

Armed Forces, and for other purposes, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

CIA CONTROVERSY MANY FACETED

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the current controversy over the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency has many facets. One aspect of the matter was covered in the Carl T. Rowan column, "In Defense of the CIA's Undercover Links," in the February 26 issue of the Washington, D.C., Sunday Star, with the emphasis placed on the possibility that in pursuit of openness of action and undisciplined speech we may be exceeding prudence.

Another aspect of the matter, the manner in which allied nations handle similar intelligence operations, was reviewed on the same date in the Washington, D.C., Post under the heading, "Other Democracies Do Their Spying in Different Ways."

I believe these areas of the current CIA furor deserve wider public attention, and I am providing these items for insertion in the RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Feb. 26, 1967]

IN DEFENSE OF THE CIA'S UNDERCOVER "LINKS"

(By Carl T. Rowan)

When the stream of criticism and contempt for the Central Intelligence Agency rolls so forcefully and resolutely, one risks all manner of accusations if he moves against the tide.

But move against it I must, for there are some tragic aspects of the furor over the CIA's financing student, labor and other private groups that have not been given adequate attention.

Surely I break no vows of secrecy made in my government days if I say now that this string of "exposes" of CIA associations can go on and on. There are dozens of yet unnamed groups that cooperated with CIA—simply because they believed it to be in their children's and the nation's interest.

I admire one of them—the Hobby Foundation of Houston, Texas—for publicly expressing pride in having cooperated.

The disciplines of self-acclaimed intellectualism, or liberalism, or idealism compel some people to deplore these private involvements in the dirty business of waging a cold war. They say the health of the nation requires that our press, universities,

students et al remain "free of government manipulation."

I cannot understand the schizophrenia that has caused these purists to exempt the Federal Bureau of Investigation from criticism for so long. The FBI has its hand, and agents, in far more domestic organizations than the CIA. But somehow the press and the public have accepted that as necessary to trap those frightful spies and saboteurs.

It must be reckoned one of the great public relations failures of American history that the CIA has not won acceptance for its clandestine activities on the valid ground that it is fighting the same deadly struggle as the FBI.

As the tedious string of "revelations" unwinds, I conclude that American opinion-molders have become almost as psychotic about "the CIA" as those foreigners who talk as though the agency is capable of overthrowing their governments on five minutes' notice.

The harsh truth is that these exposures have destroyed the CIA as an effective instrument in many arenas of the cold war that is still being waged furiously, despite the recent talk about "detente." So what the Communists spent billions—unsuccessfully—to do, we Americans, out of our idealism, have delivered to them as a gift.

It disturbs me that this rush to bare CIA "links" has tainted "Crossroads Africa," the "American Society for African Culture" and other groups that have worked honestly and intelligently to keep alive in millions of Africans a faith and hope in democracy.

Sanctimonious, theoretically, correct arguments that "private business and industry" should have provided the funds demolish themselves against one hard fact: Business and industry had neither the interest, the attitudes nor the inclination to support these efforts properly.

It bothers me that these "revelations" have compromised, perhaps fatally in some cases, hundreds of young men and women who might have become leaders of the developing nations.

The wounds inflicted upon the Alliance for Progress are grave.

Many a U.S. Peace Corps worker or diplomat, and numerous foreign scholars and labor leaders who have struggled bravely in the cause of freedom, will have their integrity impugned and their futures jeopardized before this great exposé flizzles out.

Sure, one can say the CIA built this colossal tragedy by wrongly involving all these people and groups in the first place.

I say nonsense. Several presidents, several cabinets, dozens of congressmen and the leaders of all the groups involved went into this business with their eyes wide open. And it wasn't because of an ugly assumption that the ends justify the means, as some idealists argue. They made a practical recognition of the fact that the adversary had already set the dirty rules of battle, so either we played by his rules or got our brains beaten out.

I can't find it in my journalistic heart to say the press is wrong to dredge up all it has about CIA "covers." Yet, I have an uneasy feeling that in pursuit of a hallowed bit of journalistic dogma, we are slaying some dragons that will come back to haunt our progeny.

I keep remembering President Kennedy saying to the American Newspaper Publishers Association in 1961:

"This nation's foes have openly boasted of acquiring through our newspapers information they would otherwise hire agents to acquire through theft, bribery or espionage . . .

"Today no war has been declared—and however fierce the struggle, it may never be declared in traditional fashion . . .

"If the press is awaiting a declaration of war before it imposes the self-discipline of combat conditions, then I can only say that no war ever posed a greater threat to our security."

It is heresy for me to ask whether the benefits to "freedom" accruing from these exposures of the CIA are great enough to balance out the damage done to our security?

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 26, 1967]

OTHER DEMOCRACIES DO THEIR SPYING IN DIFFERENT WAYS

IN BRITAIN, THEY KEEP QUIET

(By Karl E. Meyer)

LONDON.—A fundamental difference between British and American intelligence organizations was proclaimed last week on thousands of newsstands throughout Britain.

On the cover of the international edition of Time magazine was a portrait of Richard Helms, the director of the Central Intelligence Agency. No British magazine or newspaper could be expected to carry a similar picture of Helms' counterpart here. This name of the chief of MI-6, Britain's CIA, is never published, and indeed is not even known by the vast majority of the populace. Even Members of Parliament and ambassadors profess ignorance of his identity. He is simply "X" or, as every movie goer knows, "M."

The paucity of information about MI-6 makes it extremely difficult to offer any objective comparison between its efficacy and that of CIA. One observation can be safely made. Whether MI-6 is better or worse than the CIA, it is surely different. And so are the countries they serve.

Compared to America, Britain is a homogenous society accustomed to rule by a traditional elite. It is more like a cozy club than a railway terminal. The club's inner circle is accustomed to work in discreet intimacy, arranging with a hint what in America requires an act of Congress.

It can be assumed that over the years covert assistance has been given to private organizations engaged in cold war hostilities. But it can also be assumed that most of this aid will not become publicly known for decades.

The D-notice

Secrecy is enforced not only through tradition. The government can use an official secrets act to close blurring lips. Only the other day, Britons were reminded of another silencing weapon the government possesses—the system known as the D-notice.

Under this system, begun in 1912, newspapers have voluntarily agreed not to publish information that officials deem contrary to security. Twice last week, Prime Minister Wilson attacked the Daily Express for allegedly violating a D-notice in reporting that security agents were still reading telegrams sent overseas.

But even if silencing devices were removed, it is doubtful that the public would discover the kind of prodigious secret aid practiced by the CIA. A shrewd observer put in this way:

"Americans think they need hundreds of thousands of dollars to get anywhere—the whole paraphernalia of letterheads, carpeted suites, secretaries, first-class plane tickets. Here a few thousand pounds (a pound is \$2.80) is enough. A musty office, a scruffy bright young man and a single mimeograph machine is enough."

Moreover, there exist organizations that can provide overt assistance, most notably the British Council. Founded in 1934, this agency gives broad support to overseas cultural programs with state money. Its budget for 1966-67 was \$30 million.

BRITISH PRATFALLS

British intelligence has endured its pratfalls. There are still bitter memories in the Middle East about a "black" radio station beamed from Cyprus with covert British help during the Suez crisis. Moreover, there is a lively controversy under way over exaggerated claims some feel were made for British wartime subversion in France.

But here discretion and frugality are the rule. One qualified observer said:

"A persistent problem with CIA operations is that not enough thought is given to what might happen when they are exposed. This was true of the Bay of Pigs, of the U-2 flight and the large subsidies to student organizations. In each case, American prestige was vested in debatable risks—Cuban exiles, a hired pilot and youngsters still in college.

"No doubt these efforts often produce results. But when they backfire, the noise can be heard clear around the world."

In Britain, it might be said, any backfire is usually muffled in a clubby smoking-room. The MI-6 is not a government, but for the most part it is truly invisible.

IN FRANCE, THEY PAY OPENLY
(By Waverley Root)

PARIS.—The French reaction to the subsidy given by the CIA to the National Students Association is: "It couldn't happen here."

This is not because French secret services would necessarily be above such tactics, but because somebody else is already taking care of such subsidies—more or less openly.

During the Algerian revolution, the National Union of French Students was openly receiving a subsidy from the French government through the Ministry of Education.

When the UNEF began to espouse the cause of Algerian independence, the subsidy was canceled and government support was then given to a rival student organization, oriented politically to the right.

But the government tactics backfired. The new recipient of government largesse also took up the cudgel for the Algerian cause.

Today, the UNEF is again the principal student organization and once again is enjoying government support. The past is forgiven.

A normal action

This is the difference between French and American uses of the subsidy. In France, helping your political supporters is considered a normal action which need not be carried on in secret.

Undercover activities in connection with organizations receiving subsidies would occur either through bona fide members who would consent to inform secret services, or by secret services planting members in any organization they wanted to watch.

But there is not as much open government subsidizing of organizations as there used to be in France.

Before the war, the Ministry of the Interior had a secret account for subsidizing publications. The original idea was to reward newspapers which gave the government a break—but getting a share of the gravy came to be regarded as a right.

Secrecy distrusted

Such subsidies no longer exist. In addition, if the French spread any money about abroad, they do it through overt channels. Their secret organizations don't get it to spend. The French have had a good deal of experience with them, and don't trust them with any more power than necessary.

France's closest parallel to the CIA is the counterespionage organization which came under fire in the Ben Barka kidnaping—the SDECE.

The light the Ben Barka case turned on the SDECE revealed certain details of its modus operandi including secret agents at airports to watch the comings and goings of people in whom it was interested and bugging public rooms. But this was not much of a surprise to the French, for whom the tapping of telephones has long been commonplace.

The trial resulting from the kidnaping of Ben Barka, the Moroccan opposition leader, has not been completed—so it is not known whether the SDECE as a whole was involved in the case or only one of its agents, but the

case reminded the French of the need to keep watch over their watchdogs.

"You Americans make the mistake of leaving the heads of your secret organizations in their jobs too long," I was once told by a highly placed French politician who had held such a job.

L.B.J., A GREAT PRESIDENT WITH A GREAT MESSAGE ON HEALTH AND EDUCATION

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, the President of the United States has just sent to this body his message on education and health in America.

This is a message that should make every Member of the Congress proud.

Mr. President, with all the brickbats many of us aim at the White House, it seems to me time that we take off our hats and salute President Johnson as the President who has done more for the health and more for the education of Americans than any President in the history of this country.

After all, what is more important than education and health for our country's strength, our country's future, and the happiness of 200 million Americans?

Mr. President, this is not a matter of rhetoric or partisanship. This is a matter of fact. Within the past 2 years this Congress, led by President Johnson has done more for the health of Americans than ever before in history.

In the past 2 years Congress has provided a greater impetus to education than all other Congresses combined in the history of this Nation.

A great President has sent the Congress a great message today charting an even better future. I say this as one who has consistently fought for a reduction in spending and who will continue to do so.

But in the Nation's health and the Nation's education, parsimonious penny-pinching would be very foolish. It would mean the Nation was failing to make the sound investment in its future which will bring returns many times over.

I honor the President for asking for additional funds in these areas. Every dollar we invest in additional training opportunities will come back in full in a very few years in welfare costs. It will come back again in higher taxes paid. And most importantly it will come back in a stronger, better freer, happier America.

TRIBUTE TO HENRY R. LUCE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it is my sad duty to call to the attention of the Senate the death, earlier this morning, of Henry R. Luce, the former editor in chief of Time magazine, and well known throughout the world as the head of the Time-Life-Fortune publishing empire.

Mr. Luce, as is well known, was born in China of American missionary parents. He was a graduate of Yale University and was very prominent in its activities. In 1923, he founded, with Briton Hadden, the Time magazine; in 1930, he founded Fortune magazine; and in 1936, he founded Life magazine. Together, they represent probably the single most important publishing force that we

know. He was very active, as everyone knows, in the United China Relief which he organized in 1940. He was a stalwart advocate of freedom of the press, and was well known as having initiated the Committee on Freedom of Press in 1944.

Mr. President, when a man passes away in the fullness of his years, in the vigor of his talents, we always seek to praise him. Harry, as he was known to his friends—and I have the honor to number myself among them—and to his associates in his great publishing empire, made history.

He and his associates inaugurated a new epoch of journalism especially for the complete man; we might use the expression, "the compleat man." He was ahead of his time when he began and time has hardly begun to catch up with him now that he is gone. To those who had the privilege of knowing him, his dominant characteristic was liveliness, and our memory of him, and that of the world, will be the brighter for it.

I know of no more beautiful epitaph for a vigorous man, who died in the fullness of his activities, than a comment from one of his associates, who told me a few minutes ago:

Harry would have wanted to die this way—when he went he was barreling along with a full head of steam on the many problems which absorbed his heart and mind.

Henry R. Luce lived a life of excitement. He and his associates inaugurated a new approach to journalism: the summation of news after research in depth, and placing it in context by showing its relationship to other news. His aim was the compleat man in information, culture, education, sports, finance, and living. He made one of the truly historic contributions in communications, and to this ideal he devoted his life.

I know my colleagues will wish to join me in expressing our deepest sympathy and condolences to Clare Booth Luce, a personal friend of mine, who served the State of Connecticut in the other body. She is a very gifted, and a very exciting woman herself, for whom this is a very sad hour.

We can only hope that the expressions of friendship and sympathy which will be heard on the floor of the Senate today will be of some comfort to her in her sad bereavement.

Mr. MANSFIELD and Mr. DODD addressed the Chair.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield first to the distinguished majority leader, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] to express regret at the passing of Henry Luce. He founded Time in the twenties, during a most difficult period; he set a new standard for a news magazine which has since been emulated very often.

Henry Luce was a man of controversy and one could always take issue with some of the articles published under his direction. I believe that that was a part of the attraction which Time held for so many people. This man was born in China of missionary parents and his life