

S 14298

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 5, 1974

plans, and also a significant departure from an express representation concerning the fair treatment of all religious faiths." 24 F.C.C.2d at 32. The Commission drew the inference that these failures were a "conscious course of conduct", in distinct contrast to the explicitly and continuously fraudulent action at issue in *WOKO*.

United States of America v. Thomas E. McClure, Appellant. No. 71-1048

United States Court of Appeals, District of Columbia Circuit

Argued Sept. 25, 1972.

Decided Nov. 16, 1972.

By a judgment of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, William B. Bryant, Jr., the defendant was convicted of crimes of embezzlement of funds and collateral belonging to a federal credit union and with participation in a fraudulent loan scheme and he appealed. The Court of Appeals held there was no actual prejudice resulting from long delay in prosecution where Government evidence was largely documentary, defendant was furnished in advance of trial with copies of documents and was not surprised by the prosecution since he knew when he was separated from his job with credit union that his actions were under criminal investigation.

Affirmed.

1. Criminal Law—573

Speedy trial clause of Sixth Amendment is activated only when criminal prosecution has begun and extends only to those persons who have been accused in the course of that prosecution. U.S. C.A. Const. Amend. 6.

OUR "WATCHDOG" AGENCIES: THE NEED FOR OVERSIGHT

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, Thomas Jefferson wrote that "the God who gave us life gave us liberty, but today we find our liberties as Americans eroded by an excessively large Government that seems increasingly insensitive to our basic freedoms.

On June 20 the Government Operations Committee completed hearings on a bill I introduced with Senator ERVIN to establish every American's right to keep personal information private and to safeguard that right with criminal and civil protections.

As we draft this vital legislation, we should also begin the long overdue examination of a problem which, though separate, is equally vital to the security of our personal freedoms. We must act now to gain control over the Government's dangerously proliferating police, investigative, and intelligence activities.

In September 1972, Attorney General Kleindienst submitted the First Annual Report to Congress on Federal Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Activities. The report undertook the massive task of analyzing the crime reducing programs of 37 different departments and agencies within the Federal Government. The report was instrumental in describing many of our Federal law enforcement and criminal justice assistance programs, with an emphasis on crime control activities. However the report did not include any of the programs of the Defense Department that relate to intelligence activity, nor did it include the Central Intelligence Agency. It also includes many programs related to crime prevention—for example VISTA programs to assist ex-offenders—which

would not properly be included in a study of Federal police, investigative, or intelligence activities. In addition, the method of presentation of the material, and the fact that it contains incomplete and now dated budget data, make it unwieldy and inappropriate as the basis of congressional overview and oversight activity, though it will be very valuable in providing descriptive background on a great many of the Federal Government's varied law enforcement activities.

A list compiled by the Library of Congress in 1973 showed that over 60 units within the Federal Government are involved in police, investigative, or intelligence work. Information about many of these units remains secret.

On April 9 of this year I requested a further report on Federal Law Enforcement Forces from the Congressional Research Service. The report found that the collective cost of 14 law enforcement groups was over \$1 billion annually. However, the library was not able to include those departments and Federal agencies whose records are not available, even to an agent of Congress.

Though we know the FBI spent \$357 million last year, we do not know the exact expenditures of other massive agencies—the CIA, Army Intelligence, Air Force Intelligence, and the National Security Agency—whose records are cloaked in secrecy. One estimate places the cost of all U.S. police, investigative, and intelligence units at over \$6.2 billion annually.* The exact number of personnel employed remains unknown.

The massive size of our intelligence community, and its duplicative, overlapping nature is exemplified by the membership of the U.S. Intelligence Board, an interdepartmental body representing the major U.S. agencies having information gathering responsibilities. The Board includes members of the CIA, the State Department's division of Intelligence and Research, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency, the Atomic Energy Commission, the FBI, and the intelligence organizations of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

In addition, divisions of domestic agencies such as the Treasury, Agriculture, the Interior, and the Civil Service Commission gather information relating to their employees, and to cases involving criminal violations.

The Government also supports police units such as the Border Patrol, the U.S. Customs Service, and the U.S. Marshals Service, which enforce Federal laws on the domestic and foreign level.

Much of the work carried out by these units is necessary, to be sure. For example, the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs plays a key role in stopping domestic and international drug trafficking. The Customs Service combats smuggling and frauds. Even the Postal Service does investigative work—con-

* The figure is excerpted from *The CIA and the Cult of Intelligence* by Victor Marchetti and John D. Marks, (New York, A. Knopf, 1974), p. 80. On appeal, this information, which is an estimate of the authors, was reinstated in the book, after it had been deleted by Federal District Judge Albert Bryan in May, 1972.

ducting internal audits and postal inspections. The bulk of this work is legitimate and necessary to the national interest. But we have no comprehensive overview of the relationship of these agencies to each other. Moreover, we have shocking examples of abuse.

Information gathering on the domestic level has been coupled with improper intrusions by agencies normally involved in foreign intelligence. The case of the Army's investigation of the political activities of American civilians in Western Europe has been well documented.

The Federal Government units that do police, investigative, and intelligence work are proliferating. We find ourselves threatened by the specter of a "watchdog" Government, breeding a Nation of snoopers.

We are threatened because we do not know the facts about our intelligence community. Billions are appropriated each year, but we do not know enough about which agencies spend this money and what they spend it for.

There is an immediate, urgent need for a comprehensive accounting of the U.S. funds and Federal Government personnel devoted to police, investigative, and intelligence work. Congress is simply not performing the oversight functions our citizens expect of us.

As ranking minority member of the Senate Government Operations Committee, I am requesting the General Accounting Office to conduct a thorough investigation into the capabilities and demands of all units, departments, and agencies in the Federal Government charged with police, investigative and/or intelligence responsibilities. This comprehensive inquiry will attempt objectively to identify those units which receive Federal funds, and it will attempt to break down the annual budgetary requirements of all divisions and subdivisions within them. If the GAO is able to do its job, we will know for the first time the functions of these units, as well as the number of personnel employed or assigned to them.

In implementing this request the GAO will use the reports of the Attorney General and the Library of Congress to which I have referred above. These, in particular the report of the Attorney General, will be an extremely valuable basis from which the GAO can work in gathering, updating, and further quantifying the activities of all the Federal agencies in these fields.

When this basic compilation is completed, our committee can begin the necessary hearings and oversight activity. Our purpose should be to determine what Federal police and related activity is duplicative, what is excessive and unnecessary, what should be abandoned, and to recommend procedures for more adequate congressional control of these units. Particularly, costs can be cut substantially and efficiently greatly increased.

There is a reasonable concern that the disclosure of such organizational information might threaten the national security of the United States. But we cannot allow the cloak of national security to cover up practices abusive to the civil

August 5, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 14297

In one, the entire book or selected article is transmitted at the maximum reception speed of the user's facsimile recorder. Several hundred simultaneous transmissions in time-division multiplex are possible with 6-MHz BCN channels and reasonable recorder speed.

"As an alternative, a soft-copy display can be used. Each page is transmitted and stored at the receiver for reading. When the reader has finished one page, he signals for the next page, and this is transmitted in a small fraction of a second with no perceptible delay. This is another form of time sharing of the broad-band channel.

"To get a feeling for the capacity of a broad-band channel it is of interest to note that in the demonstration described in Reference 5, the entire text of "Gone With the Wind" was transmitted in facsimile over a television microwave circuit in slightly over two minutes."

"If more channels are wanted, a second cable can be laid, and a third, and a fourth..." Smith, *The Wired Nation* 7 (1972). See also Botein, *Access to Cable Television*, 57 *Corn.L.Rev.* 419, 424 (1972); 22 *P. & F. Radio Reg.* 2d 1759, 1981-85 (1971), (Letter from Dean Burch, Chairman, F.C.C., to Subcomm. on Communication of the Senate Comm. on Commerce, p. 1771, August 5, 1971).

"It appears today that economic, not technical, limitations in reality restrict entry into the broadcast market. And as to these, 'the economic barriers to entry into radio broadcasting are... far less restrictive than in the case of media such as newspapers.' Robinson, *supra* note 20, at 88. But of course, the economic basis of scarcity does not yet justify regulation of the content of printed press although anti-trust regulation is accepted, *Associated Press v. United States*, 326 U.S. 1, 65 S.Ct. 1416, 89 L.Ed. 2013 (1945).

"In light of the tremendous potential of cable television as a source of information concerning controversial public issues, and in view of its potential for so increasing access to the broadcast media, it is ironic to note that the FCC activity in this area has been characterized as focused, until recently, on protecting the commercial broadcast systems. See Robinson, *supra* note 20, at 78-83; Smith, *The Wired Nation* 45 et seq., (1972). See generally Botein, *Access to Cable Television*, 57 *Corn.L.Rev.* 419 (1972). Botein, *CATV Regulation: A Jumble of Jurisdiction*, 45 *N.Y.U.L.Rev.* 816 (1970); 79 *Harv.L.Rev.* 368 (1965). There are a wide variety of economic measures which might be taken to promote the ability of groups and individuals to gain access to both wired and printed media. See, e.g., Emerson at 669; Note, *Concepts of the Broadcast Media Under the First Amendment: A Reevaluation and a Proposal*, *supra* note 20.

"Senator Howell stated during the Congressional debates on the Radio Act of 1927:

"Mr. President, to perpetuate in the hands of a comparatively few interests the opportunity of reaching the public by radio and allowing them alone to determine what the public shall and shall not hear is a tremendously dangerous course for Congress to pursue. . . . Are we to consent to the building up of a great publicity vehicle and allow it to be controlled by a few men, and empower those few men to determine what the public shall hear? . . ."

"Facts were brought out before the committee to show that already plans were on foot to buy up and monopolize stations in various areas of the country, and that as high as \$100,000 had been paid for the transfer of a broadcasting license; in fact, if I remember correctly, it was intimated that \$250,000 was paid in one case. If any public question is to be discussed over the radio, if the affirmative is to be offered, the negative should be allowed upon request also, or neither the affirmative nor the negative should be presented." 67 *Cong.Rec.* 12503-12504 (1926).

The Congress did not accept proposed provisions regarding the presentation of public issues. Apparently it was thought that the words "public questions" were so vague as to raise more difficulties than the regulation could solve. *Id.*

"Cronkite, Introduction to Part III: Points of Conflict—Legal Issues Confronting Media Today, 60 *Geo.L.J.* 1001, 1003-04 (1972); Statement of Bill Monroe, Correspondent, NBC News, Before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate, February 2, 1972; Address by Julian Goodman, President, National Broadcasting Company at "Great Issues Forum", University of Southern California, October 11, 1972.

"The effect of government's 'lifted eyebrow' is discussed by both Goodman and Monroe, *supra* note 59. The problem was noted 15 years ago by Mr. Richard Salant in a speech before the National Association of Broadcasters. Salant explained that following CBS's interview in 1957 with Premier Khrushchev, the station was deluged with government criticisms and inquiry.

"This puts us on the spot before we even get started. No matter what the laws may say about immunity from censorship and about our entitlement to the guarantees of the First Amendment there are always the brooding omnipresence that a broadcaster is a licensee and if he is not a licensee, he cannot be a broadcaster."

"We are reminded of this basic dilemma with rather frightening regularity. Time and time again we are called to account by those who have, directly or indirectly, power of life and death over us. Every time we deal in our news or public affairs broadcasts with a public controversy concerning which there are strongly conflicting views, we can at least expect letters from legislators, public officials and private citizens representing important organizations who accuse us of partiality and call on us for an accounting—line by line and second by second."

Speech by Richard Salant, Broadcast Licensees and the Freedom of the Press, before National Association of Broadcasters, 1957.

Professor Harry Kalven, after studying CBS's complete file of FCC complaints covering the period from 1960 to 1964, has said about "regulation by docters":

"Think of the outcry because great daily newspaper were requested by government, and so peremptorily requested, to furnish a justification for printing the views of Walter Lippmann! To answer a letter to be sure, no great burden. But freedom has in no small part depended on awareness of the difference between doing something as a matter of grace and doing it as a matter of obligation. In the end there are two important aspects of the FCC dossier technique. First, it serves to extend the appearance of control far beyond what rulemaking or formal decisions would suggest, and it does so by process which is really not public and which is awkward to challenge. Second, as Mr. Salant has pointed up, it serves to create psychologically an atmosphere of surveillance which is destructive of the morale of a free press."

Comments Goodman,

"A timid broadcaster who has gone through one or two of these experiences may think twice before he tackles a subject of strong controversy—the kind that the public needs most to know about. It is not that he wants to avoid the obligation to be fair. But he knows that where there is controversy, there are advocates who will turn to the FCC, under the umbrella of the Fairness Doctrine, to obtain a broadcasting voice that may bear no relationship to the interest or newsworthiness of their cause. And once they invoke the government process, the broadcaster knows that he must defend himself from second-guessing that will come not from a specialist in journalism, but by a generalist in the government bureaucracy."

Goodman, *supra* note 59.

"Red Lion Broadcasting Co. v. F.C.C. 395 U.S. at 392-394, S.Ct. 1794.

"See Press Freedoms Under Pressure, Report of the Twentieth Century Fund Task Force on the Government and the Press (1972). The experience of CBS News and its documentary, 'The Selling of the Pentagon', is a case in point. The Chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce subpoenaed the president of CBS, directing him to submit 'all film, work prints, outtakes, and sound tape recordings, written scripts and/or transcripts utilized in whole or part by CBS in connection with' the documentary. See also Address by Vice President Agnew, Midwest Regional Republican Committee Meeting, Des Moines, Iowa, Nov. 13, 1969.

Such criticism and inquiries are not limited to one party or one political philosophy. During the 1972 Presidential campaign, charges of political bias have come from all sides. Goodman, *supra* note 59. What this suggests is that the potential to subject the "fairness" theory to political abuse is inherent in the operation of the doctrine.

Professor Emerson clearly expresses the potentially harmful effects of trying to solve the problems of scarcity and access through government policies like the fairness doctrine:

"[A]ny effort to solve the broader problems of a monopoly press by forcing newspapers to cover all 'newsworthy' events and print all viewpoints, under the watchful eyes of petty public officials, is likely to undermine such independence as the press now shows without achieving any real diversity." Emerson at 671.

His conclusion that such efforts will or can work via a vis radio and television is based solely on the argument of tradition—that government is involved with radio and TV so it must be all right. *Id.* at 665, 668. With all respect to Professor Emerson, this is a distinction without a difference.

"See, e.g., *Lamar Life Broadcasting Co.*, 38 F.C.C. 143 (1965), reversed for hearing, *United Church of Christ v. F.C.C.* 123 U.S. App.D.C. 328, 359 F.2d 994 (1966); *Palmetto Broadcasting Co.*, 23 *P. & F. Radio Reg.* 483 (1962), aff'd sub nom. *Robinson v. F.C.C.*, 118 U.S.App.D.C. 144, 334 F.2d 534 (1964); *Trinity Methodist Church v. F. R. C.*, 61 App.D.C. 311, 62 F.2d 850 (1932).

"See, e.g., comment of Senator Howell, *supra* note 58.

"It has been said that the average family has its television turned on for nearly six hours out of every day. National Association of Broadcasters, *Television and the Wired City, A Study of the Implications of a Change in the Mode of Transmission* 113 (1968). Clearly the impact, and audience, of the nightly news is far greater than any one paper or magazine. Furthermore, most Americans are apt to believe a story they get from television or radio over magazines or newspapers. An Extended View of Public Attitudes Toward Television and Other Mass Media 195-197, 1971, A Report by The Roper Organization, Inc. 1971.

"Banzhaf v. F.C.C., *supra* note 19, 132 U.S.App.D.C. at 34-35, 405 F.2d at 1102-1103.

"Cox, Does the FCC Really Do Anything? 11 *J. Broadcasting* 97, 104 (1967); Note, *The Fairness Doctrine and Broadcast License Renewals: Brandywine-Main Line Radio, Inc.*, 71 *Col.L.Rev.* 441, 458 (1971).

"In re The Handling of Public Issues Under the Fairness Doctrine and the Public Interest Standards of the Communications Act, 30 F.C.C.2d 26 (1971).

"329 U.S. 223, 227, 6 S.Ct. 213, 91 L.Ed. 204 (1946).

"Unlike my Brothers, the FCC never characterizes Brandywine's action as 'fraud and deception.' Instead the Commission found 'there was a substantial failure to inform the Commission fully concerning program

August 5, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

S 14299

rights of our citizens, as well as expenditures which are fiscally irresponsible.

A careful, tight definition of national security is needed, but I do not believe that disclosure of certain organizational information about our intelligence community would be harmful to our interests. Rather, such a disclosure would, for the first time, subject that community to comprehensive oversight which is the constitutional mandate of Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the Library of Congress and my letter to the GAO be printed in the Record at this point.

FEDERAL POLICE, INVESTIGATIVE, AND INTELLIGENCE AGENCIES

I. Federal Investigative Agencies; Compiled September, 1973, by the Library of Congress:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Marketing Service (Marketing Services, Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act Fund)
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

Commodity Exchange Authority
Inspector General.
Packers and Stockyards Administration.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Defense Intelligence Agency.
Defense Investigative Service.
National Security Agency.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Inspection and Safety Center.
Inspector General.
Office of Special Investigations.
Security Service.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Criminal Investigation Command
Inspector General.
Military Policy Corps.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Inspector General.
U.S. Marine Corps, Inspector General.
Naval Intelligence Command.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Food and Drug Administration.
Office of Civil Rights.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Assistant Secretary for Equal Opportunity.
Inspector General.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Mines.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division.
Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs.
Federal Bureau of Investigation.
Immigration and Naturalization Service.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Labor-Management Services Administration.
Occupational Safety and Health Administration.
Office of Federal Contract Compliance.
Employment Standards Administration.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Bureau of Intelligence and Research.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard.
Federal Highway Administration.
Federal Railroad Administration.
National Transportation Safety Board.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms.
Bureau of Customs.

Bureau of Accounts.
Internal Revenue Service.
Office of the Comptroller of the Currency.
Secret Service.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION (REGULATION ACTIVITIES, SECURITY INVESTIGATIONS)

CABINET COMMITTEE ON OPPORTUNITIES FOR SPANISH SPEAKING PEOPLE
CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Appeals Examining Office.
Bureau of Personnel Investigations.

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
Assistant Administrator for Enforcement and General Counsel.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Office of Consumer Affairs.
Office of Economic Opportunity.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Field Engineering Bureau.

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
Public Buildings Service.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL
Central Intelligence Agency.

U.S. POSTAL SERVICE

Inspection Service.

PRICE COMMISSION

Now defunct.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION

II. Federal Law Enforcement Forces Compiled April, 1974 by the Library of Congress. "Because of the varied nature of Federal activities it has been necessary over time to establish a number of organizations with protective and law enforcement responsibilities. The following is a brief survey of Federal law enforcement groups currently operating under statute or administrative order. A description of each group's responsibilities and, when possible information on size and budget is included."

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Budget

1973 actual, \$357,516,000; 1974 estimate, \$391,724,000; 1975 estimate, \$435,600,000.

THE DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Budget

Law Enforcement Activity—Criminal Enforcement.
1973 actual, \$59,787,000; 1974 estimate, \$80,383,000; 1975 estimate, \$104,109,000.

BORDER PATROL—IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Budget

1973 actual, \$39,336,000; 1974 estimate, \$42,765,000; 1975 estimate, \$50,908,000.

U.S. MARSHALS SERVICE—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Budget

1973 actual, \$38,112,000; 1974 estimate, \$45,244,000; 1975 estimate, \$52,588,000.

U.S. SECRET SERVICE—DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Budget

1973 actual, \$64,573,000; 1974 estimate, \$66,588,000; 1975 estimate, \$79,500,000.

U.S. CUSTOMS SERVICE—DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Budget

Investigations and Law Enforcement program.

1973 actual, \$53,904,000; 1974 estimate, \$54,343,000; 1975 estimate, \$57,530,000.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Budget

Park Management Program.

1973 actual, \$150,876,000; 1974 estimate, \$187,493,000; 1975 estimate, \$203,976,000.

FEDERAL PROTECTIVE SERVICE—GENERAL SERVICE ADMINISTRATION

Budget

Public Buildings Service.
Buildings Management—Operations and Protection of Government-Owned Space.
1973 actual, \$247,655,000; 1974 estimate, \$266,663,000.

Buildings Management—Rental, Operation and Protection of Leased Space.
1973 actual, \$313,089,000; 1974 estimate, \$362,656,000.

Security and Special Guarding.
1973 actual, \$15,052,000; 1974 estimate, \$15,900,000.

Federal Buildings Fund—Real Property Management and Operations.
1975 estimate, \$417,651,000.

(Protection: 1975 estimate, \$38,000,000).

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Budget

Science Information Exchange—Protection, general Administration, and Support (Salaries and Expenses).
1973 actual, \$7,330,000; 1974 estimate, \$8,240,000; 1975 estimate, \$10,523,000.

National Gallery of Art—Management and Operation (Salaries and Expenses).
1973 actual, \$5,545,000; 1974 estimate, \$6,140,000; 1975 estimate, \$6,631,000.

U.S. POSTAL SERVICE

Budget

Law Enforcement.
1973 actual, \$80,703,000; 1974 estimate, \$94,129,000; 1975 estimate, \$111,129,000.

U.S. CAPITOL POLICE

Budget

Capitol Police General Expenses (Budget Request).
1973, \$236,450; 1974, \$394,295; 1975, \$474,900.

Capitol Police Board (Budget Request).
1973, \$1,009,865; 1974, \$1,214,255; 1975, \$1,214,255.

SUPREME COURT

SKY MARSHALS

OTHER

United States Coast Guard—Department of Transportation.
Federal Aviation Administration—Department of Transportation.
Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia.
Military Police within the Armed Services.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. ELMER B. STAATS,
Comptroller General of the United States,
GAO Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STAATS: As Ranking Minority Member of the Government Operations Com-

S 14300

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 5, 1974

mittee, I am concerned with the apparent proliferation of policing, investigative, and intelligence units within the United States Government. This situation, more than ever before, threatens the basic liberties of Americans.

On April 9 of this year I requested a report on Federal Law Enforcement Forces from the Congressional Research Service. The report found that the collective cost of 14 law enforcement groups was over \$1 billion annually. However, the report did not include those investigative departments and Federal agencies whose records are not available to the Library of Congress. Though we know that the FBI spent \$357 million last year, we do not know the exact expenditures of such massive agencies as the CIA, NSA, DIA, Air Force Intelligence, and Army Intelligence, whose records are cloaked in secrecy. I am alarmed to learn that the cost of all U.S. intelligence units is estimated to be over \$6.2 billion annually.

Another list compiled by the Library of Congress showed that over 60 units in the Federal Government are involved in investigative work. The spectre of proliferating government "watchdog" agencies is a concern for every American citizen.

The facts about our intelligence community have been hidden too long from comprehensive oversight, which is a mandate of the Government Operations Committee. I am therefore requesting that the GAO conduct a thorough investigation into the capabilities and the demands of all units, departments, and agencies in the Federal Government charged with police, investigative, and/or intelligence responsibilities. This comprehensive objective overview is necessary so that the relevant Congressional committees can begin effective oversight work on this critically important, sadly neglected area of government operations.

Your investigation should attempt to identify the following:

- (1) All Federal police, investigative and intelligence units, departments and agencies.
- (2) The annual budgets of such units, departments, and agencies, and a breakdown of the budgetary requirements of all divisions and subdivisions within them.
- (3) Number of personnel employed or assigned to such units, departments, and agencies, and all divisions and subdivisions.
- (4) The functions of all units, departments, and agencies and of their divisions and subdivisions, with particular reference to the covert capabilities of each.

I would appreciate your prompt action on this request.

Sincerely,

CHARLES H. PERCY,
U.S. Senator.

THE TRANSPORTATION BUDGET AND THE COAST GUARD

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, last Friday, during the debate on the appropriations bill for the Department of Transportation, the Coast Guard, the FAA, and other related agencies, the Senate debated and passed an across-the-board cut in the bill by 3½ percent. The amendment passed by a vote of 58 to 15.

During the debate on the floor, I was involved in an Appropriations Committee markup of their Interior Appropriations bill. As a result, I was not able to speak about the effect of this kind of a cut on programs such as the Coast Guard. On Thursday, during debate on the Public Works Appropriations bill, where I serve as the ranking Republican,

I had made quite clear my opposition to these broad across-the-board cuts, using the meat ax instead of the scalpel.

A cut of 3½ percent may not appear large until an examination is made of the Coast Guard budget. As a resident of the Oregon coastal town of Newport, I have a firsthand opportunity to view the Coast Guard at work every time I return home. Anyone who has seen a search and rescue operation knows the kind of unglamorous work that the Coast Guard does every day in saving lives and property along the Oregon Coast. I recall from earlier hearings about how the Coast Guard personnel in Oregon and Washington was working overtime—some very high weekly and monthly totals—because of manpower shortages. To think about cutting funds for this critical phase of Coast Guard operations is to ignore the lifesaving aspect of their work.

Foreign fishing surveillance along our coast by the Coast Guard has not been as effective as some of us would like, and has been hindered by lack of funding. Foreign fleets operate close to Oregon shores, and vacuum up every available fish, ruining the basic fish resource, and threatening the extinction of the Northwest fishery resource. If we cut Coast Guard funding, we risk curtailing this important task even more.

Along with this aspect of Coast Guard activities is the proposed extension of our coast limits to the 200-mile limit. As my colleagues are aware, the United States recently expressed its support for a 200-mile economic zone. If the Coast Guard undertakes to patrol this extended area, its funding would be strained even more. While I would hope that, if this were undertaken, the Coast Guard would seek added funds, it provides an idea of the dimensions of what the Coast Guard is trying to do.

I found out that the Coast Guard plans to spend about \$117 million on its activities in Oregon under the 1975 budget. Some \$9.1 million of this is for operating expenses. These funds are critical for the needs of the Coast Guard in Oregon. For example, about \$1.5 million will be for the new Coast Guard Air Station at North Bend. Having sponsored the amendment while a member of the Commerce Committee, and then working on the appropriations for the funds for construction of this new station, I know that this \$1.5 million is needed along our southern Oregon coast.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I opposed this cut, and I hope the Coast Guard funds are restored in conference.

"LEGEND OF SLEEPY HOLLOW" POSTAGE STAMP

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on October 10, 1974, at Tarrytown, N.Y., the U.S. Postal Service will issue the "Legend of Sleepy Hollow" postage stamp. Washington Irving, the author of this legend, was born in New York City. I am very proud that the stamp will be issued at North Tarrytown, N.Y., the setting of the Sleepy Hollow story, and near Irving's home, "Sunnyside" at Irvington-on-the-

Hudson. This is truly timely, in that the village of North Tarrytown is celebrating its centennial this year.

New Yorkers are proud that this stamp will be issued in our State, and I want to share with my colleagues in the Senate the announcement of this issue by the postal authorities.

I ask unanimous consent to have the announcement printed in the RECORD.

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

LEGEND OF SLEEPY HOLLOW STAMP TO BE ISSUED IN OCTOBER

A colorful new 10-cent U. S. postage stamp based upon one of America's best-known folk tales, Washington Irving's "Legend of Sleepy Hollow," will be issued on October 10, the U. S. Postal Service announced today.

The Sleepy Hollow stamp shows the "Headless Horseman" in pursuit of the timid schoolmaster, Ichabod Crane, with both figures silhouetted against a full moon.

Nationwide distribution will be made in time for the stamps to be used with Halloween cards. Letter carriers deliver large numbers of Halloween cards each year.

The stamp will be issued at North Tarrytown, New York, the setting of the Sleepy Hollow story and near Irving's home, "Sunnyside," at Irvington-on-the-Hudson. The village of North Tarrytown is celebrating its centennial this year.

In the opening paragraph of the story, Irving says "Tarry Town," was so called "we are told, in former days by the good housewives of the adjacent country from the inveterate propensity of their husbands to linger about the village tavern on market days."

The stamp is the sixth in the American Folklore Series, which began with the issuance of the Johnny Appleseed stamp in 1966. Other Folklore Series subjects were Davy Crockett in 1967, Daniel Boone in 1968, Grandma Moses in 1969 and Tom Sawyer in 1972.

Leonard Everett Fisher of Westport, Connecticut, designed the Sleepy Hollow stamp. Mr. Fisher also designed the 1972 Bicentennial block of four Colonial Craftsmen stamps. He is well known for illustrating books on colonial crafts and craftsmen.

The two riders on the stamp are shown passing under the menacing tulip tree which figured in ghost stories Ichabod Crane had heard in Tarrytown.

The tree and the figures are in black accented with blue. The moon is bright orange. At the lower left in yellow appear "10c" over "US" and, across the bottom in orange is "Legend of Sleepy Hollow."

Washington Irving, who was born 1783 at New York City, was an essayist, historian and writer of short stories. He was the representative of the polite and imitative tradition in American letters rather than the vigorous pioneer spirit which typified the writings of other American authors like James Fenimore Cooper.

At 17, Irving voyaged up the Hudson River, and the new and wild country had a witching effect upon his young imagination which was to bear fruit in later years as the charming stories he wrote of the region.

"The Legend of Sleepy Hollow" appeared in The Sketch Book, a collection of tales which Irving wrote under the pseudonym Geoffrey Crayon, Gent. His deft and whimsical humor and polished style made the work immediately popular on both sides of the Atlantic. The Sketch Book also contained "Rip Van Winkle," probably Irving's best known story.

The Sleepy Hollow stamps will be printed by offset and Giori presses. The offset colors