

May 11, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 5369

## NSA TO RIDE AGAIN?

to assure the ordinary criminally accused (and not a member of the Mafia or the wealthy criminal) is interrogated in an atmosphere free from coercion as opposed to being interrogated "alone" in custody, in a police-dominated atmosphere.

Mr. WYMAN. If the gentleman will yield further, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], is he of the opinion that the police throughout the land have this understanding of the limited application of the Miranda rule to which he made reference, or does he believe that the police feel this decision puts practically the same restrictions on their investigations in the preliminary stages that the gentleman says it does if an individual was in a room with a lot of policemen in a situation such as the gentleman described?

Mr. TAFT. Of course, the expert, the skillful, and the well-trained FBI man probably does understand and understands very well the import of the limitations of the scope of this case. But for those other law enforcement officers, a great host throughout the land, there is a tremendous amount of fear and confusion. If I might call to the attention of the House in that regard the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 3, 1967, pages S3051 through S3061, in which there are numerous reports from law enforcement officers over this Nation indicating instances of inability to enforce the law.

Mr. Speaker, many of us may have seen in the newspapers an editorial written to the effect that there are present on the streets in Baltimore some 72 self-confessed felons who are free because of Miranda.

Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, these warnings and the proper action taken thereunder, perhaps could have cleared up a great deal of this crime and perhaps could have cleared the individual involved, had they not been thrown out.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York for yielding to me.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] for his contribution and for his continuing contribution, a truly distinguished member of a truly distinguished American family which continues to make great contributions to this country.

(Mr. SMITH of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

## GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks on this subject matter at this point in the record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ECKHARDT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post of May 7, 1967, contained an article on page 1 which stated that grants of \$390,000 had been given to the National Student Association by three executive agencies: the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Office of Education, and the State Department. As I understand the article, two of these grants have been made since the NSA-CIA fiasco with the third grant being a renewal of an existing federally funded program. On the strength of the Post article, I am writing to the three agencies—the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Office of Education, and the State Department for verification and full particulars on the programs. In view of the assertion that CIA at one point provided almost 80 percent of NSA budget out of taxpayers' pockets, I am sure that the sorely pressed American taxpayer will be very much interested in these expenditures. For instance, how will the reported \$250,000 for a "student tutorial program in poverty areas" be used. As Federal aid presupposes Federal supervision, how closely will the Office of Education oversee the program? What other organizations possibly more moderately or conservatively oriented organizations are participating in this program? For what purposes will the reported State Department grant of \$60,000 be used in Asia, Africa, and Algeria? How has the Office of Education grant of \$80,000, which is reportedly being renewed, been used in the past? What benefits have accrued from this program in the past? What specifically is meant by "student efforts to gain more voice in development and evaluation of course offerings"? I believe the taxpayer will agree with me that these are valid questions.

Since the NSA-CIA flareup in February there has been no public disclosure of investigations into NSA's tax-exempt status. The New York Times of February 22 of this year stated that the Internal Revenue Service was reviewing NSA's status, which review had been initiated in 1965. As NSA "hopes to finance its activities in the future by a 'consortium' of private and open Government funds," as reported by the New York Times of February 14, 1967, it seems only fair to taxpayers who will foot the bill for the Government grants and the donors of private grants that the misuse of past NSA funds be reviewed, reported, and corrected.

It would appear prudent to withhold any grants, both Federal and private, until the IRS report on NSA is forthcoming. If NSA's past misuse of funds were to be repeated in the future, the Federal agencies involved might be hard pressed to justify these expenditures before the House Appropriations Committee next year, along with continuance of these general programs. Concerning

NSA's expenditures, the Washington Post of February 16, 1967, stated:

A source within the NSA hierarchy said CIA funds, funneled to his group through the Foundation, were sometimes diverted from international accounts and used for such domestic student activities as civil rights. Travel allowances for trips abroad were also juggled in order to finance NSA's domestic activities through the CIA's indirect contributions, the source said.

Most commonly, the NSA's source said, administrative funds that came from the CIA were diverted for domestic programs, it was explained.

It is ridiculous to ask the American taxpayer to swallow the fact that his money is again being channeled into NSA, especially when so many questions remain to be answered, and in the light of the following facts.

To show the character of the leftist NSA, one need only look to its president, W. Eugene Groves.

The Chicago conference, December 28 to 30, 1966, called to discuss the idea of a nationwide student strike and other forms of demonstrations protesting the effort of the U.S. Government to resist Communist aggression in South Vietnam, NSA President Groves states: "I'm here to decide what role NSA can play."

And NSA members played an active role. At this conference, called for, set up, and dominated by Communists, Groves shared the speakers platform with such admitted Communists as Bettina Aptheker.

As shown in the House Committee on Un-American Activities report, "Communist Origin and Manipulation of Vietnam Week," this conference also included representatives of these Communist organizations: Communist Party, U.S.A.; W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America; Progressive Labor Party; Socialist Workers Party; Young Socialist Alliance; Youth Against War and Fascism, and National Guardian.

Far from a nonpolitical group of student government affiliates, a NSA member was listed as a member of the steering committee with these and other left-wing groups. This is the company to which Groves' statement above applies.

The Vietnam Week demonstrators were so infested with Communists, and fellow travelers, and so effectively controlled by these interests that it is only fair to assume that Groves and some 12 other NSA campus coordinators, delegates, or members of NSA listed as sponsors of the Vietnam Week demonstrations, were either impossibly ignorant or unconcerned about their associates while banded together in a blatant attempt to influence American foreign policy.

The committee report leaves no doubt about the degree of Communist control of both the Student Mobilization Committee, formed at the Chicago Conference, and the Spring Mobilization Committee. Groups which then joined in an effort to insure the success of their projects. I quote from the report:

The proposal for a nationwide student strike was completely Communist in origin.

And the committee makes this salient point: