

I say "unsuccessfully," as a result of Mr. Latta's comments. I sat here and heard Mr. Bennett distinctly say in answer to a question by Mr. Bolling that if this matter were turned over to the House Administration Committee, with some strong recommendations, it would be an affront to the American public.

Maybe I am a little too sensitive, even though I have a reputation for a fairly thick skin.

Mr. Bennett also, in his testimony yesterday I distinctly recall, took two different positions on the House Administration Committee. First, that we didn't have any power, and, second, that we hadn't done anything.

I am summing it up and paraphrasing. I can agree to a degree with the first allegation that we didn't have much power. I can't agree with the second, that we didn't do anything. He also was quoted in the press as making a statement, I believe I heard him make it, that he had been around here for 20 years and we had not done anything. Now, it seems to me fair to ask, do you do something before there is something to do just for the sake of doing something?

Let me put this in context a little bit. There was a committee on contracts established some 4 or more years ago. It came about because there were two chairman who seemed to be using the contract system of putting employees on the payroll, which is not putting them on the payroll, but putting them under contract for a lump sum, to a degree which no other chairmen were using.

One of them was contracting with a good many college professors. I can understand this because this chairman thinks college professors know everything, and if you would give them a contract to do a study, you would get the right answers. The other chairman's contracts were with advisers and most of them turned out to be 18- or 19-year-old girls who did not come to Washington. By the very fact that this contract subcommittee was created, these contracts ceased to be signed.

Now, under the law, the chairman of the House Administration Committee was supposed to sign these contracts as he is supposed to sign every single voucher. If he did nothing else, that is all he would get done if he scrutinized, examined, investigated, checked out every voucher on every contract. We didn't get any fanfare in the newspapers. We didn't seek any. We sent out a letter saying from now on all contracts would have to be justified before this subcommittee, and they dropped down to nil. We have approved some contracts in the cases where the Veterans' Committee, for example, needs a man to work down in the Veterans' Administration, who is on retirement, to do a special task on a special bill. If they hired him, he would have to drop his pension, come in under salary, and then go back and try to get his pension reinstated after the month or 6 weeks is up.

Sometimes they contracted a man for a thousand dollars, \$1,500, whatever length of time it took to do this. I point that out because the committee did take action in this field when it became apparent that there were abuses.

Now, there is a lot of conversation about the Powell hearing. I want to say, Mr. Chairman and members, I didn't get any pleasure out of being chairman of that investigation. I wanted to be a lawyer. I am not one. I graduated from the university in the middle of the depression and I never had the money to get back. But I suspect if