

February 21, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H1617

During our discussion of the article, it was obvious that quite a few of the children were following newspaper and TV accounts of the affairs of Mr. Powell, and were quite incensed that a Congressman would so involve himself. Before the discussion was over, these children compiled a "Code of Behavior for Congressmen"—a copy of which is enclosed. I am also sending one to Mr. Stephen Young, one of our Senators.

Respectfully,

Mrs. JOHN FLUKE.

A CODE OF BEHAVIOR FOR CONGRESSMEN (By a Sixth-grade class, Ashland, Ohio)

- I. Congressmen should not convert tax money to their personal use.
- II. Congressmen should attend at least 80% of the sessions of Congress.
- III. Congressmen should not use racism as an issue in considering actions of other members of Congress.
- IV. Congressmen should keep records of tax money spent by them, and their books should be examined regularly.
- V. Congressmen should not have any more special privileges than the people they represent.
- VI. Congressmen should remember the children of the United States are watching them, and should act accordingly.

THE APPEASEMENT OF TYRANTS

(Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. PETTIS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, it will be remembered that almost 4 years ago the U.S. Senate held its first secret session in 20 years to debate the need for emergency action to increase the defenses of the Nation against the danger of nuclear missile attack. It is now known, with technical details still classified, that Senator STROM THURMOND revealed that the Soviet Union had deployed an antimissile complex at Leningrad, leaving the United States behind in the antimissile field. Senator THURMOND pleaded for an additional appropriation for \$196 million to accomplish preproduction engineering on an antimissile system. History now relates that the Senate voted 58 to 16 against THURMOND's proposal.

Today, almost 4 years later, the Defense Department is still debating the pros and cons of the antimissile issue, but a new development has been added. It seems that now we are going to prevail upon the Soviets not to accelerate the antimissile race because of the cost to both nations and in view of the fact that modern technology cannot produce a system which would be adequate enough to prevent the loss of many, many lives, anyway. It is argued that we should persuade the Soviets to relinquish the idea of a massive antimissile defense in keeping with the policy of friendly relations with the Communist countries. If the following article from the Chicago Tribune for today, February 21, 1967, is any indication, the policy of killing the enemy with kindness has been a dangerous waste of time. The subheading of the article states that the Soviet Union is "Not Interested in Pact With U.S."

It well behooves the American public to begin thinking seriously of their per-

sonal security in the light of these developments. It is not too early for them to begin asking questions concerning national security with a view to casting an informed and intelligent vote in the 1968 elections.

I include the article, "All of Soviet Missile Proof, Moscow Says," from the Chicago Tribune of February 21 in the Record at this point:

ALL OF SOVIET MISSILE PROOF, MOSCOW SAYS—NOT INTERESTED IN PACT WITH UNITED STATES

Moscow, February 20.—Military leaders today boasted that the Soviet Union has developed an anti-ballistic missile system that will protect it from enemy attacks.

The boasts were accompanied by further indications that the Kremlin has no interest in President Johnson's proposed United States-Soviet agreement to stop development of anti-ballistic missile systems.

Gen. Pavel F. Battisky, a deputy defense minister, said the anti-aircraft troops he commands "can reliably protect the country territory from an enemy attack by air."

NEVER REACH TARGETS

Gen. Pavel G. Kurochkin, head of the Frunze military academy, said that missiles fired at the Soviet Union would never reach their targets.

"Detecting missiles in time and destroying them in flight is no problem," Kurochkin said in answering questions about the Soviet ABM system.

His remarks at a press conference and Battisky's interview with the official Soviet news agency, Tass, were in anticipation of Thursday's celebration of the 49th anniversary of the Soviet army and navy.

They represented an apparent new confidence about the capacity of Russia to defend itself against missiles armed with nuclear warheads.

WASTE OF BILLIONS

The argument used by Washington has been that the systems would mean wasting billions of dollars on both sides, since despite them intercontinental ballistic missiles could still cause catastrophic destruction.

Premier Alexei N. Kosygin 10 days ago told a London press conference that the Soviet ABM system is "designed not to kill people but to preserve human lives . . . I believe that defense systems, which prevent attack, are not the cause of the arms race, but constitute a factor preventing the death of people."

Kosygin did not explicitly reject the Johnson proposal.

The claim by the generals that enemy missiles would not reach their targets was not limited in any way.

(Mr. REID of New York (at the request of Mr. PETTIS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. REID of New York's remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

NEED TO EXCLUDE FROM INCOME REIMBURSED MOVING EXPENSES

(Mr. SHRIVER (at the request of Mr. PETTIS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to liberalize Federal income tax treatment of reimbursements for moving expenses, and, to pro-

vide a more realistic definition of "moving expenses."

For too long employers and employees have been confused and distressed over the treatment of reimbursed expenses. There is evidence that the Internal Revenue Service has defined "moving expenses" far too narrowly.

It is obvious the real price of moving a family from one city to another to accept employment opportunity includes not just the direct costs of transporting people and goods, but also the expenses of house-hunting trips, temporary living quarters in the new town, commissions to realtors to sell an old home or payments to settle a lease, and many other out-of-pocket expenses.

This legislation provides for the exclusion from gross income of a taxpayer any amounts paid by this employer to cover expenses of moving, and it carefully defines moving expenses to include a realistic coverage of the many costs connected with moving a family from one city to another.

Last year similar legislation was introduced by me and others in the House of Representatives. It met with enthusiastic response from those in management and labor. Following are excerpts of some of the favorable comments which I received from organizations and private citizens concerning this legislation:

"Because of the extreme mobility required by many engineers in industry as well as government service in today's fast moving economy we, as engineers in industry, are vitally interested in the above legislation."

"As one who has moved five times for my company in the past twenty years, I have a personal interest in this bill and know first hand how expensive such moves are in terms of other costs beyond the 'bare bones' cost."

"I have just recently been transferred by my employer and it was quite a shock when I found out that about 95% of the expenses I incurred in relocating are taxable as personal income. I am referring to all the expenses my employer reimburses me for, none of which are costs I would have encountered had I not relocated."

"We understand that you have been one of the sponsors of Moving Expense Legislation which will lessen the burden on a transferred employee. At the present time tight money and qualified labor supply seem to be the leading limitations to industrial growth which is badly needed in Kansas."

Mr. Speaker, the time has come to end the confusion for those citizens whose jobs require frequent moves and for those who may have to move in order to secure employment. This legislation is needed. I urge that early consideration and hearings be scheduled by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

PROPOSED JOINT COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN INFORMATION AND INTELLIGENCE

(Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts (at the request of Mr. PETTIS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to create a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence. This joint resolution is identical to the

H 1618

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

February 21, 1967

one I first introduced in 1964 with two exceptions. The original resolution called for membership to be made up of seven Members of the House and seven Members of the Senate without regard to their membership on other committees. This resolution calls for nine Members from each body, to be selected from the respective Appropriations, Armed Services, and Foreign Affairs Committees. This change is designed to secure the necessary coordination between the national security, foreign policy, and financial aspects of our national intelligence policy.

The second change is in the mandate of the joint committee set out in section 2(a) of the original resolution which required the joint committee to make studies of:

First, the activities of each information and intelligence agency of the United States;

Second, the problems relating to the foreign information and intelligence programs; and

Third, the problems relating to the gathering of information and intelligence affecting the national security, and its coordination and utilization by the various departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States.

I have added a fourth item for the joint committee in this resolution—"the extent to which each information and intelligence agency of the United States is providing financial and/or technical support for nongovernmental institutions, organizations, and individuals for the conduct of activities within the United States and abroad, and the propriety of such support."

The need for charging the joint committee with this additional area of study has been made obvious by the events of the past week. The need for the creation of such a joint committee has been apparent for some time.

The disclosure last year that Michigan State University was operating a police training program for the Diem government in Vietnam with close CIA involvement; the use as a legal defense against slander by a CIA employee the fact of national security considerations; the sponsorship by the CIA of an institute of foreign policy studies at a distinguished university; and now the disclosure that CIA funds were channeled through front foundations to academic, business, and labor institutions have all raised questions about the wisdom of our intelligence policies and operations. It can be argued persuasively that they reflect adversely on the credibility of all U.S. organizations conducting programs abroad, and weaken the confidence of the American people in their universities, their business associations, their labor unions, and their foundations.

It is particularly serious that our universities and colleges and those who study and teach in them have been compromised in the eyes of our own people and in the eyes of the world. We must be sure that we have not reached the unfortunate state of which former University of Chicago President Dr. Robert Hutchins spoke when he said:

What the country needs most of the university, and what only the university can supply, is intellectual leadership. The university could fashion the mind of the age. Now it is the other way around, the demands of the age are fashioning the mind . . . of the university.

I do not think it is appropriate to talk in terms of CIA infiltration of these organizations and institutions. As some of my colleagues have already pointed out, perhaps we have been deficient here in the Congress in failing to provide ample funds for appropriate U.S. representation at international meetings through open channels. Perhaps we have failed to realize that the activities of many of the organizations which have been named in the past several days are sufficiently worthwhile to stand on their own merits, without the taint of secret support.

Nor is it sufficient to talk only in terms of control of intelligence activities. As the excellent series of the New York Times on the CIA pointed out last spring, whatever the institutional forms of control, it is the substance of those controls that is most important. Review of activities without the ability to correct and contribute is meaningless and does not fulfill our responsibilities as a coequal branch of Government.

I am convinced that the Congress must have a continuing and contributory role in the conduct of our intelligence policies. No responsible person would suggest that we can be without intelligence agencies, but they must be an instrument of U.S. foreign policy, not a burden on it.

Many of the specific questions that have been raised not only in the past week, but in the past several years will be put to CIA Director Helms when he appears before the House Foreign Affairs Committee this afternoon. These briefings are worthwhile, but they will not substitute for a joint committee permanently charged with the responsibility to oversee and advise the intelligence community. To those who argue that the Congress is not sufficiently responsible or trustworthy to handle this assignment, I would suggest that many of the errors in judgment that have taken place might have been avoided if the Congress had been consulted.

In my judgment the mandate of the Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence which I propose today is sufficiently broad to deal not only with the present disclosures but with the long term dilemmas of intelligence policy.

Some of the questions we must consider are:

What is the necessary role of secret intelligence gathering agencies in a free and open society?

To what extent should intelligence gathering agencies also engage in operational activities?

Are there limits beyond which a nation's intelligence community should not go regardless of the forms of institutional control?

To what extent should nonintelligence activities of non-governmental organizations, institutions and individuals be

used, wittingly or unwittingly, as tools of the intelligence community?

Mr. Speaker, we have an obligation to deal, as a legislative body, with these problems not just for this crisis but for the long term. I urge early adoption of this resolution and the creation of a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence.

FDA APPROVAL OF FISH PROTEIN CONCENTRATE

(Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts (at the request of Mr. PETTIS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MORSE Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the Food and Drug Administration recently granted approval for the manufacture of a fish protein concentrate which, hopefully, as it is made available to undernourished people in underdeveloped countries, will play an important part in our efforts to help the people in India, in Africa and, in fact, throughout the world.

I am inserting in the Record today an article published Sunday, February 5, outlining much of the historical background of this additive which has occasionally been referred to as "a miracle food." It was written for the Boston Herald by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts, HASTINGS KEITH who, of course, represents the renowned fishing port of New Bedford.

My current interest in fish protein concentrate is prompted by my membership on the Foreign Affairs Committee, for I realize the extraordinary assistance it could give use in improving our "image" in world affairs. But, Mr. Speaker, my interest antedates my membership on that committee and in fact my membership in the Congress of the United States.

I first heard about this extraordinary product during my service as administrative assistant to Senator Saltonstall. Dr. Ezra Levin had written to the Senator protesting FDA's handling of the fish flour petition submitted by his company, the VloBin Corp. VloBin makes other health products besides fish flour and he was afraid to rock the boat too much, fearing petty reprisals in the form of FDA rejection of his other petitions.

Senator Paul Douglas, of Illinois, Dr. Levin's home State, and Senator Saltonstall engaged in the FPC fight with great determination. Neither of them could tolerate unfairness—especially of powerful government agencies to the "little guy." To persuade FDA that the fish protein concentrate was not objectionable—that, in fact, it was less objectionable than some foods currently on the market, Senator Douglas offered snacks on the Senate floor of fried grasshoppers, chocolate-covered ants, and so forth. Shortly after Saltonstall and Douglas became involved our colleagues HASTINGS KEITH and BILL BATES joined in.

KEITH's interest dates back to about 1960 when Charles Lewin, a civic-minded