

UNITED STATES

OF AMERICA



U.S. Congress.

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 93^d CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 119—PART 23

SEPTEMBER 11, 1973 TO SEPTEMBER 19, 1973

(PAGES 29103 TO 30560)

ers. Price on LP gas from my supplier increased from 13¢ to 21.4¢ per gal overnight. This is a 65% jump.

My particular experience I give you as a realistic example of the plight of a typical Illinois Hog Confinement farmer producing pork for this nation's consumer. We have the same situation—shortage of LP gas—throughout the State of Illinois.

COMMENT BY LARRY GRAHAM

Due to the ability of the American farmers, the productivity of our land and the technological advances made during the past several decades, we in the United States have enjoyed the luxury of having the best diet in the world, at the best prices in the world. However, during the past year, much of the surplus disappeared and food, so long taken for granted, has captured our national attention. One economic lesson of meat production has been learned by many the hard way—when not enough is produced to meet the demand the price goes up.

In the past pork producers have worked hard to produce better quality meat and have offered it to consumers in plentiful supplies, often at bargain prices. Now, the producers who have weathered the storms of low prices, high costs, disease losses, boycotts, price controls and government regulations, are still trying to produce this needed commodity that has suddenly become so important to the average housewife. However, due to the aforementioned problems, plus a few others, the supply of pork going to market is still not sufficient to meet demand and insure stable prices for either producer or consumer. It stands to reason, therefore, that it is in our national best interest to clear barriers to the production of meat and do everything possible to encourage more supply going to market.

One of the potential barriers to short term production (1973-74) could be a lack of propane gas to heat swine buildings this winter. Many of our members are reporting difficulties in obtaining guaranteed supplies.

There are annually over 11,000,000 hogs produced in Illinois. Of this amount approximately 65% or 7,150,000 are born in a central farrowing facility heated by propane gas during the winter months. Also, nearly 2,000,000 hogs are produced in confinement systems each year, and propane is used as heat for the animals after weaning and until they are ready to go into a finishing building to be fed to market weight. Baby pigs, like our own children, cannot survive in cold weather without heat. The buildings cannot be heated without propane gas. Switching to electrical heating would be so costly and so time consuming as to be out of the question at this time for the 1973-74 season. The loss of heat for even one day would seriously jeopardize the lives of all baby pigs in the building.

Therefore, in view of short supply situation and in view of the sure increase in prices that would follow a cut-back in production, we urge that you take the action that is in the best interest of producer and consumer alike and use the authority available to you to insure adequate supplies of propane gas for pork production this winter.

GOVERNMENT SPYING

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, it is common knowledge that all levels of government spy on citizens. In some cases, of course, these actions are executed within established legal standards and in pursuit of legitimate governmental purposes. But recent events have made clear

that all too often these spying activities are performed without legitimate justification and with little concern for an individual's constitutional rights.

None of us can afford to be insensitive to the grave implications of unjustified and unlawful spying by the Government. It poses a very real danger to the personal freedoms which are the cornerstone of our democratic system.

One man who very much appreciates the dangers of government spying is the junior Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON). He has introduced a joint resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 124, which would establish a Joint Committee of Congress to study government spying and to recommend whatever legislation may be necessary to safeguard an individual's privacy and other constitutional rights. The resolution is now awaiting action by the Judiciary Committee.

The August 1973 issue of the Progressive magazine includes an article by the Senator from Wisconsin, "How To Stop the Snooping," which details the extent of Government spying and the need for action by Congress. The need for congressional action to control government spying is echoed by James Reston in an article, "Government by Outrage," which appeared in the New York Times of Sunday, September 2, 1973. In his article, Mr. Reston also pays tribute to the Senator from Wisconsin and his efforts to have Congress enact appropriate legislation to remedy the problems of government spying.

Both the Reston article and the article by the Senator from Wisconsin deserve close reading by the Members of the Senate and the other readers of the Record.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that both items be printed in the Record.

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

HOW TO STOP THE SNOOPING

(By Senator GAYLORD A. NELSON)

Government snooping poses a threat to freedom, and Congress must move to protect the individual and the nation.

Justice Felix Frankfurter observed some thirty years ago that "the history of liberty has largely been the history of observance of procedural safeguards." As we look beyond the Watergate scandal and view the events of the past few years of American history, it is apparent that procedural safeguards for personal rights of privacy have not been observed. It is equally obvious that the procedural safeguards themselves have been insufficient to resist the increased capability and compulsion of government officials to invade privacy and trample on individual liberty.

The ease with which investigative functions of the agencies of government can rapidly grow into massive, uncontrolled intrusions into the personal and political lives of individuals and organizations certainly predates the Watergate affair and the 1972 Presidential election.

Over the past years the record shows that the U.S. Army went on a binge of unlimited snooping of ordinary citizens within this country. Although these practices of the Army apparently have ceased, dossiers on more than 100,000 law-abiding citizens were

collected and stored in more than 350 record centers throughout the country.

Also on the recent public record, we now know that the FBI engaged in general surveillance of thousands of people who participated in the first Earth Day rally in Washington, D.C., on April 22, 1970.

Statistics published by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts on the extent of government eavesdropping authorized under Title III of the 1968 Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act also reveal the increasing reliance in the past few years on government snooping. Under this authority, court-authorized wiretaps and bugs are on a rapid increase since this procedure was first formalized in 1968. In the five years for which statistics are available, more than 1,623,000 conversations involving 120,000 or so persons have been overheard.

What the Administrative Office figures on Title III taps do not reveal is the number of wiretaps and bugs which are installed without court orders under self-determined and much abused claims of national security. In 1969-1970 at least, the Government has indicated that there were as many unreported warrantless taps as there were taps under court orders. However, these self-justified taps lasted for an average of from almost three to nine times as long as the court-ordered taps and are believed to have monitored tens of thousands of individuals.

Today, with our knowledge of the proliferation of governmental snooping and surveillance, and with our knowledge of uncontrolled, self-initiated government forays into political espionage, several specific issues are paramount:

Who is collecting, storing, and using personal information about individual citizens and organizations in the United States?

How many citizens or organizations, and what kind of information, do these surveillance nets capture?

Under what authority or legitimate need to know is this surveillance conducted and the information collected, stored, and used?

What controls are exerted to assure that constitutional principles of due process and the protection of individual privacy are balanced with society's concerns for its general welfare and security?

Unfortunately, the Congress of the United States, like the general public, cannot answer these questions with any accurate, current, and comprehensive knowledge. Neither is the Congress in a position to obtain the facts of the matter in a complete and effective legislative manner because such comprehensive oversight capability has not been established to review government surveillance and information-gathering activities on a continual and regular basis.

The Constitution and the Bill of Rights established an important and delicate balance between the Government's interests and the interests of the governed. This balance dictates the need for the explicit civil liberty and political freedom of each citizen, as well as the security and welfare of the entire society. While neither the private nor the public interest is exclusive, both are necessary. It is incumbent upon Congress continually to oversee and balance both the citizen's private interest and the nation's interest.

Two centuries ago, the sanctity of the individual's right of privacy in his home and the importance of protection against unlawful invasion of privacy by the Government was argued with magnificent eloquence. The British were having difficulty collecting an excise tax that the Parliament had imposed upon cider. To solve their problem, it was proposed that the tax collectors be given the authority to enforce the cider tax by

entering a man's house without knocking. When this proposal was debated in the House of Lords, William Pitt closed his argument in opposition to this government invasion of privacy by stating:

"The poorest man may, in his cottage, bid defiance to all the forces of the Crown. It may be frail. Its roof may shake. The wind may blow through it. The storm may enter. The rain may enter. But the King of England cannot enter. All his force dares not cross the threshold of that ruined tenement."

Two hundred and seven years after Pitt's stirring affirmation of individual privacy and resistance to the invasion of the home by forces of the Crown, it is necessary to argue the case against the Government's trampling of personal rights with equal fervor. In 1766, the British tax collector sought authority to break into a private home to collect a cider tax; in 1973, agents of Federal, state, and local government act on uncorroborated tips and without warrants, and proceed to batter down the doors of two Collinsville, Illinois, homes and terrorize two law-abiding families in their mistaken frenzy.

Now, in addition to the continuing reality of smashed doors and actual physical invasion of a private home, government forces have a more insidious tool: electronic eyes and ears that need break no doors to steal privileged thoughts and record private deeds.

The surest way to destroy the concept of democratic self-government is to stand idly by while the Government itself abuses the law. The security of the Government is based upon the trust of its people. This trust cannot be compelled; it can only be given freely if our form of government is to survive. If, in a government of laws, it is the government which disregards constitutional principles and legal process, an example is set for every man to flout the law, or withdraw his expression of trust. In both cases, the result is disrespect for a system of law and it points the way to anarchy.

We must move to bring the Government's surveillance and snooping powers under effective Congressional control and review immediately. Therefore, I have introduced legislation creating a Joint Committee of the United States Congress on Individual Rights.

One—This Joint Committee on Individual Rights will be strictly bipartisan. Of its twenty members, the ten Senate members that will be named by the president of the Senate, and the ten House Members that will be named by the speaker of the House of Representatives, will be equally divided between the majority and minority parties.

Two—This Joint Committee on Individual Rights will conduct regular hearings on each and every agency and department of the Government that conducts surveillance or collects, processes, stores, and uses personal information about specific individuals.

Three—At least once each year, officials of the CIA, the FBI, all military surveillance units, and every agency of the Government that conducts personal information operations will appear before the Joint Committee on Individual Rights to testify under oath and provide all relevant books, papers, records, or other documentary evidence so that the Joint Committee on Individual Rights can ascertain the scope of Government surveillance and personal information activities, and determine whether these activities are conducted strictly according to recognized guidelines and with legal and constitutional safeguards.

Four—The Joint Committee on Individual Rights will provide a regular report to both the Senate and the House on at least an annual basis. This report to Congress and the public will contain the findings of the Joint

Committee on Individual Rights on the exact scope and nature of the Federal Government's surveillance and personal information operations. The report will contain the Joint Committee on Individual Rights' recommendations for actions and legislation that will maintain the integrity and confidentiality of personal information on specific individuals, guarantee that surveillance and personal data operations are conducted under strict, identifiable legal and constitutional guidelines, and guarantee that the constitutionally guaranteed rights of our citizens and their privacy are vigorously protected.

This is the moment for bringing the Government's surveillance powers under scrupulous, responsible Congressional control. In addition to maintaining vigilant oversight of the Government's surveillance activities by Congress, it is critically important that the Joint Committee on Individual Rights evaluate the expanding scope of the Government's authority and powers in this area, and make recommendations for tightening the law to prevent abuse.

No one can view the vast dimensions of government snooping at the Federal, state, and local level without being alarmed by the threat this snooping poses to freedom in our society. In my judgment the corrosive and corrupting effect on the delicate fabric of our system is far greater than any possible benefits to society as a whole.

GOVERNMENT BY OUTRAGE

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON.—Personalities keep dominating the news here in the blazing heat of Washington. What's going on between President Nixon and Vice President Agnew? How are they going to deal with one another and with these independent characters like Judge Sirica, Attorney General Elliot Richardson, and Senator Sam Ervin, who keep asking awkward questions?

Washington loves things like this: Is Mr. Nixon mad at Mr. Agnew or is Mr. Agnew sore at Mr. Nixon? And if the President wasn't worried about what the Vice President was about to say or do, why would he hurry back from San Clemente at Mr. Agnew's request?

Well, it is all very intriguing and it takes your mind off the heat momentarily, but it also takes Washington's mind off the things that have to be done about correcting the corruption that is at the base of all these troubles.

Two specific problems, among many others, are ready for action around here, and they may be more important in the long run than what happens to the personalities and the popularity polls.

These are the problems of controlling the practice of spying on personal privacy, which got the President into so much trouble, and the practice of misusing vast government contracts for political or private gain, which is the basis of the criminal investigation of Vice President Agnew.

Aside from the present controversies over bugging and burglarizing the Democrats and using government contracts for political kickbacks, the fact is that, since the last World War, there has developed a very serious national problem in these fields that requires corrective legislation.

The Watergate scandals tell us almost more about the improper invasion of personal privacy in America than most people seem to want to know, but they don't tell us about the things we don't know about this growing system of surreptitious surveillance.

Senator Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin has been howling in protest about this ever since 1967. He has been pointing out that at least 50 different Federal agencies, with more than

20,000 investigators, have been operating in the United States, often on legitimate missions, but often not, and always without effective Congressional supervision or control.

These include agents not only from the F.B.I. or the C.I.A. or the military intelligence services but also from the Post Office, the narcotics bureau of the Treasury, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Internal Revenue Service, the Food and Drug Administration, the State Department and the Civil Service Commission, among many others.

Also, this is occurring at a time when new inventions in the field of electronic surveillance make it much easier to monitor telephones or even to overhear private conversations in private dwellings. In fact, the art of snooping has become so sophisticated that it almost makes you grateful for the clumsiness of the Watergate burglars and of the "so-called" intelligence operators of the Army, who kept dossiers on more than 100,000 American citizens and got caught storing all this information in more than 350 record centers throughout the country.

What has happened here over the last postwar generation is that the scientific capacity to use the arts of wartime espionage on private citizens has greatly expanded while the political capacity to control all this has actually declined.

In much the same way, the Federal Government's power to grant lucrative contracts for highways, government buildings and services, to pick builders, choose consultants, rent office space, finance public housing, university housing, etc., has greatly expanded—precisely at a time when the cost of political campaigning has gone through the roof. The temptations of all this are obvious.

Thus, every watchful mind in this city knows that the problems of illegal political spying and illegal political kickbacks are not limited to Watergate and the current Baltimore investigation. No doubt there was a lot of political fiddling, in the past but the explosion of electronic invention and of government building since World War II has greatly increased the temptations and the consequent need for remedial legislation.

Fortunately, sometimes our main hope in Washington is that these outrages will enable the Government to do sensible things. There is a danger, however, that the personal problems of the President and the Vice President may divert the Congress from acting on the legislation, which is already in committee and as a result of recent scandals could now be passed.

"The natural progress of things," Thomas Jefferson wrote 185 years ago, "is for liberty to yield and government to gain ground." And Mr. Justice Felix Frankfurter observed 30 years ago that "the history of liberty has largely been the history of procedural safeguards."

Well, liberty has been yielding, government has been gaining and the "procedural standards" have been breaking down, but with a little more public outrage on these fundamental issues, it is just possible now that something could be done.

SALUTE TO THE NEW ATTORNEY GENERAL

Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. President, recently the Flint Journal published two thoughtful editorials concerning challenges confronting Attorney General Elliot L. Richardson and some of the steps he has taken since assuming that office. I ask unanimous consent that the two editorials be printed in the Record.