

Approved For Release 2005/11/21 : CIA-RDP79-00957A000100060002-2  
S. RES. 419

Approved For Release 2005/11/21 : CIA-RDP79-00957A000100060002-2

25X1

Approved For Release 2005/11/21 : CIA-RDP79-00957A000100060002-2

Approved For Release 2005/11/21 : CIA-RDP79-00957A000100060002-2

*Draft for Baltimore Sun*

*18 Dec 74*

THE NEED FOR NEW LAWS FOR THE INTELLIGENCE AGENCIES OF  
THE GOVERNMENT

By SENATOR CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, JR.

In the 30 years that have passed since the end of World War II, the foreign policy and national security needs of the United States have undergone profound changes, in large measure due to the thawing of the cold war, but in part because of advances made in technology. The new policies of political detente and military parity are partners to changes, military technology and the revolution in communications. All these are evident in the new ways we formulate foreign policy, conduct our affairs abroad, the disposition of our forces, and even in the nature of our weaponry.

It is not surprising, therefore, that there has also been a fundamental change in the nature of the intelligence activities of the United States, both foreign and domestic. The ways that intelligence is collected, analyzed and disseminated have also changed over three decades. Our policy changes have been so profound that there is vital need to examine the entire institutional structure of our government and intelligence activities to see if we are organized to meet these new circumstances. In a corresponding way because of new technology there has been an accompanying change in our intelligence requirements. There has not been a thorough study of the intelligence needs of the United States Government since the 1945 to 1947 period, and the Eberstadt report which led to the National Security Act of 1947, which resulted in the Department of Defense, the National Security Council, a science and technology board and the CIA.

-2-

If the present legislative authority for our two most important intelligence agencies, the CIA and the FBI, which have the dominant roles in foreign and domestic intelligence activities are examined, we will learn that there is no specific statutory authority to engage in covert activities. In the absence of legal authority, there is an obvious necessity for the Congress to write laws to give lawful means for the necessary activities of our intelligence agencies. But in order to write adequate statutory guidelines, Congress must first know what our people want our intelligence agencies to do, and then Congress will be in a position to provide clear guidelines for their activities as well as means for full accountability and oversight.

Although there is no clear legal authority for covert activities, it is evident that over the past 30 years <sup>they</sup> ~~covert~~ activities have been conducted on a large scale. With the exception of failures such as the U-2 or the Bay of Pigs, which occasioned public outcry, the Congress and the people have accepted the fact and the necessity for some covert activities. But in recent years public criticism over the role of the CIA in the Phoenix program in Vietnam, the secret war in Laos, the involvement in the election in Chile, or the use of the FBI and CIA in Watergate, has prompted the Congress to try and do something about the misuse of these agencies.

Since the CIA was established in 1947 there have been over 200 resolutions and other legislative proposals calling for more rigorous control, oversight and curtailment of the activities of the CIA. A lesser number have been drawn up which sought to control the FBI and other intelligence agencies. With a few minor exceptions, all of these proposals have been unsuccessful. The most recent pressures within the Congress for more stringent oversight of the CIA and FBI arising out of Watergate is really only the most

Approved For Release 2005/11/21 : CIA-RDP79-00957A000100060002-2

-3-

contemporary expression for a need that has been manifest for over 25 years -- a need to provide constitutional means to control the activities of our intelligence agencies.

It is my view that there is an urgent necessity to examine in depth to what extent covert activities are required by the United States. There is a need to understand not only the requirements of the United States for these activities, but what systems or procedures for oversight and accountability are required to assure that constitutional guarantees and processes are not abused in the future, as they have on occasion been in the past.

The Truman Administration, which wrote the National Security Act, from the Executive branch's perspective, was intended to prepare the United States to wage a future world war in the most efficient manner should it occur. The stresses that large national security establishments, including CIA and the FBI, as well as the military, might impose on our constitutional government were nowhere evident in the thinking of our leaders in 1947. There was little if any understanding of the erosive effect the new national security arrangements might place upon the Congress, the Courts, and the constitutional rights of all citizens.

The history of the past 30 years has shown that the creations authorized by the National Security Act have severely strained our constitutional system. As a consequence, there is clearly a requirement to revise the basic authorities for our intelligence agencies. But, to what extent, and in what ways, I cannot suggest at this time, nor do I believe that anyone is in an informed position to do so.

- 4 -

It is my opinion that there is far less need for covert activities than a decade ago. The suggestion that covert operations should be separated from intelligence analysis is worthy of serious consideration. The facts and analysis made by our intelligence agencies should be made available, under appropriate conditions to the Congress in order to assist the legislature to better perform its constitutional duties. The Congress must exercise far more rigorous oversight than it has in the past. These are a few of the key questions I believe need full consideration and compel answers.

Because there is a need to better understand what adjustments, revisions, changes, need to be made in our intelligence activities, I have introduced a proposal which would establish a special bipartisan committee of eight members equally divided between the majority and minority parties. To underline the bipartisan nature of the committee there would be co-chairmen, one from each party. The ad hoc committee would have full authority to study, hold hearings and conduct investigations on all aspects of governmental operations, whether secret or public, with respect to all intelligence activities, foreign and domestic. The committee would report the results of its studies and investigations of the operations of the United States Government with respect to domestic and foreign intelligence activities, and the past and future role of such activities of agencies of the Government within the United States and overseas. The committee would make a final report of its findings

and such interim reports as are necessary together with recommendations for new laws and procedures to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

The committee I have proposed follows the pattern of the highly successful record of the Committee on Emergency Powers which in a similar bipartisan fashion has been able to resolve the very difficult problems associated with the states of emergency the United States has been under continuously since 1933. It is my view, shared by Senator Mansfield, the Majority Leader of the Senate, that a bipartisan committee similarly constituted would best be able to address the problem of doing the work necessary to write sound guidelines for the country's intelligence activities.

It is the constitutional duty of the Congress to make the law and through the law to set policy for the Government of the United States. There is an urgent need to bring the requirements of national security within the bounds of constitutional rule. Congress must not fail to make new laws to prevent further abuses of power of the kind committed by the CIA and the FBI in Watergate and on far too many occasions in recent years. Our cherished liberties and freedoms have been attacked by arbitrary exercises of power. We must not let our democracy be overwhelmed by the growing demands of "national security."

93<sup>RD</sup> CONGRESS  
2<sup>D</sup> SESSION

# S. RES. 419

---

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER 4, 1974

Mr. MATTHIAS (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations

---

## RESOLUTION

To establish a Select Committee To Study Governmental Operations With Respect to Intelligence Activities.

1       *Resolved*, That (a) there is established a select com-  
2 mittee of the Senate to be known as the Select Committee  
3 To Study Governmental Operations With Respect to Intelli-  
4 gence Activities (hereafter referred to in this resolution as  
5 the "select committee").

6       (b) The select committee shall be composed of eight  
7 Members of the Senate equally divided between the majority  
8 and minority parties to be appointed by the President of  
9 the Senate.

10       (c) The select committee shall select two cochairmen  
11 from among its members, one from the majority party and



1 one from the minority party. A majority of the members of  
2 the select committee shall constitute a quorum thereof for  
3 the transaction of business, except that the select committee  
4 may fix a lesser number as a quorum for the purpose of  
5 taking testimony. Vacancies in the membership of the select  
6 committee shall not affect the authority of the remaining  
7 members to execute the functions of the select committee.

8 (d) For the purposes of paragraph 6 of rule XXV of  
9 the Standing Rules of the Senate, service of a Senator as  
10 a member or chairman of the select committee shall not be  
11 taken into account.

12 SEC. 2. It shall be the function of the select committee  
13 to conduct a study and investigation with respect to all mat-  
14 ters relating to (1) the operations of the United States Gov-  
15 ernment with respect to domestic and foreign intelligence  
16 activities, and (2) the past effect and future role of such  
17 activities of agencies of the United States Government within  
18 the United States and overseas.

19 SEC. 3. (a) For the purposes of this resolution, the  
20 select committee is authorized in its discretion (1) to make  
21 expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to  
22 employ personnel, (3) to hold hearings, (4) to sit and act  
23 at any time or place during the sessions, recesses, and ad-  
24 journed periods of the Senate, (5) to require, by subpoena or  
25 otherwise, the attendance of witnesses and the production of

1 correspondence, books, papers, and documents, (6) to take  
2 depositions and other testimony, (7) to procure the service  
3 of individual consultants or organizations thereof, in accord-  
4 ance with the provisions of section 202 (i) of the Legislative  
5 Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and (8) with the  
6 prior consent of the Government department or agency con-  
7 cerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to  
8 use on a reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any  
9 such department or agency.

10 (b) The cochairman of the select committee shall preside  
11 over meetings of the select committee, except that (1) in the  
12 absence of one of the cochairman, the other cochairman may  
13 preside, and (2) in the absence of both cochairmen, any  
14 other member of the select committee designated by both co-  
15 chairmen may preside.

16 (c) Either co-chairman of the select committee or any  
17 member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

18 (d) Subpenas authorized by the select committee may  
19 be issued over the signature of either cochairman, or any  
20 other member designated by the cochairmen, and may be  
21 served by any person designated by the cochairman or mem-  
22 ber signing the subpoena.

23 SEC. 4. The select committee shall make a final report  
24 of its findings, with respect to such period together with such  
25 recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the

1 Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than  
2 two years after the date this resolution is agreed. The select  
3 committee may also submit to the Senate such interim re-  
4 ports as it considers appropriate. Upon submission of its final  
5 report, the select committee shall cease to exist.

6 SEC. 5. (a) From the date this resolution is agreed to,  
7 through February 28, 1975, the expenses of the special com-  
8 mittee under this resolution shall not exceed \$325,000, of  
9 which amount not to exceed \$75,000 shall be available for  
10 the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or  
11 organizations thereof, as authorized by section 202 (i) of  
12 the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended.

13 (b) The select committee shall report its findings, to-  
14 gether with such recommendations for legislation as it deems  
15 advisable with respect to the study and investigation for  
16 which expenditures are incurred out of funds made available  
17 under this section, to the Senate at the earliest practicable  
18 date, but not later than February 28, 1975.

19 SEC. 6. Expenses of the select committee under this  
20 resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the  
21 Senate upon vouchers approved by the two co-chairmen  
22 of the select committee.

93<sup>RD</sup> CONGRESS  
2<sup>ND</sup> SESSION

## S. RES. 419

# RESOLUTION

To establish a Select Committee To Study Governmental Operations With Respect to Intelligence Activities.

By Mr. MATHEIAS and Mr. MANSFIELD

OCTOBER 4, 1974

Referred to the Committee on Government Operations

October 4, 1974

services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) The co-chairmen of the select committee shall preside over meetings of the select committee, except that (1) in the absence of one of the co-chairmen, the other co-chairman may preside, and (2) in the absence of both co-chairmen, any other member of the select committee designated by both co-chairmen may preside.

(c) Either co-chairman of the select committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

(d) Subpenas authorized by the select committee may be issued over the signature of either co-chairman, or any other member designated by the co-chairmen, and may be served by any person designated by the co-chairman or member signing the subpoena.

Sec. 4. The select committee shall make a final report of its findings, with respect to such period together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than two years after the date this resolution is agreed. The select committee may also submit to the Senate such interim reports as it considers appropriate. Upon submission of its final report, the select committee shall cease to exist.

Sec. 5. (a) From the date this resolution is agreed to, through February 28, 1975, the expenses of the special committee under this resolution shall not exceed \$325,000, of which amount not to exceed \$75,000 shall be available for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof, as authorized by section 202(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended.

(b) The select committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable with respect to the study and investigation for which expenditures are incurred out of funds made available under this section, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 1975.

Sec. 6. Expenses of the select committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the senate upon vouchers approved by the two-cochairmen of the select committee.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF RESOLUTIONS

##### SENATE RESOLUTION 399

At the request of Mr. ERVIN, the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RUBINOFF) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 399, urging full public access to information regarding the Watergate investigation.

##### SENATE RESOLUTION 418

At the request of Mr. GRIFFIN, the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 418, relating to the need for an increase in the price support for milk.

#### AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED FOR PRINTING

##### BROADCAST LICENSE RENEWAL ACT—H.R. 12993

##### AMENDMENT NO. 1956

(Ordered to be printed and to lie on the table.)

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators TUNNEY, MANSFIELD, HUGH SCOTT, HOLLINGS, COOK, BEALL, HRUSKA, BAYH, YOUNG, ALLEN, STAFFORD, BARTLETT, HUMPHREY, CURTIS, MONDALE, CHILES, and NUNN, I am today

introducing an amendment to H.R. 12993, the Broadcast License Renewal Act, to authorize the Federal Communications Commission to extend the broadcast license term to a maximum of 5 years. A similar amendment was offered on the House floor and was approved overwhelmingly by a vote of 308 to 84.

This amendment is a simple one. At present the maximum license term is 3 years and H.R. 12993, as reported by the Senate Commerce Committee, makes no change in this situation. My amendment merely provides that the FCC shall have the authority to grant and renew broadcast licenses for a term of not to exceed 5 years. Although this amendment will lengthen the maximum license term, it will in no way inhibit the authority of the Commission to grant licenses for a shorter period.

At the outset, the very focus of the Broadcast Renewal Act ought to be made clear. This is a bill which strikes primarily at the heart of a small industry. While there can be little doubt that broadcasting has its giants, the plain fact of the matter is that the mass of the Nation's 8,000 licenses are essentially small businessmen. And unlike other small businessmen in this country their's is a fully regulated industry, imposing on even its smallest outlet a whole range of bureaucratic responsibilities.

Mr. President, the lengthened license term is strongly recommended by the principles of good business. With the addition of 2 years to his license period, broadcasters will have a more reasonable period within which they can plan the financial future of their business. Increasingly heavy capital investments can be amortized over a more reasonable period of time, capital investments that are necessary to improve broadcasting service to the community. This bill recognizes the instability that has developed in the broadcasting industry as a result of the regulatory and judicial events of the last decade, and so will the lengthened license term provide the kind of stability necessary for financial institutions to lend the money for improved technological development of broadcast facilities.

While the renewal burden on the licensee has increased in recent years, a like increase in the workload of the FCC has been quite evident. It is not uncommon for the renewal application to consist of several hundred pages, all of which must be weighed and assessed by the staff of the Commission. While the paperwork burden can undoubtedly be decreased somewhat, it is nonetheless unrealistic to expect it to slacken to any significant degree. Comprehensive filings on all aspects of station operations will continue to be required so that the Commission will have the information it needs to adequately assess whether the licensee is fulfilling its duty to perform for the public interest, convenience, and necessity.

However, if a licensee were required to seek renewal every 5 years, other than every 3 years, a corresponding drop in the work load of the FCC could be expected with a consequently improved review of each individual application. In-

stead of processing 2,800 applications each year, only about 1,700 would need to be submitted and reviewed annually. Instead of an increasingly burdensome process for both applicant and commission, more time and energy could be spent on improving programming in the public interest. This would assure a savings of money and manpower for the taxpayer, yet the FCC would, as I have noted, retain the ability to inquire into problem areas on a continuing basis.

Moreover, permitting a 5-year term for broadcast stations will conform the length of the term to that of other communications services such as common carriers and cable systems.

In sum, Mr. President, with this amendment we reduce the staggering time, paperwork, and personnel costs of the renewal process; we allow more time and talent to be invested in community programming needs; and we improve the FCC's ability to review each individual license application. I urge the Senate's support of this amendment and ask unanimous consent that Senator TUNNEY's separate views in the report of the Commission on commerce on this matter be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the views were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

##### SEPARATE VIEWS OF MR. TUNNEY

The wide dissemination of ideas is crucial to the proper functioning of a democratic society. The Federal Communication Commission with its oversight and licensing powers over the airwaves plays a critical role in this process and must be vigilant in assuring the excellence and public service of the broadcast media.

I believe the license renewal legislation approved by the Senate Commerce Committee has gone far in clarifying the Federal Communications Commission's responsibilities in this area.

With a tightened definition of the F.C.C.'s regulatory role, there should also be consideration of developing more orderly procedures for license renewals.

Since first entering Congress 10 years ago, I have felt that the short three year license renewal period for broadcasting should be extended to five years. As a Congressman, I introduced legislation in 1968 which would have provided for this longer period. A five year renewal period, I believe, would allow the FCC to more carefully scrutinize and review broadcast licenses.

The license renewal process, which at one time was a fairly simple and straightforward procedure, has become extremely complex and time consuming. Enormous amounts of information and filings are now required by the F.C.C. This burden weighs particularly heavily on the many small broadcast stations on which millions of Americans depend for news and public service broadcasting throughout our Nation.

Also, the mountains of paperwork generated by this process have tended to clog the functioning of the FCC. Right now, there are close to one-hundred, thirty contested cases backlogged in the FCC. Some of these cases will take months and possibly years to decide.

A five year renewal period would immediately ease the FCC's burden. It has been estimated that it would reduce the number of applications which the Commission must review from approximately 2,800 a year to about 1,700. This extensive but more limited number of renewals would allow the FCC to focus

October 4, 1974

ance charges—the portion of costs that patients must pay for hospital stays longer than 60 days and for nursing home care after 20 days—would likewise increase by almost 10 percent in 1975.

What this means is that medicare beneficiaries will have to pay \$23 a day instead of the present \$21 a day for the 61st through the 90th day in the hospital, and \$46 a day instead of the present \$42 a day for the 91st through the 150th day in the hospital.

For a post-hospital stay in a nursing home of more than 20 days, the coinsurance would be \$11.50 a day compared to the current cost of \$10.50 per day, as this table indicates:

IMPACT OF RIBICOFF-CLARK LEGISLATION ON MEDICARE COSTS

	Levels for 1975	Proposed levels under Ribicoff-Clark proposal
1st day of hospital deductible	\$92.00	\$84.00
61st to 90th day hospital copayment	23.00	21.00
91st to 150th day hospital copayment	46.00	42.00
Nursing home copayment after 20 days	11.50	10.50

Almost one out of every four aged and disabled medicare beneficiaries is expected to be hospitalized next year, a total of over 5½ million people. We can be sure that the scheduled increase would fall hardest upon the aged and infirm—those individuals who already have been the hardest pressed to bear the burden of inflation.

Because of inflation, many people are being forced to eliminate even those items essential to a minimum standard of living. Older people have to pay a disproportionate amount of their income for essentials like food, fuel, utilities and health care, and these are the very items which have led the ever-increasing consumer price index. If we allow the medicare deductible and copayments to rise, we will increase their suffering.

To avoid that prospect, we must act favorably and expeditiously on this vitally important measure.

This legislation will not cost the taxpayers more money. Neither the wage base nor the payroll tax under social security would have to be increased. The unusually large assets of the hospital trust fund could cover the estimated cost of \$70 million for 1975 without impairing the long-term soundness of the program.

It should also be pointed out that the deductibles and coinsurance costs under medicare have risen tremendously over the past 6 years. At the end of 1968, for example, the hospital deductible was \$40. Currently it is \$84. If we allow the cost to go up to \$92 in 1975, the rate will have risen well over 100 percent.

Especially now, during this time of double-digit inflation, this would be intolerable for all too many of our older citizens. I urge the adoption of this bill.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

S. 3418

At the request of Mr. ERVIN, the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), was added as a cosponsor of S. 3418, to establish a Federal Privacy Board to oversee the gathering and disclosure of information concerning individuals, to provide management systems in Federal agencies, State and local governments,

and other organizations regarding such information, and for other purposes.

S. 3619

At the request of Mr. MATHIAS, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BROCK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3619, a bill to provide for emergency relief for small business concerns in connection with fixed price Government contracts.

S. 3921

At the request of Mr. MOSS, the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EALETON), and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY) were added as cosponsors of S. 3921, a bill to amend title 44, United States Code, to strengthen the authority of the Administrator of General Services with respect to records management by Federal agencies, and for other purposes.

S. 3979

At the request of Mr. MANSFIELD, the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS) were added as cosponsors of S. 3979, a bill to increase the availability of reasonably priced mortgage credit for home purchases.

S. 3985

At the request of Mr. WILLIAMS, the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3985, the Anti-Dog-Fighting Act.

S. 4021

At the request of Mr. HUGH SCOTT (for Mr. DOMINICK), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMINICK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4021, a bill to exclude from the gross income of individuals the interest on an amount of savings not in excess of \$20,000.

S. 4040

At the request of Mr. HARTKE, the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4040, a bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to liberalize the provisions relating to payment of disability and death pension, and dependency and indemnity compensation, to increase income limitations, and for other purposes.

S. 4079

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY), the Senator from California (Mr. TUNNEY), and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS) were added as cosponsors of S. 4079, the Emergency Public Service Employment Act of 1974.

S. 4081

At the request of Mr. HRUSKA, the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. McCURE), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. STAFFORD), and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. TALMADGE) were added as cosponsors of S. 4081, a bill to redesignate November 11 of each year as Veterans Day and to make such day a legal public holiday.

SENATE JOURNAL RESOLUTION 240

At the request of Mr. ERVIN, the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 240, requiring full public access to all facts and the fruits of all investigations relating to Watergate and full public access to all papers, documents, memoranda, tapes, and transcripts during the period January 20, 1969, through August 9, 1974.

SENATE RESOLUTION 419—SUBMISSION OF A RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH A SELECT COMMITTEE TO STUDY GOVERNMENTAL OPERATIONS WITH RESPECT TO INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

(Referred to the Committee on Government Operations.)

Mr. MATHIAS (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD) submitted the following resolution:

S. RES. 419

Resolved, That (a) there is established a select committee of the Senate to be known as the Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities (hereafter referred to in this resolution as the "select committee").

(b) The select committee shall be composed of eight Members of the Senate equally divided between the majority and minority parties to be appointed by the President of the Senate.

(c) The select committee shall select two co-chairmen from among its members, one from the majority party and one from the minority party. A majority of the members of the select committee shall constitute a quorum thereof for the transaction of business, except that the select committee may fix a lesser number as a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony. Vacancies in the membership of the select committee shall not affect the authority of the remaining members to execute the functions of the select committee.

(d) For the purposes of paragraph 6 of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, service of a Senator as a member or chairman of the select committee shall not be taken into account.

Sec. 2. It shall be the function of the select committee to conduct a study and investigation with respect to all matters relating to (1) the operations of the United States Government with respect to domestic and foreign intelligence activities, and (2) the past effect and future role of such activities of agencies of the United States Government within the United States and overseas.

Sec. 3. (a) for the purposes of this resolution, the select committee is authorized in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, (3) to hold hearings, (4) to sit and act at any time or place during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, (5) to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance of witnesses and the production of correspondence, books, papers, and documents, (6) to take depositions and other testimony, (7) to procure the service of individual consultants or organizations thereof, in accordance with the provisions of section 202(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and (8) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable basis the

### ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

Executive Authority  
24-702111

SUBJECT: (Optional)

FROM: EXTENSION NO.

Legislative Counsel

DATE  
20 December 1974

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)	DATE		OFFICER'S INITIALS	COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)
	RECEIVED	FORWARDED		
1. Director	12/20	1/3/75	WCC /1/3	I think you will be interested in this advance copy of an article <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 20px; width: 100%; margin: 5px 0;"></div> resolution to establish a select committee to study Government operations with respect to intelligence activities. He lumps the U-2 and Bay of Pigs failures together as covert activities, not making the distinction that has been recognized elsewhere between operations as such and intelligence collection activities. <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 40px; width: 100%; margin: 5px 0;"></div> George L. Cary Legislative Counsel
2. OLC				
3.				
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				
10.				
11.				
12.				
13.				
14.				
15.				

STAT

25X1

STAT

STAT