

August 1, 1974

Approved For Release 2005/07/20 : CIA-RDP79-00957A000100040057-4

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — Extensions of Remarks

E 5173

youngest in spirit of any resident of Florida's 13th Congressional District.

Arnold Levien earned this honor, not as we do in Congress because of seniority, not just because of a lifetime of personal accomplishments and creative business development, but primarily because he has targeted his spirit and his energy toward the service of his fellow man.

For all these reasons, it is my privilege to insert in the RECORD, the Arnold Levien Day proclamation of metropolitan Dade County.

A PROCLAMATION

Whereas Arnold Levien has reached the young age of 84 after a full life as a philanthropist, humanitarian and benefactor, and as a good neighbor and friend to all who know him, and

Whereas: During his long span of life, to mention a few of his philanthropies, he was a founder of the Albert Einstein Medical College, is deeply involved in the success of Brandeis University, and in Dade County, is a founder of the Miami Beach Taxpayers Association, and an ardent supporter of the Bascom-Palmer Eye Clinic of Jackson Memorial Hospital, and

Whereas: Arnold Levien has had a leading career as a builder and developer and his four sons, Arthur, Henry, Edward and Robert have followed in his footsteps and have made a tremendous impact on the construction industry in both Dade County and other areas of the United States, and

Whereas: His Alma Mater, Cooper Union College of New York, in recognition of his philanthropies and technical ability, will bestow upon him the special honor of being selected "Alumnus of the Year" on February 17th, 1974.

Now, therefore: Be it resolved that I, John B. Orr, Jr., mayor of metropolitan Dade County, Florida, do hereby proclaim Sunday, February 17, 1974, as "Arnold Levien Day."

In observance thereof, I call upon the people of Metropolitan Dade County to join with me in honoring a man who has assumed many responsibilities successfully for and with his community in mind and who has earned therefore the plaudits of his college.

AMENDMENTS TO THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT LIMITING CIA INTERVENTION IN THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I am offering amendments to the Foreign Assistance Act limiting CIA covert operations which manipulate and intervene in the internal affairs of foreign countries.

I consider the Foreign Assistance Act the natural piece of legislation for attaching these amendments. For there can be no doubt that when the CIA intervenes in the internal affairs of foreign countries, the CIA is usurping Congress' role and responsibility for formulating foreign policy. Such executive abuses of power must now be ended.

In the last couple of months, particular attention has been given to unlawful intervention into this country's domestic affairs, CIA intervention into the

domestic affairs of foreign countries is simply the other side of the coin and deserves equal congressional attention. Such intervention is equally illegal and is a manifestation of the same drive for unchecked power on the part of the executive branch of Government.

This committee should feel a particular obligation to limit CIA activities which intervene in the internal affairs of foreign countries. As reported in the Washington Post on October 21, 1973, CIA Director Colby in hearings on the Chilean coup told me that he would not testify before this committee to specific CIA operations. Yet, it is this committee which formulates foreign policy. If the CIA will not tell us exactly how and in what respects the CIA is influencing foreign policy, this committee's only choice is to prevent the CIA to the extent possible from anyway affecting foreign policy determinations. The CIA now enjoys the best of both worlds. It tells of its intervention in foreign policy only to those Members of Congress either not interested or experienced in formulating foreign policy; on the other hand, it tells those Members interested and experienced in formulating foreign policy that CIA meddling into foreign affairs is none of their business. This clearly cannot continue.

I envision these amendments as only a first step in regaining for the Foreign Affairs Committee power over the CIA's direction of foreign policy. Certainly, full support should be given to that part of the Bolling committee reforms which give the Foreign Affairs Committee some oversight powers in regard to the CIA. Independently, it is also necessary to work for reform which will create a CIA oversight committee which would include members of Foreign Affairs and would have the necessary powers to prevent CIA abuses of its charter.

According to President Truman, whose administration created the CIA, the agency was intended to gather, centralize and analyze intelligence and was never intended to be a "peacetime cloak-and-dagger operation." The National Security Act of 1947 authorizing the CIA gave it permission to engage only in those activities "related to intelligence." Yet, the evidence is clear that the CIA in conjunction with the National Security Council has taken upon itself the role of directing a secret foreign policy distinct from the one authorized by Congress.

Almost from its inception, the CIA has arrogated to itself the power to secretly intervene in the internal affairs of foreign countries. According to a series of articles written collectively by the New York Times correspondents Tom Wicker, Max Frankel, Bud Kenworthy, and John Finney and published in the Times from April 25-28, 1966, in the early 1950's, the CIA funded defeated Chinese Nationalists and encouraged them to raid Communist China. In Guatemala, the article noted that the CIA has admitted that it funded and engineered the revolution against the Communist-oriented President Jacobo Arbenz Guzman. As is well documented, the Bay of Pigs operation was planned by the CIA.

According to the Times, it is now documented that the CIA operated the Philippine campaign against Huk guerrillas. The CIA organized an unsuccessful coup against President Sukarno of Indonesia in 1958. According to Vincent Marchetti's book, "The CIA, the Cult of Intelligence," the CIA spent an excessive amount of energy in hunting down Che Guevera in 1966-67. All of these operations clearly affected this country's foreign policy.

In Chile, according to an April 6, 1973, Washington Post article by Laurence Stern quoting knowledgeable official sources, major intervention by the CIA helped to defeat Allende in the 1964 election for President. The CIA funded trade unions, farmer organizations, student groups, and the media in order to defeat and discredit Allende. According to testimony given before a Senate subcommittee and printed in the October 21, 1973, Washington Post, the CIA earmarked \$400,000 to support anti-Allende news media shortly before the election. In testimony before this committee and printed in the Washington Post, Director Colby refused to say that this money was not spent. The latest CIA manipulative attempt exposed by the press and admitted by the Government was the faking of a letter to Bangkok government by a CIA agent. The agent accredited the letter to a guerilla leader in order to discredit him.

CIA interference in other countries' internal affairs through military assistance has also been egregious and documented. The CIA has now admitted that it armed, trained, and operated an army of Meo tribesmen in Laos during the 1960's. The Times articles on April 25-28, 1966, documented that the CIA supplied pilots, mechanics, and aircraft to the government of Moise Tshombe in the Congo.

CIA involvement in training the military and police forces of other countries has also recently come to light. In Jack Anderson's column of October 8, 1973, he exposed the existence of papers possessed by Senator ABOWREZK which documented that the CIA was training foreign policemen under the auspices of AID in a remote desert camp in Texas. Foreign countries being trained included Chile, Brazil, Guatemala, the Dominican Republic, Bolivia, and Uruguay. The CIA taught these policemen the use of explosives, electric priming, electric firing devices, explosive charges, and booby traps.

That the CIA is still involved in these operations today is evident. A pattern of intervention in the internal affairs of foreign countries has been clear since the creation of the CIA. There is no reason to believe that the CIA has suddenly stopped these activities. Moreover, according to Marchetti, 1,800 CIA agents are still working in the covert activities unit of the CIA—engaged in financing youth, labor, cultural groups, operating clandestine radio propaganda outlets, and conducting large-scale efforts to influence foreign elections. Andrew Hamilton, former program analyst for the National Security Council, reported in the September 1973 edition of the Progressive that according to informed sources the

1971 CIA budget continued at about \$100 million for covert operations in 1971.

Finally, it should be briefly noted that not only is there the abundance of evidence mentioned previously tying the CIA to the formulation of foreign policy, but there is also evidence that some CIA funding comes directly from FAA money. First, there are the police training programs already mentioned. Marchetti reports in his book that AID's Public Safety Division regularly provides cover for CIA operatives all over the world. In addition, the staff of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee revealed that the Loatian war was financed from the budgets of AID and DOD.

These amendments to the Foreign Assistance Act limiting CIA activities offer Congress an opportunity to reassert those powers, which through neglect, have been usurped by the CIA.

LINDY BOGGS COMMENDS CAP TRIO

HON. LINDY BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to extend my heartfelt appreciation and personal commendation to three members of the Polaris Group Civil Air Patrol in Anchorage, Alaska, who recently were honored for their efforts to locate my husband, the former House majority leader, and Congressman Nick Begich, whose plane was lost in a flight over Alaska in 1972.

Receiving the Meritorious Service Award for their part in one of the longest and most intensive searches ever conducted by the Civil Air Patrol were Maj. Dale Jepson, his wife, Capt. Diane Jepson, and 1st Lt. Ralph Thomas. These public servants were among the members of the Polaris Group that participated in 444 sorties in 310 aircraft to make a total of 1,074 flight hours in a search which lasted from October 16 to November 24, 1972.

During that period, I had the distinct pleasure of visiting Merrill Field in Anchorage and meeting with this outstanding threesome. I was keenly impressed by their competence and expertise, and am immensely grateful for the services they have performed. I would like to extend my special gratitude to Captain Jepson who so kindly escorted me throughout Merrill Field during the search period, and allowed my inspection of the equipment used in the probe. She also made available to me numerous files of many earlier, successful searches in the area.

At this time, I would also like to commend Members of Congress, especially those who have belonged or now belong to Civil Air Patrol units, for their recognition of the importance of CAP projects and training programs. Men and women throughout the Nation are involved in various CAP programs, and the services they perform for our citizenry are worthy of our support and approval. It would

behoove us all to continue to conduct our legislative affairs in a manner conducive to maintaining and enhancing our commitment to Civil Air Patrol endeavors. Certainly our entire country will reap the benefits of such action.

KING CAUCUS

HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, during my tenure in this House, there has been a trend toward greater and greater openness—toward fewer executive sessions of committees, toward more clarity in telling the people what their Government is doing.

We are just now in the process of making the executive branch more open to the people's inquiry and study.

Unfortunately, at the same time, an adverse trend back to secrecy has been gaining a foothold in the House—not among all of us, but rather in some Democratic circles. My colleague from Illinois, JOHN B. ANDERSON, wrote about this threat to good government in yesterday's Chicago Tribune. I insert his statement in the Record:

SPEECHES OF RUMOR BY CAUCUS

(By John B. Anderson)

The chief deputyship in the House of Representatives, Rep. John Brademas (D., Ind.), recently advised the nation's governors they should start thinking about the prospect of what he termed "congressional government" in the next two years—a situation in which a House controlled by 300 Democrats (there are now 247) would confront a much-weakened presidency.

If the Democratic prescription for "congressional government" is filed at the polls this fall, this country could well be launched on a backward course to the "New Deal—Great Society" era in terms of domestic policy, a new proliferation of inflationary general grant programs, and a corresponding diminution of "New Federalism" programs of decentralization, including the repeal of federal revenue-sharing with state and local governments. Such legislative directions will predictably be carried by a "veto-proof," Democratic-controlled "congressional government."

But a second consideration is how the Congress itself will change in the manner in which it processes legislation. I think there is cause for serious concern about the potential impact of "congressional government."

In 1885, an obscure professor at Johns Hopkins University, Woodrow Wilson, wrote "Congressional Government: A Study in American Politics." In his book Wilson advocated a Congress patterned after the British parliamentary system: Congressional committees would be composed solely of members of the majority party, subject to strict disciplinary actions if they deviated from the party line.

Perhaps not coincidentally, Wilson's prescription for congressional government came closest to fulfillment during his tenure as President of the United States. Historians record the period 1911-1915 as the era of secret "King Caucus."

Democrats took control of the House in the fall elections of 1910. The new Democratic speaker of the House was Champ Clark of

Missouri, but the real power behind the throne of King Caucus was Oscar Underwood of Alabama, who was both the House majority leader and chairman of the powerful Ways and Means Committee and the party committee which selected members for all House committees.

Underwood exercised his considerable power thru the Democratic caucus in the House which passed resolutions right and left instructing committees on what bills they would and would not consider, and instructing Democratic members how to vote on floor amendments.

History has a way of repeating itself, and we are already beginning to witness the re-emergence of King Caucus in the House today, a development which is bound to be accelerated if the Democrats should control 300 seats in the next Congress.

When the Democrats have only resorted once in recent years to the caucus two-thirds vote rule to bind members' votes on the House floor, they are now employing a more subtle device to restore the iron-grip of King Caucus over the legislative process: issuing binding instructions to Democratic members on committees with respect to legislation under consideration. This procedure, which was used most effectively during the Underwood regime, requires only a majority vote of those present in a caucus.

What this means is that if only a bare quorum or half the total Democratic House membership was present in a caucus, as few as 51 Democrats could constitute a majority vote for the purpose of issuing binding instructions to Democratic members of committees.

The most recent example of King Caucus occurred on May 15 when the caucus, by a voice vote, instructed both the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and the members of the Rules Committee, to make only two Democratic amendments in order to an oil tax bill reported from the Ways and Means Committee.

Because both the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and some Democrats on the Rules Committee are not happy with these instructions and a fierce intra-party battle is now raging as to whether they are binding, the measure has not yet been cleared for floor action, and the American people are being denied the "windfall profits tax" in oil companies which they hold been promised by April.

More of the same can be expected in the next Congress if the Democrats are given their "congressional government" of 300 Democrats in the House. The American people should consider well what this might mean to our representative democracy as we know it.

Finally, one must remember that King Caucus reigns in secrecy, behind closed doors. If the legislative business of the country is permitted to be dictated from behind closed caucus doors, I fear there will be further erosion of confidence in Congress at a time when it is already at one of its lowest points in history.

OLDER AMERICANS COMMUNITY SERVICES EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM IMPLEMENTED AS CONGRESS INTENDED

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the rust of other business may at times

cent. In other words, in that 4-year period gas increased at a rate 150 percent greater than that of the other necessities mentioned in Mobil's statistics. Although this increase does not seem out of line to Mobil, it appears blatantly so to me.

If Mobil is seeking to ward off criticism through advertisements such as these, I wish them the best of luck. Perhaps their money could be spent on more worthwhile undertakings, such as lowering the price of their gasoline.

[Advertisement in the Washington Post by Mobil Oil Co., June 16, 1974]

PRICES IN PERSPECTIVE

You don't need a table like this to remind you that the cost of living has gone up. Still, it's another way of looking at those high gasoline prices you hate to pay.

What the table doesn't say is that average gasoline prices had risen less than 25% over the 1 1/2 years from the spring of 1960 to last fall.

Then came the Arab oil embargo. Crude oil prices skyrocketed. Gasoline prices shot up by 10 to 15c a gallon in a matter of months.

Even over a 14-year span, the gasoline price increase doesn't seem out of line with the price increases of the other familiar items listed above. That doesn't make gasoline prices more palatable, but perhaps it puts them in better perspective.

Average price	1960	1970	1972	Change (percent)
Bacon (1 lb).....	\$0.64	\$0.98	\$1.25	+95
Bread, white (1 lb).....	.20	.21	.34	+70
Cigarettes (1 pk).....	.27	.31	.47	+74
Classified ad (1 line) (New York Times).....	2.30	3.30	4.06	+77
Dental care (1 filling).....	5.00	7.33	8.99	+77
Eggs (1 doz).....	.51	.57	.78	+39
Gasoline, regular (1 gal).....	.31	.36	.54	+74
Hose, women's (1 pr).....	1.52	1.52	1.39	-9
Movie admission (adult).....	.95	1.31	2.16	+127
Roast, rib (1 lb).....	.81	1.12	1.55	+91
Shoes, men's (1 pr).....	15.24	20.40	24.71	+62
Toilet tissue (650 sheet roll).....	.09	.10	.13	+44
Washing machine.....	239.11	226.83	238.19	-1
Vitamins (100 capsules).....	3.16	2.78	2.76	-13
Consumer Price Index (1967=100).....	89	115	144	+62

Sources: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Platt's Gasoline Price Index, N.Y. Times, Tobacco Tax Council. (Prices are latest comparable figures available.)

BICENTENNIAL FOG CLEARING

HON. LINDY BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration Policy Board I would like to comment on James J. Kilpatrick's article in the Washington Star-News June 10, entitled "Bicentennial Fog Clearing."

Since the appointment of John Warner as Administrator of the Bicentennial Administration 4 months ago, there have been definite signs of increased activity and cooperation on a national level, signs which have been long overdue.

John Warner is known to many of us personally here in the Congress as an outstanding public servant who is dedicated to the belief of putting 100 percent of himself into his work. I am pleased that he is at the helm, and I believe that we can all look forward to a constructive, well-run Bicentennial observance, under his direction.

Mr. Speaker, I insert Mr Kilpatrick's article in the Record at this point:

BICENTENNIAL FOG CLEARING

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

John W. Warner, former secretary of the Navy, two months ago took over the helm of the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration. Friends of the bicentennial may wish devoutly, if vainly, that Warner had taken the helm two years ago instead. There is hope that the bicentennial effort at last is gaining momentum.

This observer expresses hope. It is something short of conviction. If Warner manages to pull this effort together, and to achieve a bicentennial observance that appropriately celebrates the past and holds meaning for the future, he will have brought off a miracle of public administration.

When Congress first authorized an official observance of the 200th anniversary of American independence, a bicentennial commission was brought into being. Lyndon Johnson window-dressed the commission with some first-class men and women, and thereafter neglected the body altogether. Richard Nixon treated the commission even more shabbily: He made it a political football and indifferently kicked it around.

By the summer of 1972, just four years before the Great Anniversary, the commission was wholly demoralized. Its chairman could provide no respected leadership. Its director resigned after a management study spoke of his "irritating and insensitive, idiosyncratic behavior." The commission was foundering in politics. The staff lacked any clear sense of direction. In December of 1972, a coldly critical report from the House Judiciary Committee left the ARBC little more than a sinking hulk.

Congress then proceeded to scrap the old commission altogether. In its place, the new American Revolution Bicentennial Administration emerged. The President announced Warner's appointment as director in March, and on April 11 Warner moved into the ARBA's office on Jackson Place. This correspondent found him there last week.

The new skipper is a pipe-smoking, 47-year-old Virginia lawyer, tall, dark-haired, ruggedly handsome. He ought to be playing one of those doctor roles on TV. His first task is to get his new 11-member board in operation. By the end of July, he expects also to have a 25-member advisory council in being. He has drafted Sydney H. Eiges, a top executive of NBC, as his new communications man. He has named James Gregory Barnes as his executive officer. Both appointees, incidentally, are Democrats.

Warner is determined to free the ARBA of its last barnacles of partisan politics. By law the advisory council can have no more than 15 members of the same party. Warner wants both his Republican and Democratic members drawn from a broad public spectrum, and he expects them to work. Their first task may involve passing judgment upon the quality, good taste, and appropriateness of products submitted for ARBA licensing.

The licensing program, not yet publicly announced, is expected to raise several million dollars a year for redistribution to state and local bicentennial committees. The general idea, subject to board approval, is for the ARBA to grant the use of its emblem and its endorsement to manufacturers of

everything from inexpensive souvenirs to costly furniture. Warner has no qualms about industrial participation in the bicentennial observance. He wants everybody to get into the act.

Except for the licensing program, the ARBA itself will operate nothing. Its task, under the new law, is to stimulate and to coordinate the efforts of others—chiefly the 1,500 to 2,000 local activities. He is not much concerned about festivals and fireworks; these, he believes, will pretty much take care of themselves. His larger concern is for a popular, nationwide re-examination of the values of 200 years ago in terms of their application to the century ahead. He wants a "do-it-yourself" bicentennial, with a minimum of governmental guidance and direction.

Not much time remains. Warner is like a destroyer captain, ordered into action before his new ship has filled its crew or secured its hatches. He inherits a scattered convoy and chests of abandoned maps, charts and canceled orders. The decks are awash, but the fog is lifting and the skipper seems to know where he is taking his ship. Those who treasure the last quarter of the 18th Century will pray he brings her into port on time.

TERMINATING MILITARY AID TO CHILE
HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 31, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, today the Foreign Affairs Committee began its markup of the administration's foreign assistance request for fiscal year 1975, a program which includes many provisions with which I have found disfavor. As a result, I intend to offer a series of amendments, in committee, is an effort to correct what I view as some of the program's major deficiencies. Primary among the faults of the administration bill is the military assistance request for the junta in Chile, a request which stands as a nagging reminder of a foreign policy at odds with itself. The proposal for \$21.3 million worth of military assistance grants and sales credits to Chile represents to me an unfortunate continuation of an American policy to influence the internal affairs of Chile, to the detriment of both the Chilean people and the principles of freedom we claim to stand for in the world. For this reason, I intend to offer an amendment which would unconditionally terminate all forms of military assistance to the Chilean junta.

It is with great regret that I note the reports from Santiago in this morning's newspapers that military courts, which have been functioning in Chile since the coup last September, have convicted 60 persons—and handed out four death sentences—for the essentially political offense of belonging to a political party. It is even more distressing to realize that such an occurrence has not been uncommon in post-Allende Chile, as a series before the Subcommittees on Inter-American Affairs and International Organizations and Movements amply documented. However, my purpose here is not

To explore the many-faceted internal repression that the Chilean people face. It is not out of a lack of sympathy, but rather a recognition I sense that the fundamental problem in Chile runs deeper than the violations of civil rights inflicted by the current military leadership, that I focus my remarks on American foreign policy toward Chile.

While some of the basic facts about events leading up to the September 1973 coup remain in doubt, it seems evident from our policies that the United States welcomed the military overthrow of President Allende. Basic economic benefits to Chile have once again begun to flow, after a period of economic estrangement while Allende was President. For example, Public Law 480 commodity sales and grants—essentially a form of economic assistance—totaling \$37 million is planned for fiscal year 1975, compared to only \$2.5 million just 2 years ago. In addition, shortly after the coup, the first major commodity loans extended to Chile in several years, totaling \$52 million were made by several lending institutions.

Both this rapid infusion of economic assistance following the military takeover and the rather deliberate reduction in aid during the Allende period, add up to a policy designed to foster the fall of the democratically elected Allende government.

Even if nothing else were done in our name there, this policy of economic isolation forces on the United States a share of the responsibility for the situation in Chile today.

My major concern, however, is not with changing our economic assistance policy. I do not favor the use of humanitarian aid programs as a political tool against the military junta, just as I did not favor the use of these programs as political leverage against Allende. What is more alarming, it seems to me, is the dramatic increase in U.S. military aid to Chile since the advent of the junta. From a modest \$10 million worth of foreign military sales credits in fiscal year 1972, the administration is now requesting more than double that amount. Furthermore, Chile is now eligible to purchase sophisticated jet aircraft. A grant training program of Chilean military officers continues, as does the presence of an American military assistance advisory group—MAAG—in Santiago. Even to continue military aid at existing levels, in the face of the military coup, indicates a basic insensitivity to the cause-and-effect relationship of our military support in a foreign country and the direction of its government. And to seek large increases in such aid programs reveals a conscious attempt to strengthen and bolster a repressive and illegitimate government.

Some have argued that a conditional cutback of military aid, linked to an improvement in the political situation in Chile, would be the most responsible way for us to exercise a positive influence. While I wholeheartedly support the goals of furthering human rights, such a policy results at best in a wrist slap to the junta, especially when our own administration appears committed to provide military aid regardless of the internal

political situation. Such legislation would only aggregate the perception that Congress can only assert its feelings about critical issues but must, in the end, settle for an administration disregard of these protestations.

I prefer to see the Congress act in a more positive and forceful manner. We must demonstrate to the ruling junta in Chile not only that the United States no longer countenances their internal policies but that we no longer actively support their continued rule of force. A complete and unconditional termination of military aid to Chile would lend veracity to our assertions of freedom and democracy, with resultant positive effects elsewhere in Latin America and the world.

Our "national security" is clearly not dependent upon a continuation of our military aid to Chile. The stability of South America is likewise not kept in balance by the \$21.3 million worth of military aid proposed for Chile. The security of Chile from external attack is not guaranteed by our assistance program, as there is no identifiable external threat. The logical conclusion is that our military aid policies do nothing more than help the junta strengthen its grip on the people of Chile.

THE MILITARY AID PACKAGE

The largest single item requested for Chile for fiscal year 1975 is \$20.5 million in credits for purchases under the Foreign Military Sales Act. This is more than double the credits authorized in fiscal year 1972, and represents a significant increase over the \$15 million in credits extended in fiscal year 1974. Even more important, however, is Chile's recently acquired eligibility to purchase sophisticated jet aircraft. Last June, President Nixon waived the restriction on such sales for five Latin American countries, including Chile. Defense Department reports indicate that Chile is interested in ordering 16, and possibly as many as 36, F-5E aircraft.

Although Congress must authorize the amount of foreign military sales credits extended to Chile, as well as to other countries, it is virtually impossible to control two aspects of U.S. military assistance. The most important of these are direct government-to-government cash sales. No congressional oversight of these arms sales is provided, and reports from DOD indicate that recent sales have included jet trainer aircraft, as well as ammunition and spare parts.

The second significant and uncontrolled source of arms are commercial sales directly from U.S. manufacturers, subject to the grant of an export license by the State Department. We have no way of knowing in advance the extent or nature of these sales. An examination of previous sales, as reported by the State Department, indicates the export to Chile of such items as pistols and revolvers, cartridges and ammunition, and riot control agents.

Another "unreported" component of our military assistance to Chile consists of \$626,500 requested for fiscal year 1975 to fund a 15-man military assistance advisory group—MAAG—an item which

does not appear in the foreign aid authorization bill now before the Congress. As a result of authority derived from a 1926 law, and years of acquiescence by Congress, the supporting funds for MAAG's in Latin America, unlike other countries, are included only in the defense budget. Nevertheless, these military missions perform the basic administrative tasks associated with the grant military assistance and foreign military sales programs currently before the Foreign Affairs Committee. According to the statement of Adm. Thomas Moorer before the Foreign Affairs Committee on May 23, 1973, the chief of each MAAG, in addition to processing military assistance requests, training quotas and sales agreements, "serves as the Secretary of Defense's representative with the Ministry of National Defense and is a high-level adviser to the Military Establishment of the host country." This function was described more succinctly in a State Department position paper submitted last year to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee:

... they promote the sale and use of U.S. military equipment.

The delicacy of undertaking such a relationship with the military junta in Chile has been underscored by the recent visit of Secretary of the Army Howard Calloway to Chile and other Latin American countries. As my colleague, Congressman FRASER, has pointed out, this visit with the military leaders in Chile has led to support and credibility to the military government there. I also feel that the Secretary's contacts with the U.S. MAAG personnel in Chile reassert the unfortunately close relationship among the Defense Department, American military personnel stationed in Chile, and the Chilean military junta.

Personal ties between the militaries of our two countries do not end there. As has been reported previously, six high ranking Chilean military officers are graduates of the U.S. Southern Defense Command School of the Americas, in the Canal Zone. The administration aid request for fiscal 1975 seeks \$800,000 to continue this and other training programs. Last year, 259 Chileans were trained at the Army school; courses for this year will include flying operations, communications, administration, and the studiously open-ended "military techniques and practices."

Several justifications have been offered for this wide variety of military aid, a considerable increase over expenditures before the coup. Whatever logic exists for providing more military assistance to Chile seems to be more than counterbalanced by the detrimental impact of pouring arms and munitions into the hands of a demonstrably repressive military junta.

First, the Defense Department has indicated that aid to Chile is "simply a continuation of the long standing and friendly relationship between the U.S. Armed Forces and their Chilean counterparts, and reflected our mutual security interest and a Chilean preference for continuing this relationship." It is almost unbelievable that the administrator has not been fit to reevaluate that "relationship" in light of the violent

August 1, 1974

overthrow of the democratically elected government of Chile that was engineered by the military. Our very recent experience in Greece during the Cyprus crisis, in which a threatened withdrawal of American military aid was seen as a significant factor in deterring all-out war and fostering reestablishment of civilian government, should have demonstrated that it is no longer consistent with our national interest to blindly ply arms into the hands of military governments.

A related justification for our military assistance to Chile came from Vice Adm. Ray Peet, in hearings of the foreign aid bill before the Foreign Affairs Committee. He said that it was necessary to continue our military assistance programs at the requested level in order to secure U.S. influence with the Chilean regime. This same argument has been posed time and time again, but the payoff never seems to materialize. To gain some minimal foothold in the minds of the military men now running Chile seems a dubiously small benefit compared to the moral and diplomatic cost of supplying those leaders with the tools to strengthen their repressive hold on the Chilean people.

We can send the junta a message. Only if we terminate our military aid to Chile will the junta know we mean to stand behind our calls for internal reform. It would be a more positive influence to withdraw our military aid, to show our fundamental disagreement with the course of events in Chile, than to follow the unproven logic of gaining influence through arms sales.

A third argument that was presented to the committee by Secretary of Defense James Schlesinger during the hearings on this bill holds that a termination of U.S. military assistance to Latin American countries would "simply encourage them to make their military purchases elsewhere. This is inconsistent with a foreign policy which seeks strong regional associations with the nations of Western Hemisphere." Later he states that we ought not "leave the supply of arms largely to those outside this hemisphere." The facts surrounding possible arms sales to Chile from foreign countries clearly refute these assertions. Of the major weapons suppliers besides the United States, none appear as willing as this administration to provide arms to the Chilean junta. The British government announced, on April 10, 1974, a termination of military aid to Chile. No new arms exports were to be licensed, and servicing for already delivered fighters has since been terminated. The new President of France has indicated that his country will seriously reconsider any weapons sales to governments such as Chile's, and the Soviet Union can hardly be expected to arm a right-wing military government. That leaves the United States in the unique position of virtually controlling the supply of available weapons to the Chilean junta. At this time, with little effect on our policy of, in Mr. Schlesinger's words, "seeking strong regional associations," we can drive home to the Chilean junta our displeasure with their policies and assert our termination of military support.

Because of the broadly based nature of the military assistance planned for Chile, it is important to enact an across-the-board termination. Otherwise, commercial sales and cash sales will continue, unregulated by the Congress and reported only after the fact. Otherwise, we will remain an active and not entirely beneficial force in Chile's internal affairs. Otherwise, responsibility for the continued repression of the Chilean people rests partly in our hands.

I include the following:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. — OFFERED BY
MR. HARRINGTON

Page —, after line — insert the following new section:

PROHIBITION OF ASSISTANCE TO CHILE

Sec. 305. Section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(x) All military assistance, all sales of defense articles and services (whether for cash or by credit, guaranty, or any other means), and all licenses with respect to the transportation of arms, ammunitions, and implements of war (including technical data relating thereto) to the Government of Chile under this or any other law shall be prohibited upon the date of enactment of this subsection."

Renumber the following sections in title III accordingly.

MONTHLY NEWSLETTER

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, last week I mailed my monthly newsletter for July 1974 to my constituents in the Fifth Congressional District of North Carolina. In that newsletter I discussed the important topic of campaign finance reform, and I want to share with my colleagues the comments I made.

The comments follow:

MONTHLY NEWSLETTER: JULY 1974

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

For the past year, a major effort of mine has been in studying the many legislative proposals that have been made on campaign reform. On many of these proposals I have asked this basic question: "Does the proposal strengthen the vitality and preserve the integrity of the electoral process?"

Nearly three years ago, I supported the Federal Elections Campaign Act. This proposal was the first campaign reform legislation to be enacted into public law in over forty years. Since that time, events have shown that reform is still needed in this area and I would like to share with you what I consider to be the basic legislative needs, which will give emphasis to further safeguarding our great American political system.

It is my belief that legislation should be enacted which would:

Limit contributions to \$1,000 per election per candidate per individual.

Limit contributions to \$5,000 per election per candidate from a political committee that makes contributions to five or more candidates.

Prohibit secretive earmarking and laundering of funds.

Prohibit a candidate from making expenditures from their personal funds or the personal funds of their immediate family in excess of \$25,000 per election.

Limit expenditures to \$10 million for a candidate for nomination for President and \$20 million in the Presidential general election. In the Senate and the House of Representatives limit expenditures to 5c times the population of the State or \$75,000, whichever is greater.

Prohibit contributions by foreign nationals.

Prohibit contributions in the name of another person.

Prohibit cash contributions in excess of \$100.

Outlaw all "dirty tricks" and provide for stiff penalties.

Provide that each candidate designate a central campaign committee through which he must report all expenditures.

Establish an independent Federal Elections Commission, which would administer and enforce the law.

Increase the penalties for violation of the law.

One proposal that has been made and one to which I strongly object is the public financing of elections. The tax dollars from the American people should not be used to finance political campaigns. It is my belief that such a policy would only undermine our traditional political process. The American way allows for free expression of our political beliefs and I do not think the beleaguered taxpayer wants his hard earned money spent by a candidate he firmly opposes.

AWARD GIVEN TO SGT. ROBERT
JAMES POTIER

HON. JOHN B. BREAUX

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my pride in an individual from my hometown who has received the highest award given by the American National Red Cross, the Red Cross Certificate of Merit.

Sgt. Robert James Potier, of the Crowley City Police Department, was recently called to the scene of an automobile accident involving a 2-year-old boy. Sergeant Potier, who had been trained in first aid, noticed that the child was not breathing and immediately administered mouth-to-mouth artificial respiration and other life supportive measures. In the time it took the ambulance to arrive, the sergeant had been successful in restoring breathing to the child.

According to the official announcement of the award from the American National Red Cross, the attending physician stated:

His (the young boy) survival is directly related to the first aid administered at the scene of the accident.

In our fast pace of life, we sometimes forget the devotion displayed to our fellow men by those who sincerely care and are dedicated to saving and protecting the lives of others.

I join, with Sergeant Potier's family and friends, in expressing gratitude for his actions and pride in his accomplishments and high standard of work.

HEW REVEALS PSRO CONTRACTS AWARDED AMA

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, at the recent American Medical Association convention, the AMA House of Delegates defeated a motion advocating the repeal of the PSRO provision of the Social Security Amendments of 1972. I consider this action exceedingly shortsighted, for it is the private practice of medicine that is most threatened by bureaucracies like PSRO.

It has recently come to my attention that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare awarded a large number of contracts for the development of PSRO's the week of the AMA convention. Whether this is a coincidence or not I cannot say. But I do think that the information ought to be made public so that those who are trying to understand the position of the AMA on this issue can also understand some of the usually unseen operations that a bureaucracy performs.

I include the following article:

HEW REVEALS PSRO CONTRACTS AWARDED AMA AND ITS AFFILIATES THE WEEK OF JUNE 23, 1974

An HEW News Release dated July 19, 1974, and additional data cited in the News Release, revealed the coverage and timing of HEW-PSRO contract awards to AMA and its affiliates.

The Release revealed a \$995,635 award to AMA on June 29 for developing screening criteria for PSRO policing of medical care—and that \$1,453,299 for training of PSRO operatives was awarded an organization representing many foundations set up by components of AMA.

Contracts below are for planning PSROs, except those identified as (SSC) which are for developing "State Support Centers," or (CO) which are Conditional and Operational PSROs.

State, organization, city, and type of contract	Date	Amount
Alabama: Alabama Medical Review, Inc., Montgomery.....	6/28	165,000
Alaska: Alaska PSRO, Anchorage.....	6/25	72,372
Arizona: None.....		
Arkansas: Arkansas Foundation for Medical Care, Fort Smith.....	6/24	65,000
California: United Foundations for Medical Care, San Francisco (SSC).....	6/27	194,335
San Joaquin Area PSRO, Stockton (CO).....	6/27	162,470
East Central Los Angeles PSRO, Los Angeles.....	6/28	78,750
Foundation for Medical Care of Santa Clara County, San Jose.....	6/24	74,000
Hem County Medical Society, Bakersfield.....	6/24	61,800
North Bay PSRO, San Rafael.....	6/24	61,200
Monterey County Medical Society, Salinas.....	6/24	45,485
Organization for PSR of Santa Barbara and San Luis Obispo Counties, Santa Barbara.....	6/28	44,700
Redwood Coast Region PSRO, Santa Rosa.....	6/24	74,500
Riverside County PSRO, Riverside.....	6/24	56,400
San Francisco PSRO, Inc., San Francisco.....	6/28	57,000
PSRO of San Mateo County, San Mateo.....	6/25	62,000
Stamislous Foundation for Medical Care, Modesto.....	6/29	50,242
Ventura Area PSRO, Inc., Ventura.....	6/24	68,590
Colorado: Colorado Foundation for Medical Care, Denver (CO).....	6/28	2,700,000
Connecticut: Connecticut Medical Institute, New Haven (SSC).....	6/28	147,812
Connecticut Area II PSRO, Inc., New Haven.....	6/24	66,000

State, organization, city, and type of contract	Date	Amount	State, organization, city, and type of contract	Date	Amount
Eastern Connecticut PSRO, Inc., Wilburhamatic.....	6/24	\$63,800	New York County Health Services Review Organization, New York City.....	6/24	\$86,332
Hartford County PSRO, Inc., Hartford.....	6/24	50,000	Richmond County Professional Standards Review, Staten Island.....	6/24	55,580
PSRO of Fairfield County, Inc., Bridgeport.....	6/25	58,654	PSRO of Central New York, Inc., Syracuse.....	6/25	54,400
Delaware: Delaware Foundation for Medical Care, Wilmington.....	6/24	45,150	PSRO of Rockland, Nanuet.....	6/25	62,871
Florida: Dade Monroe PSRO, Inc., Miami.....	6/25	73,600	Ironx Medical Services Foundation, Inc., Bronx.....	6/24	79,000
Georgia: None.....			North Carolina: North Carolina Medical Peer Review Foundation, Raleigh (SSC).....	6/29	97,767
Hawaii: Pacific PSRO, Honolulu.....	6/28	77,120	Medmont Medical Foundation, Winston-Salem.....	6/26	46,380
Idaho: Idaho Foundation for Medical Care, Boise.....	6/24	51,201	North Dakota: None.....		
Illinois: Chicago Foundation for Medical Care, Chicago.....	6/28	225,760	Ohio: Medical Advances Institute, Columbus (SSC).....	6/26	134,325
Quad River Foundation for Medical Care, Toluca.....	6/24	46,135	North Area Professional Standards Review Council, Toledo.....	6/25	59,000
Indiana: Indiana Physicians Support Agency, Indianapolis (SSC).....	6/25	195,650	Region X Professional Review Systems, Columbus.....	6/25	55,300
Indiana Area V PSRO, Indianapolis.....	6/24	51,620	Medco Peer Review Inc., Cincinnati.....	6/24	52,850
Colimet Professional Review Organization, Highland.....	6/24	39,200	Physicians' Peer Review Organization, Cleveland.....	6/28	63,000
Iowa: Iowa Foundation for Medical Care, West Des Moines.....	6/24	47,500	Region Six Peer Review Corp., Akron.....	6/24	46,000
Kansas: Kansas Foundation for Medical Care, Topeka.....	6/24	47,560	Western Ohio Foundation for Medical Care, Dayton.....	6/28	44,330
Kentucky: Kentucky Peer Review Organization, Louisville.....	6/24	36,000	Oklahoma: None.....		
Louisiana: None.....			Oregon: Multnomah Foundation for Medical Care, Portland (CO).....	6/27	662,848
Maine: Pine Tree Organization for PSRO, Waterville.....	6/24	71,000	Greater Oregon PSRO, Portland.....	6/24	58,500
Maryland: Maryland Foundation for Health Care, Baltimore (SSC).....	6/26	97,352	Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania Medical Care Foundation, Lemoyne (SSC).....	3/29	243,295
Prince Georges Foundation for Medical Care, Hyattsville (CO).....	6/29	212,458	Allegheny PSRO.....	6/27	38,217
Baltimore City Professional Review Organization, Baltimore.....	6/24	52,555	Central Pennsylvania Area II PSRO, Williamsport.....	6/28	47,175
Central Maryland PSRO, Inc., Timonium.....	6/24	41,000	Eastern Pennsylvania Health Care Foundation, Allentown.....	6/25	65,000
Delmarva Foundation for Medical Care, Salisbury.....	6/24	55,720	Montgomery/Bucks PSRO, Inc., Norristown.....	6/24	54,000
Montgomery Medical Care Foundation, Silver Spring.....	6/24	64,800	PSRO Area XII Executive Committee, Philadelphia.....	6/27	100,000
Southern Maryland PSRO, Inc., Glen Burnie.....	6/24	36,555	Highlands PSRO Corporation, Johnstown.....	6/24	46,500
Massachusetts: Massachusetts Statewide Support Commonwealth Institute of Medicine, Boston (SSC).....	6/29	289,412	Southcentral Pennsylvania PSRO, LeMayne.....	6/25	54,000
Bay State PSRO, Inc., Boston (CO).....	6/28	3,206,680	Southwestern Pennsylvania PSRO, Greensburg.....	6/24	62,500
Charles River Health Care Foundation, Newton Lower Falls (CO).....	6/27	503,420	Rhode Island: Rhode Island PSRO, Inc., Providence.....	6/24	62,000
Central Massachusetts Health Care Foundation, Worcester.....	6/25	64,000	South Carolina Medical Care Foundation, Columbia.....	6/24	60,000
Western Massachusetts PSRO, Springfield.....	6/28	46,150	South Dakota: South Dakota Foundation for Medical Care, Sioux Falls.....	6/24	51,000
Southwestern Massachusetts Professional Standards Review, Middleboro.....	6/24	61,000	Tennessee: Tennessee Foundation for Medical Care, Inc., Nashville (CO).....	6/29	1,626,305
Michigan: Michigan State Medical Society, East Lansing (SSC).....	6/29	100,475	Sibley County Foundation for Medical Care, Memphis.....	6/24	54,000
Genesee Medical Corporation, Flint.....	6/24	36,000	Texas: None.....		
Upper Peninsula Quality Assurance Association, Escanaba.....	6/24	3,300	Utah: Utah PSRO, Salt Lake City (CO).....	6/18	951,495
Minnesota: Foundation for Health Care Evaluation, Minneapolis (CO).....	6/28	886,000	Virginia: Virginia Professional Standards Review Foundation, Charlottesville (SSC).....	6/15	75,727
Professional Services Quality Council of Minnesota, Rochester.....	6/24	66,000	Northern Virginia Foundation for Medical Care, Alexandria.....	6/26	57,875
Mississippi: Mississippi Foundation for Medical Care, Inc., Jackson (CO).....	6/29	1,277,954	Vermont: Vermont PSRO, Rutland.....	6/24	52,400
Missouri: Health Care Foundation of Missouri, Jefferson City (SSC).....	6/25	106,686	Washington: Washington State Medical Association, Seattle.....	6/28	147,480
Central Eastern Missouri Professional Review Committee, St. Louis.....	6/24	61,000	West Virginia: West Virginia Medical Institute, Charleston.....	6/24	48,000
Mid-Missouri Foundation, Jefferson City.....	6/26	64,000	Wisconsin: Wisconsin Professional Review Organization, Madison.....	6/27	90,600
Northwest Missouri PSRO Foundation, Kansas City.....	6/24	49,500	Foundation for Medical Care Evaluation of Southern Wisconsin, Milwaukee.....	6/24	36,355
Southwestern Missouri Foundation for Medical Care, Cape Girardeau.....	6/27	54,440	Wyoming: Wyoming Health Services Co., Inc., Cheyenne (CO).....	6/27	604,502
Montana: None.....			District of Columbia: National Capital Medical Foundation, Inc., Washington, D.C.....	6/24	55,000
Nebraska: Nevada PSRO, Reno.....	6/29	38,200	Puerto Rico: Foundation for Medical Care of Puerto Rico, Santurce.....	6/28	45,280
New Hampshire: New Hampshire Foundation for Medical Care, Concord.....	6/24	56,000			
New Jersey: New Jersey Foundation for Health Care Evaluation, Trenton (SSC).....	6/25	193,060			
Area I—PSRO Region II, Morristown.....	6/27	46,150			
Passaic Valley PSRO.....	6/24	37,000			
Essex Physicians' Review Organization, Inc.....	6/24	54,000			
New Mexico: None.....					
New York: Medical Society of the State of New York Lake Success (SSC).....	6/25	208,596			
Adirondack PSRO, Glens Falls.....	6/24	52,000			
Area 9 PSRO of New York State, Purchase.....	6/24	57,000			
Erie Region PSRO, Inc., Buffalo.....	6/24	67,000			
Five-County Organization for Medical Care and PSR, New Hartford.....	6/24	521,000			
Genesee Region PSRO, Inc., Rochester.....	6/24	77,000			
Kings County Health Care Review Organization, Brooklyn.....	6/24	64,560			
Hudson Physicians Review Organization, Garden City.....	6/28	96,000			

Total type of contracts:	Number	Amount
Planning PSRO's.....	91	\$5,520,694
(CO) Conditionally Operational PSRO's.....	11	13,244,132
(SSC) State Support Center Development.....	13	2,085,492

MUST WE WAGE CHEMICAL WAR?

HON. WAYNE OWENS

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to