

S 21066

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

December 11, 1974

sional Record, March 2, 1971, pages E-2, 696, 2,697)

Recomputation of military retired pay is predicted. Representatives Hébert and Stratton are now willing to allow the normal processes of democracy to work.

During the past 11 years, I endeavored to have a military recomputation bill enacted, stating my belief that the members of Congress would vote overwhelmingly in its favor. The Senate passed such legislation twice by overwhelming votes. It was said that Representatives Hébert and Stratton blocked Members of the House of Representatives from voting on its merits.

Recently, on April 2, 1974, these gentlemen charged Rep. Les Aspin with using obstructive tactics to block House consideration of a bill to revise the special pay structure relating to medical officers of the armed services. Commenting on H. Res. 1017 that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (S. 2770), Mr. Hébert said:

"The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Aspin) . . . attempted to block the House from consideration of this legislation. The gentleman did not want the House to have a chance to vote on this legislation . . . and not give the Members a chance to vote. . . . I am asking that the rule be adopted to give the Members an opportunity to express themselves by voting up or down, whichever way they desire . . . in order that the Members may have an opportunity to discuss this bill in detail, make up their own minds, and then vote whichever way they desire" (page H2415, Congressional Record, April 2, 1974) (emphasis added).

Mr. Stratton said:

"I simply want to second what the chairman on Armed Services has said. We have before us in this House today, I think, a rather surprising and shocking attempt to undermine the normal processes of democracy simply because one member of the committee does not happen to like everything that is in the bill. I think those of us who have been here a few years know that the legislative process is a compromise. Probably none of us ever likes everything that is in a bill, but we allow the legislative process to function; we allow the House to work its will; and that is precisely what we are proposing here" (pages H2415-2416) (emphasis added).

After the rule was adopted, Mr. Hébert rose again and said:

"I merely rise to reexpress what I said briefly under the rule. We now have the opportunity to vote up or down on these changes that have been made to the bill. . . . This is the opportunity to offer any amendment Members desire, to strike or to add to the bill anything they care to add. I shall accept that as the will of the House. That was one thing I was fighting for, against the efforts of the gentleman from Wisconsin to prevent the vote of the House" (page H2419) (emphasis added).

It is good to know that these two distinguished gentlemen believe unequivocally that the Members of the House should have an opportunity to express themselves and vote on pending legislation.

Since (1) they say, and we agree, it would be a shocking attempt to undermine the normal processes of democracy to block a vote by the Members of the House, simply because one or two members do not happen to like everything in proposed (Recomputation) legislation, and (2) they are willing to permit the House to work its will by discussion and vote on the merits, and to accept such vote as the will of the House, (3) it is safe to assume that the House will pass it by an overwhelming vote.

HR 14,081, 14,802, and 14,803, introduced by Rep. Bob Wilson, are identical to the

Hartke one-shot recomputation amendment which passed the Senate twice but was scuttled in a joint House-Senate conference committee. The Wilson and Hartke measures have no provision granting recomputation to a pre-1949 disability retiree, not under the CCA, who, for example, was rated 20% administratively by persons who didn't even see the retiree, and whose actual degree of disability may be 30% or more. And these bills refer to the percentage of disability as "finally determined . . . at the time of that determination," which would preclude recomputation based on actual degree of disability, thus depriving over 30,000 pre-1949 disability retirees of any recomputation.

The arbitrary and ex-parte disability percentages administratively assigned after retirement, without seeing the retirees, are unreal. Many who were assigned a 20% rating had greater disabilities than some who were rated 70%.

Although ratings are supposed to be based on the same VA schedule of ratings, different doctors assign different ratings to the same individual. Examples of some of the arbitrary ratings: Sergeant Charles A. Brozik, Jr. (U.S. Court of Claims No. 97-65, 6-9-97), and Captain Bernard G. Rieth (Army Times, April 16, 1972), described on pages 17247-17249, 17260, HASC 92-78, (Hearings before the Stratton subcommittee).

Military disability retirees should be protected from the ranges of inflation and allowed to enjoy the fruit of their labor which Congress ordained in thanks for having dedicated their lives to service of our Nation and are due the benefits earned in that service.

CONCLUSION

Senator Hartke's amendment No. 494 (Title VIII, HR 9286) regarding recomputation of military retired pay, should be improved as follows:

In Section 802, lines 17 and 18, the words "in accordance with Section 411 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 823)" should be deleted.

In Section 802, line 22, after the word "to," the following words should be inserted: "be examined by the Veterans Administration which shall fix a percentage of disability under the standard schedules of rating disabilities in use by the Veterans Administration, and".

The FY 1975 cost would be about \$85 million.

The South Vietnamese budget calls for a \$85 million contribution from the U.S., for construction of a fertilizer plant (Congressional Record, October 1, 1974, Senator Alken, page S 17931). As of June 30, 1974, there was about \$4.6 billion in the U.S. foreign aid pipeline (same Congressional Record date, Senator Fulbright, page S 17934).

Purpose: eradicate present and avoid future discrimination against pre 1949 disability retirees who were retired under then existing law on the ground that their disabilities are permanent in nature, sustained to the end of duty, and of a severity which prevented them from continuing to perform active duty. No disability percentage was then assigned.

Respectfully submitted.

D. GEORGE PASTON.

PROPOSED JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE OVERSIGHT

Mr. WEICKER, Mr. President, on December 10, I offered testimony before the Senate Government Operations Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations outlining the need to create a Joint Committee on Intelligence Oversight.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of my remarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

TESTIMONY BY SENATOR LOWELL WEICKER

Watergate has dramatically detailed the dangers to democracy posed by secret intelligence and law enforcement agencies when, unaccountable and unchecked, their resources, methods and personnel are recruited to the "dirty tricks" detail of the American political process.

The Watergate scandal was a warning of a sinister potential for domestic meddling by secret agencies that cannot be left as unfinished business.

For too many years, the American intelligence community has taken the Congress of the United States for granted; has treated our citizenry more like an audience than as participants in government.

Fortunately, we have survived this period of besmirched Constitutional rights. But with no thanks to established oversight systems. Neither can these abuses be dismissed as isolated instances of individual excesses. Not an agency but agencies plural were involved. Not one misstep but a trampling of Constitutional democracy.

The lesson is that accountability cannot be assured without meaningful congressional oversight—oversight that has constancy, purpose and legislative power.

By their very natures, law enforcement and intelligence are in direct conflict with democratic concepts and ideals. I do not argue for their elimination; their mission argues most convincingly for supervision by the democracy.

Yet of all government activities, including those of the military, the doings of the federal law enforcement/intelligence community go unnoticed and unchallenged to the greatest degree.

HUD or HEW can't overthrow democratic concepts. The FBI, CIA, etc. have. Once shame on you, twice shame on me.

It is the duty of Congress, not the option in a democracy, to police the vast American intelligence setup. It is the duty, not the option, of Congress to establish a structure of legislative activities. It won't wash for Congress to complain that it was not informed of some nefarious action when Congress has permitted itself to remain ignorant or passive when knowledgeable.

We can no longer tolerate "briefing systems" in which agency spokesmen tell a select few in Congress what they feel like telling them.

We can no longer tolerate pallid agency disclaimers on covert operations.

We can no longer tolerate an Executive Branch monopoly on law enforcement and secret intelligence which negates any Congressional role in policy formulation.

We can no longer tolerate the unchecked and unaccountable spending of taxpayer's dollars to fund giant intelligence bureaucracies. (According to estimated figures, the U.S. intelligence community employs 150,000 personnel on an annual budget of \$6.2 billion).

(In May of 1973 Richard Crossman, a Labour M.P. wrote:)

THE WARTIME TACTICS THAT LED TO WATERGATE

I do not know which is sillier—to go on trying to pretend that Mr. Nixon is an American Macmillan in trouble with a clutch of Profumos, or to sit in judgment on him for defiling the purity of American machine politics. Mr. Peter Jenkins was right to remind us in *The Guardian* on Monday that Mr. Nixon has conducted some of the dirtiest election campaigns in recent history. But that is not the real trouble. What Watergate let off was an explosion of disillusionment with the American government and all it stands for, which has been boil-

December 11, 1974

ing up ever since Vietnam began to go wrong.

I have just come across a remark by Neil Sheehan, of the *New York Times*, which seems to me to get near the heart of the matter. He made it when the *Pentagon Papers* first came into his newspaper office and he had to read them through. "My main impression," he observed, "was that the government of the United States was not what I thought it was; it was as if here were an inner United States Government, a centralized State, far more powerful than anything else, for whom the enemy is not simply the Communists but everything else, its own press, its own judiciary, its own Congress . . . It does not function necessarily for the benefit of the Republic, but rather for its own ends, its own perpetuation; it has its own codes, codes which are quite different from public codes. Secrecy is a way of protecting itself, not so much from threats by foreign governments, but from detection by its own population."

The inner government is, of course, a necessary apparatus of total war; and the best paid and most attractive of its departments are those which deal with covert operations in which we British have always excelled. Indeed, apart from the RAF success at pioneering the firestorm which cooked 50,000 Hamburgers and 150,000 Dresdeners alive while officially claiming we were bombing military targets, subversive operations and black propaganda were the only aspects of war at which we achieved a real pre-eminence. We trained a small army of gifted amateurs for all the dirtiest tricks from lying, bugging, forging and embezzlement to sheer murder—all, of course, in the cause of preserving the democratic way of life. We taught them how to organize a black market, how to win friends in order to betray them, and how to persuade a stubborn prisoner to come clean with the vital information he possessed.

The Americans adored subversion, but they were too heavy-handed and they never learned from us to play it as a game and give it up when the war was over. Whereas here the secret departments withered away harmlessly, in America they multiplied and found plenty of opportunity in Korea and Vietnam, not to mention the Dominican Republic and Guatemala. It was only a matter of time before the wartime experts were being employed by business firms and by political parties against their rivals. As for the inner central government in Washington, how could it fail to employ these techniques against anyone who obstructed it when the United States was engaged in a cold war against the Communist enemy who regularly used every kind of dirty trick?

So the politicians of both parties came to rely on the authoritarian inner government and the covert operators, and most of the time they sit on top of it without being able to control it. Watergate is the first time a corner of the curtain of secrecy has been jerked aside and ordinary Americans have been able to see a little of what goes on behind it. What effect would all this have on Mr. Nixon's peace offensives in Peking and Moscow? None whatsoever, provided only that the President regains control. I believe Mr. Brezhnev felt more at home with Mr. Nixon than with any other American he had met because here at last was a man of his own kind, an apparatchik—a creature of a political machine which in some respects is beginning to resemble his own Russian apparatus of bureaucratic power.

Mr. Brezhnev takes for granted that the man in control of a modern State machine will, of course, employ all the Watergate techniques against his opponents. As for the horrors of Vietnam, there is nothing here—except failure—to upset the man who sent the Russian tanks in Prague. Mutual con-

fidence is far easier between two birds of a feather such as Nixon and Brezhnev than if by some freak of fortune a genuine Liberal got into the White House.

Nevertheless, I personally hope that the "worst" happens and that the Watergate affair does irreparable damage to the inner remembering that the United States was created by free men who rejected the dictatorship and power politics of the Old World. It remained a wonderful place, so long as it was selfishly dedicated to its neutralist ideals and had to be dragged into war in defense of freedom. Since 1945, an attempt has been made to reshape this isolationist democracy as a superpower capable of replacing the Pax Britannica by the Pax Americana. In the early years of the Marshall Plan, the attempt seemed to be succeeding. But since then it has failed because the kind of centralized bureaucracy and secret departments required by the government of a superpower are incompatible not only with the American Constitution but also with the American tradition of freedom. A Communist superpower makes sense because Communism is a totalitarian creed. The lesson of Vietnam and now of Watergate is that an American superpower is a contradiction in terms.

If public feeling is strong enough to cause a liberal purge in Washington, we can be sure that Nixon's successor will turn his back on Europe as well as on Asia. And a good thing, too. In his first reaction to Watergate, Mr. Heath on Monday gave us a vision of the United States and the European Community as "twin pillars of a revived and invigorated Atlantic alliance." I wonder. Since the Russians will be concerned with the Chinese threat for the next 20 years, there has ceased to be a military threat to Europe and the case, therefore, for an Atlantic alliance and an American army in Germany has disappeared. Even if it had not, I would rather see a liberal America returning to its neutral tradition than a continuance of the effort to transform the Republic into a militarized superstate.

* * * * *

From the U-2 and the Bay of Pigs, through the taint of Watergate, to the belated revelation of successful efforts to "destabilize" the Marxist government of Salvador Allende in Chile, the CIA's covert capers have raised the spectre of that agency's potential for domestic shenanigans.

Victor Marchetti and John D. Marks, authors of a recent bestseller about the agency, pointed out that Americans should be apprehensive.

"Nurtured in the adversary setting of the cold war," they wrote, "shielded by secrecy, and spurred on by patriotism that views dissent as a threat to national security, the clandestine operatives of the CIA have the capability, the resources, the experience—and the inclination—to ply their skills increasingly on the domestic scene."

For in ways never contemplated, or comprehended by the Congress, the CIA has operated domestically. These facts were shrouded from the public and the Congress at large. It did not become blatantly clear that covert intelligence techniques had invaded American politics until the Watergate revelations.

The Watergate scandal exposed how willing the CIA was to be used—at least at the outset—and how close the White House came to turning the CIA and the FBI into a political police force.

When Tom Charles Huston solicited support for Nixon's illegal intelligence plan, CIA Director Richard Helms readily subscribed to it.

When the White House demanded a psychological profile of Daniel Ellsberg, a private American citizen, the CIA produced it.

When John Ehrlichman sought technical assistance for E. Howard Hunt and the

Plumbers, General Robert E. Cushman, the Deputy Director and now Marine Corps Commandant, immediately complied. Later, when the Watergate prosecution requested a statement from Cushman, then Deputy Director William Colby told him to clear it with Ehrlichman, and Cushman complied with Ehrlichman's demand that his name be dropped from the formal affidavit.

Finally when H. R. Haldeman, on Nixon's instructions, ordered Cushman's successor, General Vernon D. Walters, to divert the FBI investigation of Watergate, Walters promptly did so. And Helms, who attended the meeting, with full knowledge that the CIA would not be compromised by an investigation, offered no opposition.

The Watergate inquiry was thus put off the track for a critical two weeks in its crucial opening stage. And only when Acting FBI Director Patrick Gray demanded that Walters put it all in writing did the CIA at last formally withdraw its original request for a diversion of the investigation and admit that it was completely uninvolved.

As the transcript of a pertinent conversation between Nixon and Haldeman shows, the President decided to bring the CIA into the cover-up with the full expectation that it would go along.

Do we need to be reminded that the burglars who broke into Democratic National Headquarters at Watergate had CIA backgrounds, and one, Eugenio Martinez, was still on the CIA payroll at a \$100 a month retainer? Have we forgotten that one of its former clandestine operatives, E. Howard Hunt, was provided with equipment used in the break-in of the offices of Ellsberg's psychiatrist.

Have we already dismissed the fact that a President created his own secret police force—the Plumbers and their assorted acolytes—to conduct covert operations against domestic "enemies"—real and imagined.

The intelligence files of the Justice Department's Internal Security Division were routinely shipped to the Committee to Reelect the President.

The Secret Service, which taped the phone of the President's brother, F. Donald Nixon, also was recruited to submit "intelligence" information on political candidates they allegedly were assigned to protect.

Mail sent to an affiliate of the Democratic Party was opened and photographed by the U.S. Army and military sleuths spied on the Concerned Americans in Berlin, a group of McGovern supporters who were officially recognized by the Democratic Party.

The Internal Revenue Service became a lending library for the White House, turning over confidential tax files on so-called "enemies". Its ultra-secret Special Services Section collected information on ideological organization. This was not tax collection. It was the conversion of the IRS into a spy and harassment agency.

I will spare you a recitation of the latest FBI embroglio. I am sure you are all familiar with "Cointelpro" which, by the FBI's own admission, involved "isolated instances of practices that can only be considered abhorrent in a free society.

All of the above, however, enunciates the need for tight and total congressional oversight of all snoop shops, real or potential.

More judgements are not involved here; Constitutional judgements are. No Constitution directs the United States to intervene in the domestic affairs of other nations or gives its intelligence agencies the right to spy at home.

Instead, I raise the point that covert military operations are unconstitutional. The Constitution vests the war power in the Congress. And while the President has a constitutional responsibility to protect national security, this does not encompass the waging of undeclared wars against foreigners abroad or American citizens at home.

During twenty-five years of Cold War, America's existing intelligence agencies not only grew in size, but several new ones were created. For example, the National Security Agency was born by Executive Order in 1952 and the Defense Intelligence Agency was created by Department of Defense Directive in 1961.

Let me emphasize again that these two massive institutions were created by executive fiat and not congressional statute.

The Executive Branch has at its disposal a massive intelligence apparatus—the CIA, the FBI, the NSA and the DIA among others. The point of Watergate is that the Nixon Administration simply used at home what had been developed in clandestine operations abroad.

If Congress remains blocked from access to information on the structure, operations and product of the law enforcement intelligence community, its role in the democracy will remain the role of reaction rather than action.

It is in this interest of strengthening this Congressional responsibility that Senator Baker and I have introduced legislation to establish the Joint Committee on Intelligence Oversight. It is imperative that the Congress be armed with broad powers to authorize, investigate and legislate matters related to our intelligence agencies, as well as the intelligence activities of all other federal agencies and departments.

In this way we seek to consolidate the Congressional intelligence oversight function in one Joint Committee with sweeping powers to demand full and current accountability.

The Joint Committee would be composed of fourteen members evenly divided between the House and Senate, chosen by the leadership. In order that this important Committee remains independent and healthily skeptical, we would encourage the leadership of both Houses to consider some form of rotating membership for the Joint Committee.

The Joint Committee would possess primary authorization and legislative jurisdiction over all activities and operations of:

- The Central Intelligence Agency.
- The Federal Bureau of Investigation.
- The United States Secret Service.
- The Defense Intelligence Agency.
- The National Security Agency.

as well as over all intelligence or surveillance activities or operations of any other department or agency of the federal government.

The bill clearly states the directors of the above-named agencies "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 may require from any department or agency of the federal government periodic written reports regarding activities and operations within the jurisdiction of the Joint Committee. To back up requests for the relevant information, the Committee would have full subpoena powers.

Furthermore, the legislation provides that:

"No funds may be appropriated for the purpose of carrying out any intelligence or surveillance act 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."

Therefore, the budgets of secret agencies like the CIA and NSA could not be hidden in Defense appropriation bills, and no man-

ket authorizations could be used to avoid the Committee's scrutiny of intelligence agency budgets.

While the creation of the Joint Committee would not deprive the current oversight committees (Armed Services, Appropriations, Foreign Relations, etc.) of the opportunity to exercise oversight over intelligence matters related to the jurisdiction of these committees, no legislation or no provision contained in any legislation dealing with any matter within the jurisdiction of the Joint Committee can be considered by either House unless such legislation has been reported by the Joint Committee or is a floor amendment to Committee legislation.

And, given national security considerations, the Joint Committee would be empowered to take any and all precautions necessary to maintain the confidentiality of sensitive information before it.

Mr. Chairman, let me add one final note for the record. The litany of abuses paints a sordid picture—a clear and convincing message that unless Congress exercises its oversight responsibility, our Constitutional democracy is vulnerable to continued subversion.

The subversion we have survived was not the fault of those overworked members of the four Congressional subcommittees responsible for reviewing the intelligence communities operations and budgets. But, it should be noted that none of these subcommittees publishes reports of the hearings they hold. The budgets are not made public, but are integrated into the budgets of other government departments.

The chart below indicates the number of meetings of record—or paucity of meetings—held annually between the Director of the CIA or high officials of the CIA and members of the special subcommittees. The chart, compiled in September, is based on records of the subcommittee staffs, with the exception of the figures for the Senate Armed Services subcommittee when the legislative calendar was used through the year 1970.

Year	Senate armed services	Senate appropriations	House armed services
1974	2	5	6
1973	4	8	2
1972	2	2	0
1971	2	3	0
1970	2	3	3
1969	1	3	2
1968	3	2	1
1967	5	4	4
1966	2	5	8
1965	11	11	9
1964	2	2	4
1963	4	3	5
1962	7	5	5
1961	2	1	3
1960	0	0	2
1959	2	1	7
1958	2	0	7
1957	0	0	0
1956	1	0	0
1955	1	0	0

Note: House appropriations—CIA Director briefs Defense Subcommittee 3 or 4 times a year. Its Intelligence Subcommittee spends 2 or 3 days a year with Director on budget.

One last but most important point. The question is asked as to how much information Senators and Representatives should be allowed from the various law enforcement intelligence agencies. Just the asking of the question indicates, to me anyway, a presumption that in the order of our institutions, Congress sits somewhere below the FBI, CIA, SS, etc.

Let me spell it out Constitutionally, conceptually and without qualification.

In this country the people rule. From the sheer physical demands that would occur, clearly not every person can be given access to the agencies of government. But every Congressman and Senator can and should.

It is up to the agency to justify withholding information, not up to representatives of the people to justify obtaining it.

Could there be security risks? Yes. But they are subject to the continuing judgments of the people. It is the non-accountable security risk who resides in the agency that I fear most. It is the "no people's judgment" government that we seek to eliminate here.

Efficiency has never been the hall mark of American democracy. Greatness has.

A DECLARATION OF DEPENDENCE

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the October issue of Sea Power, publication of the Navy League of the United States, has an editorial entitled: "A Declaration of Dependence." It includes the thought that most Americans do not realize our nation is "now heading for a minerals crisis which will make the energy crisis look like small potatoes."

The editorial continues:

Well, "most Americans" better wake up fast. The energy crisis is alive and well and now gathering its second wind, and the mineral crisis is about to descend on us in full force.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

A DECLARATION OF DEPENDENCE

It is difficult to report the news anymore without sounding like an alarmist.

As Paul Revere used to say.

But the news these days is not the sort to lull one into a false sense of security. On the other hand, maybe a false sense of security is better than no sense of security at all. It is, at any rate, the only type of security we might have for some time to come.

We're referring, initially, to the energy crisis. You remember the energy crisis, don't you? It was in the winter of 1973-74, as we recall, and resulted in a lot of long lines, short tempers, and medium-sized speeches about rationing and national unity and pulling together, etc. About 20,000 gas stations eventually went out of business, according to the economists, and Congress passed a 55-mile-per-hour speed limit—now observed, it seems, only in narrow alleyways and downtown Manhattan.

So much for the energy crisis. Out of sight, out of mind. That, at least, is the impression one gets from observing the business-as-usual attitude of most Americans, who apparently don't realize how close to disaster we really were.

Most Americans don't realize, either, that the nation is now heading for a minerals crisis which will make the energy crisis look like small potatoes.

Well, "most Americans" better wake up fast. The energy crisis is alive and well and now gathering its second wind, and the mineral crisis is about to descend on us in full force. Anyone who doesn't think so had best listen carefully to the words of John Kyl, the Interior Department's Assistant Secretary for Congressional and Legislative Affairs.

"There is an illusion abroad in this nation which leads people to believe that if there ever was a real energy problem, that problem is now gone," Kyl recently told a Des Moines audience.

"It is a satisfying thought. It is wrong. It is dangerous," he immediately added.

Such illusions are dangerous, Kyl said, because "the basic reasons" for the recent

H 11628

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

December 11, 1974

with an argument that we are saving nations from communism.

Italy is on the brink of going Communist but no one in our Government seems to give it a thought.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I invite the House to reflect on the fact that we have expended at least \$260 billion on foreign aid since its inception. It seems to me that this kind of business, in terms of the condition of this country, is beyond all reason and is, in fact, financial insanity.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CARNEY OF OHIO

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CARNEY of Ohio: Page 30, after line 12, insert the following new section:

TEN PERCENT REDUCTION OF EACH
AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 35. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, each amount authorized by any amendment made by this Act and each allocation and limitation of any such authorized amount shall be reduced by ten percent.

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would reduce each of the authorizations, allocations and limitations contained in this act by 10 percent. It would save the American taxpayers \$260 million.

In recent months, the President has emphasized one overriding economic fact which threatens every American—an escalating inflation which is sapping our economic gains and, unless controlled, will destroy our Nation's economy. The President told us that everyone has a stake in combating inflation, that the Government must curtail excessive spending, and that we in the Congress have a responsibility for staying within the Federal budget by making prudent cuts.

It seems obvious to me, Mr. Chairman, that the one area where the most sensible and justifiable cuts can be made is in the area of foreign aid.

From 1945 through 1973, we spent \$185 billion of the taxpayers' money to help other nations—first to rehabilitate those ravaged by the war; then to help others withstand Communist subversion and aggression, and finally to help newly-independent nations find their place in the Sun, or at least provide the necessities of life for their own peoples.

Mr. Chairman, the time has come for us to exercise prudence in our overseas giving, and prudence demands that foreign aid be cut to the bare essentials. We must not be wasteful of our own substance when our own people stand in need.

This bill authorizes \$2.6 billion in foreign aid during fiscal year 1975. While the Foreign Affairs Committee has authorized \$600 million less than the administration requested. This bill still provides \$746.3 million more than Congress appropriated for the same aid programs last year.

Furthermore, despite mass starvation in Africa, Bangladesh, and other parts of the world, this foreign aid bill is heavily-weighted with military assistance: \$1.15 billion of the \$2.6 billion authorized in this bill goes directly to military assistance, \$535 million is for military-related "Security Supporting Assistance" programs, and \$573 million is for assistance to our allies in South Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia.

Mr. Chairman, these military assistance programs do not increase the security of the countries that receive such assistance, and they do not increase our own national security. In fact, they have the opposite effect. Look at India and Pakistan; look at Greece and Turkey. These countries used American military aid against each other.

Mr. Chairman, we could phase out our military aid over a short period, say 3 years, use a percentage of that money and additional cuts in economic aid to build up our own economy here at home. The 10-percent, across-the-board cut in foreign assistance programs which I propose will demonstrate that we are serious about reducing wasteful and unnecessary Federal Government spending.

Mr. Chairman, what was wrong with our foreign aid programs 10 years ago is wrong with our foreign aid programs today. The countries that were supposed to be eliminated from our foreign aid lists are still on them; programs are still being overfunded; inefficient personnel are making the same enormous mistakes; uncommitted and undischarged carry-over funds are as large as ever; speculation in aid goods is as rife as ever; ineffective planning for too many projects is as sloppy as ever; recipient countries are being played off against each other; ability to repay is not considered.

All too often our foreign aid benefits only the ruling class and never reaches the millions of poor people for whom it was intended. One wonders whether our aid programs exist for the benefit of the people in the recipient nations or solely for the benefit of the overblown bureaucracy that administers these programs. How often has our foreign aid been used by other nations to compete against our own American workers and American businesses?

Clearly, America can no longer afford a policy of foreign aid business-as-usual. The time has come for Congress to make further cuts in foreign aid spending and to divert this money to the transportation, health, housing, and education of our own people here at home. Let us show the American people that their Government is genuinely concerned about their welfare rather than the welfare of some foreign dictator.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI).

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise reluctantly in opposition to the amendment, because I count the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CARNEY) a very close friend; however, I must submit that this is not a responsible amendment. The

committee has already cut \$609 million from the bill and with these cuts selectively made, it is much more responsible than it was when submitted by the executive branch.

This bill is a bill to help the developing countries to help themselves to grow the necessary food they are in such dire need of, if we are, indeed, going to fulfill the commitments we have made, we must not vote for this amendment.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio, I think it is a very responsible amendment for the taxpayers of the United States.

The Foreign Assistance Act authorizes a 39 percent increase over last year's expenditures. For years and years, we somehow labored under the false notion that friends and allies could somehow be bought on these massive foreign aid giveaways. I think the gentleman from Ohio is absolutely right in offering this amendment, in fact, I have a similar amendment at the desk that I will now not offer.

I have just a little additional note on what foreign aid has done for us. Since 1955, 21 wars have been fought by the governments around the world. In nine of these wars, the United States supported one of the opposing sides, but in the other 12, the United States financed and supported both sides. The cost of this kind of activity, when all things are considered, probably is in the neighborhood of \$200 billion.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a very good amendment, and I urge its passage.

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

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

Should this amendment pass, it will be cutting our assistance to Israel and undercutting the commitment made by Secretary Kissinger in the Middle East which is a part of the diplomacy he is carrying on there. It will be cutting even more from the already reduced amount for food assistance, which represents a pledge made both by President Ford and Secretary Kissinger, both here and in Rome.

Cutting indiscriminately will not solve some of the problems we have. It is no substitute for specific cuts. It will weigh very heavily in places such as Israel.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CARNEY).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RANGEL

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANGEL: Page 19, after line 9, insert the following new section.

CONTROL OF TURKISH OPIUM

SEC. 23. Section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(8) All assistance under this Act with respect to the Government of Turkey and all sales and guarantees of such sales under the Foreign Military Sales Act with respect to the Government of Turkey shall be suspended

December 11, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 11627

provide that the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico may not receive from the Caribbean Development Bank any funds provided to the Bank by the United States.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I now move that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto cease at 7 o'clock. The motion was agreed to.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. What about those of us who have had amendments at the desk all day?

The CHAIRMAN. Have they been printed in the RECORD?

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. No; but I gave them to the desk today.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. PECK of Illinois). If the amendments are printed in the RECORD, under the Rules of the House the proponents will be entitled to 5 minutes of debate.

Members standing at the time the motion was made will be recognized for 1 minute each.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Ms. HOLTZMAN).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. HOLTZMAN

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. HOLTZMAN: Page 23, line 14, strike out "important to the national security" and insert in lieu thereof "vital to the national defense".

(Ms. HOLTZMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is very simple. It is designed to enlarge congressional control over the Central Intelligence Agency's non-intelligence-gathering functions.

The provisions of this bill relating to the CIA constitute a major improvement over the situation in the past. This bill permits the CIA to engage in covert activities only after the President reports about these activities to the House and Senate committees dealing with foreign affairs and the House and Senate Armed Services Committees.

Despite the improvement, I still think these provisions are seriously deficient. This bill authorizes CIA activities designed to subvert or undermine foreign governments so long as they are "important to national security." This rubric is so broad as to be almost meaningless. Thus, the President is empowered to authorize CIA actions to subvert foreign governments basically when he thinks it would be desirable. It seems to me, however, that the circumstances in which the CIA ought ever to be permitted to subvert a foreign government with which we are at peace should be very limited at best.

My amendment would permit the CIA to engage in non-intelligence-gathering activities only when such activities are "vital to our national defense." My amendment would thus limit the instances in which the CIA would run afoul of international law, and also we

would be limiting the instances in which foreign policy is in essence being created by the President, the CIA, and four committees of Congress.

I urge support of my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. NEDZI).

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

We have in this bill a provision restraining certain operations of the CIA to those "important to the national security" and in timely fashion they are obliged to bring to the notice of Congress any activities which the CIA may be engaged in which are important to the national security. I submit that is a very important statutory provision and a departure from what the situation is at the present time. When we speak about matters "vital to the national defense" we are then it seems to me restraining the agency from perhaps operating in antidrug programs or the agency could be prevented from conducting antiterrorist activities programs, among others. In my judgment it just is not the kind of constraint that it is desirable to apply with respect to the President and the CIA. The language offered has broad implications and should not be approved without careful and detailed consideration by appropriate committees prior to bringing the matter before the entire House under circumstances of very limited debate.

While I have a moment I would like for the purpose of clarification inquire of the chairman what his interpretation of the language in the bill relating to reporting to Congress by the CIA is, particularly as it relates to the understanding we reached with the Secretary of State and the Director of Central Intelligence.

Mr. MORGAN. If the gentleman will yield, it is my belief that the amendment contained in the committee bill carries out and provides further statutory basis for the implementation of the understanding to which the gentleman has referred as it applies to the foreign policy-related operations of the CIA.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN).

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, the committee adopted an amendment to bring the CIA under more effective congressional control and the author of the amendment, the gentleman from California (Mr. RYAN), is here. I yield to him to speak in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment for I think substantive reasons. This was my amendment in the committee and it was very carefully worked out. We deal here with a very sensitive area. It was my intention and the intention of the committee to try to bring the CIA under some kind of jurisdiction by the Foreign Affairs Committee because obviously the decisions of CIA have an enormous effect upon our foreign affairs.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recog-

nizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to speak in opposition to the amendment. In my opinion we should have reservations about the language in the committee bill with respect to intelligence activities. And certainly we would be very unwise to change the language of "important to the national security" to "vital to national defense." This would preclude many activities which might well be needed in our own interest. I hope this amendment is soundly defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HALEY).

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HALEY yielded his time to Mr. MORGAN.)

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I was about to say that present language in this bill is very carefully drawn to derive the maximum amount of support from the various elements involved. If we can get this language through for those who are interested in having some kind of closer supervision for the CIA activities, this particular amendment is one which members of the committee think will pass and which we would be able to have signed. Without this particular language I think we will have serious problems with supervision of the CIA by the Foreign Affairs Committee.

I am concerned about the manner in which this particular subject is approached. On the one hand we have to be careful and delicate and on the other hand we do need jurisdiction.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment of the gentleman from New York because I believe that the language we have now is as strong as we can get at this particular time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Ms. HOLTZMAN).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I do not have an amendment, but I would like to say that I intend to vote against this legislation. I intend to vote against it for many reasons, particularly so because we now owe \$503 billion. When we started this game of Godfather to all the world, we owed \$4 billion. The interest alone on our debt is as great as the budget was in 1949. There is no way under the Sun that this Nation can possibly grow all the food for the world, provide all the guns for the world, provide all the machinery for the world, and then provide a marketplace for all the world's goods.

We are as poor as any nation we are helping, when we consider the kind of life that we have become accustomed to with our standard of living. If we really want to help some nation that is in eminent danger of collapse, one might suggest that we help the poverty-stricken country of Italy.

We sell this legislation many times