

ILLEGIB

Approved For Release 2005/04/13 : CIA-RDP71B00364R000600120001-8

Approved For Release 2005/04/13 : CIA-RDP71B00364R000600120001-8

10 June 1963

Honorable J. W. Fulbright
Chairman
Committee on Foreign Relations
United States Senate
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear Mr. Fulbright:

This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of 24 May 1963, requesting comments on S. Con. Res. 42, establishing the Joint Committee on National Security Affairs.

Upon completion of review and clearance through the Bureau of the Budget, we will be pleased to forward our comments on this bill.

Sincerely,



Assistant Legislative Counsel

STAT

Distribution:

Orig & 1 - Addressee

1 - LC Subj

1 - LC Chrono

OGC/JGO:mmm(10 June 63)

(Handwritten note: Pete: No action has been taken on this request except the acknowledgement of receipt. Probably we will draft response and coordinate it rather than sending out for comments. JGO.)

J. W. FULBRIGHT, ARK., CHAIRMAN
JOHN SPARKMAN, ALA.
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, MINN.
MIKE MANSFIELD, MONT.
WAYNE MORSE, OREG.
RUSSELL B. LONG, LA.
ALBERT GORE, TENN.
FRANK J. LAUSCHE, OHIO
FRANK CHURCH, IDAHO
STUART SYMINGTON, MO.
THOMAS J. DODD, CONN.
GEORGE A. SMATHERS, FLA.

Approved For Release 2005/04/13 : CIA-RDP71B00364R000600120001-8

Executive Registry
13-4356
rk

United States Senate
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

CARL MARCY, CHIEF OF STAFF
DARRELL ST. CLAIRE, CLERK

May 24, 1963

The Honorable John A. McCone, Director
Central Intelligence Agency
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Director:

Enclosed is a copy of S. Con. Res. 42,
submitted on May 15, 1963, by Senator
Humphrey (for himself and others).

The Committee would appreciate having com-
ments on this from the

Sincerely yours,

Jw Fulbright
J. W. Fulbright
Chairman

Enclosure

88TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. CON. RES. 42

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 15 (legislative day, MAY 13), 1963

Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. CLARK, and Mr. ENGLE) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations (by unanimous consent)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

1 *Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives*
2 *concurring)*, That (a) there is hereby established a joint
3 congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee
4 on National Security Affairs (hereinafter referred to as
5 the "committee") to be composed of twelve members who
6 are Members of the Senate and twelve members who are
7 Members of the House of Representatives.

8 (b) (1) Of the members of the committee who are
9 Members of the Senate—

10 (A) Five shall be members of the Senate Commit-
11 tee on Foreign Relations (of whom not less than two
12 shall be from the minority party);

1 (B) Four shall be members of the Senate Com-
2 mittee on Armed Services (of whom not less than one
3 shall be from the minority party) ; and

4 (C) Three shall be members of the Joint Com-
5 mittee on Atomic Energy (of whom not less than one
6 shall be from the minority party) .

7 (2) Of the members of the committee who are Mem-
8 bers of the House of Representatives—

9 (A) Five shall be members of the House Com-
10 mittee on Foreign Affairs (of whom not less than two
11 shall be from the minority party) ;

12 (B) Four shall be members of the House Com-
13 mittee on Armed Services (of whom not less than
14 one shall be from the minority party) ; and

15 (C) Three shall be members of the Joint Com-
16 mittee on Atomic Energy (of whom not less than one
17 shall be from the minority party) .

18 (c) Members of the committee who are Members of
19 the Senate shall be appointed by the President of the Senate,
20 and members of the committee who are Members of the
21 House of Representatives shall be appointed by the Speaker
22 of the House of Representatives.

23 (d) Any vacancy in the membership of the committee
24 shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection,

1 and the committee shall elect a chairman from among its
2 members.

3 SEC. 2. It shall be the function of the committee to
4 make a continuous study and investigation of all matters
5 pertaining to national defense, foreign policy, and national
6 security (including intelligence, defense policy, nuclear de-
7 velopment, and disarmament). In fulfilling this function
8 the committee shall be authorized to review the operations
9 of the respective executive agencies responsible for the de-
10 velopment and execution of policies with respect to such
11 matters.

12 SEC. 3. The committee shall make, from time to time,
13 reports to the Senate and the House of Representatives and
14 the appropriate committees of Congress concerning the re-
15 sults of its studies, together with such recommendations as
16 it may deem desirable.

17 SEC. 4. The committee or any duly authorized subcom-
18 mittee thereof is authorized to hold such hearings; to sit
19 and act at such times and places; to require by subpoena
20 or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the pro-
21 duction of such books, papers, and documents; to administer
22 such oaths; to take such testimony; to procure such print-
23 ing and binding as it deems advisable. The provisions of
24 sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes, as

1 amended, shall apply in case of any failure of any witness
2 to comply with any subpoena or to testify when summoned
3 under authority of this section.

4 SEC. 5. The members of the committee shall serve with-
5 out compensation in addition to that received for their serv-
6 ices as Members of Congress, but they shall be reimbursed
7 for travel, subsistence, and other expenses incurred by them
8 in the performance of the duties vested in the committee other
9 than expenses in connection with meetings of the committee
10 held in the District of Columbia during such times as the
11 Congress is in session.

12 SEC. 6. The Committee is authorized, without regard
13 to the civil service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, as
14 amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such clerks,
15 experts, consultants, and clerical and stenographic assistants
16 as it deems necessary and advisable. The committee is
17 authorized to reimburse the members of its staff for travel,
18 subsistence, and the other necessary expenses incurred by
19 them in the performance of the duties vested in the com-
20 mittee other than expenses in connection with meetings of
21 the committee held in the District of Columbia during such
22 times as the Congress is in session. The chairmen of the
23 various Senate and House committees referred to in subsec-
24 tion (b) of the first section of this resolution may assign
25 members of the staffs of such committees to serve on the

1 staff of the committee, without additional compensation,
2 except for the reimbursement of expenses incurred by such
3 staff members as prescribed in this section.

4 SEC. 7. The expenses of the committee shall be paid
5 one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half
6 from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives,
7 upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the committee or
8 by any member of the committee duly authorized by the
9 chairman.

88TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. CON. RES. 42

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Establishing the Joint Committee on National
Security Affairs.

By Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. CLARK, and Mr. ENGLE

MAY 15 (legislative day, MAY 13), 1963
Referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations
(by unanimous consent)

MAY 27 4 45 PM '63

Approved For Release 2005/04/13 : CIA-RDP71B00364R000600120001-8

United States Senate
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

John Fulbright
U.S.S.

The Hon. John A. McCone
Director
Central Intelligence Agency
Washington 25, D. C.



Approved For Release 2005/04/13 : CIA-RDP71B00364R000600120001-8

Approved For Release 2005/04/13 : CIA-RDP71B00364R000600120001-8

UNCLASSIFIED		CONFIDENTIAL		SECRET	
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP					
TO	NAME AND ADDRESS		DATE	INITIALS	
1	DDCI 7D6011				
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
ACTION		DIRECT REPLY		PREPARE REPLY	
APPROVAL		DISPATCH		RECOMMENDATION	
COMMENT		FILE		RETURN	
CONCURRENCE		INFORMATION		SIGNATURE	
Remarks: Attached is an excerpt from the <u>Congressional Record</u> of 15 August containing the remarks of Representative Lindsay when he introduced a resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Intelligence and Information. I have marked some of the more important parts of his arguments. In view of the personal references which he has made to Senator Russell, Senator Saltonstall and staff members of congressional committees, I have called his remarks to the attention of Robert Smart and William Darden.					
<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 200px; height: 20px; margin: 0 auto;"></div>					
FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO SENDER					
FROM: NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NO.				DATE	
Legislative Counsel, 7D01				16 Aug 63	
UNCLASSIFIED		CONFIDENTIAL		SECRET	

Approved For Release 2005/04/13 : CIA-RDP71B00364R000600120001-8

STAT

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A7313

The study was jointly sponsored by the Protestant-supported Community Service Center, the Roman Catholic Mother Butler Center and the mayor's committee.

Particular interest in the religious affiliations of the Indians in the community has made the study significant to a number of churches in the community.

Results show that those admitted to church membership, 227 families named the Roman Catholic Church, 114 the Episcopal Church, 15 the Congregational Church, 11 the Presbyterian Church, 9 the Methodist Church, but none claimed membership in the Indian Native American Church.

There were 43 families that spoke of mixed marriages and 10 adhered to various Pentecostal groups.

The census was part of a study begun by Father White in 1957 when he interviewed 150 Indian families in Rapid City.

Since then he has spent considerable time here in conjunction with his work in sociology at St. Louis University in Missouri.

Support for the census and for a related study among the non-Indian families in the city has come from the National Institutes of Mental Health, Bethesda, Md., and help in the actual canvassing was given by individuals from various organizations, including the American Association of University Women, the two church centers and the mayor's committee.

The complete report on the entire study will be presented in a book Father White is compiling. Publication is due in 1965.

John H. Averill
Watchdogs Over CIA Demanded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have continually called for the establishment of a joint congressional committee to oversee the CIA and our other intelligence agencies. Since the beginning of this year when I introduced legislation in the form of House Joint Resolution 211, which would accomplish this objective, I have called on Congress to act on this matter. The people of America are concerned over the unbridled activities of the CIA, and the news media has joined in this concern by pointing out time after time the hazards of an unscrutinized intelligence community.

I fear that the CIA sometimes seems to embody the fiction of an Ian Fleming novel—however, intelligence information is fact, not fiction, and should be dealt with accordingly.

It is clear in my mind and apparently in the minds of several of our colleagues who have joined me in introducing legislation to provide for a "watchdog committee" over the CIA, that there is a need for a joint congressional committee whose sole function is to oversee the activities of the CIA and our other intelligence agencies.

At this point in the record, I would like to insert a recent article from the Los Angeles Times entitled "Watchdogs Over CIA Demanded," written by John H. Averill:

WATCHDOGS OVER CIA DEMANDED—LAWMAKERS ASSERT THEY HAVE RIGHT TO CHECK ON AGENCY

(By John H. Averill)

WASHINGTON.—Speculation on the role of the Central Intelligence Agency in South Vietnam's coup d'etat has revived congressional demands for a special watchdog committee to keep an eye on the spy agency's activities.

There have been similar demands in the past, particularly after one of the CIA's U-2 spy planes went down over Russia in 1960. The demands got nowhere.

However, advocates of a congressional watchdog committee say that more and more Members of Congress are becoming concerned and demanding that something be done. The CIA was established by Congress in 1947 under the Defense Unification Act and given broad authority in the intelligence field overseas.

POINTS TO RIGHT

"I think that Congress has a right to know if the Nation is getting its money's worth from the CIA," said Representative PAUL G. ROGERS, Democrat, of Florida, one of the more persistent backers of efforts to create a joint Senate-House committee on intelligence activities.

As things now stand, only a select handful of Senate and House Members even know how much money the CIA gets. Estimates range from a half billion to a billion dollars a year.

It is this history which most strongly opposes creation of a watchdog committee. And since the group includes some of the most influential Members of Congress, such as Representative CARL VINSON, Democrat, of Georgia, the powerful and crusty chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, it has been able so far to stave off the watchdog committee proposals.

NO NEED SEEN

VINSON, chairman of a special nine-man Armed Services Subcommittee on Intelligence, declared he sees "absolutely no need for a joint committee."

"We know what the CIA is doing," VINSON said in an interview. "We know what goes on and we are satisfied with the operations of the CIA."

He noted that the House Appropriations Committee also has a special subcommittee headed by Representative GEORGE H. MAHON, Democrat, of Texas, to pass on CIA appropriations and that the Senate has a similar six-man group made up of members of its Armed Services and Appropriations Committees.

"I've been around here for 49 years," VINSON said, "and I'm satisfied the CIA is getting sufficient congressional supervision."

This view is challenged, however, by some other Members of Congress in both Houses.

SAYS HE'S IN DARK

"We are working in the dark," said Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY, Republican, of New York, "or at least in the semidarkness."

LINDSAY and ROGERS are among 15 House Members of both parties who are sponsoring resolutions to create either a joint committee with the Senate or a special House committee to keep a constant eye on CIA activities.

"I think we are gathering more support all the time," said ROGERS, "particularly after the debacle in Cuba, rumors of CIA foulups in Latin America and reports that the CIA was involved in the Vietnam affair."

ROGERS, while emphasizing he was not quarreling with the Armed Services or Appropriations Committees argued that an adequate job of checking CIA activities cannot be done by anything less than a full-time committee which has no other function.

"There must be a continuing watchdog,"

he said, "not only of the CIA but of the Defense Department intelligence community, too, and there must be a constant review of how intelligence information is coordinated and evaluated."

"Any agency of Government that is not carefully watched can develop practices that would not be tolerated if they were open to careful and responsible congressional review."

"I'm not saying the CIA has developed these practices. We just don't know. If it hasn't it would have nothing to fear from congressional review. But there is mistrust and concern in Congress about the CIA and if we had a joint committee we could allay these suspicions and restore confidence."

ROGERS' views were seconded generally by Representative H. ALLEN SMITH (Republican, of California), a former FBI agent who worked on several World War II espionage cases.

SAYS FBI REPORTS

"The CIA is no more secret than the FBI," SMITH said, "and the FBI gives Congress all the information it requests, puts out annual reports on its activities, and lets Congress know how much money it needs and spends."

SMITH said it was because of all the secrecy that he opposed a bill passed by the House last week to authorize more liberal retirement benefits for CIA agents involved in hazardous assignments.

In opposing the bill, SMITH said it was his guess that Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev "and even the Russian Embassy here in Washington know more about CIA than I do."

SMITH in an interview said he was not advocating release of any secret information that might harm national security or jeopardize a CIA agent's life.

"I just think we have a responsibility, since we vote the money, to know how many employees the CIA has, what they do, what the policies are, if any, and whether the job is being done as it should be," SMITH said.

POINTS TO DANGERS

This view was challenged by Representative GERALD R. FORD, Jr., Republican, of Michigan, a member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Intelligence.

"I see no need for any special committee," FORD said, "I know of no instance where we have requested information that it has been denied."

"The CIA is a lot more complicated than the FBI. It is involved in operations throughout the world and there could be real dangers to expose the CIA to total scrutiny."

FORD agreed that perhaps his and VINSON's subcommittees could do more to allay congressional suspicions about the CIA by apprising their colleagues of some of the information the subcommittees obtain.

"The trouble," he said, "is to determine what can be released. Everything about the CIA is so sensitive to national security you just can't give it to everyone but if you give it to one you've got to give it to all and then you have a big, first-class leak."

We Must Stand Together in This Hour of Sorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate Caleb King, Jr., editor of the Florida Times Union,

on the excellent editorial published in the November 25 edition of that paper. It was truthfully there said that "A man of courage and ability has fallen in the service of his country." Having served with Mr. King in World War II, I know that when he paid this tribute to our fallen leader, President Kennedy, he is conscious, as am I, that the President died as a soldier for his country, as truly as any recipient of the Congressional Medal of Honor. Soldierlike, Mr. King observes that "life must go on" and we must all "stand strongly behind" our new leader. The late President Kennedy would have been the first to say that. The editorial reads as follows:

WE MUST STAND TOGETHER IN THIS HOUR OF SORROW

A grim and sorrowing Nation will honor the late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, in solemn rites in Washington at noon today. The grief, which every American shares with the widow and family of the late Chief Executive, is in no way assuaged by the knowledge that justice is moving swiftly to exact retribution for the dastardly crime.

All Americans may, however, take justifiable pride in the way in which our Nation has drawn together in this hour of mourning and in the spirit of bipartisan cooperation which the Congress has pledged to President Lyndon Johnson upon his succession to the office lately held by a young and vigorous leader.

Many Americans are inclined to view the theory of bipartisan support with skepticism. The theory was devised by President Franklin D. Roosevelt to meet the emergencies and needs of World War II, but it has not always been successfully applied since his time.

But, bipartisanship is an honorable policy for all to follow in times of national crisis and tragedy, such as this Nation is now experiencing. In such times there can be no thought but that which is the best for the Nation as a whole.

In these modern times it is hard to decide where domestic and foreign policies end or begin. It used to be said that domestic policies ended at the water's edge, but now those things which affect us internally often affect us externally as a nation. The President's murderer has, therefore, changed all our history in the single, treacherous pull of a trigger.

No one can say with certainty what the changes will be nor how they will affect all of us or all free men in the world.

The new President has in brief and solemn words sought the bipartisan support of Congress, the help of the people, and the aid of Almighty God. The trials which now face him are many and great and upon their successful resolution much depends.

In the final analysis life must go on. A man of courage and ability has fallen in the service of his country. None can explain or understand why he should have been called upon to make this supreme sacrifice, to all it appears a useless and senseless waste of a life dedicated to service.

We may all give meaning to the life of the late President, so tragically shortened, by pledging ourselves anew to stand strongly behind President Lyndon Johnson and to offer prayers for the comfort of the living and a safe voyage through these perilous times for our Nation.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the entire world mourns the passing of our late President, as does our own Nation. We in Florida and the Sixth District feel the loss acutely, as we considered the President and his family as neighbors and friends. The winter White House at Palm Beach was a familiar place to all, and Palm Beach itself had witnessed not only the comings and goings of the President but his growth and development from childhood until the weekend prior to his tragic death.

Millions of words have already been written about the man and the act which has taken him from us at the prime of his life, when we know in our hearts words cannot express our feelings. To his family we can only say the prayer, God be with you, which has already manifested itself in the courage and strength which we have all witnessed and which will be an inspiration for years to come.

To the memory of John Fitzgerald Kennedy the American people should rededicate themselves to abolish from this land forever the hate and discord which created the atmosphere for this tragedy, and remember the warning of Lincoln that while no foreign power may ever conquer, we have within ourselves the power to destroy our own Nation. Every single citizen must take an active part in the work of returning our Nation to the rule of reason and of law.

Mr. Speaker, I include several representative editorials from Florida at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Palm Beach Post, Nov. 23, 1963]

SHOCK AND MOURNING

America today is in mourning.

A great, good man is dead at the hands of an assassin. The youngest man ever elected to the Presidency of the United States, a brilliant statesman with a valorous war record, a beloved family man with an abiding faith in God—has been cut down in the prime of his career.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy has joined the martyrs. Like his illustrious predecessors, he now belongs to the ages.

In the Palm Beaches, which was to the President a "second home" and site of the "winter White House," shock prevails. Only a few days ago, he was among us, vigorous and smiling.

We join the universal hope that his assassin will be apprehended and properly punished. But this is a secondary consideration. Such a foul deed could have been conceived and executed only by diseased minds.

Our thoughts at this time are primarily of sympathy for the bereaved family, and of hope and concern for our new President, Lyndon B. Johnson.

May God be with them all, and with us.

[From the Fort Lauderdale (Fla.) News,
Nov. 24, 1963]

**WORDS UNSPOKEN AT DALLAS OFFER GUIDANCE
TO NATION IN THE TRYING DAYS AHEAD**

President John F. Kennedy was to have made a speech in Dallas on Friday. Before he reached the appointed place, the 35th President of the United States held a rendezvous with death and his voice was stilled forever, his words unspoken.

Although they were left unsaid, the words should be our guide in this awkward hour when a President of the United States rests this very day in state in the rotunda of the Capitol, and while the new President works in the heavy presence of death and mourning, to take over our Nation's affairs and chart the direction the ship of state shall sail for the next 14 months.

Well might President Lyndon B. Johnson heed those words unspoken. Well might every American citizen weigh them and accept them as counsel through the convulsions that must occur during the difficult transition.

What Mr. Kennedy had intended to say in his Dallas speech was an excerpt from the Bible, Psalm 124: "Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it. Except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain."

Mr. Kennedy was a master of oratory and there were those among us who believed that he often spoke wise counsel, but too often did not pay heed as he spoke. All of that is of consequence no longer, for in the martyrdom of his high office, the President rests exalted of human frailties, left to the judgment of his Maker and of history.

What is of consequence is that Mr. Kennedy had chosen to recite from a psalm which, through lamentable and shocking circumstances, should now become an echoing reminder for Americans through the remaining ages.

They are the words in which can be found the answer to the anguished question of House Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK, who, when informed of Mr. Kennedy's assassination, cried out: "My God, My God. What are we coming to?"

Both the question and the reply found in the psalm should serve as admonitions to each and every American citizen. Indeed, what were we coming to in the mounting tempest, calmed for now by the chill of death?

Irrefutably, we had become a divided nation; ultra-liberal against ultra-conservative, Democrat against Republican, northerner against southerner, atheist against religionist, black against white, American against American.

We had been caught up in an ugly web of opportunism, of materialism; placed at the mercy of outside influences that would bury us, sapped of resolve to pay any cost for the preservation of our inherited doctrine, caught in a crosscurrent of demands upon another without regard for one to the other.

We were a finely divided nation and we knew it; yet little of anything was accomplished in restoring our national unity. We were on a collision course with the future that awaited us in November 1963.

Our direction from that point on shall remain forever unknown, obliterated by a searing bullet triggered by one individual whose horrendous action may leave us uncertain and exposed to deepening schism, or spared the rendering that awaited at the point of collision.

That we never will know.

But this we do know: If this Nation is to be destroyed and, as Mr. Kennedy once said,

Kennedy Hails Role of CIA

President Kennedy has given the Nation flat assurance that the Central Intelligence Agency has not carried out independent activities in South Viet Nam.

John H. Richardson, CIA chief in Saigon, recalled reportedly under some sort of cloud last week end, is "a very dedicated public servant," Mr. Kennedy told his news conference last evening. He operated under close control of CIA Director John McCone, the President added.

He referred, however, to the "transfer" of Mr. Richardson, indicating the controversial figure would not return to Saigon.

A search of the record in the last nine months shows the CIA

has done nothing but support agreed policies in South Viet Nam, Mr. Kennedy reported.

"It does not create policy," he emphasized, "it attempts to execute it in those areas where it has competence and responsibility."

Moreover, the CIA director, the United States Ambassador, Henry Cabot Lodge, and the Secretaries of State and Defense are now in agreement on policy in Viet Nam. If there is disagreement at lower levels, he speculated, this would be because "they are not wholly informed of what actions we are taking. Some of them are necessarily confidential."

Reports the CIA undercut United States policy in Viet Nam are "wholly untrue" the President declared.

"While the CIA may have made mistakes," he added, "as we all do, on different occasions, and has had many successes which may go unheralded, in my opinion in this case it is unfair to charge them as

they have been charged. I think they have done a good job."

No new congressional watchdog committee is needed to keep an eye on the CIA, in the President's opinion, because those Congressional groups now watching CIA expenditures are doing an adequate job.

The President also assured the Nation that the United States continues to oppose military coups in Latin America.

Coups are "self-defeating and defeating for the Hemisphere" he said.

Both the Dominican Republic and Honduran governments have recently been overthrown by coups.

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18143

ure we are now considering. I believe a base plan of the type I suggested would have been an effective instrument in reducing surpluses, and as it did so, it would reward those dairy farmers who had reduced their production. There is no logic whatsoever in encouraging the production of \$3 milk in an area where producers need \$5 to \$6 to cover the cost of producing milk.

However, it soon became apparent during the hearings that my bill was too severe for any serious consideration. There was too much active opposition to it by major segments of the industry. As a matter of fact, even after the Department of Agriculture proposed less stringent language it was still thought too severe by some.

Be that as it may, the fact remains that my bill was unacceptable.

In its place, however, we have a bill, S. 1915, which I believe will be helpful, over a period of years, in reducing production in market order areas. As a result we anticipate that there will be some savings to the taxpayer, and at the same time a slight increase in income to farmers.

I am a realist, therefore, I have given up hope on my bill. Instead, I support S. 1915, the measure now before the Senate, because it will accomplish some good.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for yielding to me.

SEPARATION OF INTELLIGENCE AND OPERATIONAL FUNCTIONS IN THE CIA

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the assessment of intelligence and the carrying out of covert or paramilitary operational activities are two very different functions. These days we often hear the words "conflict of interest." But, if there was ever a conflict of interest, it is when the same group of men, first, collect intelligence and make an assessment of the intelligence they have collected and coordinated, and then, secondly, proceed to carry out an operation on the basis of the selfsame intelligence they have collected and assessed. The temptation to trim the intelligence or, at least, their assessment of it, to suit the operation is well nigh irresistible.

An excellent example of the tragic results that can result from the failure to separate the assessment of intelligence from operational activities was demonstrated at the Bay of Pigs 2½ years ago.

If one result was drawn, if one lesson was learned, from that affair, it was that the responsibility for intelligence collection and assessment must be separated from the responsibility for carrying out operational activities.

I remember being among the small group of public officials who publicly took a stand prior to the Bay of Pigs, warning that an invasion would be unlikely of success since the majority of the Cuban people at that time favored the regime, a conclusion derived from my own visit to Cuba following my election in 1960 and a conclusion which I announced publicly after my return. After the Bay of Pigs, a board was set up and the general impression was that there would be drastic overhauls in our Central Intelligence Agency, including a separation of responsibility between those who gather and assess intelligence as opposed to those who carry out operational activities.

In fact, not only does the centralization of responsibility for the gathering and assessment of intelligence and the carrying out of subsequent operations rest under the same roof here in Washington, but the chiefs of station in the field appear to be carrying on these dual and conflicting responsibilities.

In this connection, too, we all recall President Kennedy's instruction to our Government personnel abroad on May 29, 1961, when he said that only the American Ambassador should be responsible for all American Government activities abroad. The President instructed that each Ambassador be fully informed about the activities of all agencies of the American Government in the country to which he is assigned. Yet, I must say that the Ambassador who is both completely at ease and fully informed about all the activities conducted by American Government people in the area of his assignment and aware of all the messages home is indeed a rare bird.

I fully realize that the Central Intelligence Agency is in general run and manned by remarkably brilliant, dedicated, and responsible individuals and that it has scored many successes. I also realize that, being an intelligence organization, the Central Intelligence Agency is in the defenseless position of being attacked for its public failures but unable to discuss freely its successes.

The question where there is doubt in my mind is whether the total number of successes outweigh the total number of failures; whether our American national interest in totality has been helped or hampered by the Central Intelligence Agency. And, when this determination is made, I believe we must separate the intelligence and assessment functions from the operational functions.

My own personal view is that a complete, fair assessment would show that the United States would have, on balance, gained greatly as the result of its intelligence collection and assessment activities. But I also believe that, on balance, the U.S. national interest may well have lost more than it has gained from its CIA operational activities, particularly if one takes into account the lives and

the dollars that have been lost in the carrying out of these activities. And I believe that an objective appraisal will show that when decisions to carry out operational activities have gone sour, the reason for clouded judgments has simply been that the same group assesses the intelligence and then proceeds to carry out the operation.

Actually, in South Vietnam, where, as the public press has set forth, we have had an excellent and veritable Central Intelligence Agency chief of station, we might find ourselves in a better position if there were a greater separation between collecting and assessing of intelligence on the one hand and the carrying out of the subsequent operations on the other. We might not then be playing quite the same role we now do where the United States is helping finance and arm the South Vietnam regime's special forces, which carry out the persecution, beating up, and abuse of political opponents. I do hope that, in order to improve our situation in South Vietnam and throughout the world, the administration will make more positive steps to separate the responsibilities for the gathering and assessment of intelligence from the carrying out of subsequent operational activities.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at this point a well thought-out editorial from Tuesday's Washington Post illustrating the necessity of such a separation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

OUR MAN IN SAIGON

The recall of the CIA chief in South Vietnam should not be an occasion for recrimination. It should be an occasion for some useful reconsideration of the general role of an intelligence agency in foreign affairs. Ambassador Lodge is reportedly concerned about the prevailing arrangement that makes the CIA both an intelligence-gathering organization and an operational agency in the field. Mr. Lodge is not alone in his concern.

In theory, within the CIA, the intelligence and operational activities are kept separate. In practice, the two functions cannot be kept apart so easily; experience has shown that agency operatives in the field have a tendency to use intelligence to support an operational decision. The result, too often, is that Washington receives neither an impartial intelligence nor benefits from operations based on a hard-headed perception of reality.

Clearly the CIA is at a disadvantage in any public debate of its activities; the agency cannot speak for itself. Success often goes unnoticed; failure just as often may lead to an exaggeration of the CIA's responsibility. This is the price that secrecy exacts. But public concern in the agency's performance is legitimate and should not be frustrated with an attempt to smear or to impede the motives of any CIA official.

What is sorely needed is a thorough and fair overall study of the intelligence community. Such an inquiry ought to deal with rivalry between the CIA and the Defense Intelligence Agency. It ought to draw on experience in other countries where intelligence and operational activities are lodged with separate organizational entities. And Congress should take the initiative in launching such a study.

For too many years, Members of Congress have closed their eyes to the need for legis-

18144

lative scrutiny into intelligence operations. Yet who else can do the job? The public lacks the facts; the administration has a record to defend; the Agency cannot be expected to study itself. Enough has come to light to justify an impartial inquiry, which might properly be conducted by a special legislative commission drawing on Members of both Chambers and upon private citizens of stature and experience.

If an investigation should discover no grounds for changing the present arrangement, public apprehension would be lessened. If an investigation should disclose need for basic changes, then the country might be saved from future embarrassment. In either case, the United States would be the gainer and Congress would have discharged a duty that it has been far too reluctant to perform.

Mr. PELL. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for yielding, and recall to his mind that I was a cosponsor with him in the previous Congress of a resolution that would have gone far in this direction, establishing a joint committee for supervision of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I was pleased to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island. There are special problems regarding the Central Intelligence Agency. I join him in expressing the hope that the Agency itself may support changes such as he recommends, and that the administration may respond not only to the criticisms about the Central Intelligence Agency and some of the more or less obvious indications of its operational failures, but what I think are some of the inadequacies of the whole structure of intelligence gathering and intelligence interpretation, and determine its action based on such information and interpretations.

If such action is not forthcoming from the Agency and such support is not forthcoming from the executive branch of the Government, Congress should move on its own initiative to try to improve the general operations of the Agency.

REDUCTION OF EXCESS MARKETINGS OF MILK

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1915) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and to encourage the reduction of excess marketings of milk, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, at the proper time tomorrow, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] I shall call up an amendment to the pending legislation, Amendment No. 193.

There is widespread unrest and uneasiness and concern among dairy farmers. In my opinion such concern on the part of dairy farmers is wholly justified. They find themselves in an economic situation which continues to grow more and more distressing. Dairy farmers are not receiving the benefits or returns from their work which are justified. Nor are they receiving the benefits of the Government program which was de-

signed to insure at least a reasonable return to them for what they contribute to the general economy and general welfare.

There is little hope for improvement in this situation unless Congress takes steps to reduce the surplus which depresses the dairy market and takes some steps to insure that dairy farmers will receive something approaching a fair return, or at least a fairer return, in the way of payment for that which they produce.

The legislation being sponsored today by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] takes one very limited step toward that objective, but, in my judgment, it falls far short of what is needed.

Of the major farm commodities which are under mandatory price supports, only the dairy industry shows a decline in the support prices received today as compared to 3 years ago.

In 1960, the average support price for wheat was \$1.78 a bushel. In 1963, the average support price was \$2.

In the case of corn, in 1960 it was \$1.06 a bushel. In 1963 it is \$1.25 a bushel.

In the case of cotton, the price per pound for upland, middling one-inch, was \$0.3242 in 1960. In 1963, it is \$0.3247.

In the case of peanuts, the 1960 average price support was \$0.1006. It is \$0.112 in 1963.

In the case of rice, it was \$4.42 in 1960. In 1963, it is \$4.71.

In the case of Flue-cured (11-14) tobacco, it was \$0.555 in 1960. In 1963 it is \$0.566.

In the case of milk for manufacturing purposes, the average support price in 1960 per hundred pounds was \$3.22. In 1963 it is down to \$3.14.

In my opinion, the producers of nearly all farm commodities deserve a higher income and a better price for their commodities. But it is clear from the comparative position of dairy price supports and dairy income that dairy farmers have more reason for dissatisfaction and greater need for remedial legislation—and that Congress, therefore, has a greater responsibility in this area.

The proposed legislation should be considered not only as dealing with the dairy industry, but also against the whole broad background in our approach to what is called the "farm problem."

Some commentators through the years have referred to what they call the farm bloc, and in recent months have observed that the farm bloc is "gone" or has disintegrated. I believe it is misleading to refer to a farm bloc, since there is no such organized bloc in Congress.

Of course, Members of Congress have a particular concern and a particular responsibility for farmers who produce specific crops in their districts or States.

However, the record of Congress over the past 25 years shows that many important pieces of farm legislation were enacted with the active support of Members of Congress from urban districts and urban States. In other words, farm legislation was not "put over" by adding up a farm bloc of sufficient votes to pass its legislation, or placed on the statute books by a kind of log-rolling operation.

Rather, it was in response to recognition by a majority of the Members of Congress of a justification and a need for this type of legislation, even though it applied primarily to the agricultural sector of our economy and to farmers.

There have been some partisan differences, of course, with respect to the correct approach to farm legislation. However, this is true with respect to almost every issue that comes before Congress. We should not enact legislation on a "bloc" basis. Congress should take problems as they come and review them and determine whether legislation is needed. The judgment should be based ultimately on whether legislation is in the national interest, and what is demanded by justice. If we were to act only when the States represented by a majority of the Members of Congress were directly benefited, much of the legislation in the way of development of water resources, and of other important conservation undertakings, which characterized the last 50 years of our history, would never have been initiated.

It is said that many Members of Congress are now indifferent to farmers and farm problems, particularly since the wheat program was rejected. I do not know whether it is true. Perhaps action on the pending dairy program may afford the first real test. Certainly I hope it is not true because the problems and difficulties of dairy farmers are serious and need attention.

The dairy program is not the same as the wheat program. Each must be dealt with separately. Each represents a particular approach to a specific problem.


In the case of the dairy industry, we are faced with the problem of continuing surpluses. The dominant influence upon the dairy industry and upon dairy prices today is the tremendous surplus of dairy products, for which there is no ready market. It acts to drive prices down toward the minimum support level, which currently is \$3.14 per hundred-weight for manufacturing milk. The surplus is so great that last year it cost the Government nearly \$500 million to maintain prices even at this near substandard or subsistence level.

In the last marketing year, the surplus of milk was 8.9 billion pounds of the 118 billion pounds marketed, or about 7.5 percent.

In April 1962, the price support level dropped to the minimum of 75 percent of parity set by law, from \$3.40 per hundred to \$3.11. It was predicted by some a year ago that the surplus problem would take care of itself because the 30-cent drop in support price would discourage production.

At best, that was a theory. Even if it were sound as a theory, it would be a questionable way to bring about adjustment in the production of milk. It shows little concern for the welfare of thousands of dairy farmers who individually have no way of bringing supplies in line with demand. It would represent a kind of squeeze-out theory for bringing about an adjustment in American agriculture.

In any case, this approach has failed, as many who discussed it at the time said it would fail. Despite bad weather

UNCLASSIFIED		CONFIDENTIAL		SECRET	
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP					
TO	NAME AND ADDRESS	DATE	INITIALS		
1	Mr. Elder 7D5617	11 Oct 63	AK WE		
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
ACTION		DIRECT REPLY		PREPARE REPLY	
APPROVAL		DISPATCH		RECOMMENDATION	
COMMENT		FILE		RETURN	
CONCURRENCE		INFORMATION		SIGNATURE	
Remarks: <p style="text-align: center;">The Director will be interested in this.</p> <div style="text-align: center; margin-top: 20px;">  </div>					
FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO SENDER					
FROM: NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NO.				DATE	
Legislative Counsel, 7D01				11 Oct 63	
UNCLASSIFIED		CONFIDENTIAL		SECRET	

Edna F. Kelly

17958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

October 8

Another good sign of the economic vitality of El Salvador is the increasing amount of outside private capital being invested in the country. A combination of Esso and Shell already has an investment of more than \$10 million; Phelps Dodge is building a \$2 million copper and aluminum wire and cable plant. The Phillips Co. of the Netherlands is constructing a \$600,000 electric light bulb and appliance plant. Italian and U.S. interests are establishing a \$300,000 pencil and office supply plant.

Under the able hand of President Julio Rivera, and with the cooperation of Alliance for Progress officials, El Salvador is demonstrating to Latin America and to the world the effectiveness of the Alliance for Progress. El Salvador is not the only Alliance success story. Venezuela, Mexico, Argentina, Colombia—are all moving ahead of the anticipated schedule for the Alliance for Progress.

In El Salvador, as in many other parts of Latin America, the desired progress is being achieved through peaceful and creative evolution—an evolution more rapid, more comprehensive, and touching the lives of more people, than any that our history has ever known.

ESTABLISHING JOINT COMMITTEE TO SUPERVISE INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

(Mrs. KELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is most unfortunate that, for the past few weeks, there is evidence of misunderstanding in our military operations and military objectives, including our Central Intelligence Agency. Mr. Speaker, I feel there is no need to enlarge on this subject, but to state the fact that back in 1952, I foresaw the need to establish a joint committee of Congress to supervise all intelligence activities. I sought the advice of the late Senator McMahon, of Connecticut, who had so ably worked and helped to establish the great Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. He gave me much good advice and I sought also the advice of many lawyers who assisted in writing a resolution which was introduced by me on July 20, 1953, and was numbered House Concurrent Resolution 168. I continued to press for the adoption of this resolution in each succeeding Congress. This same resolution was numbered House Concurrent Resolution 29 in the 84th Congress; House Concurrent Resolution 3 in the 85th Congress; House Concurrent Resolution 3 in the 86th Congress; House Concurrent Resolution 3 in the 87th Congress; and House Concurrent Resolution 3 in the 88th Congress. While I do not believe in the numbers, Mr. Speaker, I do believe that "three and out" is a good omen. Let us "out" with this resolution in the Rules Committee, and pass it on the floor.

Congressman ZABLOCKI also introduced this resolution, as did Congressman Judd. It was over a year before any other Member of the House introduced a similar resolution and it was after much urging

that Members of the other body followed our advice. The history surrounding this joint resolution is well established in the archives of Congress, but I regret to say, Mr. Speaker, that I firmly believe that, had this joint committee been established in the past, many of the problems involving U.S. intelligence would not be in the forefront of world news today. I therefore urge that the Members of Congress look into the need for such a resolution, sponsor one, and urge action by the present Congress.

To give a brief background on the story on this subject, I will insert again a statement I made in the past.

STATEMENT BY HON. EDNA F. KELLY, IN SUPPORT OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 3 TO ESTABLISH A JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE MATTERS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON RULES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MARCH 1, 1961

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of this committee. I am grateful to the committee for its invitation to appear here today and give testimony in support of House Concurrent Resolution 3 which I introduced.

Perhaps it is somewhat appropriate that this matter was originally scheduled for hearing before this committee on the anniversary of the birthday of our first President. This coincidence prompts me to look back to the principle upon which our country was founded and upon which our Constitution is based. I, therefore, urge each of the members of the committee, bear in mind when considering my resolution, the constitutional system of checks and balances between the executive and legislative branches of this Government.

While hindsight is infinitely clearer than foresight, when discussing House Concurrent Resolution 3, I cannot help but reflect and think that had this resolution been adopted 8 years ago, when I first introduced it in the 83d Congress, many unfortunate incidents involving the security and prestige of the United States might have been avoided.

I cannot emphasize too strongly, however, the continuing need for the establishment of a Joint Congressional Committee on Intelligence Matters. With the high degree of world tensions, with the farflung scope of our foreign policy and other activities, when a single miscalculation may bring disaster, such a committee, as an arm of the Congress, is urgently required. The resolution calls for a continuing study, by such committee, of our Government's intelligence activities "and problems relating to the gathering of intelligence affecting the national security and of its coordination and utilization by the various departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Government."

As you know under the present system, the Central Intelligence Agency, which was created in 1947 is responsible only to the National Security Council. There is no supervision or control by the legislative branch. The extent of its independence is demonstrated by the lack of review of the agency's expenditures by the Congress. In short, CIA makes its own policy and procedures, spends as much money as it may require, reviews its own errors if its conscience so dictates, and selects such remedies as it deems proper to correct its errors and to improve its operations. In this system the errors are never admitted while others which must be or are obvious may, after proper preparation, be presented as premature or unexpected.

While the need for secrecy in our intelligence activities is obvious, I feel, as many of my colleagues, that until a Joint Committee on Intelligence is created, there will be no way of determining what defects in the CIA

may be covered by the veil of secrecy with which it is shrouded. Our success with the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy certainly justifies the present undertaking.

Let the committee or the public consider this proposal to be quickly conceived or inspired by the recent U.S. incident, I consider it important to explore the background of this resolution.

Late in 1950, while serving on the committee which was responsible for the enactment of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951 (Battle Act), I came to realize the tremendous lack of knowledge, on the part of the Congress, of intelligence matters. After 2 years of periodic consultations with Members of the House, Members of the other body, and legal counsel, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 168 in the 83d Congress. While I endeavored to convince many other Members of the House to cosponsor my resolution, my success was limited to my distinguished colleagues Mr. Zablocki (H. Con. Res. 169, 83d Cong.) and Mr. Judd (H. Con. Res. 170, 83d Cong.).

Thereafter, I continued to press for the adoption of this resolution in each succeeding Congress (84th Cong., H. Con. Res. 29; 85th Cong., H. Con. Res. 3; 86th Cong., H. Con. Res. 3; 87th Cong., H. Con. Res. 3). As time passed, other of my colleagues either introduced similar resolutions or voiced their approval.

In 1954 a similar proposal was introduced in the other body. In 1955 this committee held hearings on this same resolution and referred the matter to a subcommittee for study. Thereafter, an additional hearing was held but no further action was taken.

During the 84th Congress, the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration considered a similar resolution sponsored by 36 Members of the Senate, and reported it favorably. (S. Rept. 1570, 84th Cong., 2d sess.). In its report the committee included several germane comments of the task force of the Second Hoover Commission.

The report stated:

"The task force is concerned over the absence of satisfactory machinery for surveillance of the stewardship of the CIA. It is making recommendations which it believes will provide the proper type of 'watchdog' commission as a means of reestablishing that relationship between the CIA and the Congress so essential and characteristic of our democratic form of government, but which was abrogated by the enactment of Public Law 110 and other statutes relating to the Agency. It would include Representatives of both Houses of Congress and of the Chief Executive. Its duties would embrace a review of the operations and effectiveness, not only of the CIA, but also of all other intelligence agencies."

The report continued:

"Although the task force has discovered no indication of abuses of powers by the CIA or other Intelligence Agencies, it nevertheless is firmly convinced, as a matter of future insurance, that some reliable, systematic review of all the agencies and their operations should be provided by congressional action as a checkrein to assure both the Congress and the people that the hub of the Intelligence effort is functioning in an efficient, effective, and reasonably economical manner."

The future insurance was not provided.

If it had, would we have been stabbed in the back by the shipment of arms by Russia to Egypt during the then pending 1955 Foreign Ministers Conference? Would we have been informed on the Hungarian Revolution; the downgrading of Stalin; Iraq; the sputniks and the Cuban situation? Because we lack information these questions must be left unanswered.

All of this does not mean that I want to see the Congress go into the intelligence business. What I desire is proper and legitimate

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

17957

of efficiency, you could do most of the work that the Navy is doing now in 2 or 3 yards, but it maintains a series of yards as standbys against an emergency. It has to have the private yards as standbys against emergency, too. Do you want to have the only know-how on building or repairing ships located in the naval shipyards, or do you want this spread throughout the economy so that in case of emergency you have this valuable asset to fall back on? I think that the division is a fair one. It protects both the Navy and encourages the private shipyards that are indispensable in time of war.

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include certain tabulations relating to the conference report and the amendments in disagreement.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the motion which is pending is to recede and concur in the Senate position that in ship alteration, repair, and conversion the business of the Navy shall be distributed 65 percent to the public shipyards and 35 percent to the private shipyards. In my judgment this seems to be a reasonably satisfactory compromise. It is the language of the present law which was approved by Congress last year; it is the language which is contained in the President's budget; it is the language which is agreeable to the Secretary of Defense. I realize that there are many shades of feeling in regard to the situation. But in view of all the facts and circumstances, I trust that the House will approve the position of the conferees and agree to the motion which provides for 65-35 percent distribution of work in this field of Navy activity.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

(Mr. FRASER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the recent military coups in the Dominican Republic and in Honduras are of grave concern to all Americans. Our Nation has a deep commitment to constitutional government not only because it raises and enhances the dignity and personal freedom of those citizens who enjoy its benefits, but also because it provides the means whereby change can come about in an orderly fashion. Our concern about the takeover by military juntas in these countries is not predicated upon approval of every action taken by the constitutionally elected leaders of those

countries—indeed, perhaps some programs and actions should have been undertaken in a different manner than they were. The true failure here, however, lies in the use of unconstitutional means to make a change instead of leaving this decision to the citizens of those countries expressed through a free ballot.

I address myself today, however, to the implications which these military coups may have for American foreign policy and our aid programs. Should we interpret these setbacks as evidence of failure of the Alliance for Progress? I think not. It is my judgment that these overthrows are clear evidence of the urgency of the need for an ever stronger effort through the Alliance for Progress.

We are engaged in a long-range war in this hemisphere to make freedom prevail over oppression; enlightenment over ignorance; and economic well-being over poverty. We will not win every battle, but we shall win the war through the combined efforts of the nations of this hemisphere joined in a common effort through the Alliance for Progress.

The 200 million people of Latin America are engaged in a gigantic revolution—the "revolution of rising expectations." It is a peaceful revolt against injustice, poverty, malnutrition, disease, illiteracy, and appalling living conditions. In many countries more than half the people are undernourished and illiterate and millions of children are denied an education because of the lack of schools and teachers.

The people of the hemisphere know that a better life is now possible. They want the material and social benefits enjoyed by the peoples of other nations in the 20th century, and they are impatient for change. They are determined that the decade of the sixties should become a decade of development.

The Alliance for Progress is a sustained cooperative effort, jointly planned through the Organization of American States and consisting of sound national programs for long-term economic and social development. The aim of the Alliance is, as President Kennedy declared:

The construction of a new community of American nations in which all our citizens can live not only free from fear but full of hope.

The Alliance has begun to lay solid foundations for progress. Latin Americans are beginning to build and own homes, send their children to new schools, receive previously unattainable medical attention, farm their own fields, gain jobs in new industries, travel over new roads, and join unions, credit institutions and cooperatives that aim to serve instead of exploit.

Thus, we must measure our setbacks in this hemisphere—hopefully only temporary—in the context of some of our gains. We are making gains.

El Salvador, for example, has become one of the shining lights in the Alliance for Progress.

Before the Alliance, El Salvador was a typical Central American Republic. Military governments, in cooperation

with the landed aristocracy, had kept the country in a semifeudal condition. Seventy-five families controlled 90 percent of the wealth, with the country's 2.7 million people working primarily on the large fincas of the great landlords.

El Salvador was one of the first Latin American nations to implement the Charter of Punta del Este, which established the Alliance for Progress. In early 1961, steps were taken to halt the flight of capital. A stabilization program was developed in cooperation with the International Monetary Fund in order to correct the balance-of-payments deficit and strengthen the country's currency. As a result of these controls, El Salvador now has a favorable balance of payments.

El Salvador continued its economic reform program by raising, in September 1961, the progressive income tax rates. These are now among the highest tax rates in the hemisphere. As a result, revenue receipts have increased over 40 percent. In 1 year governmental revenues were increased by \$10.5 million. Other tax reforms followed. Measures were taken to increase the amount of tax paid for consumption and luxury goods. Tax collecting procedures were simplified and improved.

Hand in hand with administrative reforms new planning machinery was established. A National Council of Economic Planning and Coordination, composed of El Salvador's leading economic specialists, was created to spur economic activity and prepare long-range program budgets.

Recognizing that economic development must be coordinated with social development to provide a balanced approach for the overall well-being of the people, Alliance for Progress officials in El Salvador also tackled the social problems of the country. In early 1962 an agency was created for providing supervised production credit to small farmers. In little more than a year, nearly 6,000 agricultural credit loans have been made. Seven health centers, to serve 150,000 people were constructed in 1962. In addition, a mobile rural health program was begun, designed to serve 300,000 persons a year.

The National Housing Agency of El Salvador has already constructed 1,500 home units since the start of the Alliance. Just recently a national homebuilding mortgage agency was created, modeled after our own FHA, for stimulating greater investment in housing. This is a major step forward in the housing field, which is generally recognized as one of the most important aspects of social reform.

Education now consumes 22 percent of the national budget. In October 1962, apprenticeship training legislation was enacted. By December, some 300 apprentices were registered in training. A domestic peace corps has been organized in El Salvador to perform adult education and community development work.

El Salvador's economic growth is now greatly improved. In 1962, for example, industrial production rose over 20 percent from the previous year.

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

17959

congressional control over such activities. The Hoover Commission Task Force outlined the areas of congressional interest as follows:

1. Conduct comprehensive studies of foreign intelligence activities of the United States;
2. Look for overlapping and duplication;
3. Determine whether expenditures are within budget authorizations and in keeping with the expressed intent of Congress; and
4. Consider whether any of the activities are in conflict with the foreign policy aims and programs of the United States.

With these tools the Congress would re-assume its constitutional authority and in no way jeopardize intelligence activities.

One of the principal arguments advanced against my resolution is that no other nation permits legislative control of its intelligence activities. Such system is practical for the Soviet dictatorship and even for Great Britain where the administration is a part of and responsible to Parliament. Under our Constitution, however, with delicate system of check and balances, dislocations as in the case of CIA cannot be tolerated.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I respectfully urge that this committee do favorably report House Concurrent Resolution 3 for action by the House.

SECURITY RISKS

(Mr. SNYDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, on 2 successive days last week articles appeared in Chicago's American newspaper in regard to the State Department's move to oust Otto Otepka, Chief of the Evaluation Division of the Department's Office of Security.

These articles follow:

[From Chicago's American, Oct. 2, 1963]

THE ALLEN-SCOTT REPORT: BITTER ROW ON SECURITY RISKS

WASHINGTON.—The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee has pried open a real can of worms in its investigation of the State Department's move to discredit and oust Otto Otepka, 48, Chief of the Evaluation Division in the Department's Office of Security.

In digging into the Otepka case, the Senate probers have uncovered a backstage effort within the State Department to clear the way for a number of former security risks, including Alger Hiss, to worm their way back onto the Government's payroll as either employes or consultants.

According to the sworn testimony before the subcommittee, one of the central figures in this maneuvering is Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Affairs.

ADVISORY APPOINTMENTS

Cleveland touched off the bitter security row within the Department by appointing a number of persons with questionable security backgrounds to an advisory committee to study the staffing of Americans on international organizations.

According to the testimony, Cleveland also made inquiries as to whether it would be possible to bring Hiss, a former State Department official convicted of perjury to conceal espionage, back into the Department.

Otepka was so shocked over Cleveland's activities that he sent a series of blistering reports to his superiors, including one that was routed through channels to McGeorge Bundy, the President's Chief White House Adviser on Foreign Policy.

One of these reports included a detailed box score of persons with questionable security background whom Cleveland had either brought into the Department or was

in the process of trying to obtain job clearance for.

When the State Department's daisy chain tipped off Cleveland that he was being watched, he retallied swiftly by having John F. Reilly, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Security, place Otepka under surveillance. This was arranged through the office of Attorney General Robert Kennedy, a personal friend of Reilly.

Otepka was then removed from security operations. His phone was bugged and he was placed under close observation after it was learned that Senate investigators had questioned him, under subpoena, about security risks in the Department.

Charges of misconduct, involving the alleged release of documents to the Senate Subcommittee, were filed against Otepka September 23 by John Ordway, Chief of the Personnel Operations Division.

According to the findings in a State Department investigative report, evidence was found that Otepka had furnished "a copy of classified memorandum concerning the processing of appointments of the advisory committee on international organization staffing to Mr. J. G. Sourwine, staff director of the Senate Subcommittee for Internal Security. This memorandum concerns the loyalty of employes or prospective employes of the Department within the meaning of the Presidential directives of March 13, 1948."

INFORMATION ON SECURITY RISKS

The report also charged that Otepka was responsible "for the declassification of a document containing classified information addressed to McGeorge Bundy, the White House, and signed by William H. Brubeck, Special Assistant Secretary and Executive Secretary of the Department." This document contained information about security risks within the Department.

Otepka, a civil service and State Department officer for more than 20 years, has one of the most outstanding records in his field of work in the Government. He was responsible for sending Irving C. Scarbeck, a Foreign Service Officer, to jail for passing U.S. secrets to the Russians, and for investigating William Wieland in connection with the State Department's Cuban policy. In all his investigations, the records show he has bent over backwards in protecting the rights of individuals under his surveillance. The Senate Subcommittee now plans to give Otepka the same protection.

[From Chicago's American, Oct. 3, 1963]

A PLOT TO BRING HISS BACK

We are almost beyond being surprised at any goings-on in the State Department, but we do find this one astonishing: There is a group in there that is working like mad to bring the convicted perjurer, Alger Hiss, back into the Department. And for this purpose, the group is trying to get one of the Department's chief security officers fired. The officer is Otto Otepka, Chief of the Evaluation Division. He is opposed to the return of Hiss and to the proposed hiring of several men of doubtful loyalty.

These strange facts were set out on our editorial page Wednesday in the Allen-Scott report, which said the revelations had been brought to light by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. A leader in the movement to get Otepka out of Hiss' way, according to testimony given to the Senate subcommittee, is Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Affairs. Cleveland, according to testimony given before the Senate subcommittee, has been asking how it might be possible to get Hiss back on the payroll.

Hiss, you will remember, was convicted (and served a prison term) on charges of having perjured himself to cover up the fact that, while serving as an official of the State Department, he supplied Russia with U.S.

secrets. If Cleveland wants Hiss back, then obviously Cleveland should not be in the American State Department.

The Senate subcommittee should bring all phases of this peculiar situation to the country's attention. And in the meanwhile, it should not permit the firing of Otepka for thinking and acting like a loyal American.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is degerative that the Department of State advise the country forthwith as to whether or not there is any truth in the allegation that they are working to bring Alger Hiss back into the State Department. All America will want to know whether or not the charges in the above articles are correct—and if so, it is time that the Congress do something about it. If the statements are not true, the Congress and the American people deserve to know the facts.

WHEAT SALE TO THE SOVIET UNION

(Mr. CHAMBERLAIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, last night's Washington Evening Star and this morning's New York Times carried stories saying that a wheat sale to the Soviet Union was all but concluded. I find this all a little astonishing and disturbing.

It is astonishing because the administration apparently after only a few days of trial balloons and calculated press releases, without any genuine public or congressional debate, is willing to do handsprings to help relieve Khrushchev from the disastrous failures of Soviet agriculture. It is disturbing because nowhere have I found in the press reports a consistent statement of facts and figures that clearly spell out the factors that are involved in this deal. No one seems to know where this deal will lead. This fact raises a great many questions that must be settled before I, in my own mind, can support such a sale.

For instance, we are being sold from many sides that the trade in everybody's best interests—we dispose of our wheat surplus and get some needed gold and they get the wheat. But is it really that simple? Can we treat this trade deal as an isolated event in the cold war? Can we ignore the fact that the American people are spending more than \$55 billion this year to protect the free nations of the world from communistic aggression? Why are we so eager to get a paltry \$200 to \$300 million when we are at the same time spending 250 times that much to prevent the extension of communism? Why is the administration in such a hurry to conclude this deal?

As I understand the Latta amendment to the Agricultural Act of 1961, it declared the policy of Congress to be against the export or sale of any subsidized agricultural commodity to any nation that is not considered to be friendly. In the face of this clear and unmistakable pronouncement of congressional policy, it would seem that the President would undertake to consult officially with the Congress before con-

17960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

October 8

sidering any transaction such as has been reported in the press. It seems imperative to me that under the circumstances, Congress should be consulted on such a basic and far-reaching change of policy.

Another question: So we sell \$250 million worth of wheat to the Soviets. That would really only represent a small dent in our surplus of over \$3½ billion. So we make a few fast gold bricks. Is it worth it? The consequences of this trade deal will not end when the wheat-laden ships leave our harbors. We will have taken Khrushchev off the hook at home and he will be able to say to the Soviet people, "Look what I've done. I've gotten our capitalistic enemies to subsidize communism." No one could help but applaud such an astute leader.

How can we ever again ask the free nations of the world not to trade with communistic nations?

There is much about this whole transaction to be thoroughly explored. It should be done deliberately. We should not act in haste. We should not impulsively turn to a new form of dollar diplomacy devoid of other considerations. The President should make known all of his reasons for such a deal and let the American people and the Congress evaluate them. The quick shuffle that we are getting causes me to be suspicious. We must not be too anxious for a few pieces of silver or gold.

Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I am including a sampling of letters received from residents of Michigan's Sixth Congressional District with respect to this proposed transaction:

LANSING, MICH.,
October 2, 1963.

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Your last report (Sept. 30) did not contain anything about the administration's proposal to sell surplus wheat to the U.S.S.R., but when it was composed maybe the matter did not seem so possible.

There are many things in our Government that may be the discretion of the Executive Department and the Cabinet officers reporting to it, but is there no way that the ordinary citizen who tries to think the problems of our country through can express indignation at the inconsistency (ies) of the foreign policy? (except I mean by writing you). Why cannot we, the people, vote on selling vital supplies to our enemies?

I hope I am not inhuman and un-Christian in rebelling against such a proposal. I don't want anyone to go hungry—but when someone threatens to bury you (and Mr. K's threat was not an idle one) is it sensible or commercially wise to buy some of the spades, shovels and bulldozers for him? I would be willing to help pay the sums that will compose the profit or price of such sale if the commodity was kept from Russian life in even the same fashion that pigs and wheat were destroyed 30 years ago with less purpose.

Perhaps, everyone who agrees with me will not take the time to write you about their resentment of such folly on the part of the weather-vane foreign policymakers, but considering there was no use to write Michigan Senators my opinion of the treaty because of their committed prejudgment, I couldn't let this opportunity pass to condemn such bad business and lack of patriotism.

Most sincerely,

FLINT, MICH.,

October 2, 1963.

DEAR SIR: I was reading the newspaper this evening. In it was a item saying that this country may sell wheat to the Russians, if our President approves. Well sir, I can tell you now it made me pretty damn mad to think that the leaders of this country would even think of doing a thing like that.

Here we are with a national debt so high and our leaders in Washington asking for more. But the thing that tops it off is, the money they say is necessary to protect us from the very people we are going to sell wheat to.

As I have been reading about our past relations with Russia, I keep seeing where we have pulled their "chestnuts out of the fire", before. In fact it seems we have pulled a lot of "chestnuts out of the fire", for friends and foes alike, and our friends have turned out to be not so friendly either. I hope maybe we will wake up some day to the facts of life and get a little tougher. But if not that, lets get a little more for our money.

I cannot cite all of the figures, but I am sure you know them quite well. The figures I am referring to are: what it costs to maintain our defenses, also what it cost to support our so-called friends. If you add them all up, it would come to a pretty neat sum. Yet. There are leaders in this country jumping like a lot of fish out of water for a chance to help the Russians. Who by the way are the one's who said "We will bury you." They forgot to add that we will help them dig the hole.

The argument goes like this, for selling wheat to the Russians. "If we don't sell it to them some one else will." Well let me tell you something. The only ones in position to sell to them are our so-called friends. So I say, let them sell to the Russians. It will show who will sell us out for a better deal. As you have gathered by now I am against this deal. I am a disabled veteran and I add this only because I want you to know that our country had a little pride once.

Thank you.

BRIGHTON, MICH.,
October 2, 1963.

Representative CHARLES CHAMBERLAIN,
Lansing, Mich.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you in regard to the sale of wheat to Russia.

My husband and I are against this sale of wheat to Russia or any other communistic country.

We pretend to fight communism, yet here we are in the act of feeding it.

I remember a few years ago we sold scrap iron to a country and how did it come back. This is the same thing. We will be nourishing it. I feel that President Kennedy has let the American people down by this approval of wheat being sent to Russia.

Thanking you for your kind attention to past correspondence, I am

Yours truly,

U.S. POLICY AIMS IN LATIN AMERICA

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

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, the rush of recent events makes necessary some restatement of basic U.S. policy aims in Latin America. In this regard, I commend Assistant Secretary of State Martin for his forthright and realistic statement of last Saturday relating to what this country can and should do about government upheavals in the hemisphere.

There is no question but that the best interest of the United States lies in the existence of a democratic and economically stable Latin America. Thus, our purpose in the area is to create an atmosphere in which democracy and economic stability can flourish.

But as Assistant Secretary Martin rightly points out, democracy is "a living thing which must have time and soil and sunlight in which to grow."

"We must do all we can to create these favorable conditions," Mr. Martin says, "and we can do and have done much." However, he continues, "we cannot simply create the plant and give it to them; it must spring from seeds planted in an indigenous soil."

As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, I have often criticized past State Department attitudes and actions which I believe were not in the best interests of our country. However, Mr. Martin's incisive analysis of our Nation's responsibility and capability in dealing with Latin American coups and government upheavals deserves special praise, coming as it does when a confused clamor is heard to enforce democracy-by-gunboat in the Dominican Republic and Honduras.

We may hope that Mr. Martin's words are now to be followed by action supporting his thesis that we should not adversely judge the new regimes in these countries until additional evidence is in regarding their composition and intentions.

Confused indeed is the chorus that calls for immediate action, drastic action, even direct military action by this country to restore the Juan Bosch and Villeda Morales governments to power. Many of these voices are the same ones who so often in the past have been cautioning against any effective action directed against the Soviet satellite, Cuba. Where now are their arguments concerning the U.S. need to recognize the fact that it cannot enforce its will on the hemisphere? Where now the admonitions concerning the effect on world opinion if the United States intervenes in the domestic affairs of smaller countries? Where now the counsel of inaction and patience, the talk of "complexities" and the warnings against "oversimplifications" whenever steps are urged to meet the very real threat of Castro's Cuba to the hemisphere?

Gunboat diplomacy—is that not the very course which some now urge this country to pursue in the Dominican Republic and Honduras? But why, we may ask, do some of these same observers of the Latin American scene take an ambivalent position regarding undemocratic regimes of the left and the right? If these observers can be patient about Castro's Cuba, its undemocratic and totalitarian rule over the Cuban people, its role as a Soviet satellite increasing tensions throughout the hemisphere, and its service as a base for military and subversive operations against hemispheric security—why then impatiently urge the administration to call out the marines to intervene in the Dominican Republic and Honduras?

Surely these observers cannot seriously believe that the military juntas of the

UNCLASSIFIED		CONFIDENTIAL		SECRET	
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP					
TO	NAME AND ADDRESS		DATE	INITIALS	
1	Mr. Elder 7D5617				
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
ACTION		DIRECT REPLY		PREPARE REPLY	
APPROVAL		DISPATCH		RECOMMENDATION	
COMMENT		FILE		RETURN	
CONCURRENCE		INFORMATION		SIGNATURE	
<p>Remarks: Attached is a extract from the <u>Congressional Record</u> containing the remarks of Mrs. Edna Kelly with regard to a Joint Committee on Intelligence.</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 300px; height: 60px; margin: 10px auto;"></div> <p style="text-align: center;">Assistant Legislative Counsel</p>					
FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO SENDER					
FROM: NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NO.				DATE	
Assistant Legislative Counsel 7D01				9 Oct 63	
UNCLASSIFIED		CONFIDENTIAL		SECRET	

STAT

Watchdog for CIA

THO bad blood among U. S. agencies in South Viet Nam is officially denied, the fact remains that the head of Central Intelligence Agency operations in that country has been called home for consultations.

And that this recall promptly follows the return of Defense Secretary McNamara and Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor from an investigation of affairs in South Viet Nam.

The facts concerning this intelligence organization are exceedingly hard to come by, and properly so. No reasonable person would expect the CIA to publicize its operation. Any such policy would destroy its usefulness.

But an excess of secrecy, we suggest, is good neither for the country nor the CIA which, under present arrangements, isn't even accountable to Congress.

Even the top secret Atomic Energy Commission comes under the view of a joint committee of Congress, the members of which committee are able to influence, defend and interpret the policies of AEC without exposing any of its secrets.

Proposals to establish a similar committee for CIA repeatedly have fuzed out without action. Congress should be prompted by current events to establish such a committee.

The CIA operation, admittedly highly necessary under present world conditions, is something relatively new for the United States and is accepted reluctantly by a free society. But minimum congressional supervision is essential to public confidence that it operates effectively and stays within the bounds of its avowed mission.

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

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being 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 the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to dispose of approximately five million eight hundred thousand pounds of waterfowl feathers and down now held in the national stockpile. Such disposal may be made without regard to the requirement of section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98b (e)), that no such disposition shall be made until six months after publication in the Federal Register and transmission to the Congress and to the Armed Services Committees thereof of a notice of the proposed disposition.

THE TASK OF PREPARING AN ADVISORY REPORT ON THE STEPS WHICH MIGHT BE TAKEN TO REDUCE THE BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS DEFICIT

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, you will recall that I called the attention of the House on Tuesday to the action by the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, in assigning to me and two of my colleagues, Representatives R. T. HANNA, Democrat, of California, and WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Republican, of New Jersey, the task of preparing an advisory report on the steps which might be taken to reduce the balance-of-payments deficit.

My colleagues in the House are all familiar, I am sure, with the message of President Kennedy on July 18, with specific reference to our balance-of-payments problem but because of the detail of his excellent and exhaustive message, I believe that one significant paragraph should be emphasized in pointing to the need for a special study with regard to the imbalance of tourist circulation here and abroad as it affects the overall picture.

The President said:

Another element that requires attention in our commercial transactions is the increase in our unfavorable net tourist balance. With increasing prosperity encouraging American travel abroad, total tourist spending in foreign countries rose another 10 percent last year, to nearly \$2½ billion. This was partially offset by increased foreign tourist expenditures in the United States, but the net result was an outflow of \$1.4 billion, or two-thirds of last year's overall balance-of-payments deficit. This year the cost is estimated to be still greater.

I am sure, in view of the foregoing remarks by Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Patman showed great wisdom in deciding to have this aspect thoroughly explored.

I should like, also, to call attention of the House to a letter I received today from Mr. Voit Gilmore, Director of the U.S. Travel Service of the U.S. Department of Commerce.

Mr. Gilmore, a dedicated public servant, has done an outstanding job with limited resources in our efforts to generate more European tourist traffic to the United States which is so helpful in holding down this balance-of-payments deficit. I am sure the situation would be much more serious than that related by the President had it not been for the wise move by the Congress in creating the U.S. Travel Service.

Mr. Gilmore wrote me:

We believe it is important that your study identify and highlight the relationship of the "tourist dollar gap" in our balance-of-payments situation to the total U.S. balance-of-payments position. Your subcommittee would wish to give careful attention to the fact that U.S. tourist dollars spent abroad help many other countries purchase more U.S. goods and services than we purchase from them.

In studying ways to improve our travel balance-of-payments position, we believe you will find two major areas of emphasis: the "Visit USA" campaign abroad to attract foreign visitors to the United States, and the "See America" campaign aimed at U.S. citizens which is to be energized in 1964. An important distinction exists between the two. Through the U.S. Travel Service, our Government is effectively encouraging foreign travel to the United States with a program that is understood and approved by other governments. The "See America" campaign would logically be mounted by private enterprise, not by Government, because it could not only be disadvantageous to many U.S. organizations engaged in international travel, but also resented by other governments (particularly near neighbors such as Canada and Mexico) as a "don't go abroad" policy. However, substantial encouragement can be given to the American travel industry to enlarge and improve its tourist plant, thus enhancing U.S. travel destinations for U.S. and foreign visitors.

We are at the complete disposal of your subcommittee for such assistance as you would find helpful and we wish you every success in your study.

NEED FOR A CONGRESSIONAL WATCHDOG COMMITTEE OVER THE CIA

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have long been concerned over the way the CIA has carried on its clandestine activities in an uncontrolled and unrestricted manner. For our primary intelligence community to be appropriated funds and design its own course of direction without the benefit of close congressional scrutiny is not only unwise, but also an injustice to the American citizens whom we are sworn to represent.

We need a joint congressional watchdog committee over the CIA. The only argument against such a committee is the trite argument that the Congress cannot keep a secret and this has been disproved by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The Bay of Pigs fiasco in Cuba as well as recent developments in South Vietnam clearly show that the CIA and our other intelligence agencies need careful watching and evaluating by the Congress.

The CIA's apparent mistaken role of policymaker in the South Vietnam situation has backfired, and reports advise that the head of operations has been recalled by the U.S. Government. It is the role of the President of the United States to formulate the foreign policy of the United States; not the CIA. The function of the CIA is to gather information, and in some cases interpret it. To go further into the area of policymaking is unpermissible.

An editorial in Sunday's edition of the New York Times calls attention to the problem of the CIA in the area of policymaking and calls for a Joint Congressional Committee on Intelligence. It is encouraging to notice that more and more the newspapers of this country in their news reports on the conditions in South Vietnam are showing their concern along with Congress over the unbridled activities of the CIA. I have urged the Congress since January to adopt my bill, House Joint Resolution 211, which provides for the establishment of a joint congressional watchdog committee over the CIA and our other intelligence agencies. I feel that history has proved the need for such a committee, and I hope that the United States does not have to be rudely awakened again by another Bay of Pigs or a South Vietnam hassle before it acts.

I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD the New York Times' editorial from Sunday's edition that I mentioned above:

STATE WITHIN A STATE?

Is the Central Intelligence Agency a state within a state?

President Kennedy's recall of the head of CIA operations in South Vietnam, coming after persistent reports of discord between him and Ambassador Lodge, appears to provide substantive corroboration to the long-voiced charges that our intelligence organization too often tends to make policy.

The CIA is a large and, on the whole, well-organized intelligence apparatus, which knows and employs all the tricks of the trade. But it not only gathers intelligence, it "operates" saboteurs, guerrillas, and other paramilitary forces. And its operations—particularly if they are not carefully programmed, controlled, and directed—tend willy-nilly to influence policy, if not to make it.

The Agency has many extremely able men. But it operates behind the cloak of anonymity and secrecy—and secrecy adds to power. When the same organization collects intelligence and evaluates it, and, at the same time, conducts clandestine operations—and when that organization is as powerful and as well financed as the CIA—there is an inevitable tendency for some of its personnel to assume the functions of kingmakers.

Communist imperialism and the exigencies of the nuclear age have brought us eons away—whether we like it or not—from the era of 1929, when Secretary of State Stimson closed the Nation's only code-breaking organization with the remark that "gentlemen do not read each other's mail." Today we must read the other fellow's mail if we want to survive.

But the CIA, like the FBI, has gone too long without adequate congressional accountability. A Joint Congressional Committee on Intelligence, so long urged but so often frustrated by congressional pride of place and petty jealousies, should be established to monitor our intelligence services, to safeguard their security and to reduce the dangers secret espionage and covert operations present to a free society.

THE TITO VISIT

(Mr. HORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday of next week, the White House plans to welcome Dictator Tito of Yugoslavia. I wish to register my opposition to the visit of this missionary of communism.

Frankly, I am at a loss to understand why the President invited Tito to stop in Washington for an informal visit. Surely, the meeting of this assassin with our head of state can only be called a betrayal of freedom's interests.

The United States has nothing to gain from such a visit and a lot to lose. Already we can detect indications of resentment from those in Eastern Europe who are painfully aware of Tito's long record of brutality.

Ask yourself how you would react if you were one of the millions of people enslaved by world communism and saw a picture of President Kennedy shaking hands with Tito on the steps of the White House. Would it be any less revolting than the news photographs published recently of Tito, who has been given \$2.5 billion in U.S. aid, and Khrushchev embracing each other when the Kremlin chief spent 15 days in Yugoslavia? This was the occasion when these two Reds told an international news conference that they represented and would work for the same thing: a worldwide victory for socialism.

How can we expect the world to seriously believe that the United States is committed to an all-out effort to defeat Communists when a gangster like Tito is invited to visit the President of the United States? Tito is a Communist dictator who seized Yugoslavia and for years carried on a savage campaign against those who opposed him. Let us never forget that if the United States has to go to war to protect liberty, justice, and religion from the onslaught of communism, Tito and his nation will be on the other side.

I am afraid that the current euphoria over the possibilities for relaxed tensions between the free world and the Communist bloc are lulling us to sleep. Despite the test ban treaty, the proposed sale of wheat to Russia, the toned-down speeches of Russian leaders, there has been no change in the avowed intention of Moscow or Peiping to communize the entire world. I pray there never will be cause for a future author to write "Why America Slept."

Perhaps, we are too far removed from "the scene of the crime" to recognize Tito for what he is. But the Serbian emigrants from Yugoslavia and the people there today know what kind of man Tito is. They shall not forget how he snatched power with the support of Soviet bayonets; how he never has given the people the right of free elections, a free press, or free meetings; how he has killed or oppressed all the proponents of democracy, beginning with Gen. Draza Mihailovic; how he has imprisoned without judge or court more than

7 million voters only because they were for real democracy.

It is regrettable that the past visits to our country by other foes of the United States have not convinced this administration of the sorry consequences which usually follow. With President Kennedy's good-byes still ringing in his ears, Algerian ruler Ben Bella met with Fidel Castro and pledged his undying devotion to Red Cuba's anti-U.S. policy. British Guiana's Cheddi Jagan accepted our hospitality and then denounced us the moment he arrived home. Now he is working on a deal with Moscow to establish a Cuba-style regime. Ayub of Pakistan received lavish White House treatment, but now we are using our foreign aid in an attempt to keep him from the friendly arms of Communist China.

Mr. Speaker, Tito should not be welcomed by this country. I believe the President has made a big mistake in issuing the invitation to him.

STRIKES HURT AMERICAN,
MERCHANT MARINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

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

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House the plight of the American merchant marine. It is with deep regret, distress and a sense of frustration that I point out and call to the attention of the House the unusual situation that exists with reference to the ship, the *SS America*. The American merchant marine has received another setback in this instance with the cancellation of the October 4 sailing of one of the finest transatlantic passenger ships. A similar event occurred on September 14 when the *SS America's* voyage was canceled following a labor dispute in which the unlicensed crewmembers walked off the ship making such charges against an engineering officer as, being guilty of religious and racial bias, and the locking of a toilet so that unlicensed crewmembers could not use it.

As a result of this cancellation, 945 passengers already aboard the ship had to either give up their plans to sail to Europe or find alternate means of transportation.

Some 950 passengers were booked for the return voyage.

The October 4 sailing had been booked by 640 passengers sailing from New York, and another 895 on the return voyage from European ports.

Since that time the United States Lines has announced that three cruises of the *S. S. America* have been canceled. The United States Lines applied to the Maritime Administrator for permission to cancel the balance of the schedule for the year, but the administration at this time ruled that at least 2 of the 3 remaining transatlantic sailings must be made.

At the same time there are rumors in the trade that this overage vessel may

never sail again, thus reducing the number of jobs available to our merchant seamen.

Scarcely more than a week earlier than the first cancellation, Mr. Joseph Curran, president of the unlicensed seamen's National Maritime Union, proudly announced the reaching of an agreement with passenger and freighter operators which would extend the existing contract from 1965 to 1969. In a report to the union membership Mr. Curran said:

Your union proposed this long-term contract extension to the shipowners. They wanted stability in the industry so they could make long-range plans to expand their operations and build their fleets. NMU wants that kind of stability too. It will benefit our members and the merchant marine.

After the September 14 walkout the union and the United States Lines Co. submitted the dispute to arbitration, in accordance with the procedure under their contract, but not in time to permit the September sailing to proceed. Now the October sailing is held up even after the arbitrator's ruling that the men should return to work because the indications are that further controversy with the engineers' union will develop.

Mr. Speaker, we have had many months of hearings in the Merchant Marine Committee on maritime labor-management problems. All of the labor leaders and some management officials have told us that there is no situation in which labor and management cannot resolve differences without third party intervention.

Mr. Speaker, while I would not attempt to contend that the cancellation of three sailings of the *S.S. America* creates a national emergency, I must say that I feel that these recent incidents demonstrate very vividly the helplessness of the public as innocent victims of selfish and even childish fighting, with reckless disregard of the responsibilities that both the union leaders and their members should bear.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I refer not only to this incident but the previous situation just a short while ago when we had the whole Atlantic and gulf seaboard tied up. This paralyzed not only passenger and freight vessels of this Nation but cargo vessels and vessels of other nations. The docks on the Atlantic and gulf seaboard were piled high with cargo inbound and outbound. It cost this country millions and millions of dollars and emphasized the undependability of American flag lines. During that controversy the hearings which I have spoken of on the bill H.R. 1897 were proceeding in the House.

During the hearings the gentleman who controls the longshoremen on the Pacific coast testified that if the Atlantic coast, the South Atlantic coast and the gulf port stevedores requested it, he would have locked up the Pacific coast notwithstanding a valid and subsisting contract to work. And you would have had this Nation locked up—lock, stock and barrel—in its commerce, and everything else in the Nation would have had to stop operations in a comparatively

file: Joint Committee

I have mentioned and begin to try to devise some method which would make the Government supreme and enable the American public, which must pay the tax bill, to be recognized in their dignity and their just position in this dispute. I yield the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?
Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Delaware on the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President—
The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] has control of the time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

The VICE PRESIDENT. How much time does the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield such time as the Senator wishes.

Mr. GRUENING. Five minutes will be sufficient.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alaska is recognized for 5 minutes.

to reduce the dangers secret espionage and covert operations present to a free society."

I ask unanimous consent that the Times editorial, "State Within a State?" be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE WITHIN A STATE

Is the Central Intelligence Agency a state within a state?

President Kennedy's recall of the head of CIA operations in South Vietnam, coming after persistent reports of discord between him and Ambassador Lodge, appears to provide substantive corroboration to the long-voiced charges that our intelligence organization too often tends to "make" policy.

The CIA is a large and, on the whole, well-organized intelligence apparatus, which knows and employs all the tricks of the trade. But it not only gathers intelligence; it operates saboteurs, guerrillas, and other paramilitary forces. And its operations—particularly if they are not carefully programmed, controlled, and directed—tend to influence policy, if not to make it.

The Agency has many extremely able men. But it operates behind the cloak of anonymity and secrecy—and secrecy adds to power. When the same organization collects intelligence and evaluates it, and at the same time, conducts clandestine operations—and when that organization is as powerful and as well financed as the CIA—there is an inevitable tendency for some of its personnel to assume the functions of king makers.

Communist imperialism and the exigencies of the nuclear age have brought us close away—whether we like it or not—from the era of 1929, when Secretary of State Stimson closed the Nation's only code-breaking organization with the remark that "gentlemen do not read each other's mail." Today we must read the other fellow's mail if we want to survive.

But the CIA, like the FBI, has gone too long without adequate congressional accountability. A Joint Congressional Committee on Intelligence, so long urged but so often frustrated by congressional pride of place and petty jealousies, should be established to monitor our intelligence services, to safeguard their security and to reduce the dangers secret espionage and covert operations present to a free society.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield with pleasure.

Mr. MORSE. I join the Senator from Alaska in the comments he is making critical of the CIA. I particularly commend the New York Times for the penetrating editorial which the Senator has placed in the RECORD.

As the Senator from Alaska knows, I also have been disturbed for a long time about the unchecked powers of the CIA. I have said on the floor of the Senate many times—and I repeat today—that it is not safe in a democracy to have any segment of government exercising unchecked powers. When I speak of unchecked powers, I mean powers unchecked by the legislative branch of the Government, because we cannot operate this system of government by keeping with its constitutional intent and purpose if we take away from the Legislature the power to check any segment of the Government.

I am disturbed by what I hear from members of the Appropriations Committee to the effect that after the Ap-

SENATE SHOULD PASS SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 23 TO MONITOR THE CIA

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, last Thursday I addressed the Senate, urging that it was time for Congress to monitor the CIA. While it is supposed to be a factfinding Agency, in which role it has been notably unsuccessful, as in Cuba and now in Honduras, it has been more than evident, from the information that trickles through, that it is far more than that. It is also an undercover cloak and dagger organization, making its own policies, following its own bent, subject to no control by the Congress, a respect in which it is unique. That uniqueness is undesirable in our democracy.

As I pointed out on the floor of the Senate a year ago last January, when I was in Central America on a mission for the Public Works Committee, inspecting the Inter-American Highway, the head of the U.S. mission in one of the Central American countries told me that the CIA was active there, that it had a lot of money to spend, that it was promoting candidacies of individuals which were not in accord with the instructions and policies which our mission was receiving from the State Department.

It has been more than evident in Vietnam that the CIA there has been in conflict with the policies of the State Department and the efforts of our new Ambassador, Henry Cabot Lodge.

It is high time we sought to prevent such intragovernmental conflict. I referred in my remarks to the pertinent criticism of that situation voiced in the Senate on September 20 by the distinguished majority leader the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

My proposal would slightly amend concurrent resolution 23 offered by the distinguished junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], that a watchdog committee over the CIA, consisting of both House and Senate Members, and composed of three each from the Foreign Relations, Armed Services, and Government Operations Committees of the Senate as well as from corresponding committees of the House, be enacted.

I note with interest that the New York Times yesterday, October 6, editorially endorsed such a policy. In an editorial entitled "State Within a State?" it says that the CIA "has gone too long without adequate congressional responsibility" and it urges "that a Joint Congressional Committee on Intelligence should be established to monitor our intelligence services, to safeguard their security and

ALLEGED HIDDEN MICROPHONE

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in yesterday's Washington Post there appeared a certain article. I should like to read two paragraphs from that article:

WILLIAMS began his informal one-man inquiry last week by calling into his office at least three persons who allegedly have had close commercial dealings with Baker recently.

The interviews, it was learned, lasted from a half hour to an hour and the Senator had a secretary taking notes in an adjoining room equipped with a direct microphone arrangement into his office.

I quote again the last part of that statement:

The Senator had a secretary taking notes in an adjoining room with a direct microphone arrangement into his office.

Mr. President, there is no basis for that statement. The reporter who wrote it did not talk with me or with anyone in my office that I know of. I know he did not talk with me. I have been a Member of the Senate for 17 years, and there has never been a hidden microphone in my office and never will be as long as I am in the Senate. Anyone who has ever visited my office and wished to discuss any matter has discussed it with me in strict confidence, as intended, and if I wanted any notes taken, a secretary would be called into the office with the knowledge of the visitor, and he would be sitting in the secretary's presence.

I do not know why this story was put into the newspaper in that manner—whether it was merely an irresponsible piece of reporting or whether it was to frighten away somebody who might wish to come to my office and talk over some matter. I wish to make sure it does not serve its purpose. I emphatically deny that there is any truth whatsoever to it. Furthermore, the reporter who wrote it knows it is untrue.

I regret that such a report was ever made, however, since it has been made I want to set the record straight.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time which is under the control of the majority leader be under the control of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Commerce, who is in charge of the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ropriations Committee has some sort of check on the CIA. There are members of the Appropriations Committee who tell me that is not a check of any substance.

I repeat: The Congress is ducking its responsibilities in respect to the CIA. The Congress owes to the American people the placing of a clear legislative check on the CIA. The only way we can check it is to set up a congressional watchdog committee with authority and power to require from the CIA every bit of intelligence information the Congress thinks it ought to have in order to protect the operation of this system of government by checks and balances, because the alternative is the development of a creeping police state within the Government of the United States. That is developing. One cannot explain on governmental theory the unchecked power of the CIA except on the basis of the fact—and it is an ugly fact—that there is a creeping police state power developing within this democracy. It is a cancer which must be removed. The only way we can remove it is for the Congress to assume its clear constitutional duties as well as powers in respect to the CIA.

Mr. GRUENING. I could not agree more with my friend the senior Senator from Oregon. The CIA, operating in secret, as the Senator properly says, performing wholly contrary to our American traditions and our professions, is supposed to be a fact-finding Agency. It has been notably unsuccessful as a fact-finding Agency. It was wrong on Cuba. It misled us grievously with the result that Cuba has Castro and his Communist tyranny. It certainly contributed to the Bay of Pigs fiasco. It was apparently wrong on Honduras. Only 24 hours before the revolt the State Department let it be known—and presumably the State Department had access to the CIA's information—that no revolt was coming. Yet it "popped."

In addition to that, we know the CIA is far more than a fact-finding Agency. An article in the New Republic, a responsible publication, about a year ago, stated flatly that the CIA was responsible for an assassination in a Caribbean country.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The 5 minutes for which the Senator was recognized have expired.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I shall take only 1 minute more.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is the Senate operating under controlled time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is. The Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] yielded such time as he wished to the Senator from Alaska, within his time limitation.

Mr. GRUENING. I shall need only 1 minute more.

I do not know whether that charge was true. The mere fact that a responsible publication could make the charge that the CIA was responsible for the assassination of a political leader in a Caribbean republic should have been enough to bring about a congressional investi-

gation and the kind of action I urge, which the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] has proposed, and the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] so heartily and correctly endorses.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield me a minute?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations of the Committee on Government Operations may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, how much time have I under my control on the bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington has 25 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, if it is inconvenient for the Senator to yield, I am authorized to use time on this side.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Why not use 5 minutes of the time under the control of the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York yields himself 5 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, how much time is there?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington has 25 minutes. The Senator from New York yields himself 5 minutes. The Senator from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Chair.

RADIO ASTRONOMY SERVICE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, last Friday the Federal Communications Commission completed action in a rule-making proceeding of widespread public interest involving the future of the radio astronomy service. Its decision, I am heartened to report, was that channel 37, an optimum radio astronomy frequency, would be retained in the frequency allocation but would not be licensed for commercial purposes for a period of 10 years, that is, until at least January 1, 1974.

Mr. President, radio astronomy research is a vital part of our national scientific effort to uncover some of the dark secrets of outer space, with great present and potential practical value for the U.S. space program. Around the country, indeed around the world, both publicly and privately supported radio astronomy facilities have an intense stake in an exclusive frequency which will be protected on a longrun basis

from any and all manmade interference. Any erosion of the protection afforded such a frequency as channel 37 would be extremely detrimental to the future progress of radio astronomy and wasteful of the sizable investment in facilities which has so far been made; and it may well be that the 10-year protection just ordered by the FCC will not prove to be a sufficient guaranty of protection for the long-range needs of the program.

Nevertheless, the FCC is to be commended for its recognition of the broad public interest inherent in the radio astronomy service. I know that the institutions and companies in New York State which now maintain radio astronomy facilities or which are planning to install them in the future together with the thousands employed by them—to mention only several, Cornell University, the Hayden Planetarium, and the General Electric Co.—will welcome the FCC decision of last week.

It is my intention, however, to seek out scientific opinion in order to determine whether the action that was taken stopped short of fulfilling the permanent objectives of the program, and I will certainly want to make sure, if further protection should be necessary, that it will be afforded at the proper time.

KINGS COUNTY COUNCIL OF THE JEWISH WAR VETERANS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, each year the Kings County Council of the Jewish War Veterans are hosts to hospitalized veterans at Yankee Stadium. For a day, the council provides activities and amusements for these Veterans—many of whom rarely see the outside of hospital walls.

Mr. President, the Kings County Council of the Jewish War Veterans—in fact, all Americans—have not forgotten their obligation to their war veterans—men who have given so much in the name of America and freedom. Because of my admiration for the activities of the Jewish War Veterans of America, I have introduced legislation in this Congress which would incorporate this group. If enacted, this legislation would grant Federal recognition to this organization. It is my hope that my bill will be favorably acted upon in the near future.

Mr. President, I salute the Kings County Council of the Jewish War Veterans for brightening the day for many of our hospitalized veterans. Their unselfish gesture deserves the gratitude of the entire Nation.

SITUATION IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in an unprecedented move, South Vietnam's Ambassador to the United States, Tran Van Chuong, resigned his post in opposition to the policies of President Ngo Dinh Diem.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record an interesting interview by Jock Lawrence with Ambassador Chuong which appeared in a recent issue of the Washington World.