

**THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY**

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. President, the Central Intelligence Agency has always been the subject of some controversy and it is inevitable that an Agency with the duties and responsibilities such as it has, always will be.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial on the subject of the CIA in the May 18, 1966, issue of a very reputable newspaper, the Washington Evening Star. Also, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted as a part of my remarks a column in the same issue of the Washington Evening Star which deals with the CIA, written by a very reputable journalist, David Lawrence, entitled "Danger Seen in Proposal on CIA."

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 18, 1966]

**WATCHING THE CIA**

It would be difficult to find any cloak-and-dagger organization that is more closely supervised than the Central Intelligence Agency.

It is watched over by the President and the National Security Council. By designation of the President, a non-governmental group headed by Clark Clifford closely scrutinizes what the CIA is doing. Finally, its activities and its expenditures, though concealed, have to run the gantlet of two congressional committees. In the Senate, this committee is made up of three representatives each from the Armed Services and Appropriations committees.

There would seem to be no need for any additional watchers. Senator Fulbright's Foreign Relations Committee, however, wants to add three of its members to the watching group. Senator Russell, who heads the supervisory committee, is strongly opposed.

Because there are already so many watchers, it might be wondered what valid objection there is to adding three more, especially if they come from Mr. Fulbright's committee since CIA activities undoubtedly influence foreign relations.

The reason for the objection was not quite spelled out in Monday's debate. But its essence emerged clearly enough.

Ohio's Senator LAUSCHE, himself a member of Foreign Relations, said that committee "has also distinguished itself for the frequency of leaks that come out of their (executive) hearings."

Later on, Senator MORSE, who thinks the CIA is a "police state institution," said: "I do not accept the major premise that the elected officials of the American people should not have an opportunity to be briefed in executive sessions of their committees in regard to what their checking committee has found."

This lets the cat out of the bag. While no senator would stand up on the floor and say so, the obvious fact is that the opponents of enlarging the watchdog committee are afraid of leaks if representatives of Foreign Relations should be added to the watchdog group. And this would be especially true if all 19 members of Mr. Fulbright's committee would be briefed, as Senator MORSE advocates, "on what their checking committee has found out."

The "leak" from executive sessions to favored newsmen is an ancient institution on Capitol Hill. But there have been no leaks from Senator RUSSELL's watchdog committee. The tightness of its security has been remarkable. And this is as it should be.

Why? Because secrecy, like it or not, is essential to the successful operation of the CIA. Without it, vital sources of information, carefully cultivated over a long period of time, would vanish, not to mention the informants themselves. Consequently, in the absence of a substantial showing of need, and there has been no such showing, we hope the Senate will turn down the bid by Foreign Relations to "muscle in" (Senator RUSSELL's words) on the watching process.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, 18 May 1966]

**DANGER SEEN IN PROPOSAL ON CIA**

(By David Lawrence)

There is more than meets the eye in the innocent-looking proposal to allow the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to add three members of its own to the "legislative oversight" committee of the Senate which, in a confidential way, keeps in touch with the operations of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Just why, for instance, should the Senate Foreign Relations Committee wish to check up on the special committee now composed of a small group from the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee? The reason given by Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, is that the people in the CIA "very greatly influence foreign policy."

But, in rebuttal, Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia, chairman of the special committee which now supervises CIA operations, says that "it is just pure poppycock that the CIA fixes, and makes, foreign policy."

On the surface, it might seem that the whole thing is merely a matter of procedure and that theoretically some representation from the Foreign Relations Committee, along with members of the Appropriations Committee and the Armed Services Committee, would be logical. But the truth is that the operations of the Central Intelligence Agency could be imperilled if members of the Senate who are primary interested in arguing about foreign policy were entrusted with the secrets of the agency.

It is customary for various senators every now and then to divulge things they have learned in confidence about domestic policy. But with respect to what's going on in foreign countries, there has to be restraint. For if the information obtained by the CIA is dealt with casually and "leaked" to the press like domestic news, this could cause serious damage to American interests around the world.

The risks in changing the nature of the membership of the special committee that keeps in touch with the CIA are considerable. The public knows hardly anything about the devious efforts of foreign governments to get secret data in Washington. They employ go-betweens who themselves may not know just who is behind the request for information that comes to them. After long experience with the technique of keeping things really secret, the CIA has concluded that the fewer the people who know anything about the operation, the better in the long run.

After World War II was over, the late Admiral Ernest King, chief of naval operations, told this correspondent that in two of the important engagements in the Pacific he never even told the secretary of the Navy ahead of time that a certain battle plan was about to be put into operation.

"My job," he said, "was strictly within the armed services, and if the secretary of the Navy wanted to find out what was coming, he could always ask the commander in chief—namely, the President of the United States."

This kind of caution is just as important in a "cold war" as in a "hot war." The President, of course, has access to everything the CIA is doing.

Senator FRANK J. LAUSCHE, D-Ohio, says that, while Senator RUSSELL's subcommittee has "distinguished itself" by not leaking information, the Foreign Relations Committee—of which he is a member—"distinguishes itself by the number of leaks that have come out of that committee."

Senator RUSSELL thinks that overexposure of the CIA would make difficult the gathering of information, because it would cause many people to hesitate to help for fear of eventual reprisals if their identity became known. The Georgia senator, in his speech to the Senate this week, said that the mere discussion of what appears to be a jurisdictional squabble "has a tendency to chill" some of the CIA informants even in the national capital.

It takes many years to develop contacts in foreign countries, where the CIA operates almost entirely. To require the agency to reveal much of its information to members of the Senate who are themselves involved in foreign-policy controversies could result in a substantial drop in the efficiency of the organization.