

of these men should not and cannot die. Although the death of Malcolm X left a major void in spearheading the fight for the world's oppressed peoples we take small consolation in commemorating his spirit and techniques. I wish my distinguished colleagues would join me in honoring this man who, without a doubt, was one of the most important and significant spiritual leaders in the 20th century.

CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT OF INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

HON. BARBER B. CONABLE, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1975

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I hereby submit a statement by the Republican Policy Committee on Congressional Oversight of Intelligence Activities:

CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT OF INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

Recent books and press accounts of abuses in government intelligence activities at home and abroad have focused attention on the need for Congress to strengthen its oversight of this sensitive area. The Republican Policy Committee urges the concentration of effort in a single, bipartisan committee to investigate these reports, formulate such remedies as might be needed and provide continuing oversight of the intelligence activities necessary to national security. A joint House-Senate committee would, of course, be preferable.

What is at issue is not whether Congress should intensify its until now somewhat relaxed oversight of government intelligence, but rather how this task should be accomplished.

Our first concern is the alarming proliferation of intelligence oversight committees. A Presidential Commission was recently initiated with instructions to report its findings by April 4 this year. The Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Intelligence Operations has begun hearings and the Senate Armed Services Central Intelligence Subcommittee is also conducting an investigation. On January 27 of this year, the Senate enacted S. Res. 21 to establish an 11-Member Select Committee to Study Government Operations With Respect to Intelligence Activities—authorized \$750,000 and instructed to report by September 1. In the House, pursuant to the committee reforms of the 93rd Congress, the Foreign Affairs Committee plans to establish a Subcommittee on Oversight concerned with, among other topics, foreign intelligence. The House Armed Services Committee will maintain its Subcommittee on Intelligence. The Judiciary Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights has scheduled hearings later this week on the FBI's role in the alleged abuses, and the Subcommittee on Courts, Civil Liberties and Administration is conducting hearings on FBI and military surveillance.

Against this background of burgeoning intelligence oversight, the House later this week will consider whether to establish yet another House Select Committee on Intelligence. We support a single bipartisan inquiry and feel strongly that any Select Committee should preempt the separate inquiries by the standing committees.

To allow further duplication and overlapping would be both a monumental waste of time when there are many equally pressing problems facing the country and an

unconscionable waste of money when we should be cutting rather than creating new programs.

We fear that the growing number of investigative committees will favor partisan political publicity contests rather than the extremely serious fact-finding and remedy-seeking effort needed in response to the important and troubling questions raised about government intelligence activities. Such a multitudinous investigative approach could well prove counterproductive to the national interest if it led to harmful leaks of sensitive information. The fear of such leaks, furthermore, could well compromise the effectiveness of the oversight effort. It is imperative that careful safeguards be established to protect against the leaking of national security information.

The alleged improper conduct of Federal agencies concerns both Republicans and Democrats alike, and involves both Republican and Democratic administrations. Investigating these allegations should be the responsibility of a balanced nonpartisan committee with equal representation of both parties.

Approving a select committee pursuant to H. Res. 138 would be a step in the wrong direction. It promises to have strong partisan overtones; it is open-ended in both the scope of its investigation and its cost; it provides no safeguards for protecting sensitive information; and it would delay the establishment of the kind of continuing oversight function that is truly needed.

The Republican Policy Committee advocates the establishment of a single, nonpartisan joint House-Senate permanent committee to monitor and investigate government intelligence activities, both at home and abroad, and where necessary to develop remedies to prevent future illegal activities. A committee of this type would merit considerable respect and prestige and would prove far more effective than the current trend toward the proliferation and resulting dissipation of effort.

We recognize that intelligence efforts are vital to national security and prefer the joint committee approach as the best way to monitor them and thereby guarantee that they will continue to function in the best interest of individual citizens and the entire nation.

DEREGULATION OF NATURAL GAS

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1975

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, I recently received one of the finest articles I have read to date on the subject of deregulation of natural gas at the wellhead. For the benefit of my colleagues who will be considering this issue in the 94th Congress, I would like to enter it into the Record at this point:

LOW PRICE, BUT WHERE'S THE GAS?

(By Earl W. McMunn)

We are hurting because of the shortage of natural gas. Government orders have forced industries to make big cutbacks to conserve fuel. This has created layoffs and loss of income. Nitrogen plants are working at less than capacity, because they can't get enough gas. This will mean less fertilizer and farm chemicals for the coming crop season.

People clamor for government to "do something." The truth is that government "did something" about 20 years ago. What it did was the wrong thing. It imposed rigid price controls over gas prices at the wellhead.

We have had cheap gas—too cheap in relationship to the cost of other sources of energy. This has encouraged wasteful use. It has also discouraged exploratory drilling to find new gas fields. Now we are reaping the result of our folly. Demand has outpaced supply and there isn't enough gas to go around.

In many ways, natural gas is the most desirable of fuels. It is cleanest from an environmental standpoint. It doesn't require extensive refining. It is moved to customers through unseen underground pipelines. Consumer storage facilities are not needed. No wonder gas is so much in demand.

In fact, it is estimated that natural gas now provides about a third of our energy needs. Some 40 million homes are heated with gas. Each year about half a trillion cubic feet of natural gas is used to produce nitrogen for fertilizer. Natural gas is also the feedstock for propane, another source of energy on the farm. More than half the farms in the United States use propane to heat and cool homes, dry crops and run pumps.

Yet, natural gas is our cheapest fuel. It is cheapest because of government action—not because of the forces of supply and demand. This is the heart of the problem. Gas, among all energy sources, was singled out about 20 years ago for federal price controls. This was not the result of Congressional action, or even an executive order.

Gas prices have been controlled because of a decision by the United States Supreme Court. This was the Phillips case which was decided in 1954. That decision interpreted the language of the Natural Gas Act of 1938 in such a way as to require the Federal Power Commission to regulate prices at the wellhead for gas sold across state lines.

For 20 years gas prices have been regulated, while other forms of energy have responded to the forces of supply and demand. Natural gas prices have been held far below the cost of competitive fuels. For instance, at mid-year 1974 prices, natural gas sold by producers in interstate commerce was about 26 cents per thousand cubic feet. The same amount of energy in crude oil was costing about \$1.30. Equivalent energy in bituminous coal was costing 60 to 65 cents, and this did not include the higher costs of transporting coal.

Is it any wonder that such bargain prices made gas easy to sell? Or, that use of natural gas doubled in just two decades? Something always happens when you offer rib-eye steak at hamburger prices. You soon run out of steak. That is what is happening to gas. And, for an obvious reason. Political controls were substituted for the economic forces of supply and demand.

Again, we are learning that you don't "protect consumers" by controlling prices at unrealistic levels. At least, you can't do it over long periods of time. When prices get out of line, supplies become scarce or disappear completely. There must be gas in the pipelines, just as there must be livestock in feedlots if the people are to prosper.

No one has yet been able to devise a system which combines low prices with adequate supplies. The socialist countries have tried, but with little success. This is the major reason our production has so far outpaced theirs. Where profit incentives have been permitted to operate, we have had economic development unmatched in the history of the world.

Edward J. Mitchell of the University of Michigan says it this way:

"To create a shortage, you simply depress the market price below the level that equates supply and demand. To eliminate the shortage, you free the price and allow it to rise to equate supply and demand once more. To create a surplus, you raise the price above the market-clearing level. And, to eliminate the surplus you let it fall back. We always have three options. A market-clearing price;

a price that gives us shortages; a price that gives us surpluses."

These principles are easy enough to understand. They are not going to operate in a controlled economy. They don't get the chance. Political pressures are always to keep prices low as a "protection for consumers."

It is only when supplies disappear that we become aware of the danger. There is little question but what arbitrary price control on natural gas has been one of the greatest handicaps to energy production. Congress much deregulate the gas business if we are to get production moving in the right direction.

Already, there is firm evidence to show that producers will respond to higher prices. Increases in oil prices and higher natural gas prices in the intrastate market have resulted in a sharp turnaround in drilling activity. During the first 16 years after the Supreme Court decision, the number of exploratory gas wells dropped by about 50 percent. During the past three years the number of drill rigs in operation went up more than 50 percent.

Energy experts say that our reserves of natural gas are far from exhaustion. But gas in the pipeline is what counts now. And recent price increases to oil and gas producers can't stimulate enough production any time soon. It takes time—as much as three to five years—to build new equipment, find and develop new fields. Vast amounts of new capital must be plowed back into exploration and development. All this in the face of opposition from some dreamers who clamor that "profits must be eliminated." We may eliminate profits. If we do, we will also eliminate production. And, it's production we need.

It is obvious that federal price control on gas at the wellhead was a bad choice. Only Congress can make a change. And the lawmakers have been slow to act. In fact, legislation to decontrol the industry has been stalled in the Senate Commerce Committee and the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for well over a year.

Some members say the industry is "holding back" natural gas reserves. There is ample evidence to the contrary. Others claim that decontrol would cause retail prices to rise, thus hurting individual consumers. Until this winter they didn't have to face the stark reality of plant shut down because of gas shortages. This hurts people too! Now we are face to face with the question of whether we want enough gas at higher prices, or low prices and no gas.

Gas is much more than a source of heat and power. It is also an important input in farm production. This is because a substantial part of our nitrogen fertilizer production depends upon the use of natural gas. And fertilizer plants in many parts of the country have already had their gas supplies interrupted by action of the Federal Power Commission.

Just how much government limitations will affect next spring's fertilizer supplies remains to be seen. Fertilizer shortfalls for 1974 were estimated at between five and 10 percent. Edwin M. Wheeler, president of The Fertilizer Institute, says: "With nitrogen inventories almost non-existent, the dangers to next year's food production are alarming. Our industry is making an all-out effort to prepare for a booming demand, but with our feedstocks cut off we are powerless."

We know food reserves are at low levels both here and abroad. Production is the only cure for shortages. Fertilizer is a necessary ingredient if we are to get the production. We can't have enough fertilizer if natural gas supplies are unavailable or interrupted over long periods of time. It is time for Congress to correct the mistake the Supreme Court made 20 years ago.

MY RESPONSIBILITY AS A CITIZEN— WINNING ESSAY

HON. MARK ANDREWS

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1975

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to announce that Miss Janet Doreen Sims of Enderlin, N. Dak., has won the Voice of Democracy essay contest in North Dakota.

Miss Sims is currently an 11th grader in high school and an outstanding student. She has held several school offices and has many achievements and awards to her credit. She plans to enter the University of North Dakota to pursue a career in nursing.

She is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Pershing Sims of Enderlin.

In her winning essay, entitled "My Responsibility as a Citizen," Miss Sims stressed that freedom is both a privilege and a responsibility. The spirit of responsibility that all of us as citizens must have, she says, is "one of generosity, determination, and perseverance. It gives freely of its time and energy and is never spent out, because it is identified with the will to serve."

Miss Sims is an outstanding example of one who puts her ideas of citizenship into practice. She has demonstrated her sense of responsibility and citizenship through her accomplishments and activities inside and outside of school.

I would again like to congratulate Miss Sims. Her essay deserves public attention and at this time I would like to insert it into the RECORD:

MY RESPONSIBILITY AS A CITIZEN

Being a citizen is certainly a right, but in a deeper sense, it is truly a privilege. After all, as full-fledged citizens, we are not deprived of our fundamental rights: freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, freedom of religion and the right to petition the government to correct unjust actions. What do these freedoms consist of? Freedom is often misunderstood as privileges without limitations or restrictions: in other words, doing just as one pleases. Along with freedoms come duties or obligations. When children are not taught to follow rules, they will most likely disregard regulations later in life. They will live along the side lines, hesitant, cowardly, and selfish, ready to enjoy the benefits that others provide. The sense of responsibility is rather the realization that one has certain duties and obligations to fulfill to the best of one's ability. It involves a recognition of definite laws or principles of behavior and understanding of the distinction between right and wrong, and good and better.

The spirit of responsibility is one of generosity, determination, and perseverance. It gives freely of its time and energy and is never spent out, because it is identified with the will to serve.

What is citizenship? Citizenship means full membership in a country. It signifies something much more than just a dictionary meaning. One could read a whole book on being a responsible citizen, but the reading would be worthless unless the ideas discussed were put into practice.

In the days when the Romans ruled, the fact of being a 'Roman citizen' was a source of individual pride second to none. We, too, should develop this sense of pride in our country.

Do we take our citizenship for granted? Do we realize how fortunate we are to be guaranteed of certain rights?

The establishment of a goal is the key to successful living. The most important step toward achieving responsibility is to first define it. To be responsible we must all be leaders, setting good examples. An effective leader has such qualities as confidence, energy, concern, a good set of morals, and above all, faith.

When does the sense of responsibility begin? It begins in the home with the parents' influence. If the parents are loyal and honest, their children will most likely radiate their likeness. The seeds of confidence are planted long before a child goes to school. It begins with the successful performance of limited tasks. Parents must see that certain values exist in the home: respect, pride, cooperation, and sharing. Good citizenship goes farther, though, out of the home and into the community and country.

In your community, take part in church and school doings, social affairs, organizations and clubs, and so on. Being an active member keeps you well-informed of the community's operations and goals, not only to be informed, but to help the community.

Most important, be loyal and true to your country. Have faith in your nation's leaders, even in crucial times, regarding such things as wars, energy crises, and scandalism. These problems implore an increasing need for all people to unite into one body to solve them. We gain from this atmosphere of unity an inner strength, a sense of belonging, as well as of responsibility to others.

"Life must be revealed not as a dubious and pointless struggle but as a magnificent privilege, a torch that must burn as brightly as possible before it is handed on to the next generation."¹

ENERGY CRISIS

HON. JOHN L. BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1975

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I am sure all of our colleagues are concerned with finding solutions to the energy crisis.

I would like to share with the House a letter I have received from the California Service Station Council that addresses itself to solving the current problem.

The letter follows:

CALIFORNIA SERVICE STATION
COUNCIL

Oakland, Calif., February 10, 1975.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BURTON: The California Service Station Council represents several thousand service station dealers in the state of California. We are totally opposed to President Ford's plan to conserve energy by raising gasoline taxes. We would propose to you that for a period of ninety days that the following six points be implemented:

1. Mandatory allocation per station at 90-95% of 1972 sales, and equal allocation for every dealer.
2. Major oil companies' refinery capacity to be adjusted to 90-95% allocation to conform to same allocation as retail outlets to prevent surplus.
3. Restrict imports to 1972 allocation fractions.

¹ Clark, General Mark W., "What It Takes To Be a Leader," *Reader's Digest*, July 1967, p. 162.

January 15, 1975

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

HON. DAWSON MATHIS

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MATHIS) present himself in the well of the House for the purpose of taking the oath of office?

Mr. MATHIS appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

A MAN CALLED KING

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker; I wish to join today in commemorating the 46th anniversary of the birth of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., a man whose struggle for justice for all people will long be remembered by all Americans. His life ended tragically nearly 7 years ago, but his "dream" survived and grew. His death marked the rededication on the part of many less-fortunate individuals to achieve the ideals of love, peace, and justice.

This man called King traveled a very long distance in a very short period of time. He traveled from Montgomery to Memphis, from manhood to martyrdom, from the depths of misery to the top of the mountain, where truth and love reign supreme. It seems to me that if he could go that long distance in that short period of time, then everyone can come together to take America on a journey, a desperately needed journey, from its madness to humanity, from exploitation to equality, from racism to freedom and from war to peace. I urge my colleagues today, as we pay tribute to this great man, to join in that effort.

Let Dr. King's birthday serve as a reminder not only to black people, but to all people that the struggle for justice and individual rights is eternal. Today, nearly 7 years after his death, his words continue to echo throughout America stirring the national conscience:

When we let freedom ring, we let it ring from every village and every hamlet, from every state and every city, we will be able to speed up that day when all of God's children, black people and white people, Jews and Gentiles, Protestants and Catholics, will be able to join hands and sing in the words, "Free at last! Free at last! Thank God almighty, we are free at last!"

LET'S FIGHT BACK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the United States is in danger of becoming a second-rate world power. It has been put in this danger not by any malevolent foreign power or internal conspiracy, but by the excessive use of our good will and patience, and by our failure to apply the needed caution in our dealings with other nations. We export coal and other energy sources when we do not have adequate supplies at home. We export grain to the Soviet Union in the name of détente and thereby drive the price of a loaf of bread beyond the budgets of many of our own people. We sell arms

to countries that are aggressors against our allies, and through world monetary organizations we loan money to oil and currency rich nations that are openly hostile to us. There are many more examples of how the United States, by its courtesy, naivete or pure stupidity has put its very existence in jeopardy by failing to look out for its own self-interests.

The recent attempts at détente with Russia are good in that they decrease the chances of armed conflict with them. However, in our headlong rush to cement agreements with them, we have gotten the short end of the deal. We have loaned them money to purchase our grain and have taken food out of the mouths of our own people. We have agreed to cut many of our military programs without receiving from them arms reductions of an equal magnitude. We have sold to them our American-developed technology in exchange for raw or processed materials from them. Our technology will continue to benefit their country long after we have exhausted the materials we received from them. We have not been very tough bargainers at the international market.

We have allowed a dozen half-developed nations to cow us completely with their threats of cutting off our oil supplies and we have meekly acquiesced to their horrendous and unjustified price rises. Wasteful energy practices, a lack of foresight and the almost total inaction on the part of the Federal Government has nearly put us at their mercy. Already Arabian countries who make up the majority of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries—OPEC—are dictating foreign and internal policies in many European countries who depend on these countries for 80 to 90 percent of their petroleum. A good example of this is in the Netherlands, long an ardent supporter of Israel. Since the oil embargo of 1973, Dutch support for Israel has been almost totally nonexistent. Other subtle changes in policies have taken place. We must not allow that to happen here. We would respond with force to any other country's attempts to control our affairs by military force. We must recognize that it matters little whether an aggressor conquers another by taking it militarily or economically.

Even if we prevent the OPEC countries from controlling or influencing us politically through their economic pressures, they have another perfectly legal avenue which they are pursuing vigorously. They are investing their billions of surplus dollars in our property and corporations. Through these purchases, they can literally buy large segments of our economy and through the purchases control them. And since large companies have varying degrees of influence in the country, the effect is obvious. According to estimates by economists, Saudi Arabia alone could buy IBM with 143 days of its currency surpluses accumulated from oil sales to us and other Western nations. Using the same yardstick that country could purchase every company on the New York Stock Exchange in 9 years or Exxon Corp. in 79 days. In the past we

have seen the malignant influence these OPEC countries have had on the decisions in several of the multinational oil companies. We have no reason to suspect they would be any more benevolent if they were to gain complete control of the New York Stock Exchange. Indeed, their recent attempts to gain control of Lockheed Aircraft, one of our largest defense contractors, should be a lesson to us.

Unfortunately, many investment companies and the economic development arms of many State governments are apparently oblivious to these dangers for they are continuing to court and woo the Arab interests. Great Britain did this and as a result would be liable to near total collapse of its economy should Arab investors pull out their money; as they have threatened to do should that country take actions that would have a drastic effect on OPEC.

Other so-called Third World countries have attempted to form other cartels to embargo or raise the price of resources such as copper, iron ore, tin, and phosphates. These cartels are nothing more than alliances to fight an economic war of aggression against the Western world. We and our allies must recognize this threat for what it has become and take measures to combat it.

An organization of grain exporting countries might be a logical first step. The United States, Canada, Australia, and France are the principal grain exporters in the world. They are also four countries who have been hit hard by the OPEC oil policies and would be hurt by other resource cartels.

The organization of grain exporting countries could increase by five or six times the price of grain to countries who are harming us with their natural resource cartels. Since there is a worldwide grain shortage, our export trade is not likely to be diminished by the increased price. The increased price paid for the grain would improve our balance of payments situation. Of course, there must be provisions for waiving the cartel prices for those countries who are not guilty of economic aggression against us. The cartel would also have the additional benefit of helping to weaken other cartels.

Cartels, historically, are unstable and usually short-lived affairs. They are an artificial system of pricing that have no relationship to supply and demand. Any system such as this has a limited life unless artificially supported. A grain cartel would, I feel, have a destabilizing effect on OPEC and other similar organizations. I do not favor indefinite participation by the United States in such cartels, but we may find that this limited action is preferable to the inaction that allows us to be trod upon worldwide.

The United States must wake up to realize that no one respects a patsy. Although it did the United States no good, I have to respect the decision a few weeks ago by Canada's Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau to shut off their petroleum exports to the United States. His reasons were simple: even though they are our allies, their own self-interest and predicted shortfalls of energy dictated that they cease exporting that

January 15, 1975

which they did not have in sufficient supply. It is time for the United States to start looking out for its own self-interests. We must, of course, cooperate with our allies and search for solutions to the shortages and animosities that have spawned the cartels. We must use more caution in our dealings with other countries and make sure that our benefits are commensurate with those received by the other side. We must develop the sorts of alternate energy sources and natural resource stockpiles that grant us the highest degree of independence from the influences of third world cartels and other foreign powers. We must erect safeguards to limit foreign investments whose presence and threat of withdrawal offers the specter of outside hegemony. In short, we must make the sacrifices and take the actions that will assure that the United States of America will not slide into the depths of mediocrity on a board greased with Arabian oil.

INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO CREATE A JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE OVERSIGHT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRENZEL) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FRENZEL. I rise on behalf of myself and Representative STEELMAN of Texas. Recently there has been a growing concern, both here and in the other body, with the obvious lack of oversight which we in the Congress have over the various Federal intelligence-oriented agencies.

It is our own fault that the present situation exists. For too many years Congress has been extremely reluctant to ask the kind of questions which could insure policy supervision and accountability for actions taken by the CIA, FBI, Secret Service, Defense Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency, and several others which we are only now learning about.

To correct some of the abuses which we have seen and to strengthen congressional oversight, Congressman STEELMAN and I are today reintroducing legislation to establish a Joint Committee on Intelligence Oversight. It will be provided with broad powers to authorize, investigate, and legislate on matters related to the specific intelligence agencies as well as other intelligence matters considered throughout the federal system.

The Joint Committee, would be composed of 14 members, 7 from each body, chosen by the leadership. We intend that it shall have primary legislative jurisdiction and fiscal authority over all intelligence activities.

To this end the bill states that the directors of these agencies shall—

Keep the Joint Committee fully and currently informed with respect to all the activities of their respective organizations, and the heads of all other departments and agencies of the Federal Government conducting intelligence activities or operations or the surveillance of persons, shall keep the Joint Committee fully and currently informed of all intelligence and surveillance activities and operations carried out by their respective departments and agencies.

The committee will be empowered to require periodic written reports, from any department or agency, regarding any activities or operations within its jurisdiction. In this effort the committee shall have full subpoena powers.

Additionally—

No funds may be appropriated for the purpose of carrying out any intelligence or surveillance act or operations by any office or any department or agency of the Federal Government unless such funds for such activity or operation have been specifically authorized by legislation enacted after the date of the enactment of this act.

In this we intend to prohibit the concealment of secret agency moneys from the Congress and the people in defense appropriation bills and blanket authorizations.

In pursuing its obligation to supervise intelligence activities while not endangering national security goals, the committee is empowered to take any and all necessary security precautions. This could include some additional congressional expense for security personnel or office and equipment modification.

It is not our purpose, however, to deprive committees with current oversight jurisdiction, such as armed services, foreign relations, appropriations, et cetera, from discharging their duties or to limit their ability to monitor the total of activities within their fields. But our bill simply provides that no legislation, or provision contained in any legislation, regarding matters within the purview of the Joint Committee can be considered by either House unless it has been submitted by the Joint Committee or is a floor amendment to such legislation.

The litany of offenses committed in the name of national security is too long to list. It has been well documented both here on the floor and in the national media. Something must be done. The initiative's taken by the President is creating the Commission on CIA Activities and launching other executive investigations are an excellent beginning. So is this House's action in creating a select committee. But as much as we applaud these actions, however, Congress must follow up, regardless of the immediate effects of these efforts, with long-term supervision and control through a joint committee of both Houses. It is a responsibility which we can no longer ignore.

This bill is not the only congressional suggestion which will be heard in the coming months, but, regardless of what is finally enacted, this body must assume responsibility for the actions of U.S. security agencies and the moneys which they utilize.

A copy of the bill follows:

H.R. —

A bill to establish a Joint Committee on Intelligence Oversight

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Joint Committee on Intelligence Oversight Act of 1974".

ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE OVERSIGHT

Sec. 2. (a) There is hereby established a Joint Committee on Intelligence Oversight (hereinafter referred to as the "joint committee") which shall be composed of fourteen members appointed as follows:

(1) seven members of the Senate, four to be appointed by the majority leader of the Senate and three to be appointed by the minority leader of the Senate; and

(2) seven members of the House of Representatives, four to be appointed by the majority leader of the House of Representatives and three to be appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(b) The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members at the beginning of each Congress. The vice chairman shall act in the place and stead of the chairman in the absence of the chairman. The chairmanship and the vice chairmanship shall alternate between the Senate and the House of Representatives with each Congress. The chairman during each even numbered Congress shall be selected by the Members of the House of Representatives on the joint committee from among their number and the chairman during each odd-numbered Congress shall be selected by the Members of the Senate on the joint committee from among their number. The vice chairman during each Congress shall be chosen in the same manner from that House of Congress other than the House of Congress of which the chairman is a Member.

(c) A majority of the members of the joint committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except that the joint committee may fix a lesser number as a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original appointment.

(d) Service of a Senator as a member or as chairman of the joint committee shall not be taken into account for the purposes of paragraph 6 of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

DUTIES OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE

Sec. 3. (a) It shall be the duty of the joint committee to conduct a continuing study and investigation of the activities and operations of (1) the Central Intelligence Agency, (2) the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, (3) the United States Secret Service, (4) the Defense Intelligence Agency, Department of Defense, (5) the National Security Agency, and (6) all other departments and agencies of the Federal Government insofar as the activities and operations of such other departments and agencies pertain to intelligence gathering or surveillance of persons; and to consider proposals for the improvement and reorganization of agencies and departments of the Federal Government within the jurisdiction of the joint committee.

(b) The Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Director of the Secret Service, the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, and the Director of the National Security Agency shall keep the joint committee fully and currently informed with respect to all of the activities of their respective organizations, and the heads of all other departments and agencies of the Federal Government conducting intelligence activities or operations or the surveillance of persons shall keep the joint committee fully and currently informed of all intelligence and surveillance activities and operations carried out by their respective departments and agencies. The joint committee shall have authority to require from any department or agency of the Federal Government periodic written reports regarding activities and operations within the jurisdiction of the joint committee.

(c) (1) All bills, resolutions, and other matters in the Senate or the House of Representatives relating primarily to the functions of the Central Intelligence Agency, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the United

1975

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H 141

Secret Service, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency, or to intelligence or surveillance activities or operations of any other department or agency of the Federal Government shall be referred to the joint committee.

(2) No funds may be appropriated for the purpose of carrying out any intelligence or surveillance activity or operation by any office, or any department or agency of the Federal Government, unless such funds for such activity or operation have been specifically authorized by legislation enacted after the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) No bill or resolution, and no amendment to any bill or resolution, and no matter contained in any bill or resolution in either House, dealing with any matter which is within the jurisdiction of the joint committee shall be considered in that House unless it is a bill or resolution which has been reported by the joint committee of that House (or from the consideration of which such committee has been discharged) or unless it is an amendment to such a bill or resolution. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to deprive any committee of either House from exercising legislative oversight with respect to intelligence and surveillance activities and operations related to the jurisdiction of such committee.

(4) Members of the joint committee who are Members of the Senate shall from time to time report to the Senate, and members of the joint committee who are Members of the House of Representatives shall from time to time report to the House, by bill or otherwise, their recommendations with respect to matters within the jurisdiction of their respective Houses and which are referred to the joint committee or otherwise within the jurisdiction of the joint committee.

ADMINISTRATIVE POWERS

SEC. 4. (a) The joint committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, in its discretion: to make expenditures; to employ personnel; to adopt rules respecting its organization and procedures; to hold hearings; to sit and act at any time or place; to subpoena witnesses and documents; with the prior consent of the Federal department or agency concerned, to use on a reimbursable basis the services of personnel, information, and facilities of any such department or agency; to procure printing and binding; to procure the temporary services (not in excess of one year) or intermittent services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof, and to provide assistance for the training of its professional staff, in the same manner and under the same conditions as a standing committee of the Senate may procure such services and provide such assistance under subsections (i) and (j), respectively, of section 202 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946; and to take depositions and other testimony.

(b) Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the joint committee or by any member designated by him or the joint committee, and may be served by such person as may be designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the joint committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses. The provisions of sections 102 to 104 of the Revised Statutes (2 U.S.C. 192-194) shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with a subpoena or to testify when summoned under authority of this subsection.

CLASSIFICATION OF INFORMATION

SEC. 5. The joint committee may classify information originating within the committee in accordance with standards used generally by the executive branch for classifying restricted data or defense information.

RECORDS OF JOINT COMMITTEE

SEC. 6. The joint committee shall keep a complete record of all joint committee ac-

tions, including a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded. All records, data, charts, and files of the joint committee shall be the property of the joint committee and shall be kept in the offices of the joint committee or such other places as the joint committee may direct.

EXPENSES OF JOINT COMMITTEE

SEC. 7. The expenses of the joint committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate from funds appropriated for the joint committee, upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the joint committee or by any member of the joint committee authorized by the chairman.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House, in an extremely unfortunate decision, decided to abolish the House Committee on Internal Security. The crucial vote came on the previous question on the new House rules and the vote was 247 in favor of abolishing the committee and 172 against. On this vote, the House accomplished what the committee's enemies including the Communist Party have been trying to do for more than thirty years; to destroy one of the most effective arms anticommunism has had in this Nation.

I have no doubt in my mind that if a separate roll call vote on abolishing the committee had been allowed, the majority would have favored its continuance. Unfortunately, the Democratic Caucus voted in secret on this matter and because of the parliamentary situation members were not forced, as they should have been, to vote directly on this issue.

In past sessions of the Congress a majority has voted consistently to retain this committee—most recently on October 2, 1974, when the vote was 246 in favor and 164 opposed. As was pointed out in yesterday's debate, the Committee on Internal Security has been the only standing committee in the House charged with conducting continuing investigations in order to inform the House concerning subversion. At a time when our democratic institutions are threatened, both within and without our borders, by international revolutionary forces, this House has voted to weaken the internal security of our Nation.

During the Republican Conference which was held yesterday, I offered a motion that the Republican Party in the House go on record in support of the continuation of the House Committee on Internal Security. This motion was adopted on a standing vote of 68 to 26 which demonstrates the overwhelming support the committee has amongst our Republican members. I am proud that my party was willing to take this stand and was also willing to go on record on this issue.

I intend to join others in the House in an effort to renew the mandate of this committee and its existence because I believe it is a vital part of our national interest in fighting subversion.

COMPREHENSIVE RIGHT TO PRIVACY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GOLDWATER) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to announce to the House that the bipartisan coalition of Congressman Ed Koch and myself on the issue of comprehensive privacy legislation will continue in the 94th Congress. Today, we are introducing a revised Koch-Goldwater Comprehensive Right to Privacy Act.

Because of the successful passage of privacy legislation in the closing days of the last Congress, and because that legislation applied solely to the Federal Government, the new Koch-Goldwater legislation will contain provisions that apply only to the States and localities, to private enterprise and to nonprofit organizations. A brief description of the legislation and the text, as introduced, will follow my remarks.

Congressman Koch and myself intend to offer this legislation for cosponsorship and a "Dear Colleague" soliciting your support will be sent out in a few days. Both of us encourage each of our colleagues to consider our proposal carefully. We believe that you will find the simplicity, clarity, and flexibility of our proposal worthy of your support.

Our legislation contains the following provisions:

RIGHT TO PRIVACY ACT: SUMMARY OF NEW LEGISLATION

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

An individual's personal privacy is affected by the extensiveness of collection, use, and disclosure of information about him.

Organizations keeping personal information should allow individuals the right to know files exist, to inspect them, and correct inaccurate statements.

The increasing use of computers and sophisticated information technology has greatly magnified the harm that can occur from misuse of personal information.

Personal information includes anything that describes an individual, such as his education, financial transactions, medical or employment records, and lifestyle.

SAFEGUARD REQUIREMENTS FOR PERSONAL INFORMATION SYSTEMS

All State and local governments and business organizations and nonprofit organizations must comply with these requirements, whether having manual or computer based information systems.

Information collected should be appropriate to needs of the organization seeking it, maintained completely and competently, and personal information must not be given to third parties without the individual's consent.

When information is collected, the individual must be told if the request is mandatory or voluntary and what penalty or loss of benefit will result for non-compliance.

Several categories of privileged, sensitive information should be established by organizations and particular require-

ments set before the information is disseminated.

Information about Americans cannot be transferred to a foreign country unless the provisions of the act are extended by any receiving country.

Persons involved in handling personal information must act under a code of professional secrecy and be subject to penalties for any breaches.

Anyone wishing to stop receiving mail because his name is on a mailing list can do so.

Individuals cannot be required to give their social security number for any purpose not related to their social security account.

PUBLIC NOTICE AND INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS

Organizations using personal information must give annual public notice describing their information systems.

An individual may receive at reasonable cost a copy of his file including investigative reports, which must contain its uses and transfers to third parties, be able to challenge inaccurate or undocumented information, and have his position in a dispute added to his file.

Individuals must be notified that information is being maintained about them.

EXCEPTIONS

Criminal law enforcement, press files, and certain administrative information systems are excluded if specifically exempted by statute or Executive order where Congress is duly informed.

FEDERAL PRIVACY BOARD

Establish a five-member Federal Privacy Board serving on a full-time basis, appointed by the President with Senate confirmation, having 3-year terms.

The Board will collect and publish information on personal information systems, issue regulations, conduct research on improving standards, inspect systems when noncompliance is suspected, hear requests for exceptions, and transmit annual reports to Congress and the President.

Only Congress can grant exemptions or exclusions from this act. States and localities will be encouraged to establish privacy authorities to have the same duties as the Federal Board.

PENALTIES

There are civil and criminal penalties to be assessed by the courts, at the request of individuals or the Board.

Injunctions can be sought by the Attorney General to stop practices violating the act.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT TAX IMMUNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. McKAY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McKAY. Mr. Speaker, I join today with my colleague from Utah, Mr. Howe, in introducing a bill to provide an equitable system of compensation to local governments for the tax immunity of Federal lands within their boundaries. Under the terms of this legislation, Federal land would be appraised at a rate comparable to the applicable tax rate

for private lands. County governments would then, at their option, receive payments from the Federal Government based on the actual value of the Federal lands within their boundaries or continue to receive the Federal revenues that normally flow from those lands under other Federal programs.

The bill is relatively simple in concept, uncomplicated to administer, and it offers a solution to a number of serious problems associated with Federal land ownership.

In the Western States, where much of the land is publicly owned, the impact of the Federal presence is highly visible. But anywhere that the Federal Government owns land, there is an impact, and reason dictates that there should be an orderly and logical way to deal with that impact. In Utah, with over 70 percent of the land owned by the Federal Government, the impact of public lands on adjacent communities is of real concern to us. We enjoy benefits from Federal land, but the Federal presence generates certain responsibilities and certain difficulties that are being met only haphazardly.

There are a number of programs under which local governments are compensated in part for Federal land holdings. However, none of these programs is tied to the actual impact of Federal land, nor do they assure the localities that the costs generated by the Federal presence will be met in Federal revenues.

Life in rural America traditionally has been complicated by some unique problems. The many services taken for granted in our towns and cities, such as electricity, water, telephones, health services, and law enforcement, are scarce, high priced, or even nonexistent. One major cause for this situation is the lack of a strong property tax base to finance services. In more densely populated areas of the Nation, local governments have come under increasing pressure as they try to reconcile rising expectations for services with inflation that eats into budgets and increase prices beyond the scope of affordability. Rural governments suffer these burdens, as well as the added problems of low tax bases and greater per capita expenses. And the problem is compounded where the presence of Federal lands generate a need for governmental services, while denying the corresponding tax base to finance those services.

Installations located on Federal land, mineral development and recreational use of Federal land—all attract population to adjacent areas. This population requires many services and services cost the State and local governments money. Yet the tax base to finance these services is absent, in part, due to the fact that Federal land is nontaxable. The injustice of this situation has been recognized in law by the compensation of local governments where Federal installations have depleted the property tax for schools while causing an influx of population. But, as yet, there is no uniform, fair, and logical way to provide compensation to local governments for the taxes lost to them and the added burdens placed upon their treasuries by the presence of Fed-

eral land. Under a system of payments in lieu of taxes, fairer would be instituted and the Government would provide a logical share of the costs associated with the impact of Federal lands.

This idea is not new. It was recommended by the Public Land Law Review Commission of 1970. Hearings on the proposal were held last year in my district. We need this legislation more than ever. With unprecedented demands for energy and the recognition that we must move to develop the mineral resources on Federal lands, we need a system of compensation that will meet the needs of the times. This bill will give to local governments the flexibility they must have to meet the rapid influx of population associated problems of resource development.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this measure.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT TAX IMMUNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. Howe) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOWE. Mr. Speaker, many of our Western States have substantial portions of their land areas in Federal ownership. Unlike most other States, these lands have never passed through the historical process of grant and homestead to private ownership. While realizing the ultimate goal would be the private ownership of these lands, the bill offered, today, addresses the more exigent demand for tax equity and economic development. The Federal ownership of these lands creates substantial revenue inequities for these States by depriving their counties of any right to levy taxes on these lands.

An artificial expedient has been attempted through the return of royalty payments and grazing fees to the counties affected. In my own State of Utah, these fees uniformly fall far short of what the individual counties would receive in property tax revenues if these lands were privately owned. On Forest Service lands, for example, these counties get an average return from the Federal Government of 4 cents per acre. In contrast to this temporizing solution now in effect, both reason and equity would dictate the Federal Government should be treated as the land owner which it has become. The Federal Government would, then, be required to make a fair payment in lieu of those taxes which such counties would otherwise receive.

To underscore the disparity currently existing, the testimony of Vernon L. Holman, chairman of the Utah State Tax Commission—before the House Environmental Subcommittee on September 13, 1974 at Salt Lake City, Utah, indicated an in lieu tax bill would increase Federal revenue in the four counties surveyed: Emery, Garfield, Kane, and Wayne. The increase in Wayne County, alone, would be 720 percent. The dollar amount of Federal revenue associated with land fees in 1973 would have risen from \$36,463 to \$285,735 under the in lieu tax proposal.

The aggregate tax loss to the Western

Handwritten: H. Sel. Com

(1) by striking out "\$85,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$282,000,000"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Of amounts authorized to be appropriated under this subsection, \$50,000,000 shall be available solely to pay to the trustees of railroads in reorganization such sums as may be necessary to provide such railroads with amounts equal to revenues attributable to tariff increases proposed by such railroads and suspended by the Interstate Commerce Commission during the calendar year 1975, if the Secretary determines that such payments are necessary to carry out this section."

Sec. 7. Section 215 of the Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973 (45 U.S.C. 725) is amended to read as follows:

"INTERIM AGREEMENTS

"Sec. 215. (a) **PURPOSES.**—Prior to the date upon which rail properties are conveyed to the Corporation under this Act, the Secretary, with the approval of the Association, is authorized to enter into agreements with the trustees of the railroads in reorganization in the region (or railroads leased, operated, or controlled by railroads in reorganization)—

"(1) to perform the program maintenance on designated rail properties of such railroads until the date rail properties are conveyed under this Act;

"(2) to improve rail properties of such railroads; and

"(3) to acquire rail properties for lease or loan to any such railroads until the date such rail properties are conveyed under this Act, and subsequently for conveyance pursuant to the final system plan, or to acquire interests in such rail properties owned by or leased to any such railroads or in purchase money obligations therefor.

"(b) **CONDITIONS.**—Agreements pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall contain such reasonable terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe. In addition, agreements under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) of this section shall provide that—

"(1) to the extent that physical condition is used as a basis for determining, under section 206(f) or 303(c) of this Act, the value of properties subject to such an agreement and designated for transfer to the Corporation under the final system plan, the physical condition of the properties on the effective date of the agreement shall be used; and

"(2) in the event that property subject to the agreement is sold, leased, or transferred to an entity other than the Corporation, the trustees or railroad shall pay or assign to the Secretary that portion of the proceeds of such sale, lease, or transfer which reflects value attributable to the maintenance and improvement provided pursuant to the agreement.

"(c) **OBLIGATIONS.**—Notwithstanding section 210(b) of this title, the Association shall issue obligations under section 210(a) of this title in an amount sufficient to finance such agreements and shall require the Corporation to assume any such obligations. The aggregate amount of obligations issued under this section and outstanding at any one time shall not exceed \$300,000,000. The Association, with the approval of the Secretary, shall designate in the final system plan that portion of such obligations issued or to be issued which shall be refinanced and the terms thereof, and that portion from which the Corporation shall be released of its obligations.

"(d) **CONVEYANCE.**—The Secretary may convey to the Corporation, with or without receipt of consideration, any property or interests acquired by, transferred to, or otherwise held by the Secretary pursuant to this section or section 213 of this Act."

Sec. 8. Section 303(c)(1) of the Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973 (45 U.S.C. 745(c)(1)) is amended by striking out the last word of paragraph (A), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (B) and inserting "; and" in lieu thereof, and by inserting after paragraph (B) the following new paragraph:

"(C) what portion of the proceeds received by a railroad in reorganization from an entity other than the Corporation for the sale, lease, or transfer of property subject to an agreement under section 213 or section 215 (a) (1) or (2) of this Act reflects value attributable to the maintenance or improvement provided pursuant to the agreement."

Sec. 9. Title VI of the Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"TAX PAYMENTS TO STATES

"Sec 605. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no railroad in reorganization shall withhold from any State, or any political subdivision thereof, the payment of the portion of any tax owed by such railroad to such State or subdivision, which portion has been collected by such railroad from any tenant thereof.

"(b) Any railroad which violates the provisions of subsection (a) of this section by withholding any portion of a tax referred to in such subsection shall be fined not more than \$10,000 for each such violation."

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 2051) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

ESTABLISHING A SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 174 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 174

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 138) establishing a Select Committee on Intelligence. After general debate, which shall be confined to the resolution and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, the resolution shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MURPHY) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. MURPHY of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 174 provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate on House Resolution 138, a resolution establishing a Select Committee on Intelligence.

House Resolution 138 authorizes the Select Committee on Intelligence to conduct an inquiry into the collection and use of intelligence information and allegations of improper and illegal activities of intelligence agencies in the United States and abroad.

House Resolution 138 also authorizes the Select Committee to inquire into the activities of certain government agencies in furtherance of their study.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 174 in order that we may discuss, debate, and pass House Resolution 138.

(Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.)

(Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I think the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MURPHY), my colleague on the Committee on Rules, has explained the purpose of this resolution. I would merely add that it makes in order House Resolution 138, which involves the original jurisdiction of the House Committee on Rules because it would establish a Select Committee on Intelligence.

It would have, of course, been possible under the rules of the House to bring that matter before this body as a privileged matter, not subject to amendment, in which case it would have been necessary for me, or someone on this side of the aisle, when the previous question was moved, to urge the defeat of the previous question in order to submit a resolution which would be open to amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING), who offered in the Committee on Rules a motion for an open rule, a resolution making this matter subject to debate under a completely open rule, which I think is proper procedure in view of the very important issues involved and the fact that I have four amendments that I wish to offer to the resolution. There may be, of course, others who have other amendments in addition to the four that I have to offer, but I will not take the time now under the rule to discuss those amendments. We will have an hour to do so under general debate, and at that time I will undertake to explain those particulars in which I differ with the drafters of House Resolution 138 and think that their product could be improved upon.

Mr. Speaker, I would join my colleague from Illinois in urging the adoption of the rule so that we can proceed with the debate on this resolution.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois to give me his opinion on this set of circumstances: We have a presidential commission headed by the vice president devoting itself to a complete investigation of the issues this select committee would consider.

We have a committee of the other body, which will do the same thing. Now we are creating a third independent body which may or may not cooperate with these other groups which will go over the same ground. We have just abolished the House Internal Security Committee, and one of the arguments was that it was the duty of other agencies to investigate subversion and that committee was not needed. How, in times when we are faced with economic problems and the need to cut back on the budget, can we justify creating still another committee to go over this same ground? Will the gentleman address himself to that?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I think there are some very relevant and justifiable concerns about the possibility of duplication, and those have been expressed by many Members of this body. The Presidential Commission, to which the gentleman refers, I believe is scheduled to report on or about the 4th of April 1975, and I think there are seven other members on that Commission. It was felt, and I think with some justification, that in addition to having the executive branch review this matter, that Congress, with its independent authority and with its independent responsibility for oversight, should undertake a similar investigation. My preference, frankly, would have been for a joint committee.

I introduced, along with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BIESTER), earlier this year a resolution—we had some co-sponsors, as I recall it—with the idea of a joint Senate-House committee to conduct oversight on this whole question. Unfortunately, the Senate chose to go ahead rather quickly and establish their own Senate select committee. I think that pretty well preempts any action on the part of the House to set up a joint committee. It would be rather futile for us to proceed with that idea because there is little likelihood the Senate will rescind its earlier action. However, I think that was certainly the best idea originally.

We are now confronted with the fact that the Senate has gone ahead. I heard this morning that on yesterday the senior Senator from Idaho, the chairman of that committee, has announced he will undertake to coordinate the work of his committee with the work of any committee suggested by this House to avoid the duplication which the gentleman fears. If he carries out that pledge—and I have no reason to doubt that he will—perhaps some of the duplications and the needless expense that might be incurred can be avoided.

I will have, however, some amendments, I point out to the gentlemen, to eliminate the expense, to take out of the resolution we have the open-ended authorization and replace it with the ceiling, and a subceiling, as well, on outside consultants, and I think, also, change the reporting date, to try to compress into a shorter time scale the work of the committee, so that they would not be encouraged to endlessly go on delving into these matters and they would finish their work quickly and expeditiously.

So I am going to try in these amendments to answer some of the various questions the gentleman has expressed.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was aged to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 138) establishing a Select Committee on Intelligence.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MURPHY).

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Resolution 138, with Mr. FLYNN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the resolution was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MURPHY) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. MURPHY of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, House Resolution 138 establishes a House Select Committee on Intelligence, to be composed of 10 members, to be appointed by the Speaker, who shall designate one of the members as chairman.

House Resolution 138, as reported by the Committee on Rules, includes four committee amendments which strengthen the resolution.

House Resolution 138 authorizes the Select Committee on Intelligence to conduct an inquiry into the collection and use of intelligence information and allegations of improper and illegal activities of intelligence agencies in the United States and abroad. The resolution authorizes the select committee to review the procedures and effectiveness of coordination between the various intelligence components of the U.S. Government. The committee shall also determine whether or not there is a need for improved or

reorganized oversight by the Congress of U.S. intelligence activities.

House Resolution 138 also authorizes the select committee to inquire into the activities of certain governmental agencies in furtherance of their study.

These agencies include, among others, the National Security Council; the Central Intelligence Agency; the intelligence components of the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force; the Intelligence and Research Bureau of the Department of State; the Federal Bureau of Investigation; the Department of the Treasury; and the Department of Justice.

Mr. Chairman, I think this resolution is long overdue. Earlier one of the Members questioned the idea of why the House is engaging in the same activity that the Presidential Commission and the Senate is already engaged in. I would like to answer that question in this way:

As far as the Presidential Commission is concerned, we have the executive department investigating itself, investigating an executive agency. As far as the Senate is concerned, I agree with my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON), that possibly this should have been a joint committee. However, the Senate committee is already well on the road in its investigation, and I think the House is justified in pursuing its own investigation.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday the Committee on Rules adopted four amendments to this resolution of original jurisdiction and I understand the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) has some further amendments he intends to offer today.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

(Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, as I indicated in the brief colloquy I had with the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN) moments ago, certainly my preference would have been for the creation of a joint committee in order to eliminate the possibilities of duplication and waste that are inherent, I think, when we have two committees functioning in the same area.

However, I think we have passed that point, as my colleague has just pointed out.

I want to start by saying that I certainly begin with the conviction that in view of the controversy that has arisen over the domestic activities of the CIA, in view of the report that that organization had been conducting a widespread and illegal operation in the late 1960's and in the early 1970's and that it had been keeping files on 10,000 Americans by each unit reporting to the Director, we should exercise our oversight authority in this matter.

And there were the other reports that were given great currency and circulation about domestic break-ins and wire tapping and covert mail inspections. Certainly I think that this entitles us—more than entitles us; I think it mandates our concern—to exercise our super-

visory role, our oversight authority in this area.

I cannot help but recall for the Members of this body, as I did for the members of my committee, that it was 12 years ago, in the 88th Congress, that I sponsored a resolution for a joint committee. Our now absent colleague, at that time the gentleman from New York, Mr. Lindsay being the principal sponsor, I felt then and I feel now that a committee specifically devoted and charged with the responsibility of oversight in this area is necessary and is important.

But having said all of that, it seems to me, as I read this particular resolution, that it grants the most sweeping authority imaginable. There is literally no Federal agency, as I read this legislation, that would be entirely immune from a probe because it gives no definition of "intelligence."

In section 3 it lists all of the agencies that were mentioned a moment ago by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MURPHY). These include all great departments of the Government like the Department of Justice and the Department of the Treasury, even the Energy, Research and Development Administration, as well as those intelligence agencies with which we are more familiar, the CIA, the FBI, the Defense Intelligence Agency, and all of the defense intelligence components of the Departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force.

This is sweeping authority indeed, and it seems to me that we have to be very careful that we do, therefore, make the terms of the investigative effort so broad and so all-encompassing, without any boundaries whatsoever, that we get into this mire and this morass of investigative activity that would cost untold hundreds of thousands, even millions, of dollars and yet not be productive of the kind of recommendations that we hope will come out of this committee if it is created and out of the committee in the Senate as well.

It is for that reason, not because I oppose the idea that we have a legitimate oversight function with which we ought to be concerned, that I have circulated these four amendments and commended them to the membership of this body, with the hope that they would adopt them today as amendments to House Resolution 138.

First of all, I want to refer to the one that would provide for a five and five membership on the committee. This resolution will follow otherwise the rule of the Democratic caucus, which provides for two-thirds plus one as the ratio of Democrats to Republicans on this committee.

This is not a legislative committee. Whatever justification the Members on this side of the aisle may have for such a rule in the House caucus as it applies to legislative committees, it should not apply to a select committee investigating one of the most delicate, sensitive areas that could possibly be encompassed within the scope of any congressional investigation.

I make no blind, blatant charges of partisanship over here. I make no

charges that anyone is out on a fishing expedition designed to embarrass the past administration or the present administration, because this problem extends back for many years into administrations both Democrat and Republican.

At least since the time, I believe, of John F. Kennedy there has been increasing involvement, apparently, on the part of the CIA particularly and perhaps other intelligence agencies of the Federal Government as well, in some of these activities, both covert and overt, that have stirred recent alarms. Therefore, I think that it is a bipartisan problem. It ought to be approached in a bipartisan fashion, and I would hope, therefore, that in establishing ratios on this committee, we would not be bound by some standard rule as it deals with the ordinary legislative committee.

Let me point out one specific example. In the last Congress, when we set out to investigate the operations of this Congress—and what could be nearer and dearer to our hearts than that? And more sensitive, really, to our individual role as legislators, than the operations of this body? We did not establish that committee with a partisan ratio. We established it under the chairmanship—and the very able chairmanship—of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) on a 5-to-5 ratio, 5 Democrats and 5 Republicans. They went very thoroughly, for almost 18 months, into all of the ramifications and operations of this House and its committees, and came up with a very excellent report.

I think a bipartisan committee can do the same kind of job if they are allowed to function in a truly bipartisan manner, as I have suggested.

Second, I think that the fact that there is no price tag on this resolution makes it defective; that, just as the Senate did in its resolution, it provided \$750,000 as an expense budget, and a \$100,000 subceiling budget for outside consultants. It makes good sense to do that in this resolution. If the committee finds that it is going to have to expend more funds than it can come back and get an additional authorization, I am sure, for additional expenditures. But let us not start out with what the gentleman from Maryland was worried about a few minutes ago so that we get into the kind of boundless investigation that just proliferates in all directions at once, because there is absolutely no ceiling at all on the expenditure of funds. I hope that amendment when it is offered will have your support.

Third, instead of waiting until next year, until the end of January, let us give it a September 1 reporting date. Let us coordinate our activities with the activities of the other body. The senior Senator from Idaho, as I said a few minutes ago, said that he is willing to coordinate his efforts and give their report by September 1. So it makes sense to me that we have a similar reporting date so that we can work in tandem with that committee, then, and better coordinate the activities of the two Houses in this area.

Finally, I will offer an amendment

dealing with the very important matter of specific safeguards for protecting classified materials.

There is some very general language in the resolution dealing with this subject, and it merely says that the committee shall establish rules as they deem necessary to prevent unauthorized disclosures of information and testimony. I would suggest that better language would be language identical to that in the Senate resolution. I have taken that language exactly as it was passed in the other body, providing that the committee shall set up specific procedures to clear individuals, to provide them with the necessary security clearances before they deal with these very sensitive and, I am sure, highly classified materials.

There is nothing very radical about the proposals I have made. I think they will give us the sense in this House that we are moving in a bipartisan and very orderly fashion in coordination with the activities of the other body so as to get on with the needed business of deciding what went wrong, if it did go wrong and, more importantly, what we can now do to recommend a better and more continuing type of oversight of the intelligence community in the future.

So I hope the Members will support the amendments that I have described when they are offered, when we debate this under the 5-minute rule, and with those amendments I think we will be able to get on with the very important task that has to be dealt with.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman I think no one would disagree about the oversight authority and responsibility this House has, so far as that oversight pertains to amendments and changes in the law and in the statutes, and also so far as responsibility as to how funds appropriated by this Congress are spent as respects various activities, but I am not at all sure that it is intended by the oversight responsibility to limit them to that.

Does the gentleman foresee the possibility that this oversight select committee might get into the policymaking duties of the various agencies?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. No, I do not think it would attempt to do that. We would have to physically decry any effort to interfere with the legitimate intelligence-gathering functions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

I do not think there is any disagreement—or I hope there is not any widespread disagreement—with the proposition that we need an intelligence service in this country to properly guarantee our national security. Agencies of the kind that are listed in this resolution—the Defense Intelligence Agency, the FBI, the CIA—all are needed. It is a question, however, of making sure that they carry out that intelligence function in a way that does not unconstitutionally violate individual rights of Americans here at home, and also, I think, does not involve

them in activities that are really nongermane and alien to the true intelligence function.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

If I understand his response, there is absolutely no intent to give this select committee the authority to influence policymaking by any of the agencies, that they will have the responsibility overall, but it is simply to limit the authority to oversight as to Americans and funds used; is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I want to be very candid with the gentleman. I cannot assure him that they will not make recommendations that in effect would deal in the policy area or with the policymaking function of these agencies, but let me remind him that this committee has no legislative authority. They cannot pass on anything. All they can do is report to us, I hope, by September 1, 1975, and make recommendations which we as a full House would then act upon.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BAUMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

There are at least seven different standing committees that have some sort of jurisdiction over intelligence activities in the House. I have heard rumors that, regardless of what the House may do in creating a select committee, some of these committees or the subcommittee chairmen will proceed with collateral investigations of the same issue.

Does the gentleman have any information about any plans to at least try to consolidate all of these investigations, or are we going to go off in all different directions at once for whatever purposes the individual committees involved may have?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. My personal hope would certainly be that during the period that this select committee is functioning, if it is established, there would be a moratorium on a lot of investigative activity by these other subcommittees. Obviously, I am not in a position to speak, however, for the gentlemen who might be in a position to continue to assert that jurisdiction.

Mr. BAUMAN. If the gentleman will yield further, there is, however, nothing in this resolution that says so?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. No. There is nothing in here that specifically says there is a moratorium.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GIAIMO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This legislation is not designed to prohibit in any way any existing legislative committee or any other committee which has jurisdiction in this area from conducting its work. The gentleman is right. There are about seven committees or sub-

committees that do have an involvement or a partial involvement. Possibly only one could have the overall jurisdiction to cover all aspects.

For example, some have jurisdiction over the FBI, others have jurisdiction over the CIA, et cetera. It is designed that these committees will continue to do what they are empowered to do under the existing rules of the House.

This committee is designed to look at several factors primarily: Is there substance to the allegations of wrongdoing?

Should there be recommendations for changes in the methods in which the various intelligence services are conducting their activities—things of that type? It would not be to usurp the powers of the existing committees or subcommittees.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GIAIMO).

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

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, let me explain to the Members why we are appearing here today on this resolution to establish a Select Committee on Intelligence. There has been a growing belief among the Members of Congress and among the public at large that all is not well with the intelligence agencies of the United States or that all may not be well and a growing concern that Congress should exercise to a greater degree than it has its oversight function.

We are intending to maintain a good and adequate intelligence service for the United States. We are equally determined to assure the rights of the citizens of the United States so that these rights will not be infringed in any way by anyone, and particularly by Federal intelligence agencies.

There have been very serious allegations of possible wrongdoing on the part of some intelligence agencies. We do not know whether these allegations are true in fact or not, but we certainly feel that Congress has the absolute obligation and duty to the American people to look into it and to exercise its oversight function to determine whether there is any merit to these allegations of wrongdoing.

Beyond that, many of these intelligence agencies have been in existence for many, many years, some from before World War II, and some of our major ones certainly came into prominence right after World War II. Their means of conducting their activities developed in those years, particularly in the late 1940's and early 1950's. Are these activities still proper ones? Are they still wise ones in which those agencies should be involved? Should we, for example, conduct covert operations in the same way in which we have been doing? This is another area of investigation by this select committee.

Therefore, it was the feeling of the overwhelming majority of those Members of the majority party in their caucus that a committee of the Congress should look into this entire matter of activities of the intelligence agencies. We do not

deny to the Executive the right to set up the Commission which they have to look into the allegations of impropriety, nor do we intend to prejudge the work and the recommendations of that Commission. But certainly as the executive branch has the right to oversee those actions, very clearly the Congress also does, and this is what we intend to do today.

We have many committees which have jurisdiction. For instance, the Committee on the Judiciary has jurisdiction over the FBI, and the Committee on Armed Services has jurisdiction over the CIA, and the Committee on Banking and Currency has jurisdiction over the Treasury and Internal Revenue. There are many committees. The Appropriations Committee also has a function here. But I doubt whether there is any one committee that has overall jurisdiction and can look at all the intelligence branches of the U.S. Government, with the possible exception, and I say with the possible exception, of the Government Operations Committee. It may have.

Be that as it may, there has been a growing feeling among the overwhelming majority of Members that there should be a per se Intelligence Committee to look into these allegations of wrongdoing.

I myself would have preferred a joint committee. I am sure that many of us would have, and I am sure the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) recognizes that as a practical matter the other body has already begun with its select committee and there is very little hope of having a joint committee. Incidentally, it may well be that one of the recommendations of this committee might be to recommend a permanent joint committee with the other body.

We deliberately set a termination date of January 31, 1976, because we did not want to make this select committee a permanent committee or to carry on its activities year after year.

Because of the overwhelming feeling of so many Members of the majority of this House that there was need for a select committee, this matter was referred by the caucus of the Democratic Party in the House to the Steering and Policy Committee, so that we could properly study this matter and come up with recommendations.

We met in the Steering and Policy Committee with all the interested committee chairmen and discussed the matter with them and then, because of the complexity of the matter, it was referred to a task force of the Steering and Policy Committee and other Members to make further recommendations. The task force consisted of myself, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. NEZBI), the gentleman from California (Mr. MOSS), the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM), the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. HARRINGTON), and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DAVIS). After additional meetings and considerations we proposed the resolution which is before us today, urging that it be adopted and that we get on with this work. This committee then would have the function to look into the allegations

of impropriety as one of its primary goals.

Second, it was to look into whether or not there is adequate oversight, both by the executive branch and by the Congress, of the intelligence activities.

Third, it would study the necessity, the nature, and the extent of overt and covert intelligence activities by United States intelligence instrumentalities here and abroad, and whether or not there should be some changes, for example, in the basic laws which apply to them.

This would be the function of this committee. It would be limited in duration. It would report back to the House by the end of this year. I doubt that the date that the other body has is a realistic one. I suspect that that September date will be extended to the end of the year.

I urge adoption of the resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MITCHELL).

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I want to propound a question to the gentleman from Connecticut.

First of all, let me say, that I think this resolution and the creation of this select committee is most necessary and important at this time. If for no other reason than to dispel the fears and concerns that so many of our citizens have all over the country today.

My problem is that we deal with a number of governmental agencies; however, we do not deal at all with the matter of local police. I raise this question because the inspectional services division of the Baltimore City Police Department kept dossiers on black elected officials, black clergymen, and black community leaders. These dossiers or reports were forwarded to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Army Intelligence Agency, and to other governmental agencies.

Is that not also an important link that should be looked at?

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that we should put into this legislation any authority empowering us to look into the activities of State or local government; however, to take the example that the gentleman propounds where there was an involvement of the local police force and the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the LEAA, for example, there is no question but that we have the authority to look into the activities of the FBI or the LEAA as far as it relates to police departments.

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, am I right in assuming that we are not considering the local police department sacrosanct and, therefore, not at this time involved in this question of espionage?

Mr. GIAIMO. This is not a question of being sacrosanct. We think we have a big enough job to look into the Federal agencies and whether or not they have been involved in any wrongdoing.

Incidentally, I think that is of paramount concern and if we can look into that and address ourselves to that problem, the other problems can then be resolved also.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GIAIMO. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHN L. BURTON).

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I was wondering if the gentleman would answer two questions. The resolution, although it does not state it as such, is broad enough that there would be an inquiry into the type of activities such as the destabilization of Chile or interfering with the internal affairs of other nations.

Mr. GIAIMO. The question of destabilization of the Chilean Government would come under any study of covert intelligence activities by the U.S. intelligence services abroad. That is within the committee's jurisdiction.

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. Last, the passage of this legislation and the creation of this committee in no way would put a moratorium on any legislative committee of this House from holding hearings on substantive legislation dealing with codes that we are informed concern themselves with the Central Intelligence Agency.

Mr. GIAIMO. Does the gentleman mean the standing committees which have jurisdiction?

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. Legislation dealing with matters on the part of the Central Intelligence Agency and the creation of this committee does not mean, in fact, a moratorium on any others.

Mr. GIAIMO. I think it is the opposite of that. In fact, I think the establishment of this legislation is going to give an impetus and encouragement to these other existing committees to play a greater role in oversight and legislation in these areas than they have in the past.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has again expired.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GIAIMO).

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIAIMO. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Connecticut. I believe he has very ably expressed my concerns in detail on this task force.

I would urge the adoption of the resolution as it is presented and not amended.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. McCLORY).

(Mr. McCLORY asked and was given

permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I want to express myself in general support of this legislation. It seems to me, however, that the focus of our attention should be on the illegal, the unethical, and the immoral acts, or alleged acts, conducted by the CIA, FBI and other intelligence gathering agencies.

It seems to me that the broader mandate which is involved in House Resolution 138 is so all-encompassing that the work of the proposed select committee could go on for years. The minority leader, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RHODES), introduced House Resolution 121, and it seems to me that that proposal directs its attention at the principal problem with which we are concerned; namely, the problem of jeopardizing the rights of individual American citizens by misuse of our intelligence agencies.

That is a subject over which the House Judiciary Committee, and now specifically the Subcommittee on Civil Rights, has general jurisdiction, and it is something with which that subcommittee is vitally concerned on a continuing basis.

The broader mandate which we have here, it seems to me, is going to involve us in much more than that, as the earlier colloquies have indicated. I intend to support the amendments to be offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON). It seems to me that all of those amendments are essential if we are to have the kind of objective, the kind of bipartisan select committee which it seems to me this body should provide for and which the American people deserve.

Mr. Chairman, in expressing my support for this general proposal, let me emphasize again that such action by the House should be of a truly bipartisan and objective nature. Accordingly, I am hopeful that the action which we will take here today will reflect the kind of balance and objectivity which this subject deserves and which this House acting responsibly in the national interests should take.

Mr. Chairman, I am aware of the contents of House Resolution 121, introduced by our distinguished Republican leader, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RHODES) which in my opinion sets forth more precisely the steps which this House should take. In other words, I believe the select committee should focus its attention on the abuses which may have been practiced by our intelligence gathering agencies. At the same time, we should avoid jeopardizing any and all legitimate intelligence gathering activities which are important to our national security—perhaps even to our survival as a nation in a world in which many hostile and aggressive elements exist and where we must be alert to the danger of global holocaust.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to the provisions of House Resolution 121, I am aware also of the amendments which I understand will be proposed by my colleague from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON). In my opinion, these proposed amendments to the measure before us—House Reso-

lution 138—more accurately carry out the objectives which I feel are essential to a truly bipartisan and objective investigation.

Mr. Chairman, it is important, first of all, that the composition of any such select committee should be evenly divided between Republicans and Democrats. A proposed 10-member committee evenly divided between Republicans and Democrats would carry out this goal. This is a matter of great concern to both Republicans and Democrats alike—and this inquiry will necessarily involve investigations of both Republican and Democratic administrations. A balanced bipartisan committee with equal representation of both parties would clearly be best equipped to deal with these important and sensitive matters in a responsible manner.

Our colleague (Mr. ANDERSON) also will offer an amendment to require the select committee to take the necessary steps to guard the confidentiality of the extremely sensitive material and information with which it will be dealing. Adoption of this amendment is absolutely necessary if the inquiry is to avoid leaks which could seriously jeopardize national security.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment goes in tandem with another amendment to be offered by my friend from Illinois which would require appropriate security clearances for the select committee's staff. Furthermore, section (C) of this amendment insures that no member of the staff may use the classified information which he or she receives in the course of the inquiry for later monetary gain—further minimizing the risk of security breaches after the filing of the select committee's report and the completion of its work.

Mr. Chairman, the concept of a single comprehensive bipartisan inquiry, embodied in this resolution, enjoys widespread support. Because of the problems of overlapping jurisdiction which exist in our committee structure with respect to oversight of Federal intelligence activities, it is my feeling that this select committee ought to preempt the separate inquiries by the standing committees of the House. To do an adequate job, however, the select committee deserves the set authorization of \$750,000 which is provided by Mr. ANDERSON's third amendment. This amendment should be supported if we are serious in our desire to have a single intensive investigation in the place of several duplicative, noncomprehensive inquiries.

Finally, the fourth Anderson amendment—which sets a September 1, 1975, deadline for the select committee's report—makes sense and ought to be supported. We know that the Senate's select committee will report on that date—and I believe that the House should also—in the interests of a coordinated congressional approach to these important issues. No responsible Member would oppose an extension of this deadline if it were warranted by further revelations—but for now, it is most important to strive for an expeditious and coordinated inquiry into the disturbing allegations which have been made.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, this resolution, if strengthened by the adoption of my colleague's amendments, is worthy of the support of every Member who wants a truly professional and bipartisan inquiry—in which the American people can justifiably place their trust. A country which has had its confidence shaken in the integrity of its intelligence agencies and which is concerned about the constitutional rights of its citizens being abridged, is in precarious condition indeed. Let us act today, in the highest tradition of this House, to show the American people that we are prepared to deal with the serious problems which go to the heart of our form of government by adopting my colleague from Illinois' amendments and passing this important resolution.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois, my colleague, Mr. McCLOY, for offering his support for the amendments that I described earlier. They are going to be offered, as I suggested, not with any desire to frustrate the very important aims of this select committee when it is established, but rather, I think, to undergird it with a kind of guarantee against partisanship that I think would be disastrous, so far as public confidence is concerned, or as far as any meaningful results that, hopefully, would otherwise flow from its adoption.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BAUMAN. I note in section 6 the committee is authorized to establish its own rules of procedure with regard to release of information which may come before this committee. If the gentleman will recall, in the impeachment inquiry of the Committee on the Judiciary, they voted to close certain sessions, which they had the right to do. The next morning in the metropolitan press the entire contents of those hearings were on the front page in great detail, without any names being revealed as to whom the sources were. This committee will be dealing with highly sensitive information in this investigation. Was there any testimony before the Committee on Rules or has anyone offered any recommendations which will protect the secrecy of these investigations?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I would say to the gentleman that I will offer an amendment on the subject he has raised and specify that rules and procedures must be adopted by the committee that are designed to prevent the disclosure outside of the committee of information that is not authorized to be disclosed, and, furthermore, to establish security clearance requirements for individuals who will be handling the sensitive materials.

I would agree that they are more sensitive, perhaps, than some of the materials that were before the Committee on the Judiciary in the recent impeachment inquiry. But all kinds of materials will be dealt with in this committee.

Mr. Chairman, it is essential that we

tighten up the language of this resolution and guard against the unauthorized dissemination of information on matters which are necessarily secret.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, would the gentleman's amendment apply also to Members of the House as well?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, as written, the amendment applies to staff; it does not specifically apply to Members. I think in those instances we will have to have faith in the qualifications of the Members who will be selected to serve on that committee, and we will have to have faith that they will observe the kind of circumspection that will be required of the members of that committee.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has a large measure of faith.

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Chairman, as a sponsor of legislation in both the previous and present Congress to create a Joint Committee on Intelligence, I rise in support of House Resolution 138 establishing a Select Committee on Intelligence.

I will vote for this bill with some misgivings as I do not feel it is the most preferable way to approach the problem. Few would deny that the reports and allegations involving illegal CIA and other foreign intelligence activities demand the closest examination. It is questionable, I feel, whether the House should undertake to duplicate much of the same investigative inquiry which is already being done by the President's commission and the Senate panel. The proper course for Congress to have taken in this matter would have been to create a joint House-Senate committee rather than the two separate efforts we will have should House Resolution 138 pass. The House should be involved firsthand in an examination of what has been done, and for this reason the bill before us should pass.

The need for some form of on-going oversight mechanism is not satisfied by the existence of these several groups, as important as their immediate objectives are. I believe we will still need to have a permanent body with the authority to monitor what is happening in the area of foreign intelligence operations. Right now that authority is fragmented and, for practical purposes, nonexistent. By bringing together in one committee Members from both Houses—specifically including those who serve on Foreign Affairs and Foreign Relations, Armed Services and Appropriations—we will be better able to follow on a continuing basis what is being done by our foreign intelligence apparatus.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois has joined me in introducing H.R. 201, creating a Joint Committee on Intelligence, and I hope consideration of such legislation will be forthcoming during this session. Unless we have a permanent vehicle institutionalizing supervision over this aspect of governmental activity, the problem will return to trouble us in the future.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Resolution 138, to create a Select Committee on Intelligence.

While I have indicated, through my sponsorship of House Concurrent Resolution 18, the long-range congressional need for a permanent joint House-Senate oversight committee on intelligence activities, I believe it is essential that we immediately begin an investigation of the costly and little known segments of the Federal Government, our intelligence agencies, and measure their activities against their respective charters.

The creation of a select committee to examine the specific agencies, as well as the overall conduct and responsibilities of the entire intelligence community is an important undertaking. Such an inquiry is long overdue. The demands that the House assume its responsibility for overseeing the intelligence agencies, which operate largely in secrecy, can no longer be ignored.

Obviously the Nation needs effective criminal surveillance programs. No one seriously disputes this, and there is no one in the Congress who would work toward undermining the effectiveness of our intelligence agencies in the performance of their necessary and legitimate functions.

However, it is the responsibility of the Congress to define the legitimate intelligence activities, establish guidelines for the conduct of such operations and insure that such guidelines are enforced. We have evidence of military agents spying on civilians. It has been acknowledged that the CIA became involved in domestic surveillance. Testimony before various congressional committees indicates that intelligence agencies have withheld information from the Congress and have engaged in serious abuses and misuses of authority. These are matters which must be fully and thoroughly explored.

As recent testimony before the House Judiciary Subcommittee of which I am chairman indicates, the surveillance techniques of domestic intelligence agencies are equally worthy of scrutiny.

We have evidence that warrantless wiretaps were conducted for as long as 25 years. We have admissions that the FBI monitored some 40 phone calls between one Detroit lawyer and his clients. We have evidence that the Secret Service had access without legal process to very revealing telephone toll records. We have information that the FBI used private bank and credit records without any legal authority. We have reports of FBI spying on Members of Congress and domestic political groups including actual disruption of political associations.

Mr. Chairman, we have reached a point where the public's confidence in the Nation's law enforcement agencies is legitimately shaken. A thorough house cleaning of the intelligence community will go a long way toward restoring that confidence.

I urge adoption of House Resolution 138 and the speedy selection of the House Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the resolution to create a House Select Committee on Intelligence represents a vital first step toward making this Nation's intelligence community accountable to the Congress for the first

time since the Central Intelligence Agency was created in 1947, signaling the uncontrolled growth of secret intelligence activities in the executive branch, the House will have established an effective mechanism to scrutinize questionable intelligence operations.

As one of the original sponsors of the Select Committee proposal, as well as a member of the ad hoc committee which unanimously recommended this resolution, I wish to summarize my understanding of the nature and scope of the proposed select committee's authority.

The committee's major task will be to recommend whatever new legislation and oversight structures are needed to insure that intelligence agencies are operating within the law and are accountable to Congress. This necessarily requires a reconsideration of the policies and assumptions underlying present intelligence practice. It requires careful investigation into all intelligence activities, particularly those that have resulted in the illegal political operations abroad or in violations of the civil liberties of American citizens. Finally, it requires an evaluation of the past effectiveness of House intelligence oversight committees in keeping these agencies within legal bounds. The select committee proposed today would have authority to accomplish these tasks.

My support for the select committee stems in large part from my belief that existing controls on intelligence activities, particularly on the CIA, have been wholly inadequate. Specifically, the CIA's secret program in Chile to destabilize the Allende government, have yet to be subjected to searching congressional inquiry. Likewise, the extent of CIA domestic surveillance has not been fully examined. The House Select Committee on Intelligence would be empowered, along with its more general investigations, to explore these particular intelligence activities.

It is important to realize that intelligence policies and covert operations are not established without official actions at the highest levels of the executive branch. Any complete study of the intelligence community must probe the mechanisms within the executive branch, especially the National Security Council, for initiating and controlling intelligence operations. These matters will surely concern the Select Committee on Intelligence with its subpoena power, the committee would be able to obtain valuable testimony from all executive branch officials who deal with intelligence policy.

It has been warned in debate over this proposal that care should be taken to protect the "national security" interests of the United States. I agree. However, this country's security depends just as much on the maintenance of a rule of law as it does on the preservation of diplomatic secrets. It is threatened just as seriously by a misguided covert intervention abroad as it is by insufficient intelligence gathering and analysis. "National security" means much more than mere acquiescence by Congress to asserted claims of necessity by intelligence officials. Such an abdication of congressional responsibility and control over the intel-

ligence community will, in the long run, undermine the security of this Nation and its citizens.

The Select Committee on Intelligence can play a major role in the preservation of our "national security" in this broad sense. While I regret that it has taken the House so long to recognize the need for this committee, I commend the Democratic leadership for finally supporting this much needed reform. I urge passage of this resolution so that the select committee can begin its long-overdue investigation of the intelligence community.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That (a) there is hereby established in the House of Representatives a Select Committee on Intelligence to conduct an inquiry into the organization, operations, and oversight of the intelligence community of the United States Government.

(b) The select committee shall be composed of ten Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, in consultation with the chairmen of those standing committees having current jurisdiction over intelligence matters. The Speaker shall designate one of the Members as chairman.

(c) For the purposes of this resolution the select committee is authorized to sit during sessions of the House and during the present Congress whether or not the House has recessed or adjourned. A majority of the members of the select committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business except that the select committee may designate a lesser number as a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 1, line 8, after the word "Speaker" insert a period and strike out all after the period through the word "matters." on page 1, line 10.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ANDERSON OF ILLINOIS

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Anderson of Illinois: On page 1, strike lines 6 through 11 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) The select committee shall be composed of ten Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker as follows: (1) five from the majority party, and (2) five from the minority party after consultation with the minority leader of the House. The Speaker shall designate one of the Members as chairman."

(Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, this amendment specifies that the composition of the select committee shall be completely bipartisan, with five Members from the majority party and five from the minority party. The resolution as reported contains no specific refer-

ence to the partisan makeup of the committee, but it was made clear in our Rules Committee hearings that the Democratic Caucus rule of 2 to 1 plus 1 would apply to the select committee as well. That would mean, on a 10-member committee such as this, there would be 7 Democrats and only 3 Republicans.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is especially important that this committee—having such broad authority to probe such sensitive areas spanning Republican and Democratic administrations alike—that this committee be completely bipartisan so that there is not one hint of partisanship. I think we should recall that in the last Congress we created a bipartisan select committee of five Democrats and five Republicans to investigate this House and its committees. That committee worked quite well together, and unanimously reported a comprehensive and constructive product. It put partisanship aside and acted in what it considered to be the best interests of the House. It would seem doubly important that we adopt this nonpartisan approach to investigating the intelligence community so that the committee will act in the best interests of the country.

I would also point out that our own House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is completely bipartisan, with six Democrats and six Republicans. If we feel we should be nonpartisan in investigating and policing the conduct of House Members, it should follow that we would want to be nonpartisan in investigating and policing our domestic and foreign intelligence communities—an even more delicate and sensitive area.

The Senate select committee on intelligence has a nearly bipartisan composition, with six Democrats and five Republicans, despite the fact that the majority party has a 3-to-2 ratio in that body.

I have reviewed the numerous resolutions referred to our Rules Committee which would establish either House select or joint committees on intelligence. Almost all of them, introduced by Republicans and Democrats alike, would have either a bipartisan or nearly bipartisan composition.

And yet, here we have a resolution drafted in the Democratic Steering and Policy Committee which would revert to the old partisan ratio of 2 to 1 plus one. I can understand that such a proposal is to be expected from one of the partisan organs in the House. But we are now acting as an institution—not as Republicans or Democrats—but as Members of Congress interested in doing what is right for the country and in doing it the right way. And I would suggest that we must act on a matter of this importance and sensitivity in such a way that there not even be the appearance of partisanship connected with this investigation. I urge adoption of my amendment.

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Chairman, actually the resolution before us does not provide for any ratio; it provides for a 10-member committee, and it could be

to 1 or 10 to 0 unless we spell out the ratio as to the members of the committee; is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is quite correct. But in fairness to the other side, I want to say that they made it quite clear in their testimony in the Committee on Rules that a 7 to 3 ratio is what they intended.

This was the decision of the task force appointed by the Democratic Policy Steering Committee after it had been referred to that group by the Democratic Caucus. Therefore, I am satisfied that it is going to be 7 and 3 unless we adopt this amendment.

I think, nevertheless, that the reasons I have given are good and sufficient reasons why we ought to specify an even division in the membership of the committee.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

[Mr. GIAIMO addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Chair announces that he will vacate proceedings under the call when a quorum of the Committee appears.

Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

QUORUM CALL VACATED

The CHAIRMAN. One hundred Members have appeared. A quorum of the Committee of the Whole is present. Pursuant to rule XXIII, clause 2, further proceedings under the call shall be considered as vacated.

The Committee will resume its business.

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON).

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

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that if the majority party wants to act in a responsible and a bipartisan manner, they can achieve that end through the acceptance of this amendment. I might say that in supporting the general thrust of this resolution and the establishment of a Select Committee, I am just as interested in the activities of such a select committee as any Member on the other side of the aisle. I think there is the suggestion or the implication in this 7 to 3 ratio which suggests this is going to be a partisan attack and a partisan effort. Certainly partisan control of this activity should not be patterned after a legislative function. I think the integrity of this institution, the House of Representatives, is involved in this very amendment, because this institution is the one which is going

to establish a select committee. It is this institution which is going to conduct the oversight and the investigation of the alleged impairment of the rights of individual citizens, by reason of illegal, immoral, and unethical activities alleged to have been carried out by the intelligence-gathering agencies and, consequently, it seems to me that we should do this in a responsible, objective manner through the establishment of a select committee which will be even balanced between the majority and the minority parties.

I want to assure those who are opposing this amendment on the other side of the aisle of our sincere interest on this side of the aisle of doing the kind of thorough job, not only with respect to this administration, but with respect to prior administrations, and we do not want to have any coverup of any earlier activities, which certainly could result, if the control is there and the political interest is there, to protect and to cover up with respect to an earlier administration. Consequently, I believe that if we are to be truly bipartisan and truly objective and truly responsible to the American people in connection with this select committee, we should support overwhelmingly the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON).

I hope the House will give that kind of support to this amendment.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) has offered four amendments, all of which I think would be a great improvement to this bill. I am particularly interested in the amendment which would change the composition of the committee so that it would be equal between the parties.

Select committees, without legislative authority, should be bipartisan. They are customarily evenly, or nearly evenly divided between the parties and I think this precedent followed in both Houses should not be abandoned.

I recognize the ability of the Democratic side, and of the Democratic caucus, to impose its will upon the House. It has the votes to do it, and if it wants to do it, it certainly can, but I ask the Members on my right to think ahead to the possible time when the majorities might be different, and I ask them if they think it would be a good idea for a select committee to be set up by this body which would be seven to three.

I also ask them if they think it is a good idea to change precedent so that the majority party is in complete control of something which is as sensitive as the investigation of the intelligence divisions of our Government today. It seems to me that this is such a sensitive operation, such a sensitive area, that the Members of the majority party would be well served if a committee to perform this very delicate task were to be just as bipartisan as anybody could possibly make it.

I understand partisanship is quite the vogue in this Congress, and again that is the prerogative of the majority party to make it so if it desires to do so. But I also suggest that this investigation is necessary. I agree that it is. I am pleased that it is going to be done by a select committee instead of by various other committees in which there would be overlapping investigations made. That part of it I agree with completely. But it seems to me the people, the citizens of the Republic, would feel much better about the whole thing and would feel much more confident about the findings of this committee—that there would not be a witch hunt—if the members of the committee were evenly divided between the parties.

So, Mr. Chairman, I speak for all of the amendments offered by the gentleman from Illinois, and I particularly address myself to the one involving the content of the committee.

Mr. BRODHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. BRODHEAD. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the amendment to make this committee evenly divided between the two parties would have the effect of to be trying to reverse the results of the last election. If the people wanted the responsibilities to be divided 50-50 between the two parties they would have voted that way. They did not. They voted two-thirds for one party and one-third for the other. I do not understand why the minority is trying to obstruct the work of this House by offering such an amendment with respect to this committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote. A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device; and there were—ayes 141, noes 265, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 17]

AYES—141

Abdnor	Carter	Erlenborn
Abzug	Cederberg	Esch
Anderson, Ill.	Clancy	Eshleman
Andrews,	Clausen,	Fenwick
N. Dak.	Don H.	Findley
Archer	Cleveland	Fish
Armstrong	Cochran	Forsythe
Ashbrook	Cohen	Frenzel
Bafalis	Collins, Tex.	Frey
Bauman	Conable	Gilman
Beard, Tenn.	Conlan	Goldwater
Bell	Conte	Goodling
Bennett	Coughlin	Gradison
Blester	Crane	Grasley
Breckinridge	Daniel, Robert	Gude
Broomfield	W., Jr.	Guyer
Brown, Mich.	Derwinski	Hagedorn
Brown, Ohio	Devine	Hammer-
Broyhill	Dickinson	schmidt
Buchanan	Duncan, Tenn.	Hansen
Burgener	du Pont	Harsha
Burke, Fla.	Edwards, Ala.	Hastings
Butler	Emery	Hébert

Heckler, Mass.	McKinney	Shriver
Heinz	Madigan	Shuster
Hillis	Martin	Sikes
Hinsshaw	Michel	Smith, Nebr.
Holt	Miller, Ohio	Snyder
Horton	Mitchell, N.Y.	Spence
Hutchinson	Moore	Stanton,
Hyde	Mosher	J. William
Jeffords	Myers, Ind.	Steelman
Johnson, Colo.	Myers, Pa.	Steiger, Ariz.
Johnson, Pa.	O'Brien	Steiger, Wis.
Kasten	Peyster	Symms
Kelly	Pressler	Thone
Ketchum	Pritchard	Treen
Kindness	Quie	Vander Jagt
Lagomarsino	Quillen	Vander Wal
Latta	Railsback	Walsh
Lent	Regula	Wampler
Lott	Rhodes	Whalen
Lujan	Rinaldo	Whitehurst
McCloskey	Robinson	Wiggins
McCloskey	Rousselot	Winn
McCollister	Ruppe	Wydlar
McDade	Sarasin	Wytle
McDonald	Schneebell	Young, Alaska
McEwen	Sebelius	Young, Fla.

NOES—265

Adams	Florio	Melcher
Addabbo	Flowers	Metcalfe
Alexander	Flynt	Meyner
Ambro	Ford, Mich.	Mezvinsky
Anderson,	Fountain	Mikva
Calif.	Fraser	Milford
Andrews, N.C.	Fuqua	Miller, Calif.
Annunzio	Gaydos	Mineta
Ashley	Glaime	Minish
Aspin	Gibbons	Mink
AuCoin	Ginn	Mitchell, Md.
Badillo	Gonzalez	Moakley
Baldus	Green	Moffett
Baucus	Haley	Mollohan
Bedell	Hall	Montgomery
Bevill	Hamilton	Moorhead, Pa.
Bingham	Hanley	Morgan
Blanchard	Hannaford	Moss
Blouin	Harkin	Mottl
Boggs	Harrington	Murphy, Ill.
Boland	Harris	Murphy, N.Y.
Bolling	Hawkins	Murtha
Bonker	Hayes, Ind.	Natcher
Bowen	Hays, Ohio	Neal
Brademas	Hechler, W. Va.	Nedzl
Breaux	Hefner	Nichols
Brinkley	Helstoski	Nix
Brodhead	Henderson	Nolan
Brooks	Hicks	Nowak
Brown, Calif.	Hightower	Oberstar
Burke, Calif.	Holland	Obey
Burke, Mass.	Holtzman	O'Hara
Burleson, Tex.	Howard	O'Neill
Burlison, Mo.	Howe	Otinger
Burton, John L.	Hubbard	Patman
Burton, Phillip	Hughes	Patten
Byron	Hungate	Patterson, Calif.
Carney	Ichord	Pattison, N.Y.
Carr	Jacobs	Pepper
Cassey	Jenrette	Perkins
Chisholm	Johnson, Calif.	Pickle
Clay	Jones, Ala.	Pike
Collins, Ill.	Jones, N.C.	Poage
Conyers	Jones, Okla.	Preyer
Corman	Jones, Tenn.	Price
Cornell	Jordan	Randall
Cotter	Karth	Rangel
D'Amours	Kastenmeyer	Rees
Daniel, Dan	Kazen	Reuss
Daniels,	Keys	Richmond
Dominick V.	Koch	Risenhoover
Danielson	Krebs	Roberts
Davis	Krueger	Rodino
de la Garza	LaFalce	Roe
Delaney	Landrum	Rogers
Dellums	Lehman	Roncalio
Dent	Levitas	Rooney
Derrick	Litton	Rosenthal
Dingell	Lloyd, Calif.	Rostenkowski
Dodd	Lloyd, Tenn.	Roush
Downey	Long, La.	Roybal
Drinan	Long, Md.	Runnels
Duncan, Oreg.	McCormack	Russo
Early	McFall	Ryan
Eckhardt	McHugh	St Germain
Edgar	McKay	Santini
Edwards, Calif.	Macdonald	Sarbanes
English	Madden	Satterfield
Evans, Colo.	Maguire	Scheuer
Evans, Ind.	Mahon	Schroeder
Evins, Tenn.	Mann	Seiberling
Fascell	Mathis	Sharp
Fisher	Matsunaga	Shipley
Fithian	Mazzoli	Simon
Flood	Meeds	Sisk

Slack	Teague	Wilson,
Smith, Iowa	Thompson	Charles H.,
Solarz	Thornton	Calif.
Spellman	Traxler	Wilson,
Staggers	Tsongas	Charles, Tex.
Stanton,	Udall	Wirth
James V.	Ullman	Wolf
Stark	Van Deerlin	Wright
Stephens	Vander Veen	Yates
Stokes	Vanik	Yatron
Stratton	Vigorito	Young, Ga.
Stuckey	Waggonner	Young, Tex.
Studds	Waxman	Zablocki
Sullivan	Weaver	Zerferetti
Symington	White	
Taylor, N.C.	Whitten	

NOT VOTING—26

Barrett	Foley	Passman
Beard, R.I.	Ford, Tenn.	Riegle
Bergland	Fulton	Rose
Biaggi	Jarman	Schulze
Chappell	Kemp	Skubitz
Clawson, Del	Leggett	Steed
Diggs	Mills	Talcott
Downing	Moorhead,	Taylor, Mo.
Elberg	Calif.	Wilson, Bob

So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 2. The select committee is authorized and directed to conduct an inquiry into—
(1) the collection, analysis, use, and cost of intelligence information and allegations of improper activities of intelligence agencies in the United States and abroad;

(2) the procedures and effectiveness of coordination among and between the various intelligence components of the United States Government;

(3) the nature and extent of executive branch oversight and control of United States intelligence activities;

(4) the need for improved or reorganized oversight by the Congress of United States intelligence activities;

(5) the necessity, nature, and extent of overt and covert intelligence activities by United States intelligence instrumentalities in the United States and abroad;

(6) the procedures for and means of the protection of sensitive intelligence information; and

(7) such other related matters as the select committee shall deem necessary to carry out the purposes of this resolution.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 2, line 12, after the word "of" insert the words "illegal or".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 3, line 2, strike out the word "and" and insert the following:

"(7) procedures for and means of the protection of rights and privileges of citizens of the United States from illegal or improper intelligence activities; and"

And renumber the next paragraph accordingly.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 3. In carrying out the purposes of this resolution, the select committee is authorized to inquire into the activities of the following:

- (1) the National Security Council;
- (2) the United States Intelligence Board;

- (3) the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board;
- (4) the Central Intelligence Agency;
- (5) the Defense Intelligence Agency;
- (6) the intelligence components of the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force;
- (7) the National Security Agency;
- (8) the Intelligence and Research Bureau of the Department of State;
- (9) the Federal Bureau of Investigation;
- (10) the Department of the Treasury;
- (11) the Energy Research and Development Administration; and
- (12) any other instrumentalities of the United States Government engaged in or otherwise responsible for intelligence operations in the United States and abroad.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the last committee amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: page 4, line 1, strike out the semicolon and add the following: "and the Department of Justice;"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. The select committee may require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpoenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the select committee or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by the chairman or such member. The chairman of the select committee, or any member designated by him, may administer oaths to any witness.

SEC. 5. To enable the select committee to carry out the purposes of this resolution, it is authorized to employ investigators, attorneys, consultants, or organizations thereof, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistance.

SEC. 6. The select committee shall establish and implement such rules and procedures as it may deem necessary to prevent the unauthorized disclosure of information and testimony taken in executive session or obtained by other means.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ANDERSON OF ILLINOIS

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois: On page 4, strike lines 23 through 24 and on page 5 strike lines 1 and 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 6. (a) The select committee shall institute and carry out such rules and procedures as it may deem necessary to prevent (1) the disclosure, outside the select committee, of any information relating to the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency or any other department or agency of the Federal Government engaged in intelligence activities, obtained by the select committee during the course of its study and investigation, not authorized by the select committee to be disclosed; and (2) the disclosure, outside the select committee, of any information which would adversely affect the intelligence activities of the Central Intelligence Agency in foreign countries or the intelligence activities in foreign countries of any other department or agency of the Federal Government;

(b) No employee of the select committee or any person engaged by contract or otherwise to perform services for the select committee shall be given access to any classified information by the select committee unless such employee or person has received an appropriate security clearance as determined by the select committee. The type of security clearance to be required in the case of any such employee or person shall, within the determination of the select committee, be commensurate with the sensitivity of the classified information to which such employee or person will be given access by the select committee.

(c) As a condition for employment as described in section 5 of this resolution, each person shall agree not to accept any honorarium, royalty, or other payment for a speaking engagement, magazine article, book, or other endeavor connected with the investigation and study undertaken by this committee."

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

(Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is aimed at detailing and strengthening the provisions of the resolution designed to protect classified materials and national secrets. I would stress at the outset that this language is identical to that contained in Senate Resolution 21 as adopted, establishing the Senate select committee on intelligence. As the resolution before us reads, the committee shall establish whatever rules and procedures it deems appropriate to protect such information.

My amendment simply elaborates on this by specifying that such rules and procedures should be designed to prevent the disclosure outside the committee of any information not authorized to be disclosed by the committee, and to prevent the disclosure of information which would adversely affect any of our foreign intelligence activities.

Moreover, the amendment requires that the committee establish security clearance requirements for staff people having access to classified materials, as the committee determines is commensurate with the sensitivity of the information.

Finally, my amendment requires that, as a condition of employment, staff people assigned to the committee, as well as outside consultants working with the committee, agree not to accept any payment, royalty or honorarium for speaking engagement, book, article or other endeavor in connection with his or her work on the committee. Again, I would stress, this language is identical to that contained in the Senate-passed resolution.

Mr. Chairman, while I do not doubt that any such committee would establish necessary safeguards to protect sensitive information, I think it is important that we in the House impose some minimal guidelines and requirements from the very outset in order to give guidance to the committee. There is certainly nothing in this amendment which would preclude the committee from adopting other rules in this area, and I am sure they

will. But as a bare minimum, I think these safeguards should be clearly stated by the full House. Given the nature of the investigation, we cannot abide any leaks springing from this committee. Recent past experiences with staff leaks should be sufficient in impressing on us the need for this body to make the concerns and desires of the full House membership explicit in this regard.

The conduct of this investigation will be a reflection on the entire House, and as such, we must accept full responsibility now for insuring that the investigation does not become either a Roman circus or a sieve for national secrets. I urge adoption of my amendment.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, in a spirit of democratic cooperation, our side will accept the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ANDERSON OF ILLINOIS

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois: On page 5, after line 2, insert the following new section and redesignate sections 7 and 8 as sections 8 and 9, respectively:

"SEC. 7. The expenses of the select committee under this resolution shall not exceed \$750,000 of which amount not to exceed \$100,000 shall be available for the procurement of the services of individual consultants or organizations thereof. Such expenses shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the select committee and approved by the Speaker."

(Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply sets an expense ceiling of \$750,000 for the select committee, along with a subceiling of \$100,000 for outside consultants and services. As such, it is identical to the language in the Senate-passed resolution.

In questioning witnesses on this matter yesterday in Rules, no estimate was given on what the select committee might cost. The gentleman from Michigan, (Mr. NEDZI) said he didn't think it would cost as much as the Senate investigation, despite the fact that this is due to run 4 months more than the Senate inquiry. It was also stated that the amount would be negotiated with the House Administration Committee.

Well I do not like the idea of jumping into something without having any idea how much it will cost. In the last Congress, when we established the Select Committee on Committee Reform, the resolution creating that committee, as reported from the Rules Committee, contained an authorization level.

There is no reason whatsoever why we cannot set such a ceiling in this resolu-

tion. Moreover, given the potential scope of this investigation, covering as it does every agency of the Federal Government having anything to do with intelligence—and broadly defined, "intelligence" simply means information gathering—I think it is important at the outset that we establish an overall dollar ceiling so that the committee will be forced to set its priorities immediately and get on with the most important aspects of such an investigation. I suspect that if the committee did everything he could do under its authority in this resolution, the investigation could run for years and cost the taxpayers millions. As I mentioned in the Rules Committee, this could turn out to be the biggest fishing expedition since Moby Dick. I do not think that is what most Members of this body want. We are primarily concerned with the more glaring and disturbing allegations of illegal and improper intelligence activities and operations. And we want this committee to report back as soon as possible on what steps the executive and legislative branches might take to strengthen their control and oversight over the intelligence community.

Mr. Chairman, just as other committees are required to report the expected cost of programs they recommend, I think we have an obligation to require the same of our own in-house activities by setting such cost parameters. I urge adoption of my amendment.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, in a further demonstration of that same spirit of conciliation and cooperation, we will accept the amendment on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. The select committee is authorized and directed to report to the House with respect to the matters covered by this resolution as soon as practicable but no later than January 31, 1976.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ANDERSON OF ILLINOIS

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois: On page 5, strike all of line 6 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "September 1, 1975."

(Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would change the reporting deadline for the select committee from January 31, 1976 to September 1, 1975. Again, the deadline contained in my amendment is identical to that of the Senate committee. And I think for a very obvious and practical reason. If both of these committees will be making recommendations as to how the Congress might improve and strengthen its oversight of

the intelligence communities, then we should act together as soon as possible on doing this. There can be no excuse for dragging out the House investigation 4 months beyond that of the Senate, and in the meantime delaying necessary and possibly joint action on this problem. I would add, parenthetically, that I suspect a recommendation may be made to establish a Joint Committee on Intelligence Oversight, and, for that reason, it is imperative that we act promptly and jointly.

Mr. Chairman, I know that argument will be made that there is no way our committee can carry out its assignment under this resolution in just 6 months. I have no doubt that it could take from now until doomsday to do a thorough job of implementing its mandate. But of supreme importance, it seems to me, is that this committee address itself to the most glaring and immediate allegations before it, and then turn over the rest to a more permanent mechanism of the Congress to continue with. This is what we should have been doing all along, and I do not think we have to wait 11 months for a select committee to tell us that. We should move as soon as possible to establishing such a permanent mechanism and get on with the job.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I think this reporting deadline is in the best interests of the Congress and the Nation in establishing within the Congress a permanent mechanism for conducting continuing review and oversight of the intelligence community. Let us move together with the other body, on the same timetable and deadline in accomplishing that larger end.

I urge adoption of my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not see the gentleman from Illinois, my colleague on the committee, rising, asking me to yield, so I must assume that the same spirit of conciliation and cooperation does not prevail on this fourth and final amendment that I offer to House Resolution 138, but I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois in the hope that the gentleman has changed his mind after listening to my remarks.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I must say to my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) that the same spirit of conciliation and cooperation that prevailed with regard to the other amendments does not prevail in regard to this amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I regret that the gentleman from Illinois does not have the same feeling of conciliation and cooperation with respect to this amendment, but, regardless of where we stand on the political aisle, I would invite the support of the gentleman for the amendment because I consider that it is in the interest of getting the kind of an investigation that we want on both sides of the political aisle.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON).

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

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I should

like to point out to the members of the Committee that we have taken precautions here to see to it that the select committee is limited in duration to the end of this year, January 31, 1976. It is not our intention nor our desire to perpetuate the Select Committee on Intelligence year after year after year. At the same time—and I am sure that my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois, will agree with me—we want to assure the committee sufficient time to do a creditable job and proper investigation in this area of intelligence activities. We think that the September deadline mentioned in the amendment of the gentleman is not realistic. It gives very little time.

I recognize the fact that the other body has selected that date. However, I would say that the other body has already passed its legislation. It has a head start of some weeks on this body and, quite frankly, it is our opinion and that of the cosponsors of this legislation that the deadline date which the other body has incorporated into this legislation will not be sufficient to do a proper job, and my guess will be that they will be extending theirs.

I do not think it is unreasonable to limit the duration of this select committee until January 31, 1976, and I ask that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON).

The amendment was rejected.

Mrs. FENWICK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

(Mrs. FENWICK asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. FENWICK. I should like to appeal, Mr. Chairman, to the Members of this House, and most particularly to my friends on the other side of the aisle. I think we all know that patriotism rather than partisanship is what must guide us if we are to respond to what the people told us to do in the last election. There is more to it. I think an investigatory body has to not only do justice but be seen to do justice. I think that we should rise to it. I hope very much, since the section does not describe the membership of the committee, but leaves it entirely to the generosity and the spirit of bipartisanship of the Speaker and of the leadership and of the great majority of Democrats in this House, that perhaps it could be at least 6-to-4, if not 5-to-5.

I know that my friends on the other side of the aisle know that I speak in no partisan spirit, but I think it would convince the people of this Nation that we can rise above party, that we are earnestly seeking the truth, that we are not trying to go on witch hunts or hurt people, but that we are trying to protect the integrity of our institutions and the urgent and necessary fact that the institutions of government cannot be used for personal or political reasons. All this needs to be driven home, and I hope that the composition of the committee will effect it.

I thank the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 8. The authority granted herein shall expire three months after the filing of the report with the House of Representatives.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FLYNT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the resolution (H. Res. 138) establishing a Select Committee on Intelligence, pursuant to House Resolution 174, he reported the resolution back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 286, nays 120, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 18]

YEAS—286

- Abzug
- Adams
- Addabbo
- Alexander
- Ambro
- Anderson, Calif.
- Anderson, Ill.
- Andrews, N.C.
- Andrews, N. Dak.
- Annuozio
- Armstrong
- Ashley
- Aspin
- Badillo
- Baldus
- Baucus
- Beard, R.I.
- Bedell
- Bell
- Bennett
- Biaggi
- Blester
- Bingham
- Blanchard
- Blouin
- Boggs
- Boland
- Bolling
- Bonker
- Bowen
- Brademas
- Breaux
- Breckinridge
- Brodhead
- Brooks
- Broomfield
- Brown, Calif.
- Brown, Ohio
- Broyhill
- Burke, Calif.
- Burke, Mass.
- Burlison, Mo.
- Burton, John L.
- Burton, Phillip
- Carney
- Carr
- Chisholm
- Clay
- Cohen
- Collins, Ill.
- Conde
- Conyers
- Corman
- Cotler
- Daniels
- Dominick V.
- Danielson
- Davis
- de la Garza
- Delaney
- Dellums
- Dent
- Derwinski
- Dingell
- Dodd
- Downey
- Drinan
- du Pont
- Early
- Eckhardt
- Edgar
- Edwards, Calif.
- Emery
- English
- Erlenborn
- Evans, Colo.
- Evans, Ind.
- Evans, Tenn.
- Fascell
- Fenwick
- Findley
- Fish
- Fisher
- Fithian
- Flood
- Florio
- Flowers
- Flynt
- Foley
- Ford, Mich.
- Ford, Tenn.
- Fraser
- Frenzel
- Frey
- Fuqua
- Gaydos
- Glaimo
- Gibbons
- Gilman
- Gonzalez
- Gradison
- Grassley
- Green
- Gude
- Haley
- Hall
- Hamilton
- Hanley
- Hannaford
- Harkin
- Harris
- Hastings
- Hawkins
- Hayes, Ind.
- Hayes, Ohio
- Hébert
- Hechler, W. Va.
- Heckler, Mass.
- Hefner
- Helms
- Helstoski
- Henderson
- Hightower
- Hillis
- Holland
- Holtzman
- Howard
- Howe
- Hughes
- Hungate
- Ichord
- Jacobs
- Johnson, Calif.
- Johnson, Colo.
- Jones, Ala.
- Jones, N.C.
- Jones, Okla.
- Jones, Tenn.
- Jordan
- Karst
- Kasten
- Kastnmeier
- Kazen
- Keys
- Koch
- Krebs
- Lehman
- Litton
- Lloyd, Tenn.
- Long, La.
- Long, Md.
- Luján
- McClory
- McCloskey
- McCormack
- McDade
- McFall
- McHugh
- McKay
- McKinney
- Macdonald
- Madden
- Madigan
- Maguire
- Mahon
- Mann
- Matsunaga
- Mazoli
- Meads
- Melcher
- Metcalfe
- Meyer
- Mezvinsky
- Mikva
- Miller, Calif.
- Minneta

- Minish
- Mink
- Mitchell, Md.
- Mitchell, N.Y.
- Moakley
- Moffett
- Mollohan
- Moorhead, Pa.
- Morgan
- Mosher
- Moss
- Motti
- Murphy, Ill.
- Murphy, N.Y.
- Murtha
- Natcher
- Neal
- Nedzi
- Nix
- Nowak
- Oberstar
- Obey
- O'Brien
- O'Hara
- O'Neill
- Ottlinger
- Patman
- Patterson, Calif.
- Pattison, N.Y.
- Pepper
- Perkins
- Peyster
- Pickle
- Pike
- Pressler
- Preyer
- Price
- Reichard
- Quie
- Railsback
- Randall
- Rangel
- Rees
- Regula
- Reuss
- Richmond
- Rinaldo
- Risenhoover
- Rodino
- Roe
- Rogers
- Roncallo
- Rooney
- Rosenthal
- Rostenkowski
- Roush
- Roybal
- Runnels
- Ruppe
- Russo
- Ryan
- St Germain
- Sarasin
- Sarbanes
- Scheuer
- Schroeder
- Seiberling
- Sharp
- Shipley
- Shriver
- Simon
- Sisk
- Slack
- Smith, Iowa
- Solarz
- Spellman

NAYS—120

- Abdnor
- Archer
- Ashbrook
- AuCoin
- Bafalis
- Bauman
- Beard, Tenn.
- Bevill
- Brinkley
- Brown, Mich.
- Buchanan
- Burgener
- Burke, Fla.
- Burleson, Tex.
- Butler
- Byron
- Carter
- Casey
- Cederberg
- Clancy
- Clausen
- Don H.
- Cleveland
- Cochran
- Collins, Tex.
- Comable
- Conlan
- Cornell
- Coughlin
- Crane
- D'Amours
- Daniel, Dan
- Daniel, Robert
- W. Jr.
- Derrick
- Devine
- Dinkinson
- Duncan, Oreg.
- Duncan, Tenn.
- Edwards, Ala.
- Eshleman
- Forgythe
- Fountain
- Ginn
- Goodling
- Guyer
- Hagedorn
- Hammer-schmidt
- Hansen
- Harsha
- Hicks
- Hinshaw
- Hoit
- Hubbard
- Hutchinson
- Jeanette
- Johnson, Pa.
- Kelly
- Kemp
- Ketchum
- Kindness
- Krueger
- LaFalce
- Lagomarsino
- Landrum
- Latta
- Lent
- Levitass
- Lloyd, Calif.
- Loft
- McCollister
- McDonald
- McEwen
- Martin
- Matthis
- Milford
- Miller, Ohio
- Montgomery
- Moore
- Myers, Ind.
- Myers, Pa.
- Nichols
- Nolan
- Passman
- Patten
- Poage
- Quillen
- Rhodes
- Roberts
- Robinson
- Rousselot
- Santini
- Satterfield
- Schneebeil
- Sebelius
- Shuster
- Sikes
- Skubitz
- Smith, Nebr.
- Snyder
- Spence
- Steiger, Ariz.
- Steiger, Wis.
- Stephens
- Stuckey
- Symms
- Taylor, N.C.
- Teague
- Thone
- Van Deerlin
- Vander Jagt
- Waggonner
- Walsh
- White
- Whitehurst
- Whitten
- Wiggins
- Winn
- Wyder
- Wylie
- Young, Fla.
- Young, Tex.

NOT VOTING—26

- Barrett
- Bergland
- Chappell
- Clawson, Del
- Diggs
- Downing
- Ellberg
- Flinton
- Goldwater
- Horton
- Hyde
- Jarman
- Jefords
- Leggett
- Michel
- Mills
- Moorhead, Calif.
- Riegle
- Rose
- Schulze
- Steed
- Stratton
- Talcott
- Taylor, Mo.
- Traxler
- Wilson, Bob

So the resolution was agreed to.
 The Clerk announced the following pairs:
 On this vote:
 Mr. Diggs for, with Mr. Schulze against.
 Mr. Ellberg for, with Mr. Del Clawson against.
 Mr. Bennett for, with Mr. Taylor of Missouri against.
 Until further notice:

- Staggers
- Stanton
- J. William Stanton
- James V. Stanton
- Rees
- Stark
- Steelman
- Stokes
- Studds
- Sullivan
- Symington
- Thompson
- Thornton
- Treen
- Tsongas
- Udall
- Ullman
- Vander Veen
- Vanik
- Vigorito
- Wampler
- Waxman
- Weaver
- Whalen
- Wilson
- Charles H., Calif.
- Charles, Tex.
- Wirth
- Wolf
- Wright
- Yates
- Yatron
- Young, Alaska
- Young, Ga.
- Zablocki
- Zefterotti
- Mr. Bergland with Mr. Michel.
- Mr. Chappell with Mr. Moorhead of California.
- Mr. Leggett with Mr. Hyde.
- Mr. Riegle with Mr. Bob Wilson.
- Mr. Rose with Mr. Traxler.
- Mr. Horton with Mr. Mills.
- Mr. Downing with Mr. Jarman.
- Mr. Fulton with Mr. Goldwater.
- Mr. Jeffords with Mr. Stratton.
- Mr. Steed with Mr. Talcott.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution just agreed to.
 The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?
 There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 138, the Chair appoints the following Members to the Select Committee on Intelligence: Mr. NEDZI, chairman; Mr. GRIMM; Mr. EDWARDS of California; Mr. JAMES V. STANTON; Mr. HARRINGTON; Mr. DELLUMS; Mr. MURPHY of Illinois; Mr. McCLORY; Mr. TREEN; and Mr. KASTEN.

FLOOD INSURANCE

(Mr. CASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)
 Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill that I believe will be of interest to each and every colleague in the House, since it concerns the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973.
 I know that we all fully recognize the need for flood insurance and the protection that it affords our constituents in the event of disastrous flooding. There is an urgent necessity for its continued availability and at the subsidized rates provided under Public Law 93-234.
 The law has my full support in its purpose and I would like to compliment the Flood Insurance Administration for the conscientious work it has done to implement the law.
 However, there are some provisions of the law which can have disastrous effects in themselves if implemented as scheduled on July 1, 1975. These effects, which I know were not foreseen by those of us who ardently supported the law at its passage, could be even more harmful than no law at all in some communities.
 Fortunately we still have the time to make the necessary corrections, which the bill I introduce today would accomplish.
 Unless we do make these adjustments in the act, we can expect to see many of our areas suffer unnecessarily through declining property values, an inability to

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP) is recognized for 15 minutes.

[Mr. KEMP addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

LAND USE PLANNING ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STEELMAN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. STEELMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing, together with Congressman UDALL, a new land use bill. The bill is quite similar to last year's bill reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, but we have made some changes in order to clarify and streamline the legislation. The bill still represents a State and local government approach to land use planning. The role of the Federal Government remains one of administrator of a grant program for the States. We have reduced the amount of money authorized for the grant program and have cut down on the number of required elements in State land use programs.

I wish to state to my colleagues that despite the obvious urgency of economic and energy legislation, I believe that the land use bill remains as one of the most important bills that will come before this Chamber this session. In the first place, the need to deal with problems of the effects of large-scale development, food and fiber supply, and protection of natural areas has not diminished regardless of the state of our economy.

Although in the middle of the storm of rhetoric about crude oil tariffs or rate of inflation it may seem that the environmental movement has lost its priority, I can tell you that, at the State and local level, it is gaining in strength. That is because, as we are sometimes prone to be blinded by the issue of the moment, our constituents keep focused on long-term problems, such as those the land use bill is designed to help solve.

Nevertheless, if I for the moment believed that either this country could not afford a land use bill at this time or that such legislation were inflationary or likely to be prohibitive of energy development in some way, I would be inclined to put the land use bill on the back burner for the time being. However, those of us who have been close to the legislation over the last few years know that precisely the opposite is true. The land use legislation we introduced last year and in somewhat different form this year is designed to introduce some badly needed rationality to major land use decisions in the States so that all people with an interest in such decisions are given the chance to participate in an open process. Our great desire and hope is that such an open process will put an end to expensive delays to necessary development as well as afford some protection for areas that really should be protected. In our new bill we explicitly include procedures requiring the

States to consider energy conservation and supply in actions taken pursuant to a land use program funded by our bill. Furthermore, we require that States develop methods to expedite processing of applications for development.

Our bill is balanced legislation designed to end lengthy procedures which only add cost to our market economy system. I urge my colleagues to study our new bill carefully. I am open to any and all comments on the legislation.

THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. HARRINGTON) is recognized for 60 minutes.

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

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I will not use the entire 60 minutes I have requested because I did not realize that we would consume this much time with regular business.

I have taken this special order so as to address myself to the creation by this body of a select committee to provide an overview—which in my opinion is long overdue—of the intelligence community in this country.

First, I wish to express my appreciation for this favorable action. More importantly, however, I wish to raise the question of whether or not in the choice of its chairman, who formerly and presently exercises the chief oversight function that is usually associated with the House in dealing with the intelligence community, we have not, perhaps, fatally flawed the likelihood that this select committee will be successful.

Already, there is public skepticism in having Nelson Rockefeller, a member of the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board and thus clearly identified with the preexisting civilian review facet of the National Security Council, chairman of the so-called blue ribbon investigating committee. And, we see efforts made in the Senate on the part of the present chairman of the CIA Oversight Committee, Senator STENNIS, to, unsuccessfully, have himself continue in that function. I think that by the appointment of Congressman NEDZI to the chairmanship of the House Select Committee we have inevitably further contributed to the problem of skeptical public perception of how serious our intention is to conduct the careful, independent inquiry that is long overdue.

I think in having to overcome the awkwardness of not knowing whether we are going to have an effort to defend, legitimize, and rationalize the prior stewardship of the CIA Oversight Committee that is chaired by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. NEDZI) we have also created the most awkward of human relationships.

While I do not, for the moment, as I indicated to the gentleman in our conversation this noontime in explaining my intention to pursue this subject publicly, doubt Chairman NEDZI's sincerity

or good intentions, I think that the record of his oversight subcommittee in dealing with both foreign and domestic covert operations speaks for itself.

It was not until repeated evidence became public, largely as the result of events which initiated outside that subcommittee resulted in a belated and overdue recognition of the need to undertake the more intensive that a select committee represents.

So, Mr. Speaker, I take the floor this afternoon to express my misgivings, which I have discussed previously with both the Speaker and Chairman NEDZI. I would suggest that these misgivings are shared by people who legitimately want to preserve the integrity of these institutions, but at the same time have some appreciation for the need for a select committee of both the House and Senate and to raise the question whether or not we will damage, in a fashion that may be difficult to repair, to the objectives which I think should be associated with the issue that is before the House and the Senate.

The Senate has very wisely chosen to bar from its Intelligence Select Committee those who had been closely identified with earlier oversight activities, including its oversight chairman, Senator STENNIS.

I only wish that the House had, in the selection of the chairman of the Select Committee, done likewise.

I think that this selection has contributed to the already pervasive public cynicism about the seriousness of Congress in this and many other endeavors. Criticism of Congress will continue to increase unless we demonstrate that we are not interested only in addressing the essential politics of the issues before us to avoid criticism.

It is for that reason that I think it appropriate and important, on the day following the announcement of the selection and the make-up of that committee, to at least raise this question and hope that it might be reflected upon in the conduct of the committee, in the use of its resources in its willingness to deal with the awkward situation and do what it can to overcome an unnecessarily imposed question as to whether it can fulfill its essential functions.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SYMMS. It has just been brought to my attention that the House is going to be coming in at noon tomorrow. My parliamentary inquiry is, Can a unanimous-consent request be made that the House not come in until noon on Monday?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The leadership has already announced that we would be in session tomorrow at noon. That inquiry should be addressed more properly to the Speaker tomorrow.

Mr. SYMMS. I thank the Speaker.

February 20, 1975

INQUIRY CONCERNING THE SESSION TOMORROW

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

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, can someone on the other side tell me why it is we are coming in tomorrow?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will request that the gentleman pose that question to the Speaker tomorrow.

Mr. SYMMS. I thank the Speaker.

PROHIBITING DISCRIMINATION AGAINST THE ELDERLY IN THE ISSUANCE OF CREDIT CARDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mrs. COLLINS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to prohibit age discrimination in the issuance, renewal, or terms of any credit card.

This legislation is needed to remedy situations in which senior citizens, who have good credit ratings, have nevertheless been denied credit cards or have encountered difficulties while attempting to obtain them. In such instances, the elderly have been evaluated on the basis of their age, rather than their actual credit rating. They have been the victims of a highly discriminatory and insulting practice which must be abolished.

An end to age discrimination is reason enough in itself to pass this legislation.

However, there is another reason to justify its passage. The elderly are exceptionally vulnerable to muggings and street robberies. Without credit cards, they are obliged to carry cash and thereby become easy prey for the unscrupulous.

It should be noted that this legislation does not cause credit card issuers to ignore a person's credit rating. It merely insures that the credit evaluation process will not be altered because of an applicant's age.

I invite my colleagues to join with me in remedying another example of discrimination against older Americans.

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. ADAMS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, the rules of the Committee on the Budget for the 94th Congress were adopted by the committee by majority vote, a quorum being present, at its organizational meeting on Tuesday, February 18, 1975. In accordance with clause 2 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I submit the rules as adopted for publication in the RECORD:

RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

MEETINGS

1. Regular meetings*

The regular meeting day of the Commit-

* Written rule required by House Rules.

tee shall be the 2nd Monday of each month at 11:00 a.m., while the House is in session.

The Chairman is authorized to dispense with a regular meeting when he determines there is no business to be considered by the Committee, provided that he gives written notice to that effect to each member of the Committee as far in advance of the regular meeting day as the circumstances permit.

Regular meetings shall be cancelled when they conflict with meetings of either party's caucus or conference.

2. Additional and special meetings

The Chairman may call and convene additional meetings of the Committee as he considers necessary, or special meetings at the request of a majority of the members of the Committee in accordance with House Rule XI, clause 2.

In the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Chairman shall provide written or verbal notice of additional meetings to the office of each member at least 24 hours in advance while Congress is in session, and at least 3 days in advance when Congress is not in session.

3. Open business meetings

Each meeting for the transaction of Committee business, including the markup of measures, shall be open to the public except when the Committee, in open session and with a quorum present, determines by rollcall vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public. No person other than members of the Committee and such congressional staff and departmental representatives as they may authorize shall be present at any business or markup session which has been closed to the public. This rule shall not apply to any meeting that relates solely to matters concerning the internal administration of the Committee.

4. Quorums

A majority of the Committee shall constitute a quorum. No business shall be transacted and no measure or recommendation shall be reported unless a quorum is actually present.

5. Recognition

Any member, when recognized by the Chairman, may address the Committee on any bill, motion, or other matter under consideration before the Committee. The time of such member shall be limited to 5 minutes until all members present have been afforded an opportunity to comment.

6. Consideration of business

Measures or matters may be placed before the Committee, for its consideration, by the Chairman or by a majority vote of the members of the Committee, a quorum being present.

7. Rollcall votes

A rollcall of the members may be had upon the request of at least 20% of those present.

8. Proxies*

Any member of the Committee may vote by special proxy if the proxy authorization is in writing, asserts that the member is absent on official business or is otherwise unable to be present at the meeting of the Committee, designates the person who is to execute the proxy authorization, and is limited to a specific measure or matter and any amendments or motions pertaining thereto; except that a member may authorize a general proxy only for motions to recess, adjourn or other procedural matters. Each proxy to be effective shall be signed by the member assigning his or her vote and shall contain the date and time of day that the proxy is signed. Proxies may not be counted for a quorum.

9. Announcement of hearings

The Chairman shall publicly announce the date, place, and subject matter of any Committee hearing at least one week before the commencement of that hearing, unless he determines there is good cause to begin such hearing at an earlier date, in which case

public announcement shall be made at the earliest possible date.

10. Open hearings

Each hearing conducted by the Committee shall be open to the public except when the Committee, in open session and with a quorum present, determines by rollcall vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing on that day shall be closed to the public because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives. The Committee may by the same procedure vote to close one subsequent day of hearing.

11. Quorums*

For the purpose of hearing testimony, not less than two members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum, one of whom shall be from the majority and one from the minority.

12. Time for questioning witnesses

Committee members shall have not to exceed five minutes to interrogate each witness until such time as each member who so desires has had an opportunity to interrogate such witness.

After all members have had an opportunity to ask questions, the round shall begin again under the 5-minute rule.

In questioning witnesses under the five minute rule, the Chairman and the ranking minority member may be recognized first after which members may be recognized in the order of their arrival at the hearing. Among the members present at the time the hearing is called to order, seniority shall be recognized. In recognizing members to question witnesses, the Chairman may take into consideration the ratio of majority members to minority members and the number of majority and minority members present and shall apportion the recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to disadvantage the members of the majority.

13. Subpoenas and oaths

In accordance with House Rule XI, clause 2(m), subpoenas authorized by a majority of the Committee may be issued over the signature of the Chairman or of any member of the Committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by the Chairman or such member.

The Chairman, or any member of the Committee, may administer oaths to witnesses.

14. Witnesses' statements

So far as practicable, any prepared statement to be presented by a witness shall be submitted to the Committee at least 24 hours in advance of presentation, and shall be distributed to all members of the Committee in advance of delivery.

BROADCASTING

15. Committee prints

All Committee prints and other materials prepared for public distribution shall be approved by the Committee prior to any distribution, unless such print or other material shows clearly on its face that it has not been approved by the Committee.

16. Broadcasting of meetings and hearings

It shall be the policy of the Committee to give all news media access to open hearings of the Committee, subject to the requirements and limitations set forth in House Rule XI, clause 3.

Whenever any Committee business meeting is open to the public, that meeting may be covered, in whole or in part, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, and still photography, or by any of such methods of coverage, in accordance with House Rule XI, clause 3. However, a majority of the Committee may decide at any time to exclude radio, television, and still camera equipment from the Committee room.

STAFF

17. Committee staff.

Subject to approval by the Committee, and to the provisions of the following paragraphs, the professional and clerical

February 20, 1975

ation of the requirements did not "reverse discrimination." Congressman Hawkins has taken a good, hard look, and what he sees is not reverse discrimination but "HEW-OCR's abrogating its responsibility under the law."

Under the Holmes clarification, college and university presidents, formerly under the impression that they would have to increase their hiring of minority and women faculty members, on pain of losing their federal funds, now know better.

The clarification goes in two important directions. Those university chiefs who want to increase their minority and female representation were told that they cannot advertise in any way that might seem to discourage white, male applicants.

And those who don't want to change their hiring practices were told that they won't really have to, so long as they are careful to make sure that the list of rejected applicants contains the appropriate number of minorities and women and so long as none of the rejects is demonstrably better qualified than those who are hired, with the university itself the sole judge of qualification.

The requirements, guidelines and clarifications have their roots in Executive Order 11246 (as amended), which calls for federal contractors to ban ethnic, religious or sex discrimination in their hiring practices. It also requires them to take "affirmative action" to see to it that their practices are not discriminatory. Violation of the order could lead to cancellation of government contracts, although it rarely has.

"HEW-OCR is responsible under the executive order to enforce the order's provisions in all the (approximately 1,000) higher educational institutions having contracts with the federal government," Hawkins points out. "In light of (Holmes' "clarifying" memo), a major concern being expressed by growing numbers of minorities and women seeking college faculty employment, by minority contract compliance officers, by civil and human rights advocates, and by some members of Congress, is the question of HEW-OCR's employment enforcement inadequacies."

There also are growing doubts over HEW's willingness to enforce equal-employment provisions, "since its obvious interests are in the supposed preferential treatment being given to minorities and women," Hawkins told *The Washington Post*.

The real issue—in fact, the only issue—is the systematic, consistent, deliberate denial of equal employment opportunities to minorities and women by institutions of higher education, and the encouragement HEW-OCR has given these institutions to continue their policy of discriminatory hiring of faculty."

The discrimination is continuing, says Hawkins, even though the widespread charges of "reverse discrimination" might give the impression that minority and female professors are flooding the college campuses.

He cites data from the Civil Rights Commission report of last month showing that between 1968 and 1973 the percentage of blacks rose only from 2.2 to 2.9. The increase of women faculty members during the same period was from 19.1 percent to 20 percent.

"Clearly, the promise of equal employment opportunity has not been achieved in institutions of higher education," the Civil Rights Commission said, charging that "HEW's failure to enforce the executive orders has played no small role in frustrating this objective."

Hawkins, looking at the same data, sees clear evidence of HEW-OCR's foot-dragging in response to its federally mandated obligation.

"Mr. Holmes wants to make a major case for so-called reverse discrimination," said the chairman of the Equal Opportunities subcommittee of the House Committee on

Education and Labor." If reverse discrimination truly exists, it must be operating in a vacuum, since those persons supposedly experiencing this kind of discrimination (white, Anglo-Saxon Protestant males) still overwhelmingly control all of our nation's colleges and universities.

"They have not suffered any meaningful employment problems; the continued low numbers of minorities and women in college and university faculty positions attest to this fact."

He said Holmes' office has no realistic affirmative action policy and "obviously they need some assistance in this matter."

"That assistance is forthcoming," Hawkins promised.

CYPRUS—7 MONTHS OF TRAGEDY

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1975

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, today we note a tragic anniversary, for it was 7 months ago that the nation of Turkey unleashed her forces for an illegal and ruthless invasion of the island of Cyprus. During this period both the nation and people of Cyprus have been devastated from the effects of more than one-half a year of civil strife and occupation by Turkey.

We, in the Congress, have dedicated ourselves to the restoration of peace on Cyprus. I and others pushed on numerous occasions for an immediate cut off of aid to Turkey for being in blatant violation of the Foreign Assistance Act. Finally after long months of compromise and concession we were able to cut off this aid effective February 5, which marked a historic day for this Congress and for the struggle for peace on Cyprus.

We have also been committed to the rebuilding of Cyprus. Congress overwhelmingly adopted my amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act which provided \$25 million in emergency relief aid to Cyprus. This money will be used to provide food and shelter for the quarter of a million refugees on the island, and will also help to rebuild the ravaged Cypriot economy.

Recently the Long Island Press published an article which sized up Cyprus 6 months after the invasion. The article paints a bleak and tragic picture of the current situation on Cyprus. I hope it will serve to show my colleagues the continuing need for the United States to work and help the Cypriot people achieve peace and stability. We have begun, but we must be prepared to continue.

The article entitled "Cyprus: 6 Months After the Invasion" follows:

CYPRUS: 6 MONTHS AFTER THE INVASION

(By Richard C. Gross)

NICOSIA.—Six months after an invading Turkish force split this island in two, the agony of Cyprus goes on.

Its economy is shattered, people uprooted, shops looted, its communities divided by hatred and its future clouded by a rivalry that extends beyond its shores to embrace Greece, Turkey and the superpowers.

For about 20,000 Greek and Turkish Cypriots, many of them once middle-class citizens with homes, businesses and automobiles, the misery is compounded by the winter cold

and rain, beating down on the tents where they now live.

Tourism, the second most important source of hard currency on what used to be a vacation paradise, is dead, with hotels empty and unemployment high.

Hundreds of homes of Greek Cypriots have been taken over by Turkish Cypriots in areas conquered by the Turkish army.

And a 35,000-man Turkish army of occupation roams much of the island, hated by the Greek Cypriots and, according to neutral sources, now resented even by some of the Turkish Cypriots who welcomed them when they swept ashore in July.

The spark that ignited the Turkish invasion was the overthrow July 15 of Archbishop Makarios, the only president Cyprus has known in 14 years of independence from Britain.

The Greek Cypriot national guard, led by Greek officers under orders from the now-defunct military junta in Athens, seized power and installed a onetime terrorist and newspaper publisher, Nicos Sampson, as president. Makarios fled the island with British help. Makarios returned from exile Dec. 7, but he is no longer recognized by the Turkish Cypriots as president.

The Turks, fearing the coup was a prelude to the union of Cyprus with Greece, invaded five days later.

Turkish troops still control nearly 40 per cent of the island along its northern tier only 40 miles from Turkey across the eastern corner of the Mediterranean.

The Turks hold some of the most fertile land on the island and the main port of Famagusta. Most of the Greek Cypriots have fled south and Turkish Cypriots have gone north. An estimated 181,000 Greek Cypriots and 8,500 Turkish Cypriots remain homeless.

"I don't like to call it partition but two Cypruses—a Turkish Cyprus and a Greek Cyprus," said the constitutional leader of the minority Turkish Cypriot community, Vice President Rauf Denktaş. "I think we shall be forced to move in that direction."

About 650,000 persons live on Cyprus, two-thirds of which is forested mountains, with Nicosia dominating the nearly treeless central plain. Eighty-one per cent of the people are Greek Cypriots and 18 per cent Turkish Cypriots.

Britain, succeeding earlier invaders, controlled the island from 1878 to 1959. Then a guerilla campaign led by Makarios and Gen. George Grivas forced the British to grant independence.

With a constitution that tried to spell out every detail in the apportionment of power to both sides, the Greek and Turkish Cypriots bickered incessantly over who had the right to control what.

Violence erupted in December 1963. Clashes continued until United Nations troops moved in the following year to establish order. The troops have been there ever since, at a cost of \$350 million. More clashes occurred in 1967.

Before the invasion Loukis Pieri, 42, lived in Famagusta where he owned an auto driving school with four automobiles. He fled the oncoming Turks with one of the cars, his wife and the clothes on his back.

He now lives in the Lefkardies tent city and shares a tent with his in-laws.

"I'm not used to these things," said Pieri, who said he left \$22,000 worth of assets behind. "I'm 42 and never saw a war. It's like being in a shipwreck and then being all alone on a raft waiting and hoping for another ship to come."

"These people were the well-off in the country and this is what accentuates the refugee problem," said shacallis Linus, a government refugee official. "These are not people like the Palestinians and those from Bangladesh. They had their own cars, their own businesses. Their own homes and all of

Hubel Corn

a sudden they find themselves in a tent with nothing.

"If these people cannot return to their homes, the economy will be completely destroyed and we can't foresee the consequences."

It costs the Cypriot government \$6.5 million a month to feed and care for the refugees.

Of the 105,000 Turkish Cypriots, 51,000 lived south of the Turkish-occupied region before the war. About 20,000 have fled behind the Turkish lines in the north since then, and the rest are trying to get north, government and Turkish Cypriot officials said.

"Today they feel they have a country in the north and they want to go there," an official of the International Red Cross said. "They have received instructions to go north. It's very well organized."

Neutral sources said 2,000 Turkish Cypriots have moved into Greek Cypriot homes in the north.

Several sources from international organizations said there was some disenchantment over the Turkish occupation among Turkish Cypriots.

"There are new facts being created and it is becoming a Turkish administration, not a Turkish Cypriot administration," one observer said. "Mainland generals say business executives are coming in and they are threatening to take over from the Turkish Cypriots."

ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1975

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, ironically, February 16 marked the 57th anniversary of the establishment of the free and independent Republic of Lithuania, as well as the 724th year since the founding of that state.

In fact, the history of Lithuania and her sister "Captive Nations" has been one lacking both freedom and independence, for, with the invasion and occupation of these Baltic States by the Soviet Union in 1940, Lithuanians have enjoyed the basic human liberties of independence for but 22 years since World War I.

The past decade of international intercourse has been heralded as the new age of "détente" and improved Soviet relations. Yet, the examples of Simas Kudirka and that Lithuanian sailor's bold leap for freedom, the recently arrested and imprisoned Lithuanian and Russian champions of religious freedom, and those few of the many dissidents who have gained visibility, must serve as a constant reminder of the painful, unyielding pursuit of this nation for freedom from oppression.

Mr. Speaker, we would do well to match our accomplishments on the United States-Soviet political front with efforts on the very personal, human level of securing an end to such tyranny. We have as support and testimony the strong Lithuanian people, their intact culture, unfaltering spirit, and insatiable desire for freedom, independence, and self government.

The upcoming celebration of our Bicentennial of freedom should give pause to all Americans to reflect upon the many civil liberties we so often take for granted

and others still fight so valiantly to secure. As we acknowledge our 200th year of independence, our thoughts should go to the 724-year-old nation of Lithuanians and their continuing struggle for human dignity and national recognition.

THE NONCANDIDATE

HON. WILLIAM S. COHEN

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1975

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, though we are only midway through the second month of 1975, we are already beginning to witness an increasingly intense political and public relations battle among hordes of contestants for the 1976 Democratic Presidential nomination.

As usual, most of the combatants are located in a single place, the Senate of the United States. One day we see a senatorial visage adorning the cover of Time magazine. Then we learn of a campaign announcement film costing \$23,000. We hear of yet another summons to the press to flock to the Senate caucus room for an announcement of candidacy. And we read of other Senators, seemingly more reticent, who avoid overt declarations of candidacy but await the summons of a "brokered" convention.

The question that inevitably occurs to all of us who labor in the quiet anonymity of the House is this: Where will it stop?

Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to be able to provide my colleagues with an answer to that question. It stops in room 248 of the Russell Senate Office Building, the office of the distinguished junior Senator from my home State of Maine, WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY.

No less an authority than the nationally syndicated columnist Arthur Hoppe has reported that Senator HATHAWAY will not—repeat, not—be a candidate for President in 1976. I have tried to reach the Senator for comment on these reports, but I have been told that he is studying the public statements of Gen. William Tecumseh Sherman and cannot be disturbed. However, the Senator's staff has assured me that Mr. Hoppe's report is substantially accurate. Senator HATHAWAY does not have a \$1 million war chest, and he has no plans to be photographed in an Indian war bonnet in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, while I regret that plans for the Hathaway Library in Auburn, Maine, must now be necessarily deferred for a few years, I nonetheless wish to commend my good friend for his statesmanlike decision. In keeping with the hands-across-the-aisle spirit that has characterized the Maine congressional delegation since my election to Congress, I wish my Democratic colleague well in his nonquest of noncandidacy, and I insert Mr. Hoppe's article, "The Leading Front-Non-Runner," in the RECORD at this point.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle]

THE LEADING FRONT-NON-RUNNER

(By Arthur Hoppe)

WASHINGTON.—The most distinguished senator in Washington these days is William

D. Hathaway of Maine. What distinguishes him from his colleagues is that he is the only Democrat in the Senate who is not running for President.

The bombshell news broke here last week when Senator Hathaway announced he would hold a press conference next Monday to announce he would make a major address a week from the following Tuesday to announce that he wasn't running for President.

Rumors that the husky, cigar-smoking, well-liked, freshman senator wouldn't immediately seek the presidency have been circulating here since his upset victory over Margaret Chase Smith in 1972.

As long ago as last April, he confided to a reporter from the Bangor (Maine) Weekly Bulletin that "many of my close friends and associates have urged me, for the good of the country, not to run."

He said at the time that he was "seriously considering" that course. "However, I must also think of the welfare of my family," he added. "The presidency pays more money."

Since then he has gradually been tabbed as the leading front-non-runner in an under-crowded field.

The fact that he had not raised more than \$1 million from party fat cats before the campaign contribution law was tightened only added fuel to the rumors. Moreover, he has not once been photographed eating a knish in the Bronx, wearing a Sioux bonnet in Sioux Falls, or identifying himself to disinterested, homeward-bound factory workers.

Instead of charging about the country criticizing the President, it has been widely noted, Senator Hathaway has steadfastly remained in Washington criticizing the President.

In his announcement announcing his forthcoming announcement that he wouldn't run, the senator pledged, to the relief of many, that he would not issue a position paper on the Middle East.

"It is not that I don't have a position," he said. "It's that I don't understand it."

He added, however, that he stood four-square for full employment, lower taxes, improved welfare benefits and a balanced budget. "It's just that I don't see," he told his cheering non-supporters, "how all that's possible."

In a rare private interview (he is rarely asked for one), the moderately liberal senator was asked if he would have to adopt a more conservative image in hopes of losing the liberal vote. Would he, for example, speak out for doubling the defense budget and quadrupling our aid to Vietnam?

"I've found it very difficult to change my image," he said. "My wonderful wife, Mary, has been trying for years. But I always instinctively duck."

Would he instead, then, vote for what he believed in? "Yes," he said firmly. "And I believe in getting reelected."

Finally, he was asked the critical question: "Why, sir, are you, a popular, respected member of the majority party, not running for the presidency?"

A far-away look entered his eye. "Hmmm," he said, pausing to blow a smoke ring, "now that you mention it..."

ESTABLISHING A SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

SPEECH OF

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1975

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the resolution (H. Res. 138) establishing a Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, let me associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois by saying that we, too, want to see a bipartisan effort in this area which concerns the rights and freedoms of the American people, and that is, whether or not the intelligence agencies in any way are infringing on those rights.

I hope that there will be a bipartisan effort in this committee. Certainly there should be no Republican or Democratic position in this area. They should be merged into the correct and proper bipartisan position.

However, let me say this, that we in the majority in the Congress have a responsibility and an obligation to lead and to propose recommendations, legislation, all kinds of activities designed to remedy the ills which beset us.

All one has to do is read the newspapers or listen to radio and television any day. We hear from the executive branch statements that Congress has the obligation to do this, Congress has the obligation to do that, and Congress must stand up and take positive steps and make positive decisions and resolutions.

I submit to the gentleman that from experience, as he and I well know, it is very difficult to establish policy in this august body with a five and five split. As we have the responsibility as the majority party in this body, we must insist on the regular rule and ratio for other committees, and this is one of the reasons.

The executive branch has created a board and a commission to look into this matter, and certainly we in the Congress have not told or advised the President as to what the makeup of that board should be or what the membership should be.

I do not think that we can properly exercise our function here as the majority party with the responsibility to come forth with recommendations, and I do not think we can properly exercise our responsibility unless we have a 7 and 3 ratio.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIAIMO. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As to this idea, however, when the gentleman says that we must insist on the normal rule as it applies to ratios on committees, he ignores completely the distinction that should be drawn between a legislative committee and an investigative committee. This is not a legislative committee, as we said earlier. The gentleman agrees, I am sure, that this committee cannot legislate; it can only recommend.

With investigative materials as sensitive as these, it is important that we convey to the public, which is concerned and rightfully so about these issues, that we will not simply take partisan potshots and that we will not make points for one party or in the defense of the other, but in a serious, determined, nonpartisan manner, we are proceeding to lay the ghost to these charges, either determining their truth and validity or not.

Mr. GIAIMO. I do not think we intend

to take potshots. Certainly I know that members of the majority are not, and members of the minority are not either. However, the fact is that the majority does bear the responsibility to take positive action and make positive suggestions.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that we cannot do that with a five and five committee, and I oppose the amendment.

DR. EDELIN: VICTIM OF A NEW
CRIME

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1975

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I know there must be many Americans who, like myself, were shocked to hear a verdict of guilty in the manslaughter case against Massachusetts physician, Kenneth C. Edelin. A Washington Post editorial of February 18 lays out the case and its implications extremely well and I would like to have it reprinted here:

THE EDELIN TRIAL

By convicting Dr. Kenneth C. Edelin for manslaughter, the State of Massachusetts has brought disgrace to itself and to the whole judicial system. The charge against the doctor should never have been brought by the prosecutor. The trial judge should never have allowed the case to go to the jury. And the jury's verdict, itself, is suspect. While we believe the conviction will not stand on appeal because it is constitutionally invalid, the wrong which has been committed in Massachusetts against Dr. Edelin, the medical profession and the law itself cannot be fully repaired.

The charge against Dr. Edelin—murdering a fetus during a legal operation by failing to take all possible steps to bring it to, or to continue its life—may well be unique in American legal history. There was no law on the statute books and no prior case suggesting that the routine procedure used in an abortion operation involved a criminal act. The prosecutor thought up the legal theory of his case—that a fetus is a live human being—and found someone to try the theory out on. He took no steps to warn Dr. Edelin or the medical profession that he had created a new crime. That lack of notice, alone, is enough in our view to make this conviction unconstitutional and to establish that the prosecutor grossly abused the power the law places in his hands. Regardless of what one thinks about abortion, it ought to be obvious that there is something fundamentally unfair about charging a man with murder without warning him in advance that what he and other doctors have been doing for years is now to be considered murder. Only a prosecutor with a low regard for the Bill of Rights and no regard at all for elementary fairness would proceed in this manner.

The same process, however, has been followed by the Boston prosecutor in a second case. Next on his list are four doctors who are charged with violating an 1914 law against grave-robbing. The charge against them is that they performed unauthorized autopsies by engaging in medical research on aborted and dead fetuses without getting permission for autopsies from the women who had been aborted. At the time the research was being conducted, hospitals and doctors generally regarded an aborted fetus as surgical tissue to be routinely disposed of the same way other surgical tissue is dis-

posed of. As in the Edelin case, the prosecutor created a crime, failed to warn anyone that the routine procedures would place him in jeopardy, and proceeded to seek and win an indictment.

The impact of these two cases on the practice of medicine and on medical research in Boston, and elsewhere, is likely to be enormous. It will mean that some women will be denied the abortion to which the Supreme Court has said they have a right. It will mean that doctors will have to attempt to bring life to a fetus when they are convinced it can have no meaningful life. If the principles of these cases are to be enforced, prosecutors or police will have a reason to patrol operating rooms and hospitals. And the two cases already have brought to a halt much of the medical and biological research that involves the use of a fetus or of fetal tissue. It is worth noting that one of the essential steps in developing a vaccine against polio involved the use of fetal tissue in laboratory experiments.

Behind all this, of course, is an effort to sneak around the Supreme Court decision limiting the power of states to make abortions illegal. The Boston prosecutor has done indirectly what he must know he cannot do directly. That, in itself, is an expression of gross disregard for the system of law that has generally served this nation well for 200 years. The proper way to have proceeded in these matters would have been for the Massachusetts legislature to have passed laws creating the crimes the prosecutor has created on his own. Those laws could then have been tested in court—where we believe they would have been held unconstitutional—without dragging in five bystanders and charging them with crimes for doing what they believed to be ethically and legally correct work.

Those who oppose abortion and the Supreme Court decision do have legitimate courses of action open to them. They can try to narrow the scope of the decision through legislation. They can try to persuade the Court, in a proper case, that it was wrong. And they can try to persuade Congress and the state legislatures that the Constitution should be amended. We hope such efforts fall, because we believe the matter of abortion is a subject that rests properly with a woman and her doctor. While we defend the right of those who disagree with us to seek their goal through legitimate means, it should be clear that legitimate means can never include the attempt by the prosecutor's fiat to create new crimes and thereby to control private and medical ethics.

The demonstration of raw power that has been permitted to go on this month in a Boston courtroom, unfortunately, is not unique. It has occurred before when prosecutors and judges used the processes of the law to harass those whose views they would not tolerate. But that does not excuse it.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1975

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, February 24, 1975, marks a special day in man's historic struggle for freedom and self-determination, for it was on that day 57 years ago that the Estonian people established their own government and proclaimed their independence.

The Estonian American National Council in the Chicago region is commemorating this 57th anniversary of

freedom with a program at the Latvian Community Center, 4146 North Elston Avenue in Chicago, on Sunday, February 23.

Taking part in the commemoration ceremonies are Olaf Tamrk, chairman of the Estonian Association of Northern Illinois, who will be the independence day speaker, Mrs. Tamrk, a soloist in the musical program, and the young people playing musical instruments.

The president of the Estonian Society of Chicago is August Parts, and the regional director of the Estonian American National Council for the Midwest is Alexander Koopp. These men are performing dedicated service to the members of these organizations and to their community.

The Republic of Estonia grew and prospered for 22 years from February 24, 1918, to June 1940, when that nation was overrun by the Soviet empire and forcibly incorporated by the Soviet Union. Estonians have not accepted this foreign occupation of their land and still risk their lives to defy their Communist captors.

Tragically, the freedom-loving people now living in Estonia are unable to join in celebrating this auspicious independence day occasion, as they are forced to live in bondage under the ruthless tyranny of the Soviet Union. Despite their long suffering under the harsh yoke of communism, no amount of repression has succeeded in stifling the Estonian's yearning and constant hope for sovereignty and individual freedom.

Periodically stories of persecution and suppression of human rights break through the Soviet curtain of censorship, but we may be sure that there are many such violations which do not become known publicly. According to census figures for 1970, Estonians constituted only 68 percent of the population as opposed to 88 percent in 1939. This is a reflection of the fact that the Russian Communists have continued their campaign of intimidation and harassment in Estonia through these long years of occupation with mass deportations to other parts of the Soviet Union and attempts to destroy Estonian cultural autonomy.

Mr. Speaker, it was for these reasons that I introduced the following resolution at the beginning of the 94th Congress:

Whereas the Government and the people of the United States of America have maintained and enjoyed excellent and friendly relations with the Governments and peoples of the Baltic States Republics of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, during the years of independence of these Republics; and

Whereas the concept of liberty and freedom of choice of government is still alive in this country, as it has been constantly since the Declaration of Independence; and

Whereas the evidence produced at the hearings of the select committee of the House of Representatives to investigate the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics overwhelming tends to prove that the actions of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in relation to these free and independent Baltic Republics were contrary to the principles of international law and the principles of freedom; and

Whereas the people of this Nation have consistently shown great sympathy for the peoples of these three Republics, especially as a result of their enslavement and as a

result of the inhuman exile and deportation of great numbers of law-abiding persons from their native lands to imprisonment in slave labor camps in the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the President of the United States of America should continue the American policy of nonrecognition of the unlawful absorption of the Baltic States Republics of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and continue the recognition of the diplomatic and consular officers of these Republics as the lawful representatives of these three nations in the United States of America; and

(2) the President should take such steps as may be appropriate, through the United States delegation to the United Nations, to raise in the United Nations the question of the forced incorporation of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and request the United Nations to conduct an investigation of conditions in the said Baltic Republics to the intent and purpose that Soviet armed forces, agents, and colonists be withdrawn therefrom, and that the exiled peoples of these Republics be returned thereto in freedom, and that free plebiscites and elections be held therein, under the supervision of the United Nations, to let the people, in freedom, make their own election and choice as to government.

Mr. Speaker, during ongoing negotiations with the Soviet Union, I believe it is most important that our Nation not forget the just aspirations of the Estonian people for freedom and self-determination. The United States has never recognized the forcible conquest of Estonia and because I believe that we should stand behind this policy, I also introduced the following resolution regarding this aggression:

Whereas the three Baltic nations of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been illegally occupied by the Soviet Union since World War II; and

Whereas the Soviet Union will attempt to obtain the recognition by the European Security Conference of its annexation of these nations; and

Whereas the United States delegation to the European Security Conference should not agree to the recognition of the forcible conquest of these nations by the Soviet Union: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the United States delegation to the European Security Conference should not agree to the recognition by the European Security Conference of the Soviet Union's annexation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania and it should remain the policy of the United States not to recognize in any way the annexation of the Baltic nations by the Soviet Union.

In behalf of the many thousands of Estonian-Americans residing within my own 11th Illinois Congressional District, whom I am privileged to serve, and also for Americans of Estonian heritage all over this Nation who are commemorating this anniversary, I urge the early enactment of this legislation.

On this occasion, I want to assure the courageous Estonians that our Nation continues to support their just aspirations for freedom and independence, and I want to express the fervent hope that the goal of Estonian self-determination shall soon be realized.

THE AMERICAN DILEMMA

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1975

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, recently the moral and ethical problems of our country have been the subject of much comment and attention which are long overdue. I should like to introduce into the Record an article which appeared in the February 16, 1975, edition of the New York Times, by Prof. Kenneth B. Clark, which makes a valuable analysis of these fundamental concerns:

THE AMERICAN DILEMMA

(By Kenneth B. Clark)

About seven years ago, I accepted an invitation to participate in a seminar on the ethical and moral problems of American society that was sponsored by the Aspen Institute in Colorado. Among the other invited guests were business executives, college presidents, judges, government officials, managing editors, professors and theologians.

Although there was no conflict or controversy in the discussions, one of the presentations has had a profound, almost obsessive, impact upon my own thoughts about the character and quality of American life.

In a rather quiet voice, a recently retired vice president of one of the largest corporations in America told the group that one of the persistent problems faced by his office was how to keep the accounting records of the corporation in such a way that they would be accurate and would also obscure the fact that regular operating expenses were payoffs to municipal officials to expedite the installation of new construction in the large cities throughout the United States. Casually, this participant cited this as just another example of a prevailing functional immorality with which big business had to come to terms.

When none of the other participants raised a question about the ethical implications of this practice, I eventually asked why this powerful corporation did not bring this matter to local and Federal law-enforcement officials. My colleagues clearly considered my question naive. They reacted to my persistent questions as if I were an unrealistic child who did not understand the economic and political rules of the great American game.

Now I was shocked not only by the disclosure but equally shocked at the fact that my fellow seminar participants were not shocked. They thought themselves realistic in not permitting an academic discussion of ethical and moral values to be confused by "minor" specific examples of generally accepted institutionalized immorality.

In assessing the social, political and human strength, and potential of America, one can concentrate on such large issues as America's role in Southeast Asia and such other international problems as its fluctuating relations with its economic and ideological allies and adversaries; the persistent and manifold and overtly cruel forms of racism; the more subtle manifestations of inter-ethnic conflicts and the rejection of the poor, the aged and the infirm in a nation that prides itself on its affluence; and the fact that a highly developed technological society that has pioneered in space exploration continues to tolerate large-scale decay of the residential portions of its inner cities, deterioration of public education and accelerated pollution and wastage of its natural and human resources.

What is the basic systemic problem—the fundamental problem of perspective, value