffered earlier in the tour appears to have ended. It culminated in the dismissal of the tour manager, Harry Hirsch, in Bangkok in September."

I guess you forgot to tell us about that, did you not, Mr. Isenbergh?

Mr. ISENBERGH. This was an internal matter which did not have any effects on the success of the tour with its audiences.

Mr. ROONEY. What was the trouble?

Mr. ISENBERGH. I do not know, sir. I think it was a personality difference within the company.

Mr. ROONEY. Did you have anything to do with Mr. Hirsch being fired?

Mr. ISENBERGH. No, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. How much did Mr. Hirsch get out of it?

Mr. ISENBERGH. As I told you, sir, the only arrangement we made was a package deal for the entire show.

Mr. ROONEY. Will you be so good as to find out how much Mr. Hirsch got out of it?

Mr. ISENBERGH. We will certainly make every effort to do it.

(The following information was supplied:)

"1. Mr. Adams received \$1,200 a week for the duration of the tour.

"2. Mr. Hirsch received \$300 a week for a total of 6 weeks (including a period of services abroad in advance of the arrival of the company).

"3. The Buddy Rich Sextet was paid \$2,050 a week as a unit. Neither ANTA nor Associated Bookings Corp. can advise how this sum was distributed among the six members, including Mr. Rich. Final payment for the entire show has not yet been made by ANTA to Associated Bookings Corp. In the final settlement an equitable adjustment will be made to reflect the fact that Mr. Rich withdrew from the show on November 18."

Mr. ROONEY. If you do not know what happened, how would you know it did not have any effect on the success of the tours?

Mr. ISENBERGH. Because we have reports on the impact from every country.

Mr. ROONEY. I see some of them. I am referring to Mrs. Adams' reports on the impact. I am going to refer to the item of October 5, 1961, from the paper to which reference was previously made. She says:

"I won't tell you what it cost to see us. I can only tell you that admission to the whole fair was the equivalent of 2 cents."

PERFORMANCES IN THAILAND

This is from Bangkok, Thailand. How much did it cost the American taxpayer to put on this troupe in Bangkok, Thailand?

First, I should ask: How many performances did they give in Thailand?

Mr. ISENBERGH. This company gave 15 performances in Thailand.

Mr. ROONEY. And those performances, 97 at a cost of \$256,000, cost \$2,742 for each performance; is that right?

Mr. ISENBERGH. I think this is correct, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. Just make sure now. Sometimes my arithmetic is wrong.

Mr. ISENBERGH. I will have to do the arithmetic. Would you repeat your figure again, sir?

Mr. ROONEY. \$2,742. I have divided 97 performances into \$256,000. That is the net, is it not?

Mr. ISENBERGH. Our figure is \$2,640 per performance.

Mr. ROONEY. Let us say it is \$2,640. Is it the fact that the admission to the whole fair, of which this was just a part, was 2 cents a person?

Mr. ISENBERGH. I believe this is so. May I add, sir, with your permission, that the purpose was to reach the large audience that comes to the fair, which is a great event in the area.

Mr. ROONEY. I am glad you told us that because you are leading me into my next question.

It appears from her column in this newspaper of Thursday, November 23, 1961, that, quoting her:

"Our troupe of 23 has entertained the King and Queen of Thailand, the King and Queen of Afghanistan, the King and Queen of Nepal, the Queen and a stray princess or two in Cambodia, and one of those three cranky princes from Laos."

How much did they pay to see this extravaganza?

Mr. ISENBERGH. I do not know. I believe, sir, that there were some preview performances to which notables were invited, but I am not sure that they are counted among the total of performances because, in addition to the scheduled performances, there were 40 extra ones which we did not take account of in the calculation of the average price.

PERFORMANCE IN KABUL, AFGHANISTAN

Mr. ROONEY. Can you tell us if you gave away any free tickets at that fair to which I made reference where the admission fee was 2 cents?

Mr. ISENBERGH. The answer is "No, sir." May I say that a hundred thousand Afghans from every social class and practically every region of the country did visit the U.S. exhibit at the fair where the Adams troupe was performing, and another 20,000 watched from outside the fence.

This show was seen by more people, revisited more often, left a more memorable impression than any other single attraction, Afghan or foreign. The Soviet Union brought in a variety troupe of which a high official said that the American troupe beat it all hollow. The King and Queen, Prime Minister, and Crown Prince and several ministers who had seen—

Mr. ROONEY. What are you reading from?

Mr. ISENBERGH. I am reading excerpts from a Post report.

Mr. ROONEY. Is there anything derogatory in that Post report?

Mr. ISENBERGH. No, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. Is there anything derogatory in any of the Post reports on any of the performances?

Mr. ISENBERGH. I find nothing, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. I did not expect that you would.

Mr. ISENBERGH. Except an indication that—

DIFFICULTIES BETWEEN PERFORMERS

Mr. ROONEY. By the way, was there any trouble between some other performers in this entourage, other personnel in the entourage, I mean?

Mr. ISENBERGH. I think there was some difficulty between Mr. Adams and one of the other performers.

Mr. ROONEY. Would this quotation from a column of Miss Dorothy Kilgallen be correct:

"Buddy was the only famous name in the whole Adams safari. He quit because he couldn't get along with Joey. The State Department might elicit quite a story from him. (The same Department also would do well to read Cindy Adams' columns on the tour. She makes it clear that, far from communication through entertainment to the 'little people of the faraway nations,' they have been playing nothing but palaces, amusing the heads of State, and the elite

of the various foreign lands at the U.S. taxpayers' expense."

You would not agree to that, would you?

Mr. ISENBERGH. I certainly would not. The facts are wrong.

PERFORMANCE IN INDONESIA

Mr. ROONEY. Did they play, as Cindy Adams says in the column of November 23, 1961, "before Mr. Sukarno in Indonesia at his place?"

Mr. ISENBERGH. They did, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. Had he invited, as she says, "500 of the top 400 of Indonesia"?

Mr. ISENBERGH. That imaginative language is probably a good indication of the kind of audience there was.

VERIFICATION OF REPORTS OF TROUBLE BETWEEN PERFORMERS

Mr. ROONEY. Did you get in touch with Buddy Rich to find out, when it was suggested by Dorothy Kilgallen, what trouble there was, so that in the future you might avoid such troubles? If so, when and where did you speak to him and what did you say to him and what did he say to you?

Mr. ISENBERGH. I have not personally talked to him.

Mr. ROONEY. Do you not think you should have?

Mr. ISENBERGH. No; I am informed Mr. Bowman did.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Bowman, what did you say to him and what did he say to you?

Mr. BOWMAN. I did not personally speak to him.

Mr. ROONEY. Who did?

Mr. BOWMAN. The people up at ANTA. Miss Macy actually spoke to him after he came back.

Mr. ROONEY. When did they come back?

Mr. BOWMAN. They came back just 2 days before Christmas, I believe, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. This column was written, the one to which I referred, before they came back; is that right?

Mr. BOWMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. What was the trouble between Buddy Rich and Joey Adams?

Mr. BOWMAN. I think it was a clash of personalities, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. How much did Buddy Rich get out of it?

Mr. BOWMAN. Again, sir, it is the same answer. We do not know. We bought it as a package.

Mr. ROONEY. Evidently you do not know at all what is going on. You never told us here during this presentation about trouble with Buddy Rich, you did not tell us about the trouble with this man Hirsch, the stage manager or producer, whatever his title was. You do not know how much anyone got out of the taxpayers' money. Do you think this is a good way to run this program? You are the gentleman who said this was a great program, according to one of the quotes in the newspapers I have here.

Mr. BOWMAN. Yes, sir, we believe it is.

Mr. ROONEY. Pretty expensive business, is it not?

Mr. BOWMAN. For 23 people for that many weeks?

Mr. ROONEY. \$2,640 a performance. Did you notice a statement in another of these columns—I think it was one of those that Mr. Isenbergh so kindly passed across the table:

"The tour is sponsored by President Kennedy's international cultural program and administered by the American National Theatre and Academy."

* * * * *

FRIDAY, MARCH 9, 1962.

Mr. ROONEY. The committee will please come to order.

DEROGATORY REPORTS FROM POSTS REGARDING JOEY ADAMS TOUR

On yesterday we were told that there were no derogatory reports from the posts with

regard to either the Joey Adams trip or any other trip. Since then we have asked for certain communications from the posts that were visited during the course of Joey Adams' trip. I certainly think a number of them are derogatory.

I do not know, Mr. Isenberg, whether or not you are familiar with these. In a hasty run-through I do not find your name on them but I do recall yesterday Mr. Bowman sat there and let you answer certain questions and I find his name on practically all of these.

Joey Adams advised the Department, did he not, that he had fired Hirsch for causing dissension and trouble and that Horner was a suitable replacement who would take orders from him, is that right?

Mr. ISENBERG. We first received—

Mr. ROONEY. Is what I read right? Either it is right or it is wrong.

Mr. ISENBERG. That is right, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. Was it reported that the position of the post was neither for nor against dismissal of Hirsch?

Mr. ISENBERG. This is correct, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. And that if Adams decided it was impossible to work with any member of the team, the Embassy was not in a position to tell him otherwise?

Mr. ISENBERG. This is correct, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. And that neither the post nor any member of the USIS staff has agreed that Adams was justified in dismissing Hirsch. Was that reported?

Mr. ISENBERG. I believe it was, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. And was it the view of the post that this internal matter in the variety show did make clear that Adams and Hirsch both enlisted the Ambassador's support for their positions?

Mr. ISENBERG. This is correct, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. Was it reported that the Embassy had considerable difficulty programming this Joey Adams show due primarily to the demanding personality of Adams and his open feud with Manager Hirsch?

Mr. ISENBERG. This report was made, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. And is it a fact that it was reported that Adams dismissed Hirsch for insubordination and intended to run the show personally?

Mr. ISENBERG. This was reported, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. And was it reported that members of the team resented \$1,200-a-week Adams speaking for the group on matters they were not consulted on?

Mr. ISENBERG. This was reported.

Mr. ROONEY. And was it reported that members of the group resented the attitude of Adams' wife, particularly her role in the dismissal of Hirsch?

Mr. ISENBERG. This was reported.

Mr. ROONEY. And was it reported, in the early part of the trip, September, that Adams maintained close ties with Buddy Rich, who controlled the band, thus insuring Adams' control of the show?

Mr. ISENBERG. This was reported.

Mr. ROONEY. That was as of September. We will see what happened later on.

Mr. ISENBERG. As of September 15.

Mr. ROONEY. And is it the fact that Adams while in Bangkok made many demands, including a personal car, a photographer, and special treatment from the Ambassador on down? Was that reported?

Mr. ISENBERG. Such was reported to us, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. And was it reported he usually refused any commitments before noon, especially on days after a performance?

Mr. ISENBERG. This also was reported.

Mr. ROONEY. And was it reported that members of the team resented this and told Adams so?

Mr. ISENBERG. This was reported, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. And then subsequently at another post on this trip, to wit, in Saigon, was it reported that in the final minutes

of the troupe's stay there in Saigon, and just prior to departure for Bangkok en route to Bangalore, the much-heralded feud between Adams and Buddy Rich broke out into a near fist fight at the airport?

Mr. ISENBERG. That was reported.

Mr. ROONEY. And was it reported that the immediate trigger this time, though by no means the root of the trouble, was the unpaid hotel bills run up by three members of Rich's band?

Mr. ISENBERG. This was reported.

Mr. ROONEY. And was it reported that although Adams flashed a roll of bills he signed an I O U and authorized Horner, the troupe manager, to withhold certain pay in order to defray these bills amounting to \$308.60?

Mr. ISENBERG. That was reported, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. And was it reported this was the only means of avoiding public embarrassment to the United States?

Mr. ISENBERG. That was reported also.

Mr. ROONEY. And was it reported that if this were not the fact with regard to public embarrassment in the United States that Joey Adams would have let Rich stew in his own juice until the hotel bills were dish-washed away?

Mr. ISENBERG. Yes, sir; that was reported.

Mr. ROONEY. And was it reported that this last-minute incident, which I assume referred to the near fist fight at the airport, although reflecting basic mismanagement on Adams' part which might warrant the Department's consideration, that the incident did not really mar the overall effects of the show?

Mr. ISENBERG. This was reported.

Mr. ROONEY. But was it reported, however, that the price came dangerously close to being too high?

Mr. ISENBERG. Yes, sir; it was so reported.

Mr. ROONEY. Was it reported subsequently from Calcutta that when the Joey Adams Variety Show passed through Calcutta he told the cultural affairs officer that Band Leader Rich had been a major problem at virtually all functions and was a discredit to the U.S. program, and he was requesting the recall of Rich by ANTA? Was that reported?

Mr. ISENBERG. That was reported.

Mr. ROONEY. Did Adams claim that Rich had publicly used foul and abusive language at Saigon in the presence of the Ambassador, the press, and Embassy staff?

Mr. ISENBERG. That was reported, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. I believe that the Ambassador subsequently denied that the foul and abusive language was used in his presence.

Mr. ISENBERG. This is correct, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. And did Adams ask the cultural affairs officers to relay a message through the Department to ANTA for the recall of Rich but for the remaining band members to stay with the show, even paying Rich the full amount if necessary?

Mr. ISENBERG. This was reported, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. Did the Ambassador refer the Department to the cultural affairs officer with regard to the behavior at the airport which we previously discussed?

Mr. ISENBERG. That is correct, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. Was there a time when the Department advised the post that unless a lot of the difficulties were overcome that Adams at \$1,200 a week must be warned by the Embassy that he must control the situation or the tour would have to be canceled?

Mr. ISENBERG. There was such a warning from the Department.

Mr. ROONEY. And did the Department say he had caused trouble since the inception of the tour?

Mr. ISENBERG. I do not recall that language, sir.

Yes, I find that there is an indication that he had caused trouble since the inception of the tour, although the post still reported excellent reception of the performance.

Mr. ROONEY. And did the Department report that the conduct of many of the troupe, including Adams, had been damaging?

Mr. ISENBERG. The Department did make that reference. The Department referred to reports concerning the conduct which may have been damaging.

Mr. ROONEY. Do you want to change your answer given yesterday that there was nothing derogatory in post reports with regard to the Joey Adams show and the tour they took?

Mr. ISENBERG. Sir. I was talking at that time of the audience reactions. May I say that throughout this there is an indication that the feuding was kept offstage and that the audience reaction was excellent throughout.

Mr. ROONEY. Would you say the incident at the airport just before leaving for Calcutta was offstage?

Mr. ISENBERG. That was the only incident.

Mr. ROONEY. And would you say the use of the foul and abusive language was offstage too?

Mr. ISENBERG. This is not clear, sir, because it was later denied by the Ambassador, but I would certainly say if it occurred that it was offstage.

Mr. ISENBERG. There were some indications in some of the cities of Latin America—I cannot recall which—that the audience was lukewarm to "The Skin of Our Teeth," although in the same city it is my recollection they were enthusiastic about "Glass Menagerie." It is inevitable in this kind of program that not every attraction could be a smash hit everywhere, and while I cannot cite instances to you, there were some reports that the audiences were less than ravingly enthusiastic about some of the shows. I do not recall any reported incidents of personal misconduct.

Mr. BOWMAN. Nor can I, sir.

(Discussion off the record.)

PAUL WINTER SEXTET

Mr. ROONEY. At page 355 of your justifications you set forth an item in fiscal year 1962 of \$72,457 for the Paul Winter Sextet. They are on the road right now, are they?

Mr. ISENBERG. They are, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. Where are they?

Mr. ISENBERG. In Latin America.

Mr. ROONEY. What are the details with regard to that?

Mr. ISENBERG. The Paul Winter Sextet is a jazz group which won a national competition held at Georgetown University last year as the best of its kind in the United States.

Mr. ROONEY. These are all college students, are they?

Mr. ISENBERG. They are not now college students.

Mr. ROONEY. Some of them have master's degrees, do they not?

Mr. ISENBERG. That, I understand, is correct.

Mr. BOWMAN. They are all working for their graduate degrees; yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. Go ahead.

Mr. ISENBERG. As I have said, it is a prize-winning group.

Mr. ROONEY. Just give us the facts.

Mr. ISENBERG. The facts are it is on a tour in Latin America and its itinerary is scheduled as follows:

It opened at Port au Prince in Haiti, February 8 and 9. It proceeded to Mexico, where it played in four cities until the 21st of February. It then went to El Salvador where it played in two cities until the 27th of February. It then went to El Salvador where it played in San Salvador on March 1 and 2. It then went to Honduras where it played in two cities on March 3 and 5.

The next stop is Nicaragua where it will play in one further city. It has already played in Managua. Thereafter it is sched-

uled to go to Panama where it will play in two cities.

Mr. ROONEY. What is the date of their last performance?

Mr. ISENBERGH. The date of the last performance is July 8.

Mr. ROONEY. It will be on the road from February 8 to July 8 and then return?

Mr. ISENBERGH. That is right.

Mr. ROONEY. How many performances?

Mr. ISENBERGH. I cannot tell from this itinerary. The number of performances scheduled and the dates are subject to change. I would estimate that there would be at least 60 performances.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I probably can speak quite authoritatively. As the distinguished chairman knows, and also the ranking minority member, I probably hold the only degree of doctor of music in the House of Representatives. Now, I want to say this: I think we can criticize the State Department in many ways, but let me say this, that the few dollars that we spend on cultural relations in countries abroad are well worth it. In 1950, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Dulles called me and asked me if I would be guest conductor for the Air Force Band and go to Iceland. At that time we had negotiated for that base for 1 year. Russia was moving in there with their symphonies, artists, painters, sculptors. We were considered an army of occupation there. There were 6,000 men in Iceland. We were a military force. At that time the Parliament of Iceland, which is the oldest parliament in the world, established in the year 930, consisted of 21 Conservatives, 16 members of the Democratic Labor group, and 14 members of the Communist Party. The balance of power rested with the Democratic Labor group who voted with the Conservatives.

Now, here we were. Russia could not use Iceland, but they wanted us out. And I would like to call the attention of the House to this, because I think it is very important: I took the 100-piece Air Force symphony orchestra over there and I learned one thing. I learned that despite all that Russia had done they had not taken a harp to Iceland. So, on our airplane, with that complement of 114 men that we took out of Andrews Field, we put two harps, so that if one were destroyed we would still have one to play during the symphony concerts.

All right, what happened? We had four concerts there. Let me tell you that the people of Iceland are highly cultured people. They hold culture and the arts in great esteem. They go to their concerts in black tie, which we do not do lots of times for such events in Washington. They get dressed and they listen. It might be said of the people of Iceland that they "know the score."

Mr. Chairman, I want to say this: All over the continent of Europe and the Far East people pay great tribute to our service bands. The few dollars that it costs us to send the Air Force Band, the Navy Band, the Army Band, and the Marine Band, all around the world, is well worth the money spent. The behavior of our boys in uniform is excellent. I want to tell you that the best dollar investment we make is in that boy in uniform going abroad in our great service

bands. He can play his fiddle, his cornet, or anything else. At the same time he can drop a bomb, he can go out in the field and fight. But we can win victories with music, because it is the most universal language in the whole world. Why not use it when we can.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number or words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to attempt to get information in connection with the appropriation for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. I might say that in supporting the establishment of this Agency and voting for the original appropriation, my position drew a certain amount of criticism from many of my constituents.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to know at this time how many employees are presently in the Agency. I would like to have that information from anyone who can answer the question.

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

Mr. COLLIER. Yes, I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. The record that I have here shows that at the present time there are 126 employees in this bill, taking round figures. Again I must say that these are round figures and not figures of the Department. But their best estimate would be an increase of 94 in this bill.

Mr. COLLIER. Bringing the total roll to what number?

Mr. BOW. Well, 126 plus 94 would be 220.

Mr. COLLIER. Were there any reports given to the committee on the work which this Agency has done thus far?

Mr. BOW. If the gentleman will yield further, yes. The gentleman will find in the hearings that there is a very full report by the Agency of not only what they had done up to this time but their anticipation of what they will do in the following year.

Mr. COLLIER. It would seem to me, based upon the functions which are outlined here and which were presented to this House at the time the Agency was established, that we could reach a saturation point in the number of employees required to perform these functions.

Is this going to be another one of those agencies which will grow and grow and grow like Topsy?

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

Mr. COLLIER. I would be happy to yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman, perhaps, is stating the fact but may I say to the gentleman that the committee allowed the entire amount requested in this case. I might also say to the gentleman that there was a great deal of effort made outside this Agency by people throughout the country that we increase it well over the budget. But in the budget there is a justification, although I will say to the gentleman that this may be an empire-building Agency and we may see it skyrocketing in the future.

I will say to the gentleman as one member of the committee I shall watch

it very carefully, but I would feel at this time that they did present justification for their full budget request at this time.

Mr. COLLIER. As I understand it, originally there were 90 people in the State Department who, prior to the establishment of this Agency, performed what are basically the present functions of this Agency. But they did so as a part of an assignment within the Department; is that correct?

Mr. BOW. That is correct. Then when the separation came under the act of Congress setting up this Agency, many of those people were transferred into the new function, doing the same work they had done in the State Department.

Mr. COLLIER. Of course, I presume this made it possible to reduce the number of employees in the other areas of the Department of State by reason of the transfer.

Mr. BOW. I might say there is no increase in employment under the item, "Salaries and expenses" in the appropriation bill.

Mr. COLLIER. The figure of \$6,500,000 for this appropriation actually is in excess of what we in the House were told the annual operating expense of this Agency would be, at the time the bill was brought to the floor establishing the Agency; is that correct?

Mr. BOW. I cannot answer the question; I do not recall what the amount was that was mentioned at that time.

Mr. COLLIER. As I recall it is some \$2,200,000 more than we were told the annual operating cost of the Agency would be.

Mr. BOW. I can say to the gentleman that this is the budget request that is contained in this bill.

Mr. COLLIER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, several days ago I read with a great deal of interest some of the newspaper stories my fellow newspapermen had written as to some of the things which had been found and learned during the hearings on this particular legislation as conducted by the chairman of this subcommittee, my good friend, the able gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]. And I noticed that the reporters realized the great news value of the information they had evidently obtained from the gentleman from New York. I was happy to see that they did not have any difficulty in spelling his name correctly, with the two "o's" and the "ey."

I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate and the discussion on the floor as to the expenditure of these various funds. I listened a moment ago to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS] discussing, as he did in his wisdom and his knowledge of the various arts and of the musical world, and as to his opinion of the great value that we receive from the visits of some of the Russian musical organizations, symphony orchestras, and so forth coming to the United States. And yet I find myself unconvinced that any of these Russian musical organizations

have been able to convert any Americans to communism, or that when we sent the famous "Satchmo" and Benny Goodman to Moscow, and his fellow Joey Adams down into southeast Asia, that any Communists were converted to our way of life or to our belief in the God we all worship.

And then I began to think about all these costly things that we have been discussing, and have been doing, all over the world I realize, being just a common, ordinary newspaperman from Ohio, that we have been doing all these things on borrowed money; and that we are asking our children and our grandchildren yet unborn to pay all the cost for sending a lot of these peculiar people all over the world, supposedly to spread Americanism and tell the people of other countries as to the values of our way of life, without any really beneficial effect whatsoever.

That makes me wonder, I will say to the ladies and gentlemen of the House, just how silly, how asinine, and how stupid our Government and our Congress can get at times.

The day will come, and I want to predict it as I stand here in the House today, the time will come, and not too far off, when the force of circumstances will compel us to stop a lot of these wild, extravagant, silly, and stupid expenditures that do no one any good except a few people who engage in them more or less as a racket, only as a benefit to themselves, and not as a benefit either to this country, this Government, or the peace of the world. So I am just a little bit surprised, and just a little bit ashamed of the fact, that we are wasting our time and wasting the substance of the people we represent on some of these costly activities that have been discussed here on the floor of the House today.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I join my colleagues in complimenting the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], the chairman of the subcommittee, and the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], for their most excellent presentation of this important appropriation measure before the House. I wish also to compliment the subcommittee for its wise and reasonable handling of the appropriations requested by the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West. May I assure my colleagues that this money will be wisely and prudently expended by the Center.

Mr. Chairman, may I invite my colleagues to visit the State of Hawaii and personally inspect the facilities and operation of the Center. I am certain that my colleagues will be favorably impressed.

In closing may I express my personal gratitude to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] for his great and abiding interest in the Center. May I, in behalf of the people of Hawaii, assure Chairman ROONEY and his subcommittee that we will do our utmost to live up to the confidence the subcommittee has expressed in our East-West Center.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time simply for the purpose of recounting some statements that were made on the floor of the House 10 years ago, rather 10 B.S. or 10 B.H.; that is, before Schlesinger or before Heller.

If the Members will refer to volume 96, part 4, page 5467 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, there is this very interesting colloquy between a Congressman by the name of John F. Kennedy and Congressman ROONEY, of New York. One of the nice things about the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is that although the views of the Congressmen may change, their words do not change.

I would like you to listen and think about today's events and where we find ourselves as far as financial condition is concerned, and the concern voiced at that time by Congressman John F. Kennedy. There was a colloquy between the gentleman from New York, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. ROONEY], wherein Mr. Kennedy said the following:

Mr. KENNEDY. I would like to ask the gentleman whether or not he feels that it is more dangerous to carry a deficit of \$6 billion in a prosperous year like today, or cut some of these appropriations by 10 percent? I do not see how we can go on carrying a deficit every year?

Imagine that.

I should think it would be much more preferable to cut some of these appropriations by that figure.

I am saying this is the exact bill 12 years ago, 12 years B.S., before Schlesinger and Heller, that we are discussing here.

Mr. ROONEY. I do not believe in further cutting this appropriation, which is for a vital service, in one of our most important departments, the Department of State.

Congressman Kennedy went on to say:

How are we going to bring that deficit of \$6 billion down to a reasonable figure unless we make some of these cuts?

He went on later, on page 5467, to say this:

Does not the gentleman think that a very important item in the cold war is the economic stability of our country so that we will have resources in case of war?

I simply call this to the attention of the Members of Congress. It seems rather strange that 12 years later we are discussing the same bill. The man who was Congressman then is President now, and does not seem to be concerned about the deficit as he was in those years. In fact, he would make the deficit 10 years ago of \$6 billion seem rather trivial.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY. I would like to compliment the distinguished gentleman for calling this colloquy to the attention of the House. I guess it is unfortunate that I am still here in the House of Representatives 12 years later—

Mr. ASHBROOK. The gentleman from Ohio certainly did not mean to in-

fer that, as I am sure the gentleman realizes.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, at this moment in particular I would be the last to admit that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has been in the House too long because on the subject on which I hope to speak briefly, he has been a devoted friend. He has always given strong support to our efforts to eliminate the lamprey eel.

I have been disturbed by the colloquy between the gentleman and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and Dr. Moffett as recounted on pages 1172 and 1173 of the hearings. As the gentleman remembers, the interest in my district and in the neighboring districts of Illinois and Michigan in this subject has been almost historic. From the very beginning, we have aided all efforts and sought help to eradicate the lamprey eel which went so far toward destroying the great fishing industry of Lake Michigan. I was interested in reading and, in fact, somewhat disturbed to read, on page 1172 of the hearings, that Dr. Moffett now claims a loss of faith in the method of eliminating eels by the utilization of the electrical barrier; and that, apparently, the only attempt that will be made to obtain appropriations in the future along such lines will be for the maintenance and operation of electrical barriers already in being. The good doctor is willing to rely on a substitute or alternate method, namely the use of larvicide.

I wonder if the chairman of the subcommittee could assure me that the apparent loss of faith in the electrical barrier and the turn toward the use of larvicide will not indicate any loss of realization as to the importance of this problem to the fishermen of the Great Lakes?

Mr. ROONEY. I will say this, in answer to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois, that the experts contend the larvicide method is far superior to the electrical barrier method. It is expected that it will eventually all be done by way of the larvicide method and we will then not need even to keep in repair the electrical barriers presently erected up there in the Great Lakes area.

Mrs. CHURCH. Would the gentleman assure me that there is in this bill, despite the reduction in the appropriation for fisheries, an adequate sum to give a real test to the larvicide method?

Mr. ROONEY. Most certainly, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] saw to that.

Mrs. CHURCH. I can remember even before the days here of Mr. CEDERBERG that Michigan was a great help to Illinois in this matter, and I am, indeed, very glad to have him on the appropriations subcommittee, to protect the need for continued action.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. CHURCH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. I should like to call your attention to an article which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] has inserted in the RECORD.

I was in Michigan not long ago checking on this same thing. The article says, "Nearly 90 percent of all sea lamprey in Lake Superior have been destroyed by the chemical stream treatment program of the past 4 years, according to the most recent figures."

This is by the experts. With this new chemical being used in the Lake Superior region, about 90 percent of the eels have been destroyed and people are back again fishing for trout in Lake Superior. I believe from our investigation, this is a proper method and we will eventually win this war against the lamprey eel.

Mrs. CHURCH. I thank the gentleman very much for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, I would add that my interest in this problem has been greatly heightened at this time because there actually has been a decrease in the number of fish in Lake Michigan and not an increase as occurred for so many years during the time when we first started the use of the electrical barrier.

Will the gentleman also assure me that there is provision in the bill for a sufficient appropriation to deal with the problem?

Mr. BOW. Certainly, I am glad to assure the gentlewoman and the people in the region of Lake Erie and the people around the Great Lakes that this committee is very much concerned about this problem.

Mrs. CHURCH. I thank the gentleman very much.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERNATIONAL FISHERIES COMMISSIONS

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to enable the United States to meet obligations in connection with participation in international fisheries commissions pursuant to treaties or conventions, and implementing Acts of Congress, \$1,910,000: *Provided*, That the United States share of such expenses may be advanced to the respective commissions.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMS: On page 12, line 3, immediately before the period, insert the following: "*Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated herein shall be used to pay the salary, or to enter into any contract providing for the payment thereof, to any individual in excess of \$22,500 per annum."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, this is the section under which funds are made available for entering into contracts with these entertainers.

There has been quite a bit of discussion today about our having paid Joey Adams at the rate of \$1,200 a week and having paid Helen Hayes at the rate of some \$1,500 a week to go overseas for the State Department's cultural exchange program.

The chairman of the committee has said that he could not understand where there was any justification for paying this kind of money to these people for their services. I cannot either. If these people are sincere in their desire to make a contribution to international good will for the United States, surely they should be willing to serve over there at least at the same rate of pay

that a U.S. Senator or a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives receives.

This amendment speaks for itself. I am not yet ready to say that Joey Adams or Helen Hayes or any of these entertainers can contribute more to the interest of their country than the majority leader of the House or the majority leader of the other body, or perhaps any Member of this body or the other body.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that this amendment should be adopted.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Even though in my own mind I may feel tempted to accept the amendment I am afraid of its consequences. I do not want to pay any of these people more than \$22,500, but they do not go away on these tours on an annual basis. For instance, Helen Hays might be away 15 or 16 weeks on a tour entertaining our diplomats and the American colonies abroad.

I do not think this amendment gets at the problem. Like the amendment with regard to the United Nations which I unsuccessfully fought here many years ago, also introduced by my good friend the gentleman from Mississippi, and when I said: "What you are doing here today is to approve the United States paying one-third of the U.N. expenses," and that is the way it turned out. The State Department regarded one-third as the authorized amount.

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

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the gentleman will note, the language is exactly the language of the bill. I took it from the next section of the bill. It was written in there by the committee.

Mr. ROONEY. I know, but this is a different sort of program. The program the gentleman picked out has to do with an annual salary for the Director of the East-West Center.

I know we are talking about people who have obtained large sums of the taxpayers' money, but I do not think it is good judgment to adopt the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a negative vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WILLIAMS) there were ayes—49, noes 65.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 11, line 21, strike the figure \$40,000,000 and insert \$34,000,000.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that we have already passed that and are over on page 12.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say to the gentleman that we are still on the same paragraph. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, in view of all we have heard about the alleged comedians and others that have been

running around over the world and how they have been performing, I think this appropriation ought to be cut somewhat below the funds for last year. If I understand the figures correctly, and I think I do, the \$34 million contained in my amendment will return it to what it was last year, minus \$2 million. That also leaves \$8 million in foreign currencies that would be available, or a total of approximately \$42 million for this purpose. Surely that is enough to spend on this sort of nonsense. I urge the adoption of my amendment and this modest saving to the taxpayers.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. Chairman, I do not know how the distinguished gentleman from Iowa arrived at the amount \$34 million. He might as well make it \$30 million or, if he really wants to thoroughly wreck the program, make it \$20 million.

The amount appropriated for this program in the fiscal year just closed was \$36,970,800. When this committee cut the amount \$56,657,000 to \$40 million it went far enough. The subcommittee found itself in unanimous agreement with regard to this reduced amount. It was considered and discussed for a considerable period of time between the majority and minority members of the committee.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Now, was not that figure a cut from the budget request?

Mr. ROONEY. Of course it is a cut from the budget request—from \$56,657,000 to \$40 million.

Mr. GROSS. All right, but that is like the horse trader who is trying to get rid of an old broken down spavin horse.

Mr. ROONEY. We must exercise mature judgment here, and this \$40 million is the judgment of all the members of the subcommittee, both majority and minority. We are not in the business of horse trading.

Mr. GROSS. This is a cut of only \$2 million.

Mr. ROONEY. No; it is a cut of \$4 million.

Mr. GROSS. No; it is not.

Mr. ROONEY. You are correct, it is not \$4 million; it is a cut of \$2.9 million from last year. That is exactly what it amounts to.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the pending amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 52, noes 61.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

CENTER FOR CULTURAL AND TECHNICAL INTERCHANGE BETWEEN EAST AND WEST

To enable the Secretary of State to provide for carrying out the provisions of the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West Act of 1960, by grant to any appropriate agency of the

State of Hawaii, \$8,340,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated herein shall be used to pay the salary, or to enter into any contract providing for the payment thereof, to any individual in excess of \$20,000 per annum.

RAMA ROAD, NICARAGUA

For an additional amount for necessary expenses for the survey and construction of the Rama Road, Nicaragua, in accordance with the provisions of title 23, United States Code, section 213, and the Act of September 2, 1958 (72 Stat. 1709), \$2,350,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That transfer of funds may be made from this appropriation to the Department of Commerce for the performance of work for which the appropriation is made.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language contained on lines 14 through 22 of page 12 of the bill on the ground that the appropriation made in that paragraph is not yet authorized.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I am constrained to concede the gentleman's point of order. We thought, perhaps, we could save some money for the taxpayers. But in view of this point of order made by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, we have no alternative. We must concede it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman concedes the point of order.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to draw the attention of the committee to lines 14 through 22 on page 12 relating to the Rama Road, Nicaragua. This item is discussed on page 8 of the committee report, and the details concerning the Rama Road are set forth commencing on page 1232 of the committee hearings.

Mr. Chairman, the Rama Road in Nicaragua runs 155 miles from the head of the Escondido River on the Atlantic side to a point on the Inter-American Highway on the Pacific side of Nicaragua.

The committee report refers to an agreement to construct this road. Well, the agreement was made in this fashion:

Dictator Somoza, of Nicaragua, came to Washington to visit President Roosevelt in 1939 and complained that the Corps of Engineers had recommended against the construction of a canal across Nicaragua. In the most offhand way the President, to mollify Dictator Somoza, said: "I will give you \$2 million out of my emergency fund to build a road from one side of Nicaragua to the other." And, that was the agreement.

Mr. Chairman, we have been for 20 years completing 155 miles of road. Now, the appropriation here is for \$2,350,000. Of that \$2,350,000, \$1.5 million only is authorized; \$850,000 has not yet been authorized by the Public Works Committee or the Congress, and it is my intention to make a point of order against this language.

Now, they will say this, because this road has been built piecemeal and the Senate agreed to only \$1 million out of the last authorization, leaving \$1.5 million authorized but unappropriated, that it has been more costly to complete this highway.

Mr. Chairman, I do not have the records here, but through the years I say to you that they have come in time after

time and said: "If you will give us the money, we will finish the road," a road which was supposed to have cost \$2 million over 20 years ago has cost \$16 million already, and the end has not yet been reached.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is about time that the Congress should look into this matter and find out what is going on and finally get this road finished and get it off the books.

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

Mr. MEADER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. I am wondering if the gentleman is not referring to the Inter-American Highway, where we came in and said "If you will give us the money, we will finish the road"? Not to my knowledge, since I have been on the committee, have we ever come in and said that the amount that has been appropriated would finish the Rama Road. We did at one time come in and ask for enough money to finish the Inter-American Highway.

Mr. MEADER. The record will speak for itself. But there has been before this House authorization bills and appropriation bills ever since I have been down here. I rode on this road in 1946 and there is not any reason why they could not have finished a decent road based upon the commitment that President Roosevelt made to President Somoza long before this.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ROONEY. Unfortunately, it seems that our fine Michiganites get all mixed up with regard to the Rama Road in Nicaragua. I have in mind the distinguished present judge who formerly was a Member of the other body from the State of Michigan to whom this Rama Road was a favorite whipping boy.

Mr. MEADER. Yes; because he was down there at the same time I was, and knew what he was talking about.

Mr. ROONEY. Would the distinguished gentleman let me finish my remarks?

In the 1960 fiscal year this subcommittee—the gentleman from Ohio, myself, and the rest of the members of the committee—came before the House and recommended that the House vote \$4.5 million which would have completed the road; would have finished it completely, kaput. The U.S. Bureau of Public Roads definitely assured us of this. So, what happened? The House approved and the bill went over to the other body and in order to make the bill look good they cut the \$4.5 million down to \$1 million and added the difference elsewhere in the bill. You will find in the present testimony, if you will read it, that that reduction by the other body has cost the American taxpayers \$850,000. You are now going to do about the same here in the alleged interest of economy. I am interested in saving taxpayers' money. It is my judgment and the judgment of the subcommittee that if you will appropriate this \$2,350,000 the road will be finished, kaput, and that will be the end

of it, and there will not have to be further discussions on it between Michiganites and New Yorkers.

Mr. MEADER. All I say is wait until the full amount has been studied by the Public Works Committee and the authorization made, the same as we do with public works projects in this country, and then appropriate the full amount and be sure that is going to be the end of it.

Mr. ROONEY. If the gentleman will yield further, does not the gentleman realize that this is the money for the completion of it?

Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY: On page 12, line 14, insert:

"RAMA ROAD, NICARAGUA

"For an additional amount for necessary expenses for the survey and construction of the Rama Road, Nicaragua, in accordance with the provisions of title 23, United States Code, section 213, and the Act of September 2, 1958 (72 Stat. 1709), \$1,500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That transfer of funds may be made from this appropriation to the Department of Commerce for the performance of work for which the appropriation is made."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, this is the identical language which appeared at page 12 of the pending bill, from lines 14 through 22 inclusive, except for the fact that the amount in line 19 is reduced from \$2.35 million to \$1.5 million. This is not presently subject to a point of order, and I urge the adoption of this amendment as one step in order to get this Rama Road completed so that we may be finished talking about it.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of my pending amendment.

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

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMS. As I understood the amendment as it was read, the use of these funds would be limited to surveys, is that correct?

Mr. ROONEY. No.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Surveys and planning?

Mr. ROONEY. This money is to be transferred to the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads and it would do all the construction work necessary to complete the Rama Road if we appropriated the amount \$2,350,000. We had had the assurance, if we appropriated that amount, that this long project would be completed. This will now cover \$1.5 million of the required road work.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

BOOKS FOR THE SUPREME COURT

For books and periodicals for the Supreme Court, to be purchased by the Librarian of the Supreme Court, under the direction of the Chief Justice, \$35,000.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALEY: On page 43, line 11, after "\$35,000", strike out the

period and insert a comma and the words "of which such sums as may be necessary may be used to purchase, for the personal use of each justice a copy of the Holy Bible."

Mr. HALEY. Will you accept it?

Mr. ROONEY. If the gentleman does not want to debate his amendment, I am placed in the perplexing situation of having to oppose it, and I oppose it for the reason that I happen to quite well know one of the distinguished members of the Supreme Court who was a former Attorney General of the United States, who is continually in possession of his dear mother's Bible. I think he would feel this action to be an insult. I have already and succinctly expressed my displeasure with regard to the decision of the Supreme Court regarding the New York school prayer, but I think this present proposal goes a bit too far. I am sure my distinguished friend from Florida has made his point and that he will now withdraw his amendment.

Mr. HALEY. No, I do not withdraw the amendment, Mr. Chairman. I just want to say this. We are buying \$35,000 worth of books for the Supreme Court for the use of the Justices of the Supreme Court. I merely want to buy nine Bibles, because I think that they need to read the Bible, the Holy Bible, over there. I certainly will not withdraw my amendment, and I ask for a vote on it.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to know what assurance the gentleman would have that the nine members of the Court would read it if they were provided with it.

Mr. HALEY. At least they will be available over there and we will know that they could if they wanted to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY].

The question was taken; and the Chairman being in doubt, the committee divided, and there were—ayes 47, noes 66.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS
Salaries and expenses

For expenses necessary for the Commission on Civil Rights, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$950,000: *Provided*, That the compensation of any employee paid from funds provided under this head shall not exceed \$20,500 per annum.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] if, in appropriating \$950,000 to the Civil Rights Commission, the committee took into consideration the Equal Job Opportunities Commission that is also costing the taxpayers a lot of money and, perhaps, explain why there is need for a Civil Rights Commission and an Equal Job Opportunities Commission.

Mr. ROONEY. Of course, I am not thoroughly familiar with the budget in the other commissions to which the gentleman refers. I am quite familiar with

the Civil Rights Commission. I think that the Civil Rights Commission is composed of some of the most distinguished, capable, and finest men in America.

Mr. GROSS. I would not know about that, but I do know that we are supporting two organizations which must duplicate functions.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman from New York is somewhat at a disadvantage on this because he does not know too much about the details of this other organization to which the gentleman from Iowa refers, but I do know the facts with regard to the operations of the Civil Rights Commission.

Mr. GROSS. The Equal Job Opportunities Commission is spending at least a half million dollars and, perhaps, more each year.

Mr. ROONEY. I do not know the first thing about the details of the budget item to which the gentleman refers, and I am trying to tell him so.

Mr. GROSS. The Chairman of this Commission is the Vice President of the United States, Mr. LYNDON JOHNSON. Let me tell you what this organization is doing among other things. Last year they called upon the Department of Defense to run a nose count of all Negroes employed by the Department of Defense. Applications for civil service employment carry no notation as to race or color. So this Equal Job Opportunities Commission told the Navy Department—it started, apparently, with the Navy Department—that it must have in a matter of 4 days all of the Negroes—not American Indians and not Jews and not Caucasians—just Negroes—all the Negroes in every military installation in this country and throughout the world. Of course, they had to resort to the most expensive means of communication known to mankind to get this information in 4 days from all quarters of the earth, and you may have some idea of the bill of expense. Now what I am saying is just this—

Mr. ROONEY. That is the difficulty—I have no idea of the bill of expense, but I am familiar with the bill of expense so far as the Civil Rights Commission is concerned.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, it gets \$950,000 in this bill. So they made this nose count or this line-of-sight count—call it whatever you want—and I do not know how they could tell merely by looking at a person just what the individual's racial antecedents were. But the count was later made in every branch of the military service and then spread out over the Government. I do not understand why we are maintaining both these organizations and spending at least \$1,500,000 plus all of the expenses that go with this kind of nonsense on the part of the Equal Job Opportunities Commission in obtaining this information on a forced-draft basis.

Mr. ROONEY. Would the gentleman from Iowa kindly take off after my distinguished friend, the Vice President of the United States, and leave the distinguished gentleman from New York alone.

I am primarily concerned with the Civil Rights Commission. If he wants to express his ideas as to the organ-

ization that the Vice President of the United States heads, that is his privilege.

Mr. GROSS. Help me put a stop to this waste. Let us have the Equal Jobs Opportunity Commission, or the Civil Rights Commission, one or the other, but not both.

Mr. ROONEY. I am sure if the distinguished Vice President of the United States, and former Senator from Texas, had anything to do with it, it must make good sense.

Mr. GROSS. It must what? I just said he is the Chairman of the Commission that authorized this expensive line-of-sight nose count all over the world, the results to be reported back in 4 days. If this kind of information is important let it be put on form 57 when application is made for Government employment.

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

Mr. GROSS. Certainly.

Mr. ROONEY. Has the gentleman not inquired as to the Commission the gentleman refers to?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, the Appropriations Committee appropriates money for it.

Mr. ROONEY. Which subcommittee?

Mr. GROSS. I wish the gentleman would help me find out.

Mr. ROONEY. I am sure if you turn to the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] he will find out for you by just looking up the budget.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, starting with the Hoover Commission recommendations, the Congress has adopted a number of reorganization plans. As I understood it, the reorganization plans were designated to bring about more efficient administration of Government in the various agencies and departments at less cost and with fewer employees. I am sure that under the reorganization plans that have been adopted there have been some good results, but in connection with some I am sure the reverse has been true.

Last year Congress approved Reorganization Plan No. 7 which created an independent agency called the Maritime Commission. Reading the report and the bill I find that the Maritime Commission has requested an additional 153 employees over what the committee has approved for the Commission. This is just another illustration of what often happens under reorganization plans: Instead of spending less money, instead of employing fewer people we are going to spend more money than ever before, at least in this instance.

I was one of those who opposed Reorganization Plan No. 7, and I am not taking this time just to say "I told you so." I just want some assurance from the committee with respect to the Maritime Commission. I say if we have adopted the reorganization plan let us make the plan work. I have considerable confidence in this subcommittee. I have worked with it with respect to maritime matters over the years. I would like some assurance from the committee that they have supplied adequate money for the Maritime Commission to function under the reorganization plan.

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

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield.

Mr. MARSHALL. In the first place I want to compliment the gentleman on the statement he made about reorganization plans. Unfortunately that seems to be the thing that happens as far as increased expense is concerned when reorganization plans have been approved.

As far as the Maritime Commission is concerned, we went into it very carefully. They asked for 306 personnel for 1 year. We cut down 50 percent of the increased personnel because we felt that gave them all the personnel they could use to do a good job this coming year out of these funds, and we feel the amount is sufficient to do the job.

We have found as the gentleman said about these reorganization plans. Our experience has been that when you start a new agency like this unless you hold them in line the chances are they will get out of balance and employ more personnel and spend more money than they should. Personally, I think we were overly generous in giving them the increase we did. We will watch them very closely, I am sure, and see just how well they do their work, and see that they are provided with ample personnel.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I thank the gentleman for his explanation. From what he says I can assume that the subcommittee will watch the functionings of the Maritime Commission and make adequate provision for staffing the same to make sure that it will be able to perform the functions assigned to it by law. The Commission, as I understand the present situation, says that it requires more than the 153 employees approved by this bill. Despite my opposition to the Reorganization Plan No. 7, I say that if more employees are actually needed they should be approved.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the position taken by my honorable colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON], to the effect that every effort must be made to insure that the Federal Maritime Commission be kept at maximum strength and efficiency.

Those of us representing the Commonwealth of Massachusetts know how important a progressive and effective merchant marine is. Well known as our fourth arm of defense, the Federal Maritime Commission's long-range plans, in keeping with the tenor of the President's message on transportation, are such that it must be allocated the necessary funds to do the proper job.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

Arms control and disarmament activities

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for arms control and disarmament activities authorized by the Act of September 26, 1961 (75 Stat. 631), \$6,500,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question of someone concerning the accomplishments of this new, super-duper disarmament setup that was established last year. Can anyone on the committee give me any information as to what has been accomplished? The spending for this purpose has gone from \$1 million last year to \$6 million this year. What have been the accomplishments of this new and plush outfit?

Mr. ROONEY. In answer to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, I must say I cannot agree with him that it is a plush outfit. I know it is being very capably handled when it is in the hands of Mr. William C. Foster. Bill Foster is highly respected, he is the former head of the Olin-Mathiesen Chemical Co. He was Under Secretary of Commerce under Averell Harriman; he was Under Secretary of Defense under President Eisenhower. We all have great confidence in him. But when the gentleman from Iowa pertinently and most properly asks about the accomplishments of this agency in the past year, I must confess that I am unable to advise him at this time. The agency has barely gotten started. The money included in this bill, this proposed budget of \$6.5 million, will carry out the functions that are described, beginning at page 1008 of the printed hearings.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I know that. Last year, when the bill creating this new outfit came before the House I opposed it and asked the question of what this super-duper organization could do that was not already being done in the field of disarmament. Who is disarming? Whom do they expect to disarm?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Foster advised the committee that having been in the business but 6 months at the time he appeared before the subcommittee, they were building and staffing a committee, they backstopped the United Nations debates.

Mr. GROSS. Were they very helpful in backstopping the United Nations?

Mr. ROONEY. He advised that they were backstopping the nuclear test meeting at Geneva, prepared for the general Disarmament Conference in Geneva, and were presently backstopping and instructing that delegation.

Mr. GROSS. So we have to spend \$5 million more for someone to backstop the Tower of Babel in New York?

Mr. ROONEY. This proposal is the judgment of a unanimous committee. The committee felt that if the expenditure of \$6,500,000 would help prevent nuclear war, would do some good, that we should do so, that it is worth the chance.

Mr. GROSS. You know, we got along pretty well this afternoon until right now when nuclear testing and Khrushchev came into the picture. Khrushchev did not come up in connection with consideration of the farm bill yesterday, and I do not know how that happened.

Mr. ROONEY. I did not mention Khrushchev. I was about to get to him.

Mr. GROSS. Who is going to start a nuclear war, if it is not Khrushchev?

Mr. ROONEY. I hope my splendid relationship with the gentleman from Iowa continues. It is always good to get along with the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know what we would do without Khrushchev.

Mr. ROONEY. I must say that the distinguished gentleman from Iowa is one Member of this House who reads every page of the printed hearings on this appropriation bill, and when this committee gets to the floor, he is one Member who knows as much, if not more, in regard to some items, than the committee itself. However, on this one I believe he is in error.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I do not know what I am in error about, because I have not yet gotten very much information on the accomplishments of this plush disarmament setup.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12580) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and the amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GROSS. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Gross moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 12580, to the House Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected. The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken.

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 266, nays 56, not voting 113, as follows:

[Roll No. 169]

YEAS—266

Adair	Glenn	Morse
Addabbo	Gonzalez	Mosher
Albert	Goodling	Moss
Alexander	Granahan	Murphy
Arends	Gray	Murray
Ashley	Green, Oreg.	Natcher
Aspinall	Griffin	Nedzi
Auchincloss	Griffiths	Nelsen
Avery	Hagen, Calif.	Nix
Baker	Halpern	Norrell
Baldwin	Hansen	Nygaard
Baring	Harding	O'Brien, Ill.
Barrett	Harris	O'Hara, Ill.
Bass, Tenn.	Harvey, Ind.	O'Hara, Mich.
Bates	Hechler	Olsen
Battin	Henderson	O'Neill
Beckworth	Hoever	Osmers
Bell	Hollifield	Ostertag
Bennett, Mich.	Holland	Passman
Berry	Horan	Patman
Betts	Hosmer	Pelly
Blatnik	Hull	Perkins
Boland	Inouye	Peterson
Bonner	Jarman	Pfost
Bow	Jennings	Philbin
Boykin	Jensen	Pike
Brademas	Joelson	Pillion
Bray	Johnson, Calif.	Pirnie
Brewster	Johnson, Md.	Poage
Brooks, Tex.	Johnson, Wis.	Price
Broyhill	Jones, Ala.	Pucinski
Burke, Ky.	Jones, Mo.	Quie
Burke, Mass.	Judd	Randall
Byrne, Pa.	Karsten	Reece
Cahill	Kastenmeier	Reuss
Cannon	Kearns	Rhodes, Ariz.
Cederberg	Keith	Rhodes, Pa.
Chamberlain	Kilburn	Riehlman
Chelf	Kilgore	Rivers, Alaska
Chenoweth	King, Calif.	Roberts, Tex.
Chipperfield	Kirwan	Robison
Church	Kitchin	Rodino
Clancy	Kluczynski	Rogers, Colo.
Clark	Knox	Rogers, Fla.
Coad	Kornegay	Rooney
Cohelan	Kowalski	Roosevelt
Collier	Kunkel	Rosenthal
Conte	Kyl	Rostenkowski
Cook	Laird	Roudebush
Cooley	Langen	Rutherford
Corbett	Lankford	Ryan, Mich.
Corman	Lennon	Ryan, N.Y.
Cunningham	Lesinski	St. George
Curtin	Libonati	St. Germain
Daddario	Lindsay	Schenck
Daniels	Lipscomb	Schneebell
Dawson	McCulloch	Schweiker
Delaney	McDonough	Schwengel
Dent	McDowell	Scott
Denton	McFall	Seely-Brown
Derounian	McIntire	Sheppard
Diggs	Macdonald	Shipley
Donohue	Mack	Shriver
Dooley	Magnuson	Sibal
Doyle	Mahon	Sikes
Durno	Marshall	Sisk
Dwyer	Martin, Nebr.	Smith, Iowa
Edmondson	Mathias	Smith, Va.
Elliott	Meader	Springer
Evins	Michel	Stafford
Fascell	Miller, Clem	Staggers
Fenton	Miller,	Stratton
Finnegan	George P.	Stubblefield
Fisher	Miller, N.Y.	Sullivan
Fogarty	Milliken	Taylor
Ford	Mills	Teague, Calif.
Fountain	Minshall	Teague, Tex.
Friedel	Monagan	Thomas
Garmatz	Moore	Thompson, N.J.
Gary	Morgan	Thompson, Tex.
Gavin	Morris	Thomson, Wis.

Thornberry
Toll
Tollefson
Trimble
Tupper
Udall, Morris K.
Ullman
Vinson

Abbutt
Abernethy
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Beermann
Bennett, Fla.
Brown
Bruce
Burluson
Casey
Colmer
Curtis, Mo.
Davis, John W.
Derwinski
Dorn
Dowdy
Everett

Forrester
Garland
Gathings
Goodell
Grant
Gross
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Harrison, Wyo.
Hemphill
Herlong
Hiestand
Hoffman, Ill.
Huddleston
Johansen
King, N.Y.
Landrum
McMillan

Wickersham
Widnall
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Wright
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—56

McVey
Matthews
O'Konski
Poff
Ray
Riley
Rogers, Tex.
Rousselot
Saylor
Schadeberg
Selden
Short
Siler
Smith, Calif.
Stephens
Tuck
Whitten
Williams

Mr. Farbstain with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Dominick.
Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Utt.
Mr. McSween with Mr. Merrow.
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.

Mr. Roberts of Alabama with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Healey with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Bailey with Mr. Harsha.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Multer with Mrs. May.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Becker.

Mr. Santangelo with Mr. Curtis of Massachusetts

Mr. Loser with Mr. Fulton.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Van Zandt.
Mr. Spence with Mrs. Bolton.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Moorehead of Ohio.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Frazier with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Moorhead of Pennsylvania with Mr. Dole.

Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Scranton.

Mr. Fallon with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Hardy with Mr. Norblad.
Mr. Harrison of Virginia, with Mr. Latta.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Findley.
Mr. Lane with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Moeller with Mr. Bromwell.
Mr. O'Brien of New York with Mr. Barry.
Mr. Slack with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Moulder with Mr. Taber.

Mr. EVERETT and Mr. SHORT changed their vote from "yea" to "nay." The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed, H.R. 12580.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 10062) entitled "An act to extend the application of certain laws to American Samoa," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JACKSON, Mr. GREENING, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. MILLER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2996) entitled "An act to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes."

NOT VOTING—113

Alford	Fino	Montoya
Alger	Flood	Moorehead,
Andersen,	Flynt	Ohio
Min.	Frazier	Moorhead, Pa.
Anfuso	Frelinghuysen	Morrison
Ayres	Fulton	Moulder
Bailey	Gallagher	Multer
Barry	Gialmo	Norblad
Bass, N.H.	Gilbert	O'Brien, N.Y.
Becker	Green, Pa.	Pilcher
Belcher	Gubser	Powell
Blitch	Halleck	Purcell
Boggs	Hardy	Rains
Bolling	Harrison, Va.	Reifel
Bolton	Harsha	Rivers, S.C.
Breeding	Harvey, Mich.	Roberts, Ala.
Bromwell	Hays	Roush
Broomfield	Healey	Santangelo
Buckley	Hébert	Saund
Byrnes, Wis.	Hoffman, Mich.	Scherer
Carey	Ichord, Mo.	Scranton
Celler	Jonas	Shelley
Cramer	Karth	Slack
Curtis, Mass.	Kee	Smith, Miss.
Dague	Kelly	Spence
Davis,	Keogh	Steed
James C.	King, Utah	Taber
Davis, Tenn.	Lane	Thompson, La.
Devine	Latta	Utt
Dingell	Loser	Vanik
Dole	McSween	Van Pelt
Dominick	MacGregor	Van Zandt
Downing	Madden	Waggonner
Dulski	Mailliard	Westland
Ellsworth	Martin, Mass.	Willis
Fallon	Mason	Winstead
Farbstain	May	Yates
Feighan	Merrow	Zelenko
Findley	Moeller	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Cramer for, with Mr. Alger against.
Mr. Breeding for, with Mr. Alford against.
Mr. Downing for, with Mr. Winstead against.

Mr. Gialmo for, with Mr. Rivers of South Carolina against.

Mr. King of Utah for, with Mr. Waggonner against.

Mr. Halleck for, with Mr. Van Pelt against.
Mr. Frelinghuysen for, with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Andersen of Minnesota.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Scherer.

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.

Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Dague.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Westland.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962, H.R. 11038, and also to consider on Monday next a concurrent resolution in connection with the said bill, H.R. 11038.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF JULY 23

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute to ask the majority leader to advise as to the program for next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. ARENDS. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Monday is District day. There are two bills: H.R. 6967, nonprofit corporation—accept Senate amendments—and S. 2321, develop medicine and surgery.

Also on Monday there will be the conference report on the bill H.R. 11038, the second supplemental appropriation bill; and

S. 476, California, Point Reyes National Seashore.

On Tuesday there will be the conference report on the bill S. 2996, the Foreign Aid Assistance Act of 1962.

And also H.R. 12648, the Department of Agriculture and related agencies appropriation bill for 1963 will be taken up.

For Wednesday and the balance of the week:

H.R. 11677, Equal Pay Act of 1962, and H.R. 529, construct Mann Creek Federal reclamation project.

I would like to advise the Members of the House that any record votes except on rules or procedural matters on Saturday next, if the House is in session, will go over until Wednesday because of the Louisiana primary.

This announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program will be announced later.

ADJOURNMENT FROM TODAY UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in

order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

LOWER BRULE SIOUX RESERVATION, S. DAK.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill—H.R. 5144—to provide for the payment for individual Indian and tribal lands of the Lower Brule Sioux Reservation in South Dakota, required by the United States for the Big Bend Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River, and for the rehabilitation, social and economic development of the members of the tribe, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: MESSRS. HALEY, EDMONDSON, MORRIS, BERRY, and LANGEN.

CROW CREEK SIOUX RESERVATION, S. DAK.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill—H.R. 5165—to provide for the payment for individual Indian and tribal lands of the Crow Creek Sioux Reservation in South Dakota, required by the United States for the Big Bend Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River, and for the rehabilitation, social and economic development of the members of the tribe, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: MESSRS. HALEY, EDMONDSON, MORRIS, BERRY, and LANGEN.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Elections of the Committee on House Administration may be permitted to sit on Tuesday, July 24, during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ASSESSMENTS VOTED BY GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the International Court of Justice has today affirmed that the assessments voted by the General Assembly of the United Nations to finance peacekeeping operations of the organization in the Congo and the Middle East are legally binding on the member states. This historic opinion is of fundamental importance to international law and to the present and future capacity of the United Nations to maintain peace.

The U.S. Government consistently has been of the view that the assessments in question are expenses of the organization within the meaning of the United Nations Charter and thus binding upon the members. The Legal Adviser of the Department of State so argued before the International Court of Justice during its consideration of this issue.

The Court's opinion will strengthen the efforts of the Secretary General to collect arrearages on assessments to finance the United Nations peacekeeping missions in the Congo and Middle East. Some members have not paid these assessments, claiming that they were not legally binding. In view of the Court's opinion this claim is plainly not tenable.

Collection of outstanding arrearages on these two accounts would help the United States to pay accumulated bills for these two missions through the period ending June 30 of this year. Financing the Congo and Middle East operations beyond June 30, however, depends upon the success of the United Nations proposal to borrow \$200 million. No assessments have been voted for these operations after June 30. Expenses for the Congo and Middle East missions are now running at approximately \$11.5 million per month; 44 nations have purchased or pledged \$72.4 million toward the \$200 million so far. The U.S. Senate has passed a bill authorizing the President to lend up to \$100 million to the U.N. and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs is currently holding hearings on this legislation. This action further emphasizes the importance of our immediate and affirmative action on this legislation.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Can the distinguished majority leader tell us what effect this decision will have upon the voting rights of the members of the U.N. if they do not pay their assessment?

Mr. ALBERT. I am not in a position to answer the gentleman.

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

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Very recently I had the opportunity to question our Ambassador to the United Nations on a television program on this point, and it was the position of our Ambassador to the United Nations that a ruling to this ef-

fect by the International Court would put us in a legal position to press for denial of the right to vote for all member nations who have not paid up their assessments.

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

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, who can give a specific answer to the question raised by the gentleman from California.

Mr. MORGAN. Under article 19 of the charter, when a country's arrears equals or exceeds the amount of its contributions due to the 2 preceding years, it loses its vote in the General Assembly.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Now that the court has ordered these deficiency nations to pay up, do you suppose we can get the \$82 million that is owed to the taxpayers of this country for the airlift and various other expenses in the Congo and elsewhere, all of which is owed to us by the United Nations?

Mr. ALBERT. I would hope that we might make progress in that direction. The opinion of the Court is not yet available in this country, and I would want to withhold a judgment until I can study it.

VOTING RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, a little earlier today in the course of debate on the bill just passed, one of our colleagues, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] quoted from a 1950 statement of a former Member of this body who is now President of the United States on the subject of need to cut down on spending and to get our budget in balance at the earliest possible date.

Mr. Speaker, I think two things are interesting in connection with that statement by the distinguished gentleman who was then known as Congressman Kennedy. In the first place, he proceeded in the course of that bill, during the several weeks of debate which followed the colloquy read from by the gentleman from Ohio, to vote for amendments which did have the effect of making substantial cuts, where cuts were feasible in the bill. However, when he got to the point of a final vote on this important bill at that time—and, incidentally, this was the \$29 billion general appropriation bill at that time—he did the responsible thing which most of us in the House did today, and voted for the final approval of that appropriation bill. Thus did Congressman Kennedy demonstrate even at that time in his career in public service that he was being responsible in his leadership and in rec-

ognition of his responsibility to the people, just as he continues to demonstrate the same responsible qualities in the Nation's highest office today.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, FISHBAIT

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to wish a happy birthday to a very distinguished employee of the House, our Doorkeeper, Mr. Fishbait Miller, who, I understand, is celebrating his 53d anniversary today. I want to join other Members of the House in wishing Fishbait a happy birthday.

HOORAY! HOORAY! HOORAY!

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, \$560,000 may be peanuts to the Government, but it is big money to the rest of us. That is what has been wasted in the past by the purchase of just one radar set, but I am elated to report today that the taxpayers have won a victory in this case and will soon see some money saved.

June 12, 1962, I detailed eight cases of military procurement waste for the House and the Armed Services Committee. Case No. 5 was a report on purchase of a radar set known as the APS-88. It was purchased in the past by sole source or negotiated bid and my study showed these tactics overcharged the taxpayer by over a half million dollars. It also appeared that a new planned procurement, in which only two firms were asked to bid, was going to result in a higher price for the equipment. I promised to study the new action closely.

Yesterday, Comptroller General Joseph Campbell advised me that the Navy has now delayed this procurement and will probably buy at least part of the set through open, competitive bidding. The Navy is going to open the door. Regardless of how it rationalizes this action, here is what happened. When bids were opened, they were, indeed, higher and the Navy had to get off the spot. It will do so shortly by buying the set competitively. The how and why of this are not really as important as the fact that much money will now be saved. Just how much will be saved will be known when a contract is let and I shall follow this procurement closely until that time.

Yesterday, the taxpayers lost a battle when the Navy awarded a contract for production of the PRC-41 radio set on a sole source basis. The taxpayers pockets were picked and the Navy said, in

effect, "Damn the dollars, full speed ahead," even though a subcommittee of the House said the radio could have been bought by competitive bidding.

Good news about the APS-88 is the important thing today. The APS-88, the arrests last week in New Jersey and the progress of the amendment which will do away with much sole source buying by the military are all evidences of progress. If American industry gets a fair chance, the taxpayers will get a break, and that is what I am fighting for.

STRATTON COMPENSATORY PAYMENTS AMENDMENT TO THE FARM BILL

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the amendment which I offered to the administration farm bill during debate in the Committee of the Whole, an amendment to provide a legal basis for the compensatory payments feature of the New York-New Jersey milk-marketing order which was invalidated by a decision of the Supreme Court on June 4, was ruled out of order by the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]. A point of order was made against my amendment by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] and the pertinent discussion appears on page 14192 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 19. The gentleman from Wisconsin is quoted as follows:

The gentleman's amendment amends the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937. The legislation which is before us does not amend that act in any way in any section. This particular amendment amending the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 is not germane to this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that the gentleman from Wisconsin did not advise me in advance of his intention to raise a point of order against this amendment, which, of course, he strongly opposed. I had assumed that there was no question as to the germaneness of the amendment, since it had been offered to the previous farm bill several weeks ago with no point of order raised against it.

While I pointed out in speaking to the point of order that title III of the farm bill dealt with dairying, a subject also covered by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, I neglected to point out that section 326 of the legislation, which appears on page 36 beginning with line 12, specifically does refer to the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 and does, in fact, undertake to write statutory law with respect to pricing agreements on milk "notwithstanding any provision" of this act. In fact the whole program outlined in subtitle C of title III of the bill, relating to dairy products, in effect establishes a new pricing arrangement for milk, and therefore necessarily relates directly to the

Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 in areas such as the New York-New Jersey area where the price of milk is fixed by milk orders issued by the Secretary of Agriculture directly pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937. Therefore subtitle C of title III is in effect an amendment to this act, and this fact is specifically recognized in the provisions of section 326.

Mr. Speaker, in ruling on the point of order offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], the Chairman of the Committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], said:

The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York contains a matter which is in nowise related to the subject matter of the several sections under consideration.

Inasmuch as my amendment did relate to the very same act discussed in section 326 of the bill, I respectfully suggest that the amendment was in order and that the Chair should have overruled the point of order.

DONALD WINE

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the opposition which has developed to the confirmation of my constituent, Attorney Donald Wine, of Davenport, Iowa, who has been appointed U.S. district attorney for southern Iowa by President Kennedy, prompts me to take the floor in behalf of Mr. Wine. I realize that this has been an intraparty fight where one Democrat opposed another but since Mr. Wine has no one to come to his defense at this level, I feel it incumbent upon me as his Congressman, to step across party lines and rise in his behalf. I do this knowing that a Democratic Congressman from Iowa has withdrawn his objections. I am disappointed that he has not come out forthrightly in support of Mr. Wine.

A point of contention has been raised about Mr. Wine's competency for this position on the basis of the speed with which he handled one of the first cases to come to his attention right after he was sworn in. It happens that this is one of those smelly grain storage cases with which the Department of Agriculture has been plagued and where dispatch has not always been the hallmark of its action.

In fact, the attention which District Attorney Wine gave this case might well serve as a pattern for a harried Secretary of Agriculture and an uncertain Attorney General to follow in dealing with such distinguished members of their party as an appointee to the President's Cotton Advisory Committee, Billie Sol Estes, and his henchmen when such nefarious machinations as theirs are brought to light.

U.S. District Attorney Wine has voluntarily documented the immediate ac-

tion which his office took to close the Alex Barbour warehouse and take court action to bar any further illegal disposition of grain. This is in strong contrast to the confusion, the whitewash jobs, and the coverup which went on in the Department of Agriculture when the Billie Sol Estes stew started to boil.

I have personally known Don Wine for a long time. He is a Democrat and I am a Republican but we have always had a healthy respect for the honest difference of political philosophy which puts us on opposite sides of the political fence and this has never interfered with our friendship and our cooperation on matters of community and civic interest.

He is well respected not only in Davenport and Scott County but in Iowa and Illinois where he is widely known as a rising young attorney and as a member of his political party.

He has earned the right to be elevated to this position of U.S. district attorney and I call upon the Senate Judiciary Committee to judge Donald Wine solely on the basis of his qualifications for the position. He has been tested and has already shown that he can take over a difficult assignment and handle it well. He has the background; he has the experience.

There should be no question about his confirmation. Personal animosity, petty likes and dislikes, should not enter into this picture. Any comparison to the speed with which the U.S. district attorney's office in Iowa handles a grain storage case and the way the same type of case is handled in the U.S. Department of Agriculture under the present leadership is so farfetched as to be ridiculous.

Despite the manufactured opposition, I trust that it will be dismissed for what it is and that Senate confirmation of Donald Wine as U.S. district attorney for southern Iowa will be forthcoming just as confirmation for the two new Federal judges in Iowa was forthcoming in spite of the same type of manufactured opposition.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I am not recorded on rollcall No. 169, which has just been completed. Had I been here, I would have voted "aye."

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my special order be temporarily vacated in favor of the special order of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT] and that I may succeed him in his remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE CLARE E. HOFFMAN

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter, and I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the subject matter of this special order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on tomorrow, the Fourth District of Michigan is having an all-day celebration to pay special tribute to our colleague, CLARE HOFFMAN, who is retiring from the House of Representatives at the end of this session after 28 years of continuous service.

I have asked for this time so his colleagues here could join in extending their congratulations and best wishes to CLARE simultaneously with the people of Michigan.

Someone recently said about CLARE that he is one of the last of a breed of men that "they don't hardly make them like any more." Those who know him will well recognize how perfectly this comment applies to CLARE and gives the reason why he has always stood apart as a Member of this body. His limitless energy and vigor at 80 years plus surpasses that of many men 35 years his junior. If there has been a more fearless and courageous Member of the House of Representatives than CLARE HOFFMAN, I have never seen one during my many years of service here.

There are many who disagree with his views and perhaps his philosophy of government, but none that I know of have ever questioned the honesty of his motives or the forthright courage with which he pursues an objective which he believes to be right. He will stand alone against tremendous odds as he has done many times in this House if he believes his cause to be just. A fighter by nature CLARE has always loved to participate in congressional debates and he never lacked for attention once he took the floor. Most Members are reluctant to engage him in an argument on the floor of the House. His quick mind and his subtle wit together with his knowledge of the subject under discussion along with unexcelled parliamentary skill have always made him a feared adversary in House debates.

I think I can say without fear of contradiction that his presence here during the past few months has been sincerely missed by all Members of this body on either side of the aisle. I am sure that all of my colleagues join with me in wishing CLARE a restoration of his good health and a welcome return to the floor of this House before his term expires at the end of this year.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include the following biographical sketch of CLARE HOFFMAN:

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

CLARE E. HOFFMAN was born at Vicksburg, Pa., on September 10, 1875, the only son of Samuel D. and Mary V. (Ritter) Hoffman. He has one sister, Elizabeth, who resides at Terra Bella, Calif.

He received his public school education at Constantine, Mich., to which place his parents had moved when he was 1 year old.

Following his graduation from Constantine High School, he studied medicine for a year, then transferred to Northwestern University Law School, where he received his bachelor of law degree. During the year following, he attended Valparaiso University at Valparaiso, Ind.

He then went to Otsego, Mich., where he lived a short time and then moved to Allegan, where he was employed in the law office of Charles Wilkes.

He was married to Miss Florence M. Wason, of Otsego, on November 21, 1899. They have two sons, Carl E. and Leo W.—both attorneys practicing at Allegan, Mich.; five grandchildren; nine great-grandchildren.

He remained in Allegan 6 years; then went to Muskegon, Mich., where he was employed by Clarence Sessions, later a U.S. district judge at Grand Rapids.

Following the Muskegon association, he returned to Allegan, set up his own law office and practiced law in that city until 1935.

During that period he was elected and served as prosecuting attorney of Allegan for two terms of 2 years each.

He was always interested in the betterment of his city. He handled all the proceedings connected with the acquiring of the municipal dam and powerplant of the city of Allegan, including all court proceedings, involving land condemnation and procuring rights-of-way in not only circuit court, but the State supreme court, district court, and finally the circuit court of appeals of the United States.

In November 1934, he was elected to the Congress of the United States, representing the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, and has, on the expiration of each of his terms, been reelected to that office, the last time in November 1960. He is the dean of the Michigan delegation.

During his service in Congress, he has been a member of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the Committee on Agriculture; is presently second ranking Republican member of the Committee on Education and Labor, and the ranking minority member on the Committee on Government Operations (the latter formerly having been known as the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments). He was chairman of the latter committee in the 80th and 83d Congresses.

He also served as a member of a number of special House committees, including the so-called Townsend committee and the Committee To Investigate Acts of Executive Agencies Which Exceed Their Authority, generally known as the Smith committee.

He has been a consistent advocate of fair treatment of the workingman; the exposure of racketeering in the labor movement; efficiency and economy in Government.

As long ago as 1947 and 1948 he was chairman of subcommittees investigating racketeering in labor unions and in 1953 supervised and directed investigations of the misuse of welfare and pension funds in labor unions, the fields later explored by the Senate Labor Racketeering Investigating Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan, CLARE HOFFMAN's, district adjoins mine to the south. He has most ably represented the Fourth Congressional District for 14 terms. CLARE has made an invaluable contribution to his district, his State, and his country.

The gentleman from Michigan, CLARE HOFFMAN, had a most successful career as a lawyer in the State of Michigan for

many, many years prior to his election to the Congress. It has been said that the gentleman from Michigan, CLARE HOFFMAN, was more successful before the Michigan Supreme Court than any lawyer in the history of the legal profession in our State. Those of us who have seen him operate so effectively in the House of Representatives can well appreciate how CLARE could have been so successful as a lawyer in Michigan.

The gentleman from Michigan, CLARE HOFFMAN's, contributions in the Congress are almost unlimited. His knowledge of parliamentary procedure, his desire to see that the House of Representatives proceeded properly was a fetish; and his contribution in making the Members of the House proceed in an orderly way was one that all of us should seek to emulate in the years ahead.

All of us are familiar with his very strong, dedicated views on such matters as economy in government, constitutional government, and his total and complete dedication to the American way of life.

There are many who have said that CLARE was disagreeable and difficult to get along with, but may I say from my own personal experience of some 14 years in the House that I have never found an instance where you could not go to CLARE prior to the discussion of a matter on the floor of the House and reason with him. If your case was good, if you were right and had sound reasons for your position, he would be as helpful and cooperative as possible.

His staunch adherence to his views was something that we all might follow. No one ever fought harder, regardless of the odds against him. I never saw him compromise a principle, even though on some occasions he has stood absolutely alone. Of course, over the years, he has been an ardent, adamant Republican, but aside from that no person who knew him could ever say that he was anything but a great American.

We all hope that CLARE will regain his health and we all trust he will return to the House prior to our adjournment.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am glad the distinguished gentleman from Michigan and his colleagues have taken this time to pay tribute to a distinguished Member of this House and a great American. The gentleman from Michigan, CLARE HOFFMAN, is a man whose heart is as strong as steel and sharp as an arrow. He is one of the most articulate men I have ever known. He is one of the finest parliamentarians to have served in this House in this generation. He is a man who has to be recognized by all who know him among other men as an extraordinary man. I join the distinguished gentleman from Michigan in hoping that the gentleman from Michigan, CLARE HOFFMAN, may be back with us before we adjourn. We here in the House of Representatives miss him.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. I wish to join with the Michigan delegation and other Members of the House in this tribute that is being paid to a truly great American, the gentleman from Michigan, CLARE HOFFMAN. For 24 of the 28 years that CLARE HOFFMAN has served in the House of Representatives we have been companions in arms, as it were, and have served together on the same committees.

When the good Lord made CLARE HOFFMAN he then broke the mold, because there has only been one individual, one man in all history, like CLARE HOFFMAN.

He is a complex man, he is an able man, he is a courageous man. Sometimes there were those who thought he had a gruff and a rough exterior, but down inside he has a heart of gold. He will always do everything that he can to help his fellow men and his neighbors.

As has been said on this floor, CLARE HOFFMAN is not only a great parliamentarian but a great debater as well. He is the type of debater, as many Members of the House learned rather quickly, that we in southern Ohio describe as being hard to curry around the hind legs. You do not want to get into a dispute or an argument with CLARE unless you know whereof you speak, because he will cut the sand out from under your feet so quickly you will not realize you are sinking into a morass until after it happens. Yet he is a kindly man, and after the debate is over he will come around and visit and talk with you and explain why he takes the position he does.

This Congress, this country, and certainly the State of Michigan are all better off for CLARE HOFFMAN's having served so long in this great Capitol of ours. We all owe him a debt of gratitude for that which he has given to us, to his State, and to his Nation. It is my hope and my prayer that he may soon be restored to health and that he may have the opportunity to come back before this session of Congress adjourns and take his place here in this House. But if not, I am sure that when he comes later he will find a warm welcome among friends who appreciate the many good qualities that he has.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in that prayer I join, that before we adjourn the gentleman from Michigan, CLARE HOFFMAN, will be able to return to the floor of this House and experience, as we gather around to greet him, the warmth of our affection.

CLARE HOFFMAN represented in 13 Congresses the district in Michigan where I was born. When I was a young man, attending the high school at Benton Harbor, the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan was represented by Edward La Rue Hamilton, of Niles. Mr. Hamilton served in the House from March 4,

1897, to March 3, 1921, a Member of 12 Congresses. CLARE HOFFMAN on his retirement on the adjournment of the 87th Congress will have served the Fourth Michigan District 2 years longer, his tenure in the congressional office thus being the longest in its history. It is a tribute to these two men, and an index of their popularity, that together they represented in this body the Fourth Michigan District a total of 50 years out of the last 86 years.

There is not a warmer personal friendship in this Chamber than that of CLARE HOFFMAN and BARRATT O'HARA. We are of different political parties, of different philosophies, but on the personal side we had so much in common. I have missed him every day that he has been away since illness struck one whom we had come to think of as impervious to age and human frailties. I have missed the dropping in at his office, his cheery words of greetings, and so much I have missed the life and labor he gave to the daily sessions of the Congress. Often I did not agree with what he said, but I know that what he said he believed and that no power on earth could silence him in the expression of his convictions.

Certainly, CLARE HOFFMAN is a fighter, a rough and tough scrapper, not an easy-going man for anyone to tangle with. He fights with wit at times, humor and sarcasm, and at other times with the rapier of acid words. But even if he stands alone, he never retreats. He can be outvoted, but never does he admit to being vanquished.

More often than not CLARE and I have been on different sides of issues. Our differences on partisan and philosophical approaches he did not hold against me, or I against him. His personal friendship, true and unwavering during all the years of my service here, has been one of the richest experiences of my life.

I have never known a kinder heart. That is the side of CLARE HOFFMAN that is known only to those who know him best.

Mr. Speaker, I am very happy for this opportunity to join with my colleagues from my native State of Michigan in paying homage to CLARE HOFFMAN.

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

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, commend the gentleman from Michigan, my colleague [Mr. BENNETT], for taking this occasion to pay tribute to the gentleman from Michigan, CLARE HOFFMAN, just prior to the celebration of CLARE HOFFMAN's service and career in the House of Representatives by his constituents back home. Some of us hope to bring this message from his colleagues to CLARE at that celebration.

I should like to refer not so much to his work on the floor of the House,

which was outstanding, but to his work on the committee now known as the Committee on Government Operations of which he is the ranking minority member and on which I have served with him in the 12 years I have been in the Congress.

We all know of CLARE HOFFMAN's diligent attendance in this Chamber and his active participation in debate. We know of his mastery of parliamentary procedure and his willingness to employ that knowledge to protect the rights of his colleagues whenever he believed those rights were being infringed upon.

His committee achievements may not be as widely known.

There are three particular matters which in my mind were outstanding in CLARE's service on the Committee on Government Operations.

First of all, the Hoover Commission was created when Congressman HOFFMAN was chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, then known as the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments in the 80th Congress; and he was chairman of that committee both in the 80th and 83d Congresses.

I would like to include at this point in my remarks a letter written to a constituent of CLARE HOFFMAN's dated August 26, 1950, and signed by our former colleague, Carter Manasco, then a member of the Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government, testifying to CLARE's activities as chairman of the Expenditures Committee—later renamed Government Operations Committee—in creating the Hoover Commission:

Mr. F. L. GRANGER,
Benton Harbor, Mich.

AUGUST 26, 1950.

DEAR MR. GRANGER: Your query as to what part, if any, your Congressman, CLARE E. HOFFMAN, had in the attempt to reorganize and bring about economy and efficiency in executive departments, received.

Prior to the 80th Congress, when I was chairman of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, your Congressman was for several years a member of that committee. He made a point of being present at and participating in all meetings of the committee. Other members of the committee listened to him with respect, for he not only was capable, possessed of ability, but we all knew he had the interests of the country as his first objective.

When the Republicans took over in the 80th Congress, he became chairman of that committee. I then became the ranking Democratic member of the committee. Your Congressman not only continued his constructive service, but saw to it that the new members took an active part in committee work. In fact, he went out of his way to assist Democratic as well as Republican freshmen Members of Congress who served on his committee.

Your Congressman, CLARE E. HOFFMAN, was chairman of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments when it wrote the reorganization bill authorizing the creation and activities of the Hoover Commission.

I was one of the two Members of the House to be named to the Hoover Commission by President Truman. The recommendations of that Commission, tending to give us efficiency and economy, have been consistently and with ability supported by your Congress-

You and your friends will make no mistake in returning him to Congress.

Sincerely yours,

CARTER MANASCO,
Member of the Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government

ALEXANDRIA, VA.

Mr. Speaker, I include a similar tribute by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] with respect to the work of the gentleman from Michigan, CLARE HOFFMAN, in connection with the Hoover Commission from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 9, 1949:

The work of several committees of the House was extremely important and of benefit to the commission, and it would be unfair for me to conclude my remarks without paying tribute to the House Committee on Expenditures also—not only to the present committee but to the former committee under the leadership of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] which reported unanimously the legislation creating the commission. It subsequently passed the House of Representatives. I think full credit is due for that committee of the 80th Congress for its very good work.

Mr. Speaker, a further aspect of the work of the gentleman from Michigan, CLARE HOFFMAN, on the Committee on Government Operations in connection with the Hoover Commission was his effort to carry out the recommendations of the Hoover Commission and its task forces in bringing about greater economy and efficiency in the executive branch of the Government.

Another important piece of legislation to be enacted during CLARE HOFFMAN's chairmanship of the Expenditures Committee in the 80th Congress was the act unifying the armed services of the United States and establishing the Department of Defense.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I include an excerpt from page 8261, volume 93, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 3, 1947, containing a tribute by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], now Speaker of the House of Representatives; relating to the armed services unification bill:

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the committee that my friend is chairman of, and I have sat through all of the consideration of the merger or unification legislation. I can testify, and I now testify as emphatically as it is possible for me to do so, that at no time has the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] done anything to try to hinder the early consideration of the bill, either in hearings or in executive session. I say that as one who watched closely to see, because I wanted action taken on the bill by the committee. I state to the House now, and I hereby testify, that the evidence has been directly to the contrary. The gentleman from Michigan, as chairman of the committee and as a member of the committee, has done everything he possibly could to expedite action on the bill.

Perhaps one of the most outstanding efforts over the years as a member of the Government Operations Committee was CLARE's opposition to the Reorganization Act. I think from the very beginning CLARE thought that that legislation was unconstitutional because it granted our legislative power and authority to the President.

In that connection there was an interesting episode when he was chairman of the Government Operations Committee in the 83d Congress. President Eisenhower had just taken office and Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 was sent down to create a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

CLARE showed his legal skill and also his parliamentary ability in proving that a reorganization plan can be amended in effect, because he introduced a resolution not to disapprove the plan but to advance its effective date. We passed it and it was approved April 1, 1953, a resolution which became Public Law 13 of the 83d Congress. It can thus be said that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was created by law, rather than reorganization plan, since the effect of his resolution, adopted by both houses and signed by the President was to incorporate the provisions of the reorganization plan by reference and advance the date for taking effect.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD an article from the South Haven (Mich.) Daily Tribune of Monday, November 23, 1959, which is a profile sketch of CLARE HOFFMAN on the occasion of his 60th wedding anniversary:

HOFFMAN LEGEND GROWS WITH 60TH ANNIVERSARY FETE

ALLEGAN, November 22.—November has been a month of anniversaries for CLARE E. HOFFMAN, just turned 84 and dean of Michigan's 18-member congressional delegation.

It was just 25 years ago last week that voters in the six counties in the Fourth Congressional District (Allegan, Barry, Berrien, Cass, St. Joseph, and Van Buren) gave HOFFMAN a majority of 13,000 votes to defeat the Democratic incumbent, George Foulkes, of Hartford, and send him to Washington for the first time.

And yesterday four generations of Hoffmans gathered in their Washington apartment to observe the 60th anniversary of the marriage of a Constantine blacksmith's son and an Otsego hotelkeeper's daughter.

They were wed November 22, 1899, in the parlor of the bride's home in Otsego where her father, LaFayette Wasson, operated the town's leading hotel. Whether HOFFMAN realized it at the time is not known but his new wife, Florence, had an invaluable political asset * * * she was born in a Trowbridge township (Allegan County) log cabin.

But that was about the only asset the newlyweds did have. The groom had graduated from Northwestern University Law School 3 years before, too young by a year to take his bar examination. He had spent the year of waiting at Valparaiso University studying shorthand and other business subjects. After being admitted to practice law in Michigan, he had hoped to work in the offices of Charles Wilkes, then Allegan's leading attorney.

Wilkes had no vacancy on his staff at the time, so HOFFMAN decided to start his own practice in the lawyerless village of Otsego. But business was none too good and when Wilkes offered him a post as clerk at \$6 a week, less than a year later, HOFFMAN didn't hesitate to accept. He was working as a stenographer at \$1 for an 11-hour workday which started at 7 a.m. when he arrived to build fires in the office's heating stoves, when he returned to Otsego to claim Florence Wasson as his bride.

He worked for Wilkes for 4 years, receiving pay increases of \$2 a week each year until early in 1903 when he was made a partner in the firm. The next year he left Allegan to gain wider experience by working for a

Muskegon firm of attorneys for a year, then returned to open his own offices in Allegan.

Although he had been unsuccessful as a candidate for prosecuting attorney in 1900 (when Michigan was holding its first primary elections) Allegan County voters were more kind to him upon his return here in 1904. They elected him to the first of two terms as prosecutor.

BOLTED PARTY

Completing his second term in 1912, the young country lawyer was among the thousands of Michigan Republicans who bolted the party to follow the banner of ex-President T. R. Roosevelt's Progressive Party. Running for reelection to the prosecutor's office as a "Bull Moose," HOFFMAN's candidacy suffered the same fate as T.R.'s, probably marking the last time that a Hoffman and a Roosevelt ever had anything in common.

HAND IN POT

During the next 22 years, HOFFMAN kept his hand in local politics, serving many times as city and county Republican chairman, but was far too busy building a statewide reputation as a sharp-witted and sharp-tongued trial lawyer. In an era when doctors were without X-ray and other modern diagnostic aids, HOFFMAN became the courtroom nemesis for many a general practitioner being sued for malpractice. His reputation for winning large judgments in such cases extended beyond State lines.

But the period also saw him in the customary wide variety of criminal and civil cases that make up a country lawyer's practice. By 1934, he had defended and prosecuted murderers, horse thieves, wife beaters, rapists, bank robbers and even the operator of a nudist colony.

Running for Congress was furthest from his mind in 1934 although he had been a most vocal and vituperative critic of Franklin Delano Roosevelt's New Deal ever since the Democratic landslide of 1932. He was actually drafted as a candidate and was in Muskegon trying a malpractice case when his nominating petitions were circulated and filed. He was a reluctant but hard-working candidate and immediately began stumping the district to defeat two State senators, George Barnhard and Earl Burhans, and a widely respected Paw Paw physician, Dr. F. A. Racette, in the Republican primary of 1934.

In other primary campaigns, two other State senators, Theodore Harmons, of Hastings, and G. Elwood Bonine, of Vandalia, failed to unseat the hard-hitting HOFFMAN who learned his infighting techniques from a vanishing generation of circuit-riding trial lawyers.

DEFEATED INCUMBENT

But after he defeated the Democratic incumbent in the November 1934 election, HOFFMAN was not so sure he wanted to go to Washington after all. His son, Leo, recalls the consternation shared by his father's family and friends as the day for his swearing in came closer and closer and HOFFMAN seemed to be making no preparations to leave for Washington. A few days before the 74th Congress was to convene, Leo finally asked his father when he was leaving and the elder HOFFMAN blurted out that he wasn't going. It took the combined efforts of his family, friends, and political affiliates to convince him he had to go to Washington.

That probably was the last time anyone had the least difficulty getting him to the Capital. It has been his favorite battleground ever since. In fact plans had been made for a family celebration in Allegan to mark Mr. and Mrs. HOFFMAN's 60th wedding anniversary, but the program was hastily switched to Washington when he received a call to attend labor subcommittee sessions late in the week.

Although he relished his congressional role, HOFFMAN never was afflicted with Potomac fever. Old acquaintances in the District

agree that CLARE HOFFMAN has gone through 25 years in Washington without changing his habits or his mind. He's never attended a Capital cocktail party or gone off on a freeloading congressional tour to inspect something or other in some faroff country. His workday still starts at the same hour that he used to build the fires in Charlie Wilke's law office when he was a \$6 a week legal stenographer.

NO PARTY LINE

Never one to follow a party line or go along with political bossism, Michigan's senior Congressman hasn't changed much from the young lawyer who bolted the Republican Party back in 1912 to cast his lot with T. R. Roosevelt's ill-fated "Bull Moose" movement. Friends are certain that he enjoys being in the minority even if it is often a minority of one—himself.

"I'm proud to say I'm still a Taft man, never was an Eisenhower man," he said the other day. Even so, he takes a lot of pride from the fact that the Eisenhower administration has called on him more frequently than any other Republican in the House to get needed legislation through the legal entanglements of the congressional maze.

HOFFMAN has made a career of turning political liabilities into assets. In 12 election campaigns he has never sought, nor had the support of a political machine or organization of any kind. But he recalls with pleasure the year that one county Republican organization passed the word that no one should either support HOFFMAN or contribute to his campaign. It was the year he received his largest majority from that particular county.

In an era when school pupils are graded on their ability to submerge themselves in group activities, and "togetherness" is an unofficial motto and millions of people strive for the anonymity and security of "averageness" HOFFMAN stands out like an eagle in a tree full of starlings.

INDIVIDUALISM

A man to whom rugged individualism is almost a religion, HOFFMAN takes pride in such things as having the briefest (five lines) biographical sketch in the Congressional Directory; wearing suits without pockets (a throwback to his trial-lawyer days when he had his suits made that way to cure himself of putting his hands in his pockets); and the unsuccessful efforts of big labor and leftist organizations to defeat him at the polls (one union organization spent \$40,000 in a single campaign against him).

He attributes his political success to being a "fundamental Republican" and never ignoring an individual's request for help, regardless of his political affiliations.

But he admits that these qualities barred him from any higher office or position of leadership in the House.

HOFFMAN ranks the Armed Forces Unification Act and Taft-Hartley labor laws as his most important accomplishments in Congress, although he admits that both acts fell short of what was needed. He's resigned to the fact that, because of his role as a "lone wolf," no piece of important legislation probably will ever carry his name as a sponsor.

Nor is he bitter because the McClellan committee's recent investigations into labor union racketeers * * * covering virtually the same ground as a HOFFMAN chaired subcommittee did in 1934-44 got more headlines and more results than he did. "The public wasn't ready for it in 1944 * * * not enough individuals had been hurt by union racketeering," he said, recalling that his subcommittee's probing had been halted by a coalition of both Democrats and Republicans.

The Fourth District's "ornery octogenarian" has had his share of criticism from the Nation's press, but the two accolades he

prizes most, even more than personal tributes from Presidents Eisenhower and Hoover, came from two publications which represented conservative and radical extremes. The leftist weekly PM, now defunct, and the ultraconservative Detroit Athletic Club News both summed up stories on HOFFMAN with virtually the same comment: "You don't hear CLARE E. HOFFMAN when he speaks in Congress * * * you hear the voice of his people."

Before returning to Washington for subcommittee sessions, the 84-year-old Congressman kept two secretaries busy answering mail, hunted ducks and geese in the bayous near New Richmond, buzzed stovewood with a chain saw for his hunting cabin and got acquainted with his first great-grandson, 9-month-old John William Hoffman, son of Mr. and Mrs. John Hoffman. The senior Hoffmans also have two sons, five grandchildren and five great-grandchildren.

But he wouldn't give a yes or no answer to queries on whether he would be a candidate for a 14th term in Congress in the 1960 elections.

I also include an interesting editorial entitled "The Splendid Gadfly," from the Grand Rapids Press, which was reprinted in the Chicago Tribune of February 16, 1962.

THE SPLENDID GADFLY

If Representative CLARE E. HOFFMAN, of Allegan, retires from Congress at the end of this year, as he is expected to do, he will have served 28 years. No man, no matter how unobtrusive, can serve in a legislative body that long without having made his presence felt. And CLARE HOFFMAN has been anything but unobtrusive.

In fact, he has made a career of intruding on the rosy dreams of many a fellow Member. Spendthrifts have been the special objects of his scorn, but others who, in his opinion, have sought to depart from the basic philosophy of the Republic also have been taking verbal lashings from him. HOFFMAN has feared none, and least of all has he feared speaking his mind.

It may be argued that the times have left HOFFMAN behind, but we should dispute that. The impulsive, in and out of Congress, need the corrective influences of a CLARE HOFFMAN. We have disagreed with him many times, but always have been ready to concede that his views have supplied the counterweight needed to maintain a reasonable balance in spending and other governmental activities. At times, too, we have felt that HOFFMAN was far more conservative than the Fourth Michigan District he represented. But every 2 years a handsome majority of voters returned him to the House. Part of this support, we suspect, was in the nature of personal loyalty to a man who had the courage to row against the current.

Mr. Speaker, I also include a profile feature article from the Kalamazoo Gazette of Sunday, March 18, 1962, entitled "Hoffman's Career Long and Colorful":

HOFFMAN'S CAREER LONG AND COLORFUL

(By Joe Armstrong)

CLARE E. HOFFMAN, Allegan County's colorful entry in the field of national politics, has decided to retire.

The Republican Congressman's son, Leo, made the announcement to the press last week. In Washington, Saturday, the younger Hoffman said his father has improved after having suffered a second stroke in his Capital City home.

Leo Hoffman, an attorney, plans to bring his father back to Allegan after he recovers enough to leave the Bethesda, Md., Naval Hospital.

Representative HOFFMAN, 86, suffered a stroke last November while driving to a

favorite duck-hunting spot near Allegan. Since then he has been unable to resume his duties in the House, where he has represented the Fourth District of Allegan, Barry, Berrien, Cass, St. Joseph, and Van Buren Counties since 1935.

HOFFMAN plans to go fishing, he said, when he gets back home with his wife, the former Florence Wasson, daughter of an Otsego hotelkeeper. It's a cinch he'll be a hard man to keep down—he always has been.

He was born September 10, 1875, in Vicksburg, Pa., the son of Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Hoffman. His father was a wagonmaker and blacksmith and, in the 1880's, moved his family to Constantine in St. Joseph County.

In his early teens HOFFMAN was apprenticed to a country doctor and after graduating from Constantine High School, enrolled in Northwestern University's Medical School. He soon transferred to law school, but neglected to tell his parents about the change until he returned home for Christmas.

He was 20 when he was graduated from Northwestern, too young by a year to be admitted to the bar to practice law. He spent the year at Valparaiso University, studying shorthand and other business subjects.

After being admitted to practice in Michigan, HOFFMAN opened his own offices in Otsego, which had no attorney. His lack of success in Otsego is indicated by the fact that when Charles Wilkes, Allegan's leading attorney, offered him a job as clerk at \$6 a week, HOFFMAN accepted without hesitation.

HOFFMAN was making \$12 a week in 1903 when he was invited to join the firm as a full partner. He left Allegan a year later to spend a year with a Muskegon firm to gain wider experience then returned to open his own offices.

HOFFMAN was unsuccessful in his first bid for political office. It was in 1900 when Michigan was holding its first primary elections and he was defeated in the primary as a candidate for prosecuting attorney. He had better luck on his return in 1904 when county voters elected him to the first of two terms as prosecutor.

In 1912 the young country lawyer was among the Republicans who left the party to follow the banner of Teddy Roosevelt's Progressives. Running as a "Bull Moose" candidate for reelection as prosecutor, HOFFMAN's candidacy shared the same fate as T.R.'s.

In the next 22 years, HOFFMAN kept his hand in local politics as city and county Republican chairman, but was too busy building a statewide reputation as a sharp-witted, sharp-tongued trial lawyer to seek office again.

His legal career seemed to have been divided into a series of campaigns. As a young lawyer, he won a name for himself for bringing fraud cases against unethical horse traders.

The young attorney next concentrated on local real estate dealers, then busy selling worthless burned-over timberland west of Allegan to unwary Chicagoans who thought they were buying valuable farmland. HOFFMAN once recalled that, at one time or another, he had sued every real estate dealer in Allegan County.

HOFFMAN became a specialist in malpractice suits against physicians. Imperfectly set fractures were common in those days and HOFFMAN's practice became statewide.

Many of his real estate and medical cases were appealed to the State supreme court and, at one time, HOFFMAN was considered to have "made as much law as any lawyer in Michigan," that is to say that decisions in his cases established precedents still in use today.

The Nation first heard of HOFFMAN in October 1933, when he defended Fred and Ophelia Ring, Kalamazoo dancing teachers,

arrested for operating one of the country's first nudist colonies, on Swan Creek, west of Allegan.

An outspoken critic of the Roosevelt New Deal ever since the 1932 landslide, HOFFMAN still was more interested in his practice than in politics. In 1934 he was actually drafted as a Fourth District Republican congressional candidate.

He was in Muskegon, trying a malpractice case, when his nomination petitions were circulated and filed. He was a reluctant, but hard-working candidate and he defeated two State senators, George Barnhard and Earl Burhans, and a widely respected Paw Paw physician, Dr. F. A. Racette of Paw Paw, to win the GOP nomination. A scandal over solicitation of campaign funds from Federal employees in the district helped HOFFMAN defeat the Democratic incumbent in November 1934.

Even after his election, HOFFMAN wasn't so sure he wanted to go to Washington. His son, Leo, recalls the consternation shared by his family and friends as the day for his swearing in came closer and his father showed no indication that he would be in Washington for the ceremony.

A few days before the 74th Congress was to convene, Leo finally asked his father when he was leaving and the elder HOFFMAN said flatly, "I'm not going." It took the combined efforts of his family and political supporters to get him to the Capital for the opening of the session.

Washington was his favorite battleground from then on. Even so, no one ever accused him of contracting "Potomac fever." He never attended a Capital cocktail party or took advantage of congressional inspection tours to far-off countries. Friends say he spent 28 years in Washington without changing his old habits or his mind.

Until he suffered his first stroke, driving alone to a favorite duck hunting spot near New Richmond last November, HOFFMAN's working day usually started at about the same hour he used to start the fires in Charlie Wilke's law offices as a dollar-a-day legal stenographer.

On his arrival in Washington, HOFFMAN had announced that he was there for the sole purpose of denouncing the New Deal and he soon found an effective weapon in a little-known House rule which permitted Members to talk for 1 minute on any subject, before each day's session. Virtually every day that Congress was in session during the Roosevelt era, HOFFMAN made a 1-minute speech against the New Deal.

Within 5 years, HOFFMAN had House Democrats so mad they tried to link him with an alleged home-grown Fascist conspiracy.

Feuds with Walter Winchell and Drew Pearson, the columnists, and the Washington Post helped to make him famous and, at one time or another, he sued all three for libel.

Without question, HOFFMAN was a Taft man, is proud of the part he played in helping draft the Taft-Hartley labor law. Although he frequently has stated, "I never was an Eisenhower man," he put in some of his longest hours under Eisenhower.

In 1959 he said, "I do not have so much to do with the passage of legislation desired by the administration as I do with defending some of those in the executive departments who are put on the hot seat by Democratic committees and subcommittees."

Elected to 14 terms in Congress by pluralities which ran as high as 78 percent of the total vote, HOFFMAN had a knack of turning political liabilities into assets. Never supported by a "machine" or organization of any kind, he frequently recalled the campaign year in which a county GOP organization passed the word forbidding members to either support HOFFMAN or contribute to his campaign. That was the year he received his largest majority from that particular county.

Rugged individualism is HOFFMAN's creed and he boasted of such things as having the shortest biographical sketch in the Congressional Directory—just five lines—wearing suits without jacket pockets, and the unsuccessful attempts of large labor organizations to defeat him at the polls.

As a "lone wolf" he realized no important piece of legislation would ever bear his name as author, but he played a large part in drafting the Armed Forces Unification Act and Taft-Hartley labor law, tempering his pride in those accomplishments with the frequent comment that "both acts fell far short of what was needed."

He received personal citations from ex-Presidents Eisenhower and Herbert Hoover for his work in drafting and supporting government reorganization bills which resulted from the work of the Hoover Commission.

In 1943-44 as chairman of a labor subcommittee, he dug into labor union racketeering. He was senior Republican member of the Government Operations Committee—which he headed for 2 years in 1952-53 when it was the committee on expenditures in executive departments—and second-ranking Republican on the Education and Labor Committee.

Unknown to anyone but his immediate family, HOFFMAN has been a diabetic most of his adult life. But no one ever noticed that the disease handicapped him in any way.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I join those colleagues who expressed the hope that we can have him back here before the end of this session, for I am sure he would receive a rousing welcome.

I look forward to participating tomorrow in the celebration in his hometown of Allegan, honoring the gentleman from Michigan, CLARE HOFFMAN, for his long and distinguished career as a great legislator.

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

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I want to join today in saying to CLARE HOFFMAN that we miss him and that we hope he will be back with us before the session is ended, and that after he retires he will have many good years in which to enjoy fishing, which he loves so well.

When CLARE was able to be with us he really always held our feet right up close to the fire. We could not get very far away because he would call a quorum. If I were to give him a nickname I would call him Quorum Call HOFFMAN.

CLARE HOFFMAN was always present and followed legislation very keenly. He was always ready with a motion to strike out the enacting clause. If other means failed for getting time he was always ready with his motion to strike out the enacting clause.

We of the Michigan delegation always used to have an 8:30 breakfast once a week. It used to be 8 o'clock but 8 o'clock was too early for some of us young fellows like myself, so we made it 8:30, but CLARE was always there at 8 o'clock and sometimes he came in with a catch of fish. He had been up at 5 o'clock in the morning and gone fishing—this vigorous young man of 85 years of age.

I will never forget the first speech I made in the House. I was standing right down there where the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT] is stand-

ing at the present time. I was making a great speech—at least I thought it was a great speech. CLARE had always said: "You young men get up there and make your views known." So I did.

So I took his advice. I stood down there, I got going along real good, when CLARE HOFFMAN asked me to yield to tell me in as polite a way as I ever heard anyone express it that I did not know what I was talking about.

We all accepted CLARE and enjoyed him. We miss him around here. It has not been the same since CLARE left. I do not think he ever spent over 10 minutes sitting in a chair unless he was working on something with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS]. He was always around seeing everybody. He was a man of great integrity and great ability.

One of the stories I remember he always told us in the lobby or in the cloakroom, and I am going to remind him if I see him tomorrow, was when he was a young lawyer. One of his first cases was to defend a chicken thief down in his area. CLARE said he got as far as the circuit court trial. The jury was there, CLARE was there making a real plea for the jury, working real hard, trying to do his best to defend this chicken thief. He said he was a young lawyer, still green behind the ears, and in the midst of all this the defendant leaned over and said to him: "Don't get so excited young man, the fellow who stole the chicken with me is on the jury."

These are the kind of stories CLARE used to have. We miss him a great deal, and we are going to tell him so tomorrow.

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

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, men come and go in the Halls of Congress. Some are soon forgotten; some are never forgotten. Certainly CLARE HOFFMAN will never be forgotten.

No man has ever served in either House who has had the wit and ability to use words more effectively than CLARE. He was one of the best informed persons on parliamentary procedure and tactics in the Congress, and he used this skill to the fullest extent possible.

It was my privilege to serve with CLARE on the Committee on Education and Labor when I first came to Congress 16 years ago. CLARE played an important role that year in the enactment of the Taft-Hartley law.

He was off the committee for 4 years but went on again in 1953 and it has been my privilege to serve with him for the last 10 years. His long experience, wise counsel, and strong support have been invaluable to me, especially in my years as ranking minority member of the Education and Labor Committee.

We will all miss CLARE and the great contribution he always made, not only to our committee, but to the Congress as a whole. We wish him well as he retires from the national scene.

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

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I join with the citizens of the Fourth District of Michigan in paying tribute to a great man, one of the greatest I have ever known, CLARE HOFFMAN.

I join my colleagues in paying tribute to his integrity, to his keen mind, his fearlessness, his forthrightness, his ideals, his principles, and, above all, his humor. Sometimes we do not properly pay tribute to those qualities which make effective these other qualities. A never-failing humor was a quality of CLARE HOFFMAN. CLARE merits respect of friend and foe alike.

He was sharp on the uptake, he always had that twinkle in his eye, and you knew that he saw the other side while he was espousing his own side.

To me he is and will always be an inspiration.

I join with my colleagues in wishing him a speedy return.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOX].

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, I would be inclined to say "Amen" to everything that has been said in honoring our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, CLARE HOFFMAN. I have known CLARE HOFFMAN for many, many years. Back in his early days in the Congress he made great contributions to his party and to his fellow man. I remember the days back in the 1930's when CLARE HOFFMAN toured the State of Michigan in behalf of the principles which he stood for. He never hesitated when he was invited to come into a congressional district in behalf of the members of that district. He always came through and left the people with a message that gave them words of wisdom; at least, words that they could weigh very easily and gain knowledge therefrom.

Mr. Speaker, CLARE HOFFMAN, of course, spent many days in my congressional district because he had a summer home at Grand Marais. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] referred to the fact that CLARE used to get up early in the morning and go fishing.

That is true, because CLARE HOFFMAN is an ardent fisherman. He still retains his summer home at Grand Marais and still goes up there to enjoy lake fishing as well as fishing in the streams in that area.

CLARE HOFFMAN's contribution to the State of Michigan, his congressional district especially, and the Nation as a whole, will be very difficult to match. The pathway that we all travel has alongside of it many pitfalls, and his objective was one that sought to guide those that travel the pathway against pitfalls which they might fall into. His period of service here in the House has alerted many Members to this pathway with its pitfalls, and from it we have all gained great admiration for CLARE HOFFMAN and we have all been able to travel this pathway without becoming involved in so-called pitfalls.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I am leaving to go to Michigan for one purpose, and that is to be one of the thousands of people that will gather at Allegan to honor this great statesman. I wish the

entire membership of the House of Representatives could be present on this occasion. I commend the people of Allegan County for making this ox roast rally an honor dinner to CLARE HOFFMAN. I believe it speaks for itself, because if he had not been such a great, outstanding citizen, this honor tomorrow possibly would not be bestowed upon him.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope, along with the rest of the Members of the House, that CLARE HOFFMAN will, before this session ends, when his name is called, vote "present," and if he does, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] has said, I believe there will be a rousing welcome for this man who has made such great contributions to the welfare of this great Nation of ours.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recall just one experience which came to mind when I first became a Member of the House and CLARE, I suppose, was in his superprime at that time. There was a distinguished Member here from Mississippi by the name of John Rankin, a Democrat from that State, who was in many respects a good deal like CLARE. He was keen minded. He was a sharp parliamentarian. He was an excellent debater. He was always well informed on the issues that were pending before the House. He was like our distinguished friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS]. He read the RECORD. He read the debates. He read the hearings. He knew the rules. So did CLARE. It was a sight to behold, at least for me—and I think it was for every Member of the House during those years—to see those two—CLARE HOFFMAN and John Rankin—skirmish with one another, whether they were on the same side of the issue or whether they were on opposite sides—you could always depend upon an interesting parliamentary discussion. You could always be sure of a keen, intelligent, interesting, and most of the time fiery discussion of the issues involved.

Mr. Speaker, I shall never forget those years. I think CLARE himself, if he reads this RECORD—and I hope he will—will recall, himself, the pleasure of the years that he spent here trying to outmaneuver his good friend, John Rankin, from Mississippi.

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

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I join wholeheartedly in this tribute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]. I will say that I share the hope of the gentleman from Michigan that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] will read the RECORD of this special order. I am glad that he may not be able to read it before tomorrow, because some of us expect to be with him on this occasion tomorrow and I am not sure as to the nature of the rebuttal that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] might make.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy and honored to share this tribute, both as a colleague from Michigan and as a neighbor, in a very special sense. The gentleman

from Michigan [Mr. FORD] mentioned that his district is bounded by the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman HOFFMAN's Fourth District on the south. My Third District is bounded by the district of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] on the south, the west, the north, and the northeast. Therefore, I consider myself to have a particular claim as a neighbor.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question in his 28 years of service as a Member of Congress that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has proved himself a rugged individualist in the best sense of the term, a courageous and skillful battler for his convictions, a devoted servant of his constituents, an adherent to fiscal prudence, and an ever-faithful supporter of the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, to be sure, his comments and even his wit have sometimes had a bit of astringent and caustic quality, but I wonder if there is any one of us on either side of the aisle who will doubt the need for this sort of therapy on the part of us all from time to time. I shall presume, along with my colleagues from Michigan and with the special resolution, to convey the greetings of the House to the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman HOFFMAN, when we see him tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, his announced retirement, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] has mentioned, evoked a great deal of newspaper and editorial comment. I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the June 24, 1962, Kalamazoo Gazette in my own district with the appropriate title applied to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]: "Political Counterweight."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The editorial referred to follows:

POLITICAL COUNTERWEIGHT

There's going to be an ox roast over at the Allegan County Fairgrounds July 21.

It's billed as a political rally, being sponsored by the Allegan County Republican Committee. And it will be a political rally because the principal speaker will be George Romney, the Republican candidate for Governor.

But we suspect there'll be some Democrats and independents there, too. Of course they'll be wanting to hear what Mr. Romney has to say about the way he'll run the executive branch of the State government if he is elected as Governor. But the Democrats and independents, as well as a great many of the Republicans, will be there for another purpose, also.

That will be to pay tribute to Representative CLARE HOFFMAN who is retiring after 28 years as Representative from the Fourth District to Congress.

Representative HOFFMAN is a Republican. Make no mistake about that. He is as Republican as they come.

But in the years that he has represented the Fourth District in Washington he has become an institution: A man who has won the respect of both political friend and political foe for not fearing to speak his mind when he thought something should be said. And it has mattered not what the subject might be nor what individual might be concerned.

One of our editorial colleagues elsewhere in Michigan summed it up well some time ago when the venerable Congressman announced that he would not run again.

"It may be argued that the times have left HOFFMAN behind, but we should dispute that. The impulsive, in and out of Congress, need the corrective influences of a CLARE HOFFMAN. We have disagreed with him many times, but always have been ready to concede that his views have supplied the counterweight needed to maintain a reasonable balance in spending and other government activities.

"At times, too, we have felt that HOFFMAN was far more conservative than the district he represented. But every 2 years a handsome majority of voters returned him to the House. Part of the support, we suspect, was in the nature of personal loyalty to a man who had the courage to row against the current."

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY].

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to be associated with anybody from Michigan, and it is a particular pleasure to be associated with my colleagues this evening to pay a tribute to our mutual friend and colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, CLARE HOFFMAN. Knowing the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] as well as I do, I think he would want me to do this, Mr. Speaker. I am going to ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] be granted the opportunity to disavow or disclaim any of these compliments that have been paid to him this afternoon. Just on the basis of my personal relationship with him I know that he is somewhat reluctant to accept without challenge any compliment, no matter whence it might come. So, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] may reply to us in any way he cares to, in the RECORD, as a Member of the House, on the day of his choosing, to this tribute being paid to him here this afternoon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make only one further observation. I can remember the first morning I came into this Chamber when the House was about to convene. I sat down beside a senior Member of the House from Kansas and just watched as the Members came onto the floor. That senior Member was Clifford Hope and he said, "Well, there's CLARE HOFFMAN." I said, "Who is CLARE HOFFMAN?" And he said, "You just wait a while and you will find out." And I did. Although I do say that my association with him was always very pleasant. I was not so unfortunate as to find out the hard way.

Mr. Speaker, the only other observation I want to make is that I think one of the most delightful opportunities I had, serving with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], was to observe the relationship that he enjoyed, mutually I am sure, with the former beloved Speaker of the House, Mr. Rayburn. It always fascinated me to watch the expression that appeared on Mr. Rayburn's face when the gentleman

from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] asked to be recognized. I thought there was always a sense of apprehension in Mr. Rayburn's countenance about something that was going to be said by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], or that he was going to make a certain point, and he was not just sure in which direction the point was going to be made. It may have been my imagination, but I thought I saw a little reflection of relief when Speaker Rayburn finally dropped the gavel and said, "The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired."

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT] yielding to me, and if any of the Members present today are going to Michigan tomorrow for the special Clare Hoffman Day, I sincerely hope they will convey my personal best wishes to him.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kansas. At this time I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN].

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in this tribute to the dean of our Michigan delegation, CLARE HOFFMAN. During my service in the Congress I have enjoyed the rare and unique privilege of serving with the gentleman from Michigan, CLARE HOFFMAN, on both the Committee on Education and Labor, and the Committee on Government Operations. For me, as a younger student of the legislative process, this has been a great experience, and needless to say, a real education.

Certainly no one would deny, and least of all those whom he often criticized in the labor movement, such as Walter Reuther, for example, that the gentleman from Michigan, CLARE HOFFMAN, has attained the stature of a giant in the field of labor-management affairs. If he were here today, I think he would probably rise to a point of personal privilege if anyone were to suggest that he is, or ever has been a progressive Republican—or, indeed, progressive in any way. But I should like to suggest, that although his tactics often seemed to be those of obstructionism and reaction, in many interesting ways he was actually progressive, in the field of labor law, for example.

Incidentally, those of his colleagues who may not be familiar with his biography, will be interested to know that CLARE was a rugged individualist as far back as 1912, when he broke away from the regular Republican Party and ran for reelection as county prosecutor on the progressive Bull Moose ticket of Teddy Roosevelt.

As early as 1937, the gentleman from Michigan, CLARE HOFFMAN, introduced important bills in the field of labor reform in the Congress. In fact, during his 28 years of service, he introduced some 135 different legislative proposals in this field. He has been consistently ahead of his colleagues in their thinking on this subject. Throughout his career he has been a trail blazer for labor-management reform legislation. In that sense, surely he has been, and is, truly progressive and constructive in the finest sense of those words.

Although he has enjoyed the privileges of high seniority, he did not attach his own name to legislation. When his proposals finally became law, he was usually working ahead on other problems.

Although there is no labor law that actually bears his name, he has made great, monumental contributions to each and every piece of major legislation in this field.

For example, his work on the Taft-Hartley Act was particularly significant. In this connection, it is interesting to read a letter written in 1948 to the gentleman from Michigan, CLARE HOFFMAN, by Fred A. Hartley, Jr., who was at that time chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor. It is as follows:

AUGUST 9, 1948.

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CLARE: As the 80th Congress nears the end, I desire to express my heartfelt appreciation for the cooperation you have given me during this Congress.

I know of no one in the Congress with greater zeal, intelligence, and the capacity for work than you. No one that I know has made a greater study of labor-management relations than you have. Your counsel and advice in our committee's deliberations has been most vital.

Because we happen to have been chairmen of these House and Senate Labor Committees, the names of Taft and Hartley have been applied to the new Labor-Management Relations Act. The name of Hoffman might easily have been applied to the law because much of your thinking on this subject is embodied in it.

I appreciate the spirit in which you have accepted the many assignments I have given you, and I am grateful for the cooperation you have given to the problems confronting the committee during this Congress.

Thanking you again, and with expressions of highest esteem, I am,
Sincerely,

FRED A. HARTLEY, JR.,
Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, the so-called Landrum-Griffin Act which was enacted in 1959 embodied much of the thinking and many of the ideas which were advocated by the gentleman from Michigan, CLARE HOFFMAN, many years earlier.

Very early in his service in the Congress he proposed that union officials be elected by a secret ballot of union members. He strongly advocated that union finances and dues be accounted for, and that union members be afforded an opportunity to find out what happens to their union funds. So, some of the most important ideas embodied in the Landrum-Griffin Act in 1959 were not new at all but were ideas that had long been advocated by the gentleman from Michigan, CLARE HOFFMAN.

I am pleased to join in this salute to a great champion of labor reform—a great and distinguished American—and to wish him a very speedy recovery.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, one of CLARE's best friends in the House, particularly in recent years, is the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS]. I know that there is a mutual admiration between them, a feeling of respect and of mutual interest in legislation before the House. In fact, for several years CLARE and the gentleman

from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] have been referred to as the "minority minority party" here. I must say that in my judgment the minority minority party has been right more often than it has been wrong.

It will be a pleasure for me, and I know it will be a pleasure for CLARE in reading this RECORD, to hear the remarks of his distinguished friend from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], to whom I now yield.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and for his kind words.

It is not particularly easy for me to speak on this subject, but I do appreciate the opportunity to join with the Michigan delegation and others in this tribute to the gentleman from Michigan, CLARE HOFFMAN.

At this time I should like to say something which, perhaps, I ought to have said long ago and that is to thank all the Members of the House who signed the huge card that was presented to CLARE earlier this year at the time he was in Washington and seriously ill. No one will know how much he appreciated the thoughtfulness of his colleagues and the sentiments that some of them appended to this huge card. My friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], said something that I would like to say, that when the gentleman from Michigan, CLARE HOFFMAN, was made, the mold was thrown away. He has no peer in Congress for ability and sheer courage. Our party, the party of HOFFMAN and GROSS, will never be the same as long as he is absent for he was the leader. I know of no man I hold in greater esteem or deeper affection.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I thank the gentleman very much.

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

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the courtesy of the gentleman from Michigan in yielding to me. I would just like to say that the tributes that have been spoken here today are certainly well deserved. I would personally like to express my admiration and appreciation to the gentleman from Michigan, CLARE HOFFMAN, for the many instances of friendliness and instruction that he gave to me as a newer Member of the House. It was my privilege to serve on a committee with him, and further on a select committee with him. There were occasions when I was in doubt and I would go to him, and he with his keen mind and his ready wit and his stout adherence to his principles would advise me. I want to say there is no one in the House of Representatives that I ever admired to a higher degree than the gentleman from Michigan, CLARE HOFFMAN. Just this afternoon as the gentleman from Iowa, H. R. GROSS, was speaking, I turned to a colleague sitting next to me and suggested to him that we certainly missed the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] and how well the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] worked together for the good of the Congress and the good of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent when I conclude that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may have his remarks inserted in the RECORD directly following mine.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say it is our hope and it is my hope that he will return to us. He has been sorely missed and he will be sorely missed.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I remember well the days when I first trod these Halls, taking those first, unsure steps as a freshman Congressman. Those steps, however, soon became much more sure through the efforts of the gentleman from Michigan, CLARE E. HOFFMAN, who extended a hand not only as a fellow colleague here in the House but on one of my committee assignments as well. I will be forever grateful for his help and advice that will benefit me throughout my service here.

Certainly I know of no man who possesses to a greater degree the rare combination of dedication, alertness, and sound principle. He is a Member who has always been willing to express himself on all matters at any time. His very example has been an inspiration to every new man who has entered this room.

The gentleman from Michigan, CLARE HOFFMAN's, dedication is exemplified by his attendance on the floor of this House. If at all possible, he was here, carefully watching the details of every matter that came before this body. We miss that dedication during these days when illness keeps him away.

We also miss his sense of humor. Certainly all of us recall fondly the spice he regularly added to business that might otherwise have been routine.

Men may disagree with the gentleman from Michigan, CLARE HOFFMAN, but all respect him. It is my fond hope that he will find his way back to these hallowed Halls before this session of Congress ends, to resume his distinguished role of statesman, friend, and national defender.

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

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, I know many Members, and the freshman class of the 87th Congress, I think, would unanimously want to thank the gentleman from Michigan, CLARE HOFFMAN, for just being CLARE HOFFMAN. I think many of us are here because of the interest aroused in us by the gentleman from Michigan, CLARE HOFFMAN, and men like him who stood as giants in the legislative field and who had the courage to express their convictions in forthright terms, reaching down into the grassroots and into the hearts and minds of young men across the country inspiring us to try at least to do what we could. So without going any further on behalf of myself and many other Members of the 87 Club, we can say sincerely—thank you, CLARE HOFFMAN, for being CLARE HOFFMAN.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I thank my colleague very much.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I wish it might have been possible for me to attend the event at Allegan, Mich., CLARE HOFFMAN's friends and neighbors have planned in tribute to this stalwart American. I know of no Member of the Congress who has been more faithful to his convictions than my colleague from Michigan.

In an age when self reliance is too often downgraded as one of the great contributions to our success as a nation, CLARE HOFFMAN has stood like a rock in support of those who still believe that the freedom of the individual is all important.

There was never any doubt in the minds of any one in this House of Representatives as to where CLARE HOFFMAN would stand when the chips were down.

Nobody ever pushed CLARE HOFFMAN. He made up his own mind as to what was right and what was wrong and that was as it should be. But his stern sense of personal discipline was tempered by a wonderful wit that all of us enjoyed, especially at times when situations might be tense.

Having known CLARE for many years, it is not hard for me to understand why the people who sent him to Congress stuck with him time after time.

His is the type of indomitable spirit that we all admire.

There could only be one CLARE HOFFMAN and I am proud that he was my friend.

I am truly sorry to see him leave our ranks and wish for him many happy years of well deserved respite, among his friends, from the burdens of office that he carried in a difficult age of our history.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to join in paying tribute to my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, the Honorable CLARE HOFFMAN, from the Fourth Congressional District.

While he and I did not often agree on many things, I must admit that he is one of those rare creatures whose outstanding feature is his individualism. And I must concur in the statement that someone once made, "they don't hardly make 'em like that any more."

As he retires at the end of this session of the 87th Congress after 28 years of service in the House of Representatives, I want to wish him full and happy days ahead, and lots of good fishing.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan, CLARE HOFFMAN, is a unique individual. By "unique" I mean unequaled and matchless. It has been my rare privilege and pleasure to have been associated with Mr. HOFFMAN throughout my service in Congress. We acquired a warm friendship, which I cherish very much.

I deeply regret that CLARE HOFFMAN is retiring from Congress. He has been one of our most competent Members, always alert and ever active in the service of his constituents and his country. A man of keen mind and intellect, he had no peer in debate and his knowledge of parliamentary procedure in the House

was often made evident. I know of no one who is a more dedicated public servant than is CLARE HOFFMAN.

CLARE HOFFMAN is a great American. Firm in his convictions he has no fear of man or devil. He stood for what he considered to be right, honest, and just. What more can be expected of any man? CLARE HOFFMAN has well served his day and generation.

I wish for CLARE HOFFMAN everything that is still best in life for him—improved health and the privilege of living out a well-rounded life with his loved ones and his friends and neighbors.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I join with pleasure in this tribute to my friend, the gentleman from Michigan, CLARE HOFFMAN. In a body of this size, there are men and women from all walks of life, many with tremendous ability and talent. Despite this great variety, the gentleman from Michigan, CLARE HOFFMAN, in many ways is a unique individual. He has made invaluable contributions over the years to the strengthening of this body. Perhaps even more important, CLARE also has injected much zest, yes, sometimes even controversy, into matters which otherwise might have been routine and humdrum. His keen mind, his sharp tongue and his wit have been coupled with a devotion to his job which have made him a truly formidable figure.

As a member of the House Education and Labor Committee for almost 10 years now, I have come to know CLARE HOFFMAN well. He is a man with convictions, and an ability to express himself which commands respect. He is, furthermore, a man of understanding and humanity. By that I do not mean he does not become impatient or frustrated, but he never lets these feelings get out of hand. We have missed him this year in committee, and regret that he has decided not to run for reelection. This body will be the poorer next year without him. I should like to join in sending him my warm good wishes.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable CLARE HOFFMAN is one of America's greats in the annals of United States of America legislative history. Every inch a man.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, there will always be a Congress, but there will never be a Member of Congress like our beloved colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, CLARE HOFFMAN. He will be greatly missed by all of us.

He and I entered Congress at the same time. We were able to win our seats against a strong political tide. On our side of the aisle we were little more than a corporal's guard in number, but we were an entire army in our courage of convictions. And CLARE was then, as he was throughout his entire career in Congress, an inspiration to all associated with him.

CLARE was an individualist but he was not a maverick. He was a born leader, not a follower. He demonstrated time and time again his capacity for leadership. In the many legislative battles he was always in the front lines.

The accomplishments of the gentleman from Michigan, CLARE HOFFMAN, are innumerable. They stand as a lasting

monument to him. His contribution to the deliberations of Congress are beyond measure.

We shall miss him not only as a man of great ability. We shall miss him as a man of sterling character. I shall miss him also as a very fine personal friend.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful indeed for this opportunity to join the Michigan delegation and other Members of the House in paying tribute to our revered colleague, CLARE HOFFMAN, who has represented Michigan's Fourth District in the House of Representatives so ably since 1935.

As the citizens of his district are gathering to honor CLARE HOFFMAN as his 28th and final year in the Congress draws to a close, I think it is well that we, who have had the opportunity of years of close association with him, join in expressing our respect and appreciation for his devoted years of service to his country. In a sense it is altogether fitting that CLARE HOFFMAN is not here with us today as we speak these words of appreciation, admiration, and above all, lamentation at the thought that he will not be returning to the 88th Congress, for his avoidance of such demonstration is well known, his distaste for personal publicity is long acknowledged as genuine. While it is not my purpose to attempt to sum up such a long and colorful career as has been his, I do hope that our warm words of praise and affection can in some way convey to him the depth of our actual sentiments that we cherish for this man.

CLARE HOFFMAN has not been a man of gaudy altruism, but a man of deeply rooted convictions, passionately held. His congressional life has been a relentless effort to live by and up to those convictions. The tenacity with which he has adhered to his beliefs and principles is legendary. The vigor and rigor with which he carried out his legislative tasks, and particularly the agility of his leadership and participation in floor debate, will be, indeed has been, sorely missed. The pages of the Record will be less lively, less interesting for his departure.

Having served in the Congress with CLARE HOFFMAN and having had the opportunity of knowing him as I have is an experience for which I shall always be grateful. I join his legions of friends that extend their warmest wishes for his retirement.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of satisfaction to join with other Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle to show my respect and appreciation to our esteemed colleague, the Honorable CLARE E. HOFFMAN, who has represented the Fourth District of Michigan so ably since the 74th Congress and during each succeeding Congress since then.

It has been my privilege to work with CLARE HOFFMAN on the House Committee on Education and Labor, and I have never known a more devoted or conscientious public servant. He has always displayed great courage and unquestioned integrity and his colleagues have never been doubtful as to where he stood on an issue when it was presented to the House for consideration. I am sorry that he finds it necessary to retire, thus

ending an illustrious career as an outstanding legislator.

It is fitting that his neighbors and friends are joining together on Saturday, July 21, to express their gratitude for the wonderful contributions he has made to his district, the State of Michigan, and our Nation. The recognition he will receive is well deserved, and I am happy to join my colleagues in showing our respect and appreciation as his 28th and final year in the Congress draws to a close.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, much of the substance as well as the style and flavor of the Congress is accounted for by the personality and character of its Members. The legislative process is not an automatic one. It is shaped and directed by people, and one of the most vivid and colorful and unforgettable of these people is our friend and colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, CLARE E. HOFFMAN.

It is especially fitting that the House should take this time to pay tribute to a man who has left a deep imprint upon this institution during his 14 terms of service. As former chairman of the Government Operations Committee, and now its ranking minority member, CLARE HOFFMAN has influenced an enormous volume of important legislation—sometimes as a proponent, often as the skillful and determined and outspoken opponent, deeply conscious of the fact that good legislation demands that a bill's weaknesses and inconsistencies be revealed and revised.

I consider myself especially fortunate, Mr. Speaker, to have served on this committee under his leadership throughout my 6 years in the House, and to have shared some of the memorable moments he brought about in committee and on the floor of the House. To me, he has been an unfailing friend and counselor—helpful, tolerant, and understanding.

In an age which some have characterized as conformist, CLARE HOFFMAN will always stand apart, firmly, and ruggedly independent. He has a mind of his own and he has put it to the service of an active conscience. And the Nation has been the beneficiary.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to join in this tribute today to our esteemed colleague from Michigan, CLARE HOFFMAN. It is a fine thing that we are paying tribute here to the gentleman's many years of devoted and conscientious service just as his friends and admirers back in Michigan will honor his service tomorrow.

The gentleman was chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments when I came to the House 16 years ago and I have worked with him on that committee and its successor, the Government Operations Committee, ever since. It is with regret, therefore, that I note his decision not to seek reelection. CLARE HOFFMAN is a man of firm convictions and his presence here will be sorely missed.

I join my colleagues in wishing the gentleman many, many years of eventful and satisfying retirement. They are richly deserved.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, any organization or group of people who

can boast that CLARE HOFFMAN is one of its members is bound to be a live one. Here is a man fearless and consistent, never a demagog, who says what he thinks and means what he says. With his unusual personality he makes friends of those who disagree with him and commands the admiration of all he comes in contact with. There is never a dull moment when he is around.

CLARE HOFFMAN has no sophisticated air, nor does he preach his philosophy. Like the able lawyer he is, he argues his case with facts and force interspersed with a brand of keen but gentle humor which charms his hearers and convinces them that he knows what he is taking about.

CLARE HOFFMAN is missed in this session of Congress, and it is a great loss to all of us that his health has prevented his attendance. So it is indeed a privilege to do him honor and together with his host of friends I wish him serenity and contentment in the knowledge that he has worked faithfully and well for the people he has represented for such a long time. There can be no doubt that although he is retiring from active duty in this great legislative body, his capacity for friendship and his devotion to our country will always be an inspiration.

May I add my personal good wishes to him and assurance that I am very proud of his friendship, and hope I may always be worthy of it.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, as a partisan of long standing, CLARE HOFFMAN probably had little sympathy with what I was doing, but as a partisan he understands why I could not be here.

We shall miss CLARE HOFFMAN. The number of times CLARE HOFFMAN and I have voted together probably could be enumerated with the fingers of one hand. In the Committee on Education and Labor if we ever cast a single identical vote—unless it had to do with impacted-area legislation—it escapes me.

Although we differed—and still do—it was comforting to see him around. You knew where he stood. He made it clear and consistent. He has not, nor does he now, talk one way and vote another.

CLARE HOFFMAN and I have one thing in common. We love to fish. Dipping a line in a clear stream provides us both with relaxation from the strains of legislation. His forays on worms on the Capitol grounds have been nationally noted. For my part, I fish in West Virginia streams. I would not think of trying to feed those fish any flatland foreign worms.

I wish CLARE many days of good fishing when he closes his office for the last time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, during the 16 years which I have served in the House, it has been my privilege to observe the many contributions made by our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]. He is an extremely valuable Member of Congress; and it was with regret that I learned that he will not be with us after this session.

Mr. HOFFMAN is a sincere and dedicated patriot. His devotion to duty, his courage, and his energy know no bounds,

and they have been an inspiration to all of us.

I will miss CLARE HOFFMAN. I will miss his engaging personality, his willingness to debate any Member of the House. But, above all, I shall miss his intense concern for the future of our Republic.

It is my hope that he will spend many happy years in retirement from the Washington political arena.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to serve in the House of Representatives with the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, CLARE HOFFMAN, for nearly 20 years. We were both members of the House Committee on Labor back in the old days when the Taft-Hartley Act was being drafted. I have had many pleasant dealings with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] and have had an opportunity to observe him and his activities throughout the years.

The gentleman from Michigan, CLARE HOFFMAN, has made a legislative record which reflects untiring energy, unquestioned courage, and a dedicated desire to serve the public interest. I can hardly think of a Member I have known since I have been here whose conduct has been quite as free of demagoguery. The gentleman from Michigan, CLARE HOFFMAN, asks for no quarter and gives none. He is in every sense a rugged individualist. He is a patriot who has never failed to speak up in behalf of what he considered best for America.

In my judgment, the gentleman from Michigan, CLARE HOFFMAN, has been a valuable balance wheel, a most useful advocate, and a public servant who has never faltered in his devotion to the cause of good government.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLATNIK). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time this afternoon to lay the groundwork for one of the amendments which I will offer to the agriculture appropriation bill when it comes before this House next Tuesday.

During the past year or more we have seen a major change come about in the Rural Electrification Administration. This change has brought concern and uneasiness from all sides. Even REA's most devoted defenders have wondered whether that program is perhaps getting out of hand. But so sacred has it become that we tend to let it get by with just about anything it does. That is not right and it is not good.

Today that agency is getting tremendous sums of money for a program we all thought was completed. It has adopted criteria for making loans which tell the Congress nothing except that the Administrator can interpret loan justifications just about any way he wants to. And, it has made some loans which give rise to the most serious doubts about the intentions and plans of that agency.

The situation I am concerned about is clearly demonstrated this year in the

budget requests for the rural electrification loan program.

When the President submitted his budget for fiscal 1963 in January, he proposed a loan authorization program of \$345 million. This was \$100 million more than Congress voted in new funds for the fiscal year 1962. We were given no indication of why this tremendous increase in REA funds was justified. We never are.

Sure, there was some generalized comment to the effect that the recommended sum includes a substantial increase in loan funds to permit financing of additional generation and transmission facilities, but this is not adequate justification. And the President's budget message also stated that the adequacy of the funds would depend on the willingness of other power suppliers to meet the requirements of the rural electrification cooperatives on a reasonable basis.

Then late last June, notwithstanding this already large request for electrification loans, the administration asked us to transfer another \$55 million to this program from the 1963 telephone program. Again, this request is merely accompanied by generalities such as that there is greatly increasing need for electric loan funds over previous estimates. There is no clue, no concrete hint as to why what was adequate in January is inadequate in June.

This situation to my mind borders on the ridiculous. Why stop at \$400 million, I say. Why do we not just take it up to \$1 billion. After all, it is only the taxpayer's money.

Let me point out again that we in the Congress do not know and cannot find out how this money is going to be used. True, we know it is going to be for rural electrification, but that is not enough. The United States, we know from every available record, has adequate supplies of power. We know that there is not a single rural electric cooperative that does not have adequate supplies of power. Why then, I ask, is there need for this tremendous increase in loan funds? Ask the administrator that question, and he virtually takes the 5th amendment. Try and get any details whatsoever out of him and it is a lost cause.

I say again that this program is changing drastically and changing right under our eyes. It is the responsibility of us here in Congress to stop and take a good hard look at what is happening. For too many years now we have been appropriating blindly for this rural electrification program in the belief that it can do no wrong. Here is how it is changing and why it is changing. And it is for these reasons that we in Congress need to know in advance how, why, and when the Administrator plans to make his loans.

In 1936, when the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was considering the original Rural Electrification Act, the first Administrator of the program, Morris L. Cooke, told that committee:

In 99 instances out of 100 they [the REA cooperatives] are going to buy current from existing plants.

When that bill was before the House for enactment in 1936, Representative Moran, of Maine, told the House:

With probably very few exceptions power will be purchased from present generating plants, increasing the revenues of the utilities.

Speaking in consideration of that bill at that time our former beloved Speaker, Sam Rayburn, who was very active, had this to say:

We are not, in this bill, intending to go out and compete with anybody. By this bill we hope to bring electrification to people who do not now have it. This bill was not written on the theory that we were going to punish somebody or parallel their lines and go into competition with them.

In that period through 1941, loans for generation and transmission purposes constituted only about 3 percent of all funds loaned. By 1950, this had risen to 18 percent. From its inception through 1961, the percentage had increased to 25 percent.

Speaking before the 20th annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association at Atlantic City on March 6, 1962, Norman M. Clapp, the present Administrator, said:

Calendar year 1961 set a new record for REA generation and transmission loans; more than 56 percent of all REA electric loans for the year was approved for G. & T. facilities.

The rural electrification program was intended to bring electricity to people on farms in rural areas that did not have central station service. Now it is becoming a program to make independent businesses of rural electric cooperatives regardless of whether they serve industry, city, or rural customers.

This tremendous rise in volume of loans for generation and transmission purposes is spectacular. But even more significant is the change in the policy of the REA concerning such loans.

Mr. Claude Wickard, for many years Administrator of REA, and before that Secretary of Agriculture, wrote in March 1951 in an article in a magazine entitled, "The Nation's Agriculture":

The Congress, by expressing endorsement of the REA policy, indicated that G. & T. loans shall be used to help the farmers of America get electric power in the most reliable manner at the lowest possible cost. For REA to deviate from this policy—either by refusing to make loans or by making those that do not meet the requirements—would obviously be contrary to the will of the people as expressed through the Congress.

It should be noted that he stressed the purpose of generation and transmission loans was to help the farmers of America to get electric power in the most reliable manner at the lowest possible cost.

At that time it was the REA policy to make generation and transmission loans in only two situations: First, where the REA borrower did not have an adequate supply of electricity available from existing sources; or second, where the price charged by existing suppliers would be greater than the cost of electricity from facilities financed by an REA loan.

On May 31, 1961, Administrator Clapp stated a new third criterion on the basis of which generation and transmission

loans could be made. This new third criterion provides that in addition to the other two criteria previously mentioned such loans can be made to protect the security and effectiveness of REA-financed systems.

In addition, Mr. Clapp has said that it is not enough to judge the desirability of generating and transmitting loans in terms of adequacy, dependability, and the low cost of the source of available power.

We must be certain—

He has said—

that cooperatives enjoy a supply of power which will guarantee the cooperative device a permanent place in the American power industry. (Speech made on April 21, 1961, before the Louisiana Electric Cooperative Association at Jennings, La.)

This, my friends, is the crux of the matter but I ask in all seriousness whether this is what we should be using Federal funds for. Is this what the Congress intended in 1936 when it passed the REA Act?

Under this new philosophy, this new policy, let's look at some of the recent loans that have been made.

The largest loan in the history of the REA was made June 15, 1961, to the Hoosier Cooperative Energy, Inc., in Indiana. This was for over \$60 million to build a 198,000-kilowatt steamplant. All the cooperative members of Hoosier are now receiving adequate supplies of power from existing sources and it has been clearly indicated that all their future needs can be met from the same sources. When it became evident that the Indiana Public Service Commission might question the need for this plant, the cooperatives switched the loan to the Indiana Statewide Cooperative Association in a clear and blatant effort to circumvent the State commission.

Last November a loan of over \$20 million was made to the Alabama Electric Cooperative to build a 660,000-kilowatt steamplant. Again, this co-op has access to all the power it needs now or will need in the future. Another large loan—nearly \$20 million—was made to the Arizona Electric Power Cooperative. This time it was for a 75,000-kilowatt steam-generating plant, which is not needed by the co-op.

Last March a loan of over \$15 million was approved for the Colorado-Ute Electric Association and an additional \$6 million was switched from the Arkansas Valley Co-op to Colorado-Ute to start construction of a 150,000-kilowatt steam-generating plant which is planned to go to 600,000 kilowatts ultimately. This loan is one of the most questionable the Administrator has made to date. This borrower had contracted to sell a large portion of the output of the plant to the Salt River district in Arizona, more than 600 miles away. The power will be wheeled to Salt River over Bureau of Reclamation transmission facilities which are part of the Colorado River storage project. The power will be delivered to the Salt River district by displacement from a power house of the Bureau.

Equally questionable is the \$36 million loan made in May to the Basin Electric

Power Cooperative in South Dakota. This will finance a 200,000-kilowatt steamplant and the output will be sold to the Bureau of Reclamation to firm up the hydropower produced in the Missouri River Basin. This loan was made in the face of an offer by 14 local electric suppliers in the area to supply the Bureau from their existing facilities with all the energy the Bureau needed to firm up the Federal hydropower.

Finally, last month, REA loaned \$18 million to the Big Rivers Rural Electric Cooperative in Kentucky to build a 66,000-kilowatt steamplant. Again, existing supplies of power were adequate.

What can we learn from these six large loans totaling over \$175 million? First, they were not needed because of any power shortage. In other words, over \$175 million of taxpayer funds was loaned out at a losing interest rate which need not have been loaned out. Second, there is nothing, absolutely nothing in the record to establish that the loaning of this money is going to make cheaper power available to the borrowers. Third, there is emerging a most dangerous and disturbing alliance between the Bureau of Reclamation and the REA which, in effect, is circumventing the will of Congress. Congress has never authorized the Federal construction of steam powerplants except in the case of TVA which is a different proposition. Now, through REA, we are getting what are to all intents and purposes Federal steam powerplants. In two of the loans I mentioned previously—Colorado-Ute and Basin Electric—the steamplants are going to be tied in with Federal hydrosystems.

This is why Congress needs to have more control over this program. We need to know what is going on—before it happens, not after. We need to get more information from the Administrator when he comes to ask us for money. We have got to realize we are dealing with a changed REA. There is a new philosophy operating in that agency today and I do not think it is a philosophy the American people care too much about. Our responsibility is to all the people but as long as we appropriate blindly for this REA program every year we are not exercising that responsibility.

When some of us here in Congress began to see which way this REA program was going we began to complain a little. And then some of our constituents began to complain. And then the papers found out about that rural electric loan for a ski jump, and with all of this the Administrator began to jump a little. So in April he made a big announcement and issued a long statement all of which was supposed to be a new policy of giving out information and throwing secrecy out the window.

After I took a good hard look at that policy statement I realized it qualified for the neatest-trick-of-the-week department because it said a lot but gave away very little.

At that time I requested that REA supply information to me on pending generation and transmission loans. But the list they gave me was incomplete. It contained no reference to an appli-

cation from the Associated Electric Cooperative of Springfield, Mo. REA loaned them \$8 million in July, less than 3 months after I received the list. Also, it did not contain any information concerning the loan application of the Big Rivers Rural Electric Cooperative of Kentucky. This co-op was given \$18 million, also in July.

I can only suppose information on these loans was not included in the list because these borrowers wanted the information on their applications held in confidence. This is a strange situation where a borrower can restrict a lending agency from telling a member of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives that the borrower has requested an \$18 million loan. This is not defensible.

This refusal of the Rural Electrification Administration to tell Congress about such loan applications means that Congress is being denied the information that it needs in order to act intelligently upon REA's request for funds.

It cannot even act intelligently on the test set forth by the President in the budget when he said:

The adequacy of the recommended funds will depend on the willingness of other power suppliers to meet the requirements of the rural electric cooperatives on a reasonable basis.

If we in Congress do not even know what loans for generation purposes the REA is contemplating, we certainly are not in a position to determine whether electric power suppliers are willing to meet the requirements of co-ops on a reasonable basis. To apply the President's test, Congress must know which major loans the REA is planning to make.

It is quite evident that the Congress is becoming increasingly aware of the change in REA policy. I remind my colleagues of the action taken by both bodies in connection with farm legislation earlier this year. There was a provision in that bill to establish a rural electrification loan account under the Electrification Act. When the House Agriculture Committee reported out the bill, they had this to say in part about the program:

It is evident that REA borrowers have done a good job; but it is equally apparent that widespread controversy has been evoked by administrative policy, particularly as relates to the secrecy surrounding loan applications and to industrial loans.

Testimony revealed a growing public concern over the failure of the REA to disclose information on various phases of its operation. The public is entitled to know how public funds are being used, and the REA should approach the consideration of loans for generating facilities in a manner designed to provide as full public information as possible. The ultimate consumer is entitled to the most advantageous source of power, determined by bringing together all pertinent facts in an objective manner. Public hearings appear to be a reasonable means of accomplishing that end. Certainly, interested parties should be notified and their views obtained before such loans are approved. Secrecy tends to kindle doubt, whereas public knowledge of the reasons for and justification of loans would go far toward dispelling criticism which threatens to bring the program into disrepute.

The committee heard testimony that loans under section 5 of the act, which was intended to help farm and other rural people to utilize the electricity that the REA program was bringing to them, are now used to finance industry. The committee feels that REA's present interpretation of section 5 of the 1936 act is inconsistent with the original intent of Congress.

It is the opinion of the committee that loans for generation and transmission facilities should be made only when it is shown conclusively that: (1) energy is not available on reasonable terms from any existing source, (2) the proposed generating plant can produce energy at a lower cost than it could be obtained from any other source, and (3) the output of such plant will be used mainly for supplying energy for use in rural areas. Decisions on all generation loan applications should take into account fully the willingness of other power suppliers to meet the requirements of the rural electric cooperatives on a reasonable basis.

Congress, of course, is charged with the responsibility of assuring that public funds are handled in accordance with the original intent of the Rural Electrification Act. Since it appears that the rural electrification program will be requiring continuing large amounts of Federal funds, it will be necessary to devote careful consideration to the need for such funds.

The other body had even more to say about the REA program. Again, I would like to quote pertinent sections from the report of the Senate Committee on Agriculture.

It is evident that REA borrowers have done a tremendous job in providing power to rural areas in furtherance of the purposes outlined in the act.

However, this has not occurred in the absence of controversy between private power and the REA system, particularly regarding loans by REA for the construction of generating and transmitting facilities in direct competition with private power.

The committee is of the opinion that these controversies could be minimized if not eliminated entirely. Clearly the REA system, under the act, has the authority and the responsibility to provide power to its users at fair and reasonable rates. On the other hand, the committee feels a responsibility that the operation and expansion of private power utilities not be impaired by arbitrary and adverse government action. * * *

The act was intended not only as a direct means of bringing service to rural residents, but also as a lever to encourage the investor-owner utilities to serve all prospective customers within their service areas. REA financing may not be used to extend service to any person who already has service from an investor-owned company. To the extent that investor-owned companies provide service to all who desire it within their area, the need for Government loans is reduced. And to the extent that investor-owned companies make power available to REA borrowers at fair and reasonable rates, and on terms which permit them to serve all eligible customers within their service areas, the need and justification for loans for generating facilities disappears. * * *

Government loans should not be made unnecessarily. They should not be made to give cooperatives an unfair competitive advantage over investor-owned companies. REA borrowers should restrict themselves to the areas they were intended to serve, and should seek to use available investor-owned power to the maximum extent possible, rather than to supplant it unnecessarily. On the other hand, investor-owned companies should seek to furnish REA borrowers with power on a completely fair and equitable basis without delay or harassment or conditions which will force the cooperative to turn

to the REA for loans for generating facilities needed not because of a lack of facilities, but because of a lack of fairness on one side or the other of the bargaining table.

The REA for its part has a responsibility to see that Government funds are not loaned unnecessarily. In making a loan for generating facilities, it should investigate very carefully the need therefor. Public hearings may not be the way to do this, but interested parties should be notified and their views obtained in a reasonable period of time. The Rural Electrification Administration should approach the consideration of such loans in a manner designed to provide as full public information as possible. Open and aboveboard consideration of loans, bringing together all pertinent facts in an objective manner, would preclude the possibility of charges that such loans were unjustified. Secrecy, on the other hand, might well tend to induce doubt that responsible action was taken. Public knowledge of the reasons for and the justification of loans might well go far in mitigating unjust criticism.

I think the concern of Congress is very evident in the report language just mentioned. But let me assure my colleagues that the concern does not end with us. It is pretty widespread throughout the country. I have numerous newspaper editorials to establish this point. For example, here is a quotation from the Indianapolis Star, October 13, 1961, in connection with the Hoosier loan.

Might not a generating plant in southern Indiana be the opening wedge for a giant Government authority covering both the Tennessee and the Ohio River valleys?

The point is that the Federal Government wants to set up a power business in Indiana complete with its own generating plants and distribution system.

On November 6, 1961, the Chicago Sun-Times in my home State had the following to say.

What has happened to the REA? * * * The agency has moved into activities far removed from those envisioned when it was created.

Another paper in my State, the Granite City Press-Record, in October 1961, editorialized as follows:

Not content with fulfilling its original purpose, REA in some areas now seeks to expand its role, to crawl to new heights of subsidized expansion over the bodies of the taxpayers.

Over in Missouri the St. Louis Globe-Democrat in November made this comment in an editorial:

Obviously, the co-ops have overstepped the bounds set for them in the REA Act. Namely, to provide electric energy to persons in rural areas who are not receiving it from private utilities.

In South Dakota, the Valley Irrigator of Newell, also in November 1961, had this to say:

The questions that now arise, with respect to reappraisal of REA are (1) whether the program is going beyond its purpose of making power and telephone services available to all farms and ranches, (2) whether the REA cooperatives are no longer to be operated on a nonprofit basis, and (3) whether the farm and ranch priority for electric power as expressed in original sign-up of members is to be subordinated to other uses.

These are just a few comments taken at random. But they are indicative of

the growing concern over this program. It seems clear to me we have two choices. First, we can continue as we have in the past making blind appropriations, giving the REA the increasing amounts of money it asks for each year—and I am predicting now that it would not be long before they are over the billion-dollar-a-year figure in their loan requests—or, two, we can take such action as will return to the Congress, the necessary control to keep this program in line.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply close by informing the Members of the House that this morning, when our Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations reported to the full committee, I offered an amendment containing some strengthening language, which was narrowly defeated, by three votes. But I should like at this point to have included in my remarks the text of that amendment, which reads as follows:

The committee desires to make the necessary funds available to REA for pursuing its program with the utmost expediency. The agency justifications, submitted to the committee by the Department do not contain the necessary detail to make informed decisions. The committee, therefore instructs the Department in presenting REA's program for its fiscal year 1964 to itemize and justify in detail all projects over \$5 million for which funds are to be loaned.

Mr. Speaker, I think that was good amending language to the bill, because in my judgment we in the Congress ought to know more about what is involved in all of these loans of \$5 million. There are not really too many. As a matter of fact, I asked the specific question in the hearings as to what the 10 largest loan requests were. The answer came back, ranging from some \$5 million to \$34 million. Probably all we would have to have before our committee then would be detailed information on 7 to 10 applications a year that are in that magnitude. But I think it would be certainly well for us to have that information. Finally, again, Mr. Speaker, as I said, I offered another amendment. This is a limiting amendment which would limit the \$400 million appropriation for rural electrification to no more than \$100 million for the purposes of generation and transmission lines. This amendment was likewise defeated by a narrow vote in the committee. But I intend to offer it when the bill is considered by the House on next Tuesday. I would hope that the Members of the House would support me as I give the arguments in support of that amendment at that time.

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

Mr. MICHEL. I would be glad to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER].

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to compliment my colleague from Illinois and would like to be associated with his

remarks and his efforts in this important matter.

It seems to me that scrutiny of the activities and appropriation of the REA is long overdue. This is probably because the REA has assumed the role of a sacred cow in the eyes of many Members of this body, particularly from the rural areas. Yet going back to the original act of 1936 which created the REA and reviewing its action over the years, one can hardly recognize it for its original purpose. I hasten to say at this time, should there be any doubts regarding these opening statements, that I wholeheartedly endorse the original purpose of this program and lauded its achievements in accomplishing this purpose, but it seems to me that many of its functions go far beyond its purposeful intent—to a point where it stands to alienate many of its friends on both sides of the aisle who have supported REA appropriations for many years.

Mr. Speaker, in reading through the Department of Agriculture appropriations hearings for fiscal 1963 before the House subcommittee, I found bits of testimony regarding REA which were most disturbing. I request permission to have reprinted at this point the line of questioning conducted by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] beginning on page 2040 of part 4 of the hearings:

Mr. MICHEL. Are there provisions that would preclude one from doing a sizable business with the co-op while serving on the board of directors of that cooperative?

Mr. DELL. Some of them do.

Mr. MICHEL. Has there been any general policy by REA on that?

Mr. DELL. As far as REA is concerned, our policy has been that directors and officers of a co-op should not be doing business with the co-op. I believe that is correct, is it not, Mr. Koebel?

Mr. KOEBEL. I believe that is right. There may also be State laws bearing on the subject.

Mr. DELL. Let me add one thing which has been called to my attention here. If they come to us for advice on making up their bylaws, we have a standard provision which prevents that.

Mr. MICHEL. If a situation existed where a member of the board or the president of the co-op is doing better than, say \$60,000 a year business with the co-op; with that cooperative operating under your set of bylaws, is there any machinery that you have at all to bring any kind of pressure to bear upon this co-op to change this hypothetical situation?

Mr. DELL. I do not know that we would go in. I do not know whether we could or not. It may be Mr. Koebel or Mr. Gorrin should answer this question from the legal standpoint. Administratively, I do not know that we would do it. When charges are made—I suspect I know now the system you are talking about—if it is the one I think you are talking about, we have had an investigation down there. We sent our own Department of Agriculture investigators in there. We have gone into it thoroughly. We have not been able to find anything criminally wrong.

Mr. MICHEL. I am not suggesting that there is, but I am suggesting that administratively there should be some tightening within the REA to prevent a situation such as this from developing.

Mr. DELL. I am not sure you and I are talking about the same situation.

Mr. MICHEL. It may not be. There is really no need to cite a specific case here. Evi-

dently these figures start falling in line as far as you folks are concerned.

Mr. KOEBEL. I think I could make this comment, Mr. Michel: We did have the situation of a cooperative where apparently a member of the board of directors was an officer of a company doing business with the cooperative. We could not find that there had been any collusion or chicanery. Apparently even the officer was at some time unaware of this business. It apparently was a routinized operation and the company of which he was an officer was a large supplier in the area. So it was a logical organization with which to do business.

However, after consultation with the board of directors, we were given assurances that the cooperative would see that this connection was dissolved. We would certainly have authority under the loan contract to bring such irregularities to the attention of the board, or perhaps what type of practice they have, good or bad, for the board's correction. Normally, we get good cooperation from the boards.

Mr. DELL. If this is the same case, we had our people meet with the board.

Mr. KOEBEL. Yes. This was all done in complete agreement.

Mr. MICHEL. When an REA co-op has some maintenance work to be performed, it is not unique at all for them to farm out that maintenance work to a contractor, is it?

Mr. KOEBEL. Sometimes it is done.

Mr. MICHEL. Is it a generally accepted practice?

Mr. DELL. No. I would say it is not a generally accepted practice to farm it out to contractors. Usually the cooperative has its own maintenance crew.

Mr. MICHEL. Is there a case where an REA co-op ever farmed out this kind of work, without a contract, at cost-plus, and the "plus" was something like 40 percent?

Mr. DELL. If I may interrupt you there, that statement has been made on several occasions. We did not find the plus to be 40 percent.

Mr. MICHEL. What did you find it to be?

Mr. DELL. Considerably less than that. In the one I am talking about—and I am sure now it is the same one—that system has had costwise one of the best operating conditions of any system in that area, and has been commended in a letter from its power supplier on its good operating condition. I am willing to go into that system to any extent that you want to. It is the cooperative at Jefferson City, Tenn., that I am talking about, and I think it is the same one you are talking about.

Mr. MICHEL. Thank you for that information, Mr. Dell. I guess that is about all, Mr. Chairman.

This interrogation and replies seems to me, substantiate the reason for the following statement which appeared in House Report 1691, and I quote:

Testimony revealed a growing public concern over the failure of the REA to disclose information on various phases of its operation. The public is entitled to know how public funds are being used.

The gentleman from North Carolina, Chairman COOLEY, and the Agriculture Committee are to be congratulated for this forthright statement. The time has come for an open hearing, for, as President Kennedy once stated:

In America, the people, if they are armed with the truth, can be trusted to make the right decision.

In the case of the REA, their commercial activities are supported by the tax payments of the very, private, investor-owned enterprises with which they compete. Mr. Speaker, if there

are those in REA who think that the American people would approve the nationalization of electric power, let them in all candor submit that issue to a clear-cut choice by voters.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to thank the gentleman from Illinois for his contribution.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SLACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, as a supplement to the comments being made regarding the rural electrification program which is in prospect for fiscal year 1963, I would like to bring some special emphasis to a few points which have troubled me considerably, and which were explored in some detail during the hearings before the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee.

Let it be understood, first of all, that I am not opposed to the REA program in principle or in application where it clearly conforms to the original intent of Congress. In fulfilling its assigned task of distributing electric power to residents of rural areas who cannot obtain power from commercial sources, the REA has clearly met a well-defined need and has played an important role in the economic upgrading of many rural areas.

Occasionally, however, the very success of an enterprise leads to complications not previously foreseen. In the business world we find many examples of firms which have reached an economic peak in certain narrow ranges of manufacture, and have earned large surpluses; they have determined that the most profitable course lay in diversification of their interests by investing in other, completely different, kinds of businesses.

This discussion today arises out of an apparent tendency for REA to diversify and to thereby begin a journey down a road not previously mapped out by the Congress. The REA estimates that for fiscal 1963, there will be 301 applications for a total of \$200 million in loans for funds to be used for distribution facilities.

During that same year, the REA estimates there will be 50 applications for a total of \$508 million for funds to be used for generation and transmission facilities.

Out of these loan requests, only two will be requests for new borrowers interested in distribution—less than 1 percent of the total. Yet, out of the 50 anticipated generation and transmission loan requests, 10 will be new borrowers, or 20 percent of the total. These figures demonstrate quite clearly that the emphasis of the REA program is changing drastically.

It has been established that REA, from its inception up to January 31, 1962, has approved loans totaling over \$1,180 million for generation and transmission purposes. Present trends indicate that cooperative power loads are doubling about every seven years.

While we cannot completely anticipate the future, there appears to be every possibility that REA will require for generation and transmission loans some \$3 billion within the next 10 years.

The most disturbing feature of this development is contained in the newly established criterion for REA generation and transmission loans. This criterion states that REA will approve loans for generation and transmission where such REA-financed facilities are necessary to protect the security and effectiveness of REA-financed distribution systems.

When REA adopts this approach, it is treading on dangerous ground. This is the philosophy of every monopolist in the history of American industry, and these very tactics—a planned program to control more than one level of an industry in a particular area of operations—have brought congressional criticism and prosecution to the oil, aluminum, railroad, and private power industries in years past.

And REA is given two gilt-edge privileges not open to private power companies—the right to use 2-percent Federal money, and immunity from taxation.

The request to transfer \$55 million in telephone funds to increase loan capacity for generation and transmission systems is another indication of the same tendency. Private power companies must carry on many activities which are not of themselves profitable, and must often sequester funds for anticipated developments which have not yet materialized. But REA, since the demand for telephone funds is below expectations, does not choose to explore what might be done to make telephone distribution more attractive. Instead, REA asks for the right to transfer the telephone funds into a loan program which represents diversification.

If this process continues for 10 or 15 years, and generation and transmission commitments will outstrip both transmission and telephone interests. Under those conditions, there would simply be no incentive for REA to adhere to its original mission and explore means and methods of seeking the best possible arrangements to render the best possible transmission service.

It would be easier to simply diversify, enter heavily into another level of the industry, and soon monopolize, since no competitor could match its tax-free status and 2-percent fund source.

Since the issue has been raised by REA through the medium of this request, it seems that this is the time for us to make a decision as to just what mission the Congress has assigned to this agency. If we are to approve a program which will result in a basic change in the scope and character of REA, then let us do so with our eyes open, and understand clearly that we are so doing, with full realization of the consequences. Those of us, including myself, who support the original mission of REA, and who feel that it has performed well in that assignment, should give very serious thought to the question of whether or not we want that mission to be fundamentally altered.

That is the real question before us today, and our decision will have far-reaching consequences for the electric power industry of the entire country during the years ahead.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to the comments of the gentleman from Illinois with interest. From everything he has said I can see that there would be advantages in treating REA loans in the same manner we now treat the funds sought by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers.

I have been puzzled by the comments that I have seen from time to time in the present hearings that the Administrator cannot provide in advance, information about loans he might be planning to make for large generating plants. The reason I am puzzled is that it has always been my understanding that a powerplant takes considerable advance planning. I have the impression that any utility, whether it is a cooperative or investor owned, will know at least 3 to 5 years in advance of construction whether or not it is going to need additional capacity. I have been informed that the science or the art of forecasting power needs is perhaps more accurate today than any other type of forecasting.

On top of this, it takes at least a year and a half to two and a half years to build a plant and obviously under those circumstances you have to plan in advance so that the project comes on the line when you need it.

This being the case, I fail to understand why the Administrator cannot tell the Congress a year in advance what generating plants will be needed for which he may be making loan applications.

Also, in this connection I find myself greatly puzzled by REA's unwillingness to disclose plans for financing generating plants. The argument is made that the release of such information would impair the legitimate interests of the person requesting the loan. And I ask what possible legitimate interests can be impaired in a powerplant. This is not the same as the grocery business, or the dry cleaning business, or the corner drugstore, where advance information might enable a competitor to jump in and grab the site. A cooperative, just as a municipality or an investor owned electric utility, is tied to its territory and nobody is going to come in and build a competing powerplant. It just is not practical. So this argument of impairing legitimate interests does not impress me very much.

If REA is afraid that by disclosing its plans to finance a powerplant it will invite some counteraction by an existing power supplier, let us for a moment be realistic and analyze what the possible end result of such action can be. The power supplier would probably do one of

two things, lower its rates to the cooperative or if power were unavailable build a powerplant itself. The cooperative and its members certainly will not lose under the first possibility and under the second possibility we could avoid an unnecessary expenditure of Federal funds. And I remind my colleagues that the REA Act wanted it this way. Up until the present Administrator changed the criteria for G. & T. loans it was distinctly and clearly the intention that cooperatives should only build their own generating plants when existing supplies of power were not adequate or available at reasonable prices.

There is one important aspect that none of us should lose sight of and that is that the utility business whether it be cooperatively owned, publicly owned, or investor owned is in effect a public business and there can be no excuse for any concealment of any of the operations of this agency that relates to providing people with an essential service. The power companies have to operate in a goldfish bowl under both State and Federal regulations. Their construction plans, their financing, their bookkeeping are all a matter of open record. There is no reason why this should not also be possible for rural electric co-ops. They have nothing to hide. So why all this unnecessary secrecy from REA.

FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a proposal to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to broaden the construction of the word educational, which is otherwise undelineated in the statute. Under the present title donations of property can be made to "States, territories, and other possessions for educational, public health, or civil defense purposes."

As it is, many programs are presently denied land because of this interpretation that are in a broader sense educational. This seems especially pertinent in those areas of education that are concerned with handicapped children. In these areas there are programs that greatly augment the experience and knowledge of handicapped children that cannot be classified as educational in the strictest sense of that word. There are areas of experience that are taken for granted by the unhandicapped that are a rare treat and delight for the less fortunate. Such programs do not fall into the classroom instruction area. Experiences such as hearing, feeling, seeing, and participating in an outdoor or rural atmosphere can go a long way toward filling in the educational experiences of people who cannot enjoy the benefits of normal sight, hearing, or

mental faculties. For the Congress to fail to keep pace with the educational changes in this area would be a grave oversight.

The amendment purports to broaden the interpretation of the word educational to include programs designed to provide physically and mentally handicapped persons an opportunity to experience and develop an ability to participate in outdoor and rural activities.

INTEROCEANIC CANALS COMMISSION

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, over the past few years I have watched with considerable concern the evolving situation at Panama, with special reference to the needs for a steadily increasing volume of interoceanic commerce.

It is pertinent here to remark that the historic policies under which the Panama Canal was constructed and has since been maintained and operated were evolved by such eminent statesmen as Theodore Roosevelt, John Hay, John Bassett Moore, Elihu Root, and Charles Evans Hughes.

Since 1957, it has indeed been refreshing to hear and study many scholarly addresses on interoceanic canal problems by my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood], whose notable contributions on this subject are unique in the history of the United States.

The Isthmian question is not a mere routine matter to be handled by harassed routine administrators, but a challenge to the Congress that transcends all questions of party or professional considerations. The Congress should have the benefit of information that can be supplied only by an independent body composed of the best qualified men available. Toward this end, I wish to associate myself with my distinguished colleague [Mr. Flood] in urging the creation under congressional authorization of the Interoceanic Canals Commission to delve into the entire canal question.

I have introduced a bill to create such a Commission and include it at this point in my remarks:

H. R. 6296

A bill to create the Interoceanic Canals Commission, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Interoceanic Canals Commission Act of 1961".

SEC. 2. (a) A commission is hereby created, to be known as the "Interoceanic Canals Commission" (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), and to be composed of eleven members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as follows: One member shall be a commissioned officer of the line (active or retired) of the United States Army; one member shall be a commissioned officer of

the line (active or retired) of the United States Navy; one member shall be a commissioned officer of the line (active or retired) of the United States Air Force; and eight members from civil life, four of whom shall be persons learned and skilled in the science of engineering. The President shall designate one of the members from civil life as Chairman, and shall fill all vacancies on the Commission in the same manner as are made the original appointments. The Commission shall cease to exist upon the completion of its work hereunder.

(b) The Chairman of the Commission shall receive compensation at the rate of \$20,000 per annum, and the other members shall receive compensation at the rate of \$18,000 per annum, each; but the members appointed from the Army, Navy, and Air Force shall receive only such compensation, in addition to their pay and allowances, as will make their total compensation from the United States \$18,000 each.

SEC. 3. The Commission is authorized and directed to make and conduct a comprehensive investigation and study of all problems involved or arising in connection with plans or proposals for—

(a) an increase in the capacity and operational efficiency of the present Panama Canal through the adaptation of the Third Locks Project (53 Stat. 1409) to provide a summit-level terminal lake anchorage in the Pacific end of the canal to correspond with that in the Atlantic end, or by other modification or design of the existing facilities;

(b) the construction of a new Panama Canal of sea-level design, or any modification thereof;

(c) the construction and ownership, by the United States, of another canal or canals connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans;

(d) the operation, maintenance, and protection of the Panama Canal, and of any other canal or canals which may be recommended by the Commission;

(e) treaty and territorial rights which may be deemed essential hereunder; and

(f) estimates of the respective costs of the undertakings herein enumerated.

SEC. 4. For the purpose of conducting all inquiries and investigations deemed necessary by the Commission in carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Commission is authorized to utilize any official reports, documents, data, and papers in the possession of the United States Government and its officials; and the Commission is given power to designate and authorize any member, or other officer, of the Commission, to administer oaths and affirmations, subpoena witnesses, take evidence, procure information and data, and require the production of any books, papers, or other documents and records which the Commission may deem relevant or material for the purposes herein named. Such attendance of witnesses, and the production of documentary evidence, may be required from any place in the United States, or any territory, or any other area under the control or jurisdiction of the United States, including the Canal Zone.

SEC. 5. The Commission shall submit to the President and the Congress, not later than two years after the date of the enactment hereof, a final report containing the results and conclusions of its investigations and studies hereunder, with recommendations; and may, in its discretion, submit interim reports to the President and the Congress concerning the progress of its work. Such final report shall contain—

(a) the recommendations of the Commission with respect to the Panama Canal, and to any new interoceanic canal or canals which the Commission may consider feasible or desirable for the United States to construct, own, maintain, and operate;

(b) the estimates of the Commission as regards the approximate cost of carrying out

its recommendations; and like estimates of cost as to the respective proposals and plans considered by the Commission and embraced in its final report; and

(c) such information as the Commission may have been able to obtain with respect to the necessity for the acquisition, by the United States, of new, or additional, rights, privileges, and concessions, by means of treaties or agreements with foreign nations, before there may be made the execution of any plans or projects recommended by the Commission.

SEC. 6. The Commission shall appoint a secretary, who shall receive compensation fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and shall serve at the pleasure of the Commission.

SEC. 7. The Commission is hereby authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of such engineers, surveyors, experts or advisers deemed by the Commission necessary hereunder, as limited by the provisions in title 5, United States Code, section 55a (1946 edition); and may make such expenditures—including those for actual travel and subsistence of members of the Commission and its employees—not exceeding \$13 for subsistence expense for any one person for any calendar day; for rent of quarters at the seat of government, or elsewhere; for personal services at the seat of government, or elsewhere; and for printing and binding necessary for the efficient and adequate functions of the Commission hereunder. All expenses of the Commission shall be allowed and paid upon the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Chairman of the Commission, or such other official of the Commission as the Commission may designate.

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions and purposes of this Act.

THE STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Keith] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, last week I had the privilege to include in the Record a number of articles on the State Department by political writer Everett S. Allen. All but the first of these eight articles were reprinted in the body of House proceedings. Now, to make the entire series a matter of permanent record, I have requested unanimous permission to extend my remarks at this point to include that first article, which was originally reprinted in the Appendix of the daily Record.

The article by Everett S. Allen follows:

WASHINGTON, June 25.—By accident or design, this is where the cold war is being lost. No matter how fastidiously the State Department may censor speeches containing nasty truths about the Russians, the untidy fact remains that in the last 43 years—during both Republican and Democratic administrations—Soviet-led Communists have taken control of one-third of the world's population.

Officially, one does not talk about this.

Last February 11, Gen. George H. Decker addressed the 111th Infantry of the Pennsylvania National Guard. He was talking to men who may be called upon to fight and die for this Nation's security.

General Decker wanted to say: "Aggression and subversion in Africa, Asia, and Latin America are timely examples of the means used to pursue their (i.e., Communist) aims of world domination."

The State Department forced General Decker to say instead: "Intervention and subversion in Africa, Asia, and Latin America are timely examples of the means used by others to pursue their aim of world domination."

Thus, even our fighting men are not permitted to know the enemy's name, presumably lest the latter be affronted.

In "explaining" to Congress this and other State Department censorship, Under Secretary George Ball referred eloquently but not informatively to "conditioning factors" and "the kaleidoscopic pattern" of foreign affairs. There were those who came away feeling the State Department, in general, believes Congress and the general public are too dumb to understand policy.

This is not a new attitude.

In any event, it is impressive, in a chilling sort of way, that the Communist conference in December 1960 included representatives from 81 countries. It also is a fact that although Presidents of both parties have given periodic pep talks, the United States world position is each year less enviable.

This is not so much a reflection upon our fighting strength because we do not allow ourselves to fight much. It is instead the direct result of a foreign policy so inadequate or unrealistic, or anti-American in concept, as to permit the steady crumbling of the free world's frontiers.

Thus, in the present moment of history, both Republicans and Democrats question whether the State Department, charged with the shaping of this policy, is performing its job properly. It is neither pertinent nor reasonable for Secretary of State Rusk, in an uncharacteristic burst of petulance, to snarl at his critics: "If you think we're losing, what would you do?" It is his job, not theirs, and if we are not, in fact, off the track somewhere, how does one account for the following:

In the summer of 1961, Secretary of State Rusk wrote to Chairman HOWARD W. SMITH of the House Rules Committee, opposing creation of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations "at this time." Rusk expressed concern that Moscow would not like it, and said governmental and private sources long have been studying this subject anyway.

Have they?

Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of economics at Georgetown University, has publicly challenged Rusk to produce any comprehensive study dealing, for example, with Soviet Russian economic colonialism within the Soviet Union.

NO ANSWER YET

This was last December, and Dobriansky hasn't had an answer yet.

Rusk's letter to SMITH said the U.S. Government's position is "weakened by any action which confuses the rights of formerly independent peoples or nations with the status of areas, such as the Ukraine, Armenia, or Georgia, which are traditional parts of the Soviet Union. Reference to these latter areas places the U.S. Government in the undesirable position of seeming to advocate the dismemberment of a historical state."

This is a classic of how to lose the cold war.

Each of the countries mentioned was independent in the post-World War I period, was recognized by Soviet Russia and other countries at that time as being independent, and has fought valiantly to this day to regain its independence.

The Soviet Union has scarcely been in existence 45 years, but Rusk, presumably reflecting the State Department's policy, deems this "traditional enough to seal the fate of the first victims of Soviet imperialism.

FOR TWO-CHINA POLICY

This attitude, Dr. Dobriansky commented with considerable restraint, "suggests a poor state of knowledge, interpretation, and vision which is appalling at this perilous juncture of our history."

Or consider China.

A brandnew 286-page State Department document entitled, of all things, "Basic National Security Policy," recommends that:

The United States adopt a "two China" policy under which the Chinese Communist government would be admitted to the United Nations.

Peiping be given a seat in the U.N. General Assembly, while the Chinese Nationalist Government on Formosa retains its seat on the U.N. Security Council.

New diplomatic pressures be brought on the Chinese Nationalists to take their troops off the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu.

This master plan was prepared by Dr. Walt W. Rostow, counselor and Chairman of the Policy Planning Council of the State Department; it now is being reviewed by the National Security Council. It represents a complete reversal of present U.S. policy, certainly would be strongly opposed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff (who actually are responsible for our national security) and probably would mark the end of amicable United States-Nationalist China relations.

This plan is hailed as something new, but it's not new for Rostow. As early as 1955, in his book "An American Policy in Asia," he advocated virtually the same thing, declaring, "The entrance of Peiping into the U.N. is a limited political movement, the importance of which can be easily overestimated * * * the United States should sharply reduce its exhortation and pressures for anti-Communist action in southeast Asia."

U.S. support for Peiping in the U.N. certainly would reduce such action in southeast Asia; it probably would discourage anti-Communist Asians that they would discard their guns and throw in with Mao Tse-tung.

Some already are doing it, and we are helping them along the Red route; consider Cambodia, where the U.S.-financed commodities were used in connection with the construction and operation of the Russian-sponsored hospital in Phnom Penh, the capital.

SOVIETS USE U.S. AID

Jerry Jackis, a former ICA "end-use investigator," in June 1958 reported to his superior in the U.S. foreign aid mission in Cambodia that he had observed a tractor and bags of cement, both with ICA markings, being used on the Russian project. This hospital, it is worth remembering, was a major Russian propaganda showcase, designed to seduce Cambodia into communism.

Jackis also reported he observed other materials being used, such as reinforcing steel and barrels of asphalt, which probably were ICA financed. According to Jackis, he made this report with the expectation that the matter would be promptly investigated.

Instead, his superior, Marlin F. Haas, former controller of the Cambodia mission, reprimanded him and within hours thereafter Jackis found himself relegated to a job in a mission storage warehouse with the duties of a caretaker or janitor. Although Haas has testified to the contrary, the files of his agency show that he instituted this transfer and shortly thereafter approved an unsatisfactory efficiency rating for Jackis, the only such Jackis ever received either before or since.

The documents in Jackis' personnel file indicate that this unsatisfactory rating either caused or stimulated a series of actions which apparently led to his dismissal from the agency on January 15, 1962. It might be added parenthetically that Haas since has been promoted.

UNITED STATES GOT NO THANKS

ICA, now called AID (Agency for International Development), is basically a State Department responsibility.

The latest development is this: I sat in on a recent hearing in Washington at which it was revealed that when the Russian hospital in Phnom Penh wouldn't work, because of the inadequacy of Soviet electrical equipment, U.S.-manufactured items—a transformer and cable—were provided, so that it now operates. By way of thanks, the Ministry of Information of Cambodia (this country is leaning to the left a little more each day) publicly denied that any U.S. help was involved in creating the hospital.

In my presence, State Department officials concerned with AID in Cambodia also conceded, with great reluctance, that it was "possible" that American-manufactured vehicles made available to Cambodia could, for all they knew, be in use by Chinese Communists in transporting troops to South Vietnam to fight Vietnamese—and Americans.

Relate this sort of thing to one more item, an address before the New School for Social Research in New York City by Assistant Secretary of State Harlan Cleveland. Cleveland attacked the "illusion that foreign policy issues are comfortably two sided, that we're either up or we're down and that something called victory can be something called total." Having reiterated therefore his well-worn theme that no one is going to win and no one is going to lose this cold war—having implied, in essence, that we should forget the idea of victory—he declared, "We see new leaders of communism facing with realism the fact that their old dream of a Communist one world is an obsolete and perilous delusion."

THEORY IS SURPRISE

This theory is bound to surprise a lot of people, not excluding Mao Tse-tung and Khrushchev. It prompted Senator MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, to comment, "Unless Mr. Cleveland is in the confidence of the Red leaders, I do not know how he could have made this statement."

"Everything that the Communist leaders have said and done for 45 long years make clear their persistent drive to complete world revolution.

"If Mr. Cleveland's is the sort of thinking that is going on in high places in the Government, it is no wonder this year we are defending Thailand instead of holding Laos, and trying to meet Communist threats in Latin America emanating from Cuba, instead of eliminating communism inside Cuba."

The big question behind all of this State Department policy, which seems determined to alienate our friends, help our enemies, and reduce our own position, is: Why? Who creates U.S. foreign policy?

A former Assistant Secretary of State said to me bluntly, "When you experience failure after failure like this, it has to be the result of inefficiency or design."

This series of articles will endeavor to show the several major forces that influence this policy and the weaknesses within the structure of the State Department which foster it.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as we conclude Captive Nations Week, 1962,

with larger, more effective nationwide observances than in any previous year, I deem it helpful to have the RECORD show the tremendous interest with which this issue has been received by the American public.

As a sample of this nationwide grassroots interest, I submit for the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Cameron County Press-Emporium Independent, of Emporium, Pa., on July 12, entitled "Prayer Can Win Cold War." This is an effective commentary reflecting good, sound American commonsense:

PRAYER CAN WIN COLD WAR

Since our Nation was "founded under God" it is essential that the first thing we should do when in trouble is to take our problem to God. Surely we have not forgotten that during times when our Nation was in most trouble and victory seemed impossible our leaders went to God in prayer and we won. If you doubt this, reread the stories of Franklin and delegates at the Constitutional Convention, Washington at Valley Forge, and Lincoln during the Civil War. The story is told, too, that during World War II, at the time of the evacuation of Dunkirk, the British people, knowing that they needed more strength and courage than they alone had, prayed unceasingly that God make the mission successful against all odds. After the war was over German officers reported that during the time of Dunkirk they felt that some strange, unexplainable power beyond their control was interfering with their well made plans.

Operation Freedom Builders have organized prayer groups and ask all of you who will to join them or organize your own groups. Each group has selected a definite time when each person, in her or his own home or place of business, will pray to God the prayer which we will print in this paper for you. Most groups have their prayer time at 9:15 a.m. just after the religious radio time.

What must the prayer be is the question. It is not enough to just pray for peace. There can be no peace as long as 900 million people are in slavery. Operation Freedom Builders believe the prayer should help in depriving the slave masters of their power and give hope and courage to the people in slavery. Dr. Dobriansky, professor at Georgetown University and chairman of National Captive Nations Week, tells us that the resolution passed by Congress 3 years ago to aid the captive nations hurt Khrushchev more than anything we have done. It was the cause of Russia's mistreatment of Nixon and it is the Achilles' heel of the Soviet Socialist Republic. How better can we attack communism than to play up the captive nations? Also we are told by people who defect from communism that the thing Russia would hate most to have happen would be the breaking of diplomatic relations with the United States. She knows how many trained enemy we could boot out of the country. Also, we know that we must never try to make judgment, but leave that up to God. With these thoughts in mind we offer you the following prayer:

"Dear God, we know that is not Thy will that 900 million of Thy people be held in slavery under communism, but that You want them to be free even as we are free. We believe that You are waiting for us to call upon You to help us. Give judgment for us, O God, and decide our cause against an unholy people; from which the wisdom to know that their nations cannot live in peace with communism, and the courage to break off diplomatic relations and economic exchange with Russia and her satellite nations until they prove by word and deed that they are willing to live by the laws of God and free nations. Give all enslaved people every-

where the power to break their chains and help them to establish governments that will recognize their inalienable rights. We ask this in Christ's name. Amen."

Mr. Speaker, many groups throughout the country have expressed their basic interest and concern with this issue, including groups representing the people of Yugoslavia, which I personally feel is as much a captive nation as any other Communist country. I submit for the RECORD at this point a statement issued by the United American Croats on the subject of relations with Yugoslavia's Red dictator, Tito:

We have many unsolved problems in our own country, which should be helped:

1. Scientific research field of medicine, technology, sociology, etc.

2. Thousands of young and talented Americans, who are hungry to study at universities, who look for progress in education, but who are sentenced to give up this idea of higher education because they do not have financial possibility. This youth is sent all over the world as American soldiers to protect freedom and democracy, and they were ready to make any contribution to protect the freedom and liberty. This youth deserves to be helped by all of us.

3. We have our problem in securing better relations between the capital and the labor, what will enable us to promote American production and export, too.

What Tito has contributed to or helped American efforts in defending freedom?

1. Tito was and is still now the purest Communist. The struggle in 1948 between Tito and Russia was only the play, well planned by the Communists who are doing everything to conquer the world. Tito was chosen to be Trojan horse of communism in the Western World, who blindly and naively accepted that struggle as a true one.

2. In 1946, in peacetime, Tito shot down in western Yugoslavia an American plane and murdered American fliers. He has not since apologized to the President of the United States, nor to the American Government, nor to the parents of the murdered fliers, nor to the American Nation. We still train his pilots in this free country, and Tito is training the pilots of Castro in Yugoslavia.

3. The arms given to Tito he uses for training of soldiers and agitators and saboteurs to fight against freedom. Partially he has sold some arms to the countries in the Near and Middle East.

4. The help Tito received in cash he used partially as contributions to the central committee of Communist party in Moscow, which uses that money for Communist propaganda in free countries, including America. On the end it looks like the American taxpayers pay with their own money for the Communist propaganda here.

5. No one ruler in Yugoslavia before Tito has traveled so extensively as Tito. He has traveled and made many trips to the countries in the Near and Middle East. He never flies. He sails on ships and usually as his escort he has a few destroyers. How expensive is traveling with destroyers, our Navy Department knows. During such trips he is making propaganda—propaganda for Communists and against freedom and democracy. He is organizing at least the "neutralism" in the countries, who do not show much interest for his Red system of government.

6. All information over the world confirms that Tito has never separated himself and Yugoslavia from communism and Russia. He is going closer and closer to Russia, taking the same stand as Russia more openly today than ever.

7. At the Belgrade Conference he has not condemned Russia's breaking of the nuclear test ban, because he is a Communist and a

good Communist will never make any gesture against other Communists.

In the U.N. Tito never supported any U.S. resolution or proposition. All the time he supported Russia in one way or another.

8. Tito claims economic help because his economy is in a bad situation; hunger, poverty, etc. The whole economy of all Communist-dominated lands and countries, including Russia, is in collapse.

Tito and his Communist diplomats complain that failure of their economy is to be blamed on a bad year, drought, flood, free world, and on God. Let us tell to Tito and other of his comrades that we believe in God, in freedom, in free enterprise, and that our country is based on those fundamentals, and because of that our economy is highly developed and productive, and that we have enough production to supply the world, and that we are ready to help the people all over the world—the peoples—but not Communist oppressors.

I have also received correspondence from the Supreme Cossack Representation in Exile, with headquarters in New York City, which is an effective statement on Captive Nations Week, and I submit it for the RECORD at this point:

MEANING OF THE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK RESOLUTION

The passage of the Captive Nations Week resolution by the U.S. Congress and the subsequent proclamation of the same by the President of the United States have evoked great acclaim and enthusiasm among the freedom-loving nations and individuals the world over. They also made a powerful impact upon the nations enslaved by Communist Russia, as well as upon political emigres hailing from the countries behind the Iron Curtain. Both the Captive Nations Week resolution and the Presidential proclamations have confirmed the traditional principles of the American people and the U.S. Government in expressing support and sympathy for the enslaved nations.

As expected, these historical acts of the U.S. Congress and the President of the United States provoked extremely bitter attacks against the United States and its Government on the part of Moscow and Nikita Khrushchev himself. No decision or move of the Congress or the Government of the United States has ever evoked such violent reactions from the Kremlin tyrants as the Captive Nations Week resolution and the Presidential proclamation of the same. These reactions, as far as the Soviet press was concerned, lasted for over 17 weeks (from July 22 to November 29, 1959; of *Novoye Vremia* Nr. 47, Moscow).

By its reactions Moscow openly conceded that the resolution and the proclamation touched the most vulnerable and sorest spot of the Russian totalitarian empire. It demonstrated beyond any doubt that the weakness of the Soviet Union is engendered by the enslaved non-Russian nations, whose national aspirations provoke constant concern for the Kremlin and heighten its fears as to the inevitable fall of Communist tyranny and enslavement.

During the visit of Vice President Richard Nixon to the U.S.S.R. both Khrushchev and the Soviet press demonstrated that the most dangerous and most fearful questions for Soviet Russia are above all the enslaved nations, while the American military bases, which the United States is maintaining for the purpose of deterring further aggressions on the part of Moscow, are relegated to second place.

What disturbed the Kremlin most is the circumstance that for the first time in the history of the United States a congressional resolution enumerated among the victims of Russian communism and Russian imperialism the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R., such as Ukraine, Byelorussia, Cossackia,

Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Turkestan, Idel-Ural.

Khrushchev endeavored in vain to mislead the world by his article in *Foreign Affairs* (October 1959) by suggesting a false interpretation of the Captive Nations Week resolution and erroneously comparing the status of the non-Russian countries, such as Ukraine, Byelorussia, and others, to the status of the American States of Texas, Arizona, and California. By such a comparison he was pursuing a clearly propagandist line. In spite of all the declarations and in spite of the Soviet Constitution itself, he wanted to strengthen in the opinion of the West the old Russian propaganda slogan of the "one and indivisible Russia." Moscow sought the same propaganda objective by the visit of Soviet Premiers, who arrived in the United States on January 29, 1960, to repay the visit of nine U.S. Governors, who toured the Soviet Union in June and July 1959.

Nikita Khrushchev, in stubbornly demanding a summit conference, wants to compel the West to grant a series of concessions for Moscow, not only in the matter of disarmament, Berlin, and other matters, but also in the matter of liberation of the nations enslaved by Moscow, and in trying to persuade the West to discontinue any anti-Communist propaganda, while maintaining for himself freedom in spreading Communist propaganda and subversion in the countries of the free world, conditioning them for eventual conquest by Moscow.

Khrushchev wants at all cost to prove to the enslaved nations that their hopes for liberation are baseless and that the free world will not support them in the struggle against Moscow and that they must become reconciled to their present fate and recognize the Soviet Russian Communist domination over them as final.

It is exactly in the light of these objectives of Khrushchev that the significance of the congressional resolution expressing official sympathy and support by the American people to the enslaved nations is most fully demonstrated.

Mr. Speaker, last Saturday morning, the Washington, D.C., Captive Nations Committee held a breakfast in the Dodge House, which was attended by representatives of scores of civic, patriotic, and fraternal organizations in the Washington area. At that breakfast a song, "The Captive People," which was composed by Sgt. Anthony Lucarelli, U.S. Army, immediately after the erection of the Berlin wall, was played publicly and dedicated to Captive Nations Week. I submit this song at this time for the RECORD:

THE CAPTIVE PEOPLE

Oh hear those captive people!
Cut off from precious freedom;
They're there but you can't see them
Behind a wall so high.
Oh hear those captive people!
Cut off from friends and loved ones;
Oh how they try to break from
The chains of tyranny
But through all of history
Man has fought this tyranny,
And the day will soon be here
When the one thing man holds dear—
Liberty! Liberty!
Oh hear those captive people!
Oh hear their cry for freedom!
They are there but you can't see them,
They cry for liberty.
Liberty! Liberty!

THE MARKET SPEAKS ON STEEL PRICES

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, if President Kennedy had shown more faith in our marketplace economy, much of the unfortunate repercussions which resulted from his use of governmental powers in clamping down on the attempt of some of the steel companies to raise prices in order to maintain profits they deemed necessary to run an up-to-date industry might have been avoided.

Although the bad effects resulting from the excessive use of governmental power would have been avoided, we still would have, as we do have, the serious question of what we are to do about diminishing corporate profits. Corporate profits are a primary source of economic growth and employment, not to mention a major source of Federal revenues.

I include an editorial from the July 17, 1962, New York Times, commenting upon recent events in steel pricing:

THE MARKET SPEAKS

Last April's much controverted price rise in steel was rescinded before there was an opportunity for the marketplace to pronounce definitive judgment on whether higher prices were supportable. Now the market is speaking, softly but firmly. The nature of its conclusion is indicated by United States Steel's quiet announcement last week of a 5-percent cut in line pipe. This followed an even more circumspect downward revision on prices of secondary steel sheet. Meanwhile, Allegheny Ludlum cut the price of stainless steel and plate, and Republic Steel reduced charges on some other steel products.

No sure answer can be given on what would have happened to steel prices if the major producers had refused to back down after President Kennedy's intervention. But the verdict now rendered by the most neutral and dispassionate arbiter of all—the indisputable action of the market itself—lends support to those who felt a general increase in prices could not have been sustained.

INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY IN ACTION

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

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest examples of American trade unionism at its best came to my attention recently. I am so impressed by this exemplary action that I would like to call it to the attention of the representatives of the American public through this great forum of the Congress of the United States.

I refer to the significant action of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen's Union of North America, AFL-CIO, against one of its own locals.

This 350,000-member organization, under the able leadership of Jack Lloyd, its president, Patrick E. Gorman, its longtime secretary-treasurer, and Joseph Belsky, its vice president, boldly placed one of its locals, namely local No. 474 of New York, in trusteeship and

suspended its officers for instigating and staging a wildcat strike against First National Safeway Stores. This strike was in direct violation of the international union's own constitution.

The irresponsible act of the local impaired the rights and security of its 2,200 members. The failure of the office of this local to hold a secret ballot strike vote was contrary to the true democratic principles of trade unionism and violated other procedures consistent with the best interests of organized labor.

The forthright and courageous action taken by the international union is most refreshing and heartening to the cause of labor everywhere and to all the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that Mr. Lloyd, Mr. Gorman, Mr. Belsky, and the international are to be commended by this House for their action. They have demonstrated organized labor's adherence to the principles of industrial democracy and they have proved that labor is responsible and reliable.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning I was busy with an appointment downtown in an office of one of the Federal agencies on business concerning my district and the city of San Francisco. My office notified me that a rollcall had just started on the adoption of the conference report on H.R. 10606, extending the public assistance and child welfare program. By the time I could get a cab and get to the floor of the House, the rollcall had been completed. If I had been present at the time of rollcall No. 165, I would have voted "aye."

FOREIGN OIL IMPORTS

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, it lies within the power of the President of the United States at any time to take effective action to moderate the rampant flood of foreign oil imports and provide for our domestic oil industry the room it needs to breathe and survive.

For 7 years two national administrations have etched a remarkable record of persistent promises to deal with this problem, but of effective action there has been none.

While this procrastination continues, the curve of our domestic oil exploration continues to swerve ominously downward. Drilling companies are going out

of business; the geology schools at great State universities are largely empty; the economy of many States is stricken; thousands of workers have been displaced from their jobs. And even more important, every day brings closer the time when we will be dependent in the event of war upon foreign oil sources because our own are not being developed under the scourge of the inflow of cheap supplies from abroad.

I am convinced that the minimum action to avert this catastrophe is the reorganization of our oil imports program to limit the imports to a fixed percentage of domestic demand. The President would, as long as the national security is at stake, establish the base year. Despite claims to the contrary, this would not deprive the President of flexibility. He would have the power to select the year on which the import quotas would be based. He would still have the power to kill the whole program if at any time he found that the national security is not threatened.

It was for these reasons that I sponsored, together with 47 other Members of the House, an amendment to the trade agreements bill that would write this guarantee into law. This effort has failed in the House. But the White House still can take action under existing law that would institute provisions to keep the domestic oil industry alive. Time after time have come promises to do so. Now is the time to act.

The domestic oil industry, particularly the thousands of independent producers who have historically discovered more than 75 percent of our oil, and the coal industry whose plight is so well known to all of us, have been led to believe that a reduction in the level of oil imports was imminent. In a speech to oil producers at Kansas City, Mo., April 30, 1962, the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Udall, stated:

I am hopeful that before Congress acts on the trade bill, that we can announce and will announce new steps have been taken to provide new stability and to provide a larger share—a much substantially larger share—of the growth market in this country for the domestic industry. This has been an objective of our Department, because in terms of the national security—in terms of what we see of the whole broad picture—it has been our opinion that this is the best solution for the country, and I think this must be the final test.

This promise of fairness and equity to the oil-producing branch of the petroleum industry raised the hopes of producers in all of the 33 States where oil has been found. The promise was made in good faith by the Secretary in charge of the Government department that is the most informed and knowledgeable in this area. The Department of Interior has the oil specialists including engineers, geologists, economists, and statisticians whose function it is to keep informed and recommend policies in the energy field. But here we are 2½ months later and nothing has happened—nothing except the oil import quotas for the second half of 1962 have been announced, and they are found to be 85,000 barrels a day higher than for the comparable period of 1961.

What happened? Why this interminable delay in coming to grips with the problem of excessive oil imports? We are told that it is because a committee is studying the matter. The committee, incidentally, was directed by the President originally to finish its assignment by the middle of 1962. But do we really need still another committee poking around amid the long-established facts in this matter? Time has moved relentlessly on for 7 years while the problem has been studied and re-studied by eminently qualified committees. As long ago as 1955 the executive branch of Government instituted voluntary import controls. For 3½ years, various voluntary methods were tried while time moved on accompanied by ever-increasing oil imports. Special committees composed of members of the President's Cabinet studied the problem and reached the same conclusions as previous committees—imports of oil must be controlled or our security would be threatened. Public hearings were held by the Office of Defense Mobilization. The Director of ODM in April 1957 certified to the President of the United States the fact that oil imports constituted a threat to our national security. On July 11, 1957, the then majority leader of the Senate, now the distinguished Vice President of the United States, went to the core of the question in a speech in the Senate, when he said:

Mr. President, it is vitally necessary that we keep the American oil industry healthy enough to meet all foreseeable defense needs, in addition to our normal nondefense needs. We cannot afford to run out of oil—oil produced in our own country.

Crude-oil imports have been increasing ever since the defense amendment to the Trade Agreements Extension Act was approved more than 2 years ago. Up to now, action by the administration has been limited to study and consultation.

The time for study has passed. Congress gave the administration authority to curb excessive imports of oil.

Mr. President, that authority should be exercised now.

Five years later, with imports still mounting, this warning is more valid than ever.

A special committee was appointed by the President to study the matter and report to him. Their conclusion was the same as the ODM's. Time moved on and imports rose. A mandatory import program was instituted in April 1959. Within a month, special exemptions were made to overland imports that materially reduced the effectiveness of the plan. Time moved on, the vigor of the domestic industry continued to wane and oil imports continued to climb.

Now a review of the supply and requirements made by the Petroleum Study Committee established by the President 8 months ago—December 2, 1961—is still underway. Two administrations have apparently followed too long the policy attributed to a 19th-century Secretary of State, William H. Evarts:

If you don't do anything long enough, you'll be surprised at how many of these problems will go away.

But this one will not evaporate. It will have to be dealt with.

July 1 has come and gone and now talk of September 1 is in the air. As Mr. Clyde LaMotte, Washington editor of the Oil and Gas Journal, observed in the July 16 issue of that publication, the administration seems to have no clear-cut oil policy. He stated:

The administration not only has failed to solve any of the major oil problems during its 18 months in office, but has managed to create some new ones to add to the list.

The net effect has been to leave the oil industry up in the air, waiting for some semblance of a recognizable pattern on oil policy to emerge.

This uncertainty was understandable at the outset. But as the months have rolled by with no break in the fog, many have begun to wonder if there is reason to hope the situation will ever improve * * *.

As the administration gets bogged down on oil problems, its communication with industry tends to worsen. This intensifies the guessing-game atmosphere in Washington and leaves the door open to rumor peddling.

The snafu on communications was demonstrated at the time the trade bill was nearing a showdown vote in the House recently. The official White House position on the crude-oil import-control program was that this issue was under study by OEP and that a White House stand would have to be delayed until after that report was made—around September 1.

However, White House aids were quietly circulating a memorandum to key oil-producer-State Congressmen. The intent was to show there was no need for congressional action on oil imports because the administration was planning to take action to help producers. Some hints were dropped as to what this action would be.

This sort of procedure indicates the administration has already decided what it plans to do and is simply using the OEP study as a stalling device. Otherwise, how could the administration make any promises when it hadn't yet seen a report from OEP?

At this stage, the administration technique appears to be to try to placate all factions as much as possible until the time arises when it is ready to take a position on a given oil issue—or until it is forced to do so by political or other considerations.

This is a sobering and accurate picture of the oil industry and Government today. What is needed is followup action in the spirit of the President of the United States, when as a candidate for that office, he told the people of the Southwest at Wichita Falls, Tex., November 3, 1960:

They [the Eisenhower administration] must think the memories of the people of Texas and the United States are pretty short. Here in this old community Sam Gray, who sells shoes, in 1955 to 1960 sold 60 pairs of oil safety shoes a month. Do you know how many he sold last month? Two. Mr. Nixon talks about unexampled prosperity. I want him to tell me how a man can work 8 days a month and have unexampled prosperity? I don't want that example, I don't want that prosperity. Eight days an oil well works in the State of Texas. Eight years ago it worked 20 days. [Applause.]

What kind of counsel has the President been getting that keeps postponing the implementation of these intentions? The President's advisers seem to be playing a form of Ivy League peekaboo with the future of the oil-producing States. Now you see them; now you do not.

When they are advising the President against the use of his appropriate powers to contribute to the solution of the oil imports problem, for example, you can see them, complete with cap, gown, horn rims, pipe and tassel. When the Congress is considering legislation which would solve the problem, they are behind the barriers and out of sight, but their influence is there, subtle and effective. One sometimes gets an impression from them of government by Univac, by group-think, by closeted advisers not representative of the voter and never responsible directly to him.

There is a sharp contrast between the button-down collar and the tin helmet of the oilfield, and it does not reflect, I want to emphasize, a contrast in quality of intellect. I would like to persuade the President's advisers to join in saving the life of a vital and traditional American industry. This life is well worth saving. It may be our own. It is not a frivolous effort. I believe that sound thinking now will result in more intelligent advice to the President and the effective use of his power to solve this problem.

When Mr. Kennedy became President, Texas was operating on a 9-day-a-month basis, and he said that was too small. Oklahoma was operating on a 13-barrel-a-day basis and he said that was too small.

More than a year after he became President, Texas is down to an 8-day-a-month program and Oklahoma is down to an 8-barrel-a-day program.

Did the President mean what he said during the campaign? Did the Vice President mean what he said in the U.S. Senate? If they did, why then the delay in using existing power of law to improve the situation?

Does not America's domestic oil security command any regard in high places?

MEXICAN FARM CONTRACT WORKERS

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, some controversy has arisen over the ruling by the Department of Labor with respect to the meaning of "temporary or seasonal occupations" in Public Law 78, relating to the employment of Mexican farm contract workers in this country.

In an effort to clarify the intent of Congress, when it amended Public Law 78, several members of the House Committee on Agriculture joined with me in addressing a letter to the Honorable Arthur J. Goldberg, Secretary of Labor. I desire to make this letter a matter of record, and with the permission of the House I submit the letter to be published in the Record.

The letter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., June 25, 1962.

The Honorable ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG,
Secretary of Labor,
U.S. Department of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY GOLDBERG: We believe that recent rulings by the Department of Labor with respect to the meaning of "temporary or seasonal occupations" evidence a misunderstanding of the intent of Congress when it amended and extended Public Law 78. The limitation of 210 days in 35 calendar weeks on the employment of Mexican farm contract workers is, in our opinion, erroneous. We therefore thought it desirable to give you our views concerning the express meaning of the statutory language and of the language contained in section 3 of the statement of the managers on the part of the House of Representatives.

In section 504(1) it was provided that no Mexican farm contract workers should be made available "for employment in other than temporary or seasonal occupations." Section 3 of the statement of the managers on the part of the House, in explanation of the meaning of this provision, stated that the purpose of the program "is to supplement the domestic labor force in peak periods, such as harvest time, when crops may be lost through a lack of sufficient workers. It is not intended to provide Mexican workers for year-round jobs which might well be filled by domestic workers. Nor is it intended to provide Mexican workers for higher skilled jobs for which domestic workers can be found."

It was clear to us during the hearings on H.R. 2010 and in the debates on that measure that the explicit intention of this temporary or seasonal limitation was merely to prevent utilization of supplemental Mexican farm contract workers in full year-round or longer employment. We certainly had no idea that such workers would be denied farm employers for a period of less than 1 year. We thought then and still are of the view that the language referred to above in the statute and in section 3 of our statement would be applied by the U.S. Department of Labor on a crop and/or area basis. In other words, our intent was that temporary or seasonal occupations be construed as any occupation necessary in the preparation, cultivation, and harvesting of particular crops or of multicrops, if such the case may be, in any given area.

Certainly there are variations with respect to various areas and with respect to various crops because of differences in weather conditions, soil conditions, growth rates, crop practices, and other natural factors which affect the growing and harvesting of the many crops produced in the United States. It was never our intention to frustrate the basic purpose for which Public Law 78 was first enacted; namely, to assure an adequate supplemental farm labor supply to prevent the loss of crops by the growers of such crops. In our opinion, any construction of the statutory language contrary to that given above would have such an effect.

In fact, when you testified before the Congress on H.R. 2010, you expressly said in relation to this amendment:

"We are not now even considering the question of stoop labor but of employing braceros to operate costly machinery and in year-round occupations. In my opinion, there is no question but that domestic workers will accept such employment provided that the wages and conditions of work are reasonable. Whenever there is a need for additional workers for year-round employment which cannot be met from our

domestic labor force, they could be admitted under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act which deals with the permanent admission of workers for employment in the United States." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 107, pt. 14, p. 18785.)

Yet the current interpretation of the Department with respect to seasonal or temporary employment would prohibit the employment of braceros on many stoop labor activities, and is, therefore, in conflict with your explanation of the meaning of this term to the committee. The references in section 3 of the statement of the managers on the part of the House to "peak periods such as at harvest time" were merely illustrative of the legislative intent that supplemental Mexican farm contract workers should not be utilized as permanent or year-round employees. In no sense can that language be construed as any further limitation on the right of farm employers to obtain supplemental Mexican farm contract workers for any period up to 1 year.

Where a farmer raises one or several crops, there can be no question but that each occupation performed in the preparation, cultivation, and harvesting of such crops would be temporary or seasonal. Operations with respect to each separate crop are temporary or seasonal activities. This was the intent of section 504(1). There is no other valid construction of the amendment.

The construction in which we have set forth the statutory language in our opinions is not only the correct meaning of same, but has the practical effect of carrying out the basic intent of Public Law 78.

Yours sincerely,

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
CHARLES B. HOEVEN,
W. R. POAGE,
E. C. GATHINGS,
PAGE BELCHER,
WATKINS M. ABBITT,
CHARLES M. TEAGUE.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SHELLEY (at the request of Mr. CORMAN), on account of official business.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. RODINO), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

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. HALPERN, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts and to include extraneous material.

Mr. ROONEY, to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and include tables, testimony, and other pertinent matter.

Mr. Bow, to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CEDERBERG (at the request of Mr. Bow), to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and include extraneous matter.

Mr. McCULLOCH (at the request of Mr. Bow), to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request to Mr. GOODELL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FINO.

Mr. ASHBROOK.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MULTER in three instances.

Mr. HERLONG.

Mr. BOYKIN.

Mr. HENDERSON.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1811. An act to amend chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code, relating to war orphans' educational assistance, in order to permit eligible persons thereunder to attend foreign educational institutions under certain circumstances;

H.R. 3383. An act for the relief of Joseph Starker;

H.R. 5061. An act for the relief of James L. Merrill;

H.R. 6655. An act for the relief of Cecil A. Sims;

H.R. 8282. An act to amend section 3203 (d) of title 38, United States Code, to provide that there shall be no reduction of pension otherwise payable during hospitalization of certain veterans with a wife or child;

H.R. 8415. An act to change the classes of persons eligible to receive payments of benefits withheld during the lifetime of deceased veterans while being furnished hospital or domiciliary care;

H.R. 8484. An act to authorize establishment of the Theodore Roosevelt Birthplace and Sagamore Hill National Historic Sites, N.Y., and for other purposes;

H.R. 9599. An act for the relief of Solomon Annenberg;

H.R. 9844. An act to waive section 142, title 28, United States Code, with respect to the U.S. District Court for the District of Connecticut for holding court at Bridgeport;

H.R. 10012. An act to waive section 142, of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee holding court at Winchester, Tenn.;

H.R. 10016. An act to waive section 142 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the holding of court at Decatur, Ala., by the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Alabama;

H.R. 10068. An act to amend section 742 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the exchange of 5-year term policies of U.S. Government life insurance to a special endowment at age 96 plan;

H.R. 10389. An act to waive section 142 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Marshall Division, holding court at Marshall, Tex.

H.R. 10669. An act to liberalize the provisions of title 38, United States Code, relating to the assignment of national service life insurance;

H.R. 11670. An act to postpone by 3 months the date on or before which the Securities and Exchange Commission shall report to the Congress the results of its study and investigation pursuant to section 19(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 714. Joint resolution authorizing the acquisition of certain property in the District of Columbia and its conveyance to the International Monetary Fund, on a full reimbursement basis, for use in expansion of its headquarters.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 46. An act to provide for the establishment and administration of basic public recreation facilities at the Elephant Butte and Caballo Reservoir Areas, N. Mex., and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 23, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2330. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the appointment of certain officers by the President, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2331. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the examination of selected aspects of the pricing and administration of certain Department of the Navy contracts awarded to Douglas Aircraft Co., Inc., El Segundo, Calif.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2332. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the use of the Department of the Air Force of certain public lands of the United States at Cuddeback Lake Air Force Range, Calif., for defense purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2333. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report relating to the administration and development of a program for the public lands and resources coming under the care of the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Land Management; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2334. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to extend the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MORGAN: Committee of conference. S. 2996. An act to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 2008). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 3086. An act to provide for reduction in the workweek of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2018). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WHITTEN: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 12648. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2024). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMAS: Committee of conference. H.R. 11038. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2025). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6940. A bill for the relief of Henry Armstrong, administrator of the estate of Ella Armstrong; without amendment (Rept. No. 2009). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1450. A bill for the relief of Maria Odella Campos; with amendment (Rept. No. 2010). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2659. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jane R. Moore; with amendment (Rept. No. 2011). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3125. A bill for the relief of Joao de Freitas Ferreira de Vasconcelos; with amendment (Rept. No. 2012). Referred to the Committee of the Whole Houses.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6653. A bill for the relief of Maurizio Placidi; with amendment (Rept. No. 2013). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7437. A bill for the relief of Stella Rosa Merello; with amendment (Rept. No. 2014). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10796. A bill for the relief of Kazimierz Krupinski; without amendment (Rept. No. 2015). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1174. An act for the relief of Dr. Kwan Ho Lee; without amendment (Rept. No. 2016). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1849. An act for the relief of Stephen S. Chang; with amendment (Rept. No. 2017). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2208. An act for the relief of Su-Fen Chen; with amendment (Rept. No. 2019).

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2455. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Lovic; without amendment (Rept. No. 2020). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2614. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Alfredo Hua-Sing Ang; without amendment (Rept. No. 2021). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2769. An act for the relief of Renato Granduc and Grazia Granduc; without amendment (Rept. No. 2022). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Concurrent Resolution 76. Concurrent resolution withdrawing suspension of deportation of Ioannis Constantellis; without amendment (Rept. No. 2023). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 12632. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide for reform of personal and corporate income tax rates and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAKER:

H.R. 12633. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide for reform of personal and corporate income tax rates and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 12634. A bill to facilitate the entry of alien skilled specialists and certain relatives of U.S. citizens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 12635. A bill to amend section 311 of the Tariff Act of 1930 to permit the manufacture in bonded manufacturing warehouses of cigars made of tobacco imported from more than one foreign country; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 12636. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 12637. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit contingent fees for lobbying; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOW:

H.R. 12638. A bill to create the Inter-oceanic Canals Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 12639. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H.R. 12640. A bill to amend the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 relating to tobacco to permit increased allotments to compensate producers of flue-cured tobacco for production losses sustained through natural disasters; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 12641. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 12642. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to install a system of small and intermediate-size reservoirs in the Cape Fear River Basin, N.C.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H.R. 12643. A bill to amend section 203 (k) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the transfer of surplus property for certain uses by educational institutions; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 12644. A bill to amend section 304(a) (3) of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the marking requirements in the case of imported woven labels; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H.R. 12645. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide vocational rehabilitation, education, and training, and loan guarantee benefits to persons who served in the Armed Forces on or after January 1,

1962, in combat zones, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 12646. A bill to change the name of San Angelo Federal reclamation project, Texas, to the "M. D. Bryant Federal reclamation project, Texas"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H.R. 12647. A bill to authorize the donation by Commodity Credit Corporation of surplus feeds to State agencies to provide feed for livestock in areas determined to be emergency areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 12648. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

By Mr. WAGGONER:

H.J. Res. 827. Joint resolution requesting the President to enter into negotiations with Canada with respect to imports of softwood and authorizing the establishment of temporary import quotas for softwood; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.J. Res. 828. Joint resolution designating the bridge constructed over the Washington Channel of the Potomac River, in the District of Columbia, as the "Francis Case Memorial Bridge"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. Res. 734. Resolution amending the rules of the House of Representatives relating to the appointment of professional and clerical staffs of the committees of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 12649. A bill for the relief of Witold A. Lanowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 12650. A bill for the relief of Luella O. Babb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Speaker John W. McCormack Receives Award for Efforts in Behalf of Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1962

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, July 19, our beloved Speaker, the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, was presented with a most significant and important award. The Assembly of Captive European Nations presented a plaque to the Speaker which read:

Presented to JOHN W. McCORMACK, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, uncompromising foe of totalitarianism, faithful friend of the captive peoples, in grateful recognition of his undaunted support of the

Soviet-subjugated nations in their struggle for liberty.

Our Speaker rightly deserves this award for the strong support that he has always given to the captive nations. In 1959, the Speaker, then majority leader, introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives the resolution known as the Captive Nations Week resolution. This resolution was very significant and gave much hope to the tens of millions of people residing behind the Iron Curtain in Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania. This resolution was an indication to these people that America had not forgotten them and that we were still hoping and working for their emancipation from Soviet domination and that we support them in their efforts to regain, as soon as possible, their liberty and independence.

The President has just signed a resolution designating this week as Captive Nations Week. It is well and good that

we do this. In marking Captive Nations Week we bring to light the fact that Communist Soviet dictatorship has caused more suffering to more millions of innocent and helpless peoples than all other dictatorships known in human history. The curse of Soviet dictatorship extends today from the Baltics to Vladivostok, to the isles of northern Japan and to North Korea.

Since the end of the last war at least 100 million peoples have been placed, directly or indirectly, under the Soviet dictatorship, the preponderant majority of them being in central, eastern, and southeastern Europe. The industrious, stouthearted and liberty-loving peoples in these countries were relatively free from dictatorships in their homelands. Many of them had regained their freedom at the end of the First World War, and they all were content with their lot. And then came the war, which was bad enough, and in which they all suffered immeasurably, in a degree beyond our imagination. But what followed after